

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

Summer 2012

## A country in need of American instruction : The U.S. mission to shape and transform Mexico, 1848-1911

Michael Allen Ridge Jr.  
*University of Iowa*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Copyright 2012 Michael Allen Ridge Jr.

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/3376>

---

### Recommended Citation

Ridge, Michael Allen Jr.. "A country in need of American instruction : The U.S. mission to shape and transform Mexico, 1848-1911." PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 2012.  
<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.2yk23ymf>

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

A COUNTRY IN NEED OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTION: THE U.S. MISSION TO  
SHAPE AND TRANSFORM MEXICO, 1848-1911

by  
Michael Allen Ridge Jr.

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the Doctor of  
Philosophy degree in History  
in the Graduate College of  
The University of Iowa

July 2012

Thesis Supervisor: Associate Professor Michaela Hoenicke-Moore  
Associate Professor Michel Gobat

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines U.S. views of Mexico from the end of the U.S.-Mexico War in 1848, to the end of the first phase of the Mexican Revolution in May 1911. During this period numerous Americans saw Mexico as a laboratory to test their ability to transform a country seemingly in need of guidance. Americans, however, struggled to define the role of the United States: whether it was solely to be a model for other nations to follow, or whether Americans should be actively involved in this process. In the years after the U.S. Civil War, a diverse group of Americans, especially missionaries, investors, and working-class activists, saw Mexico as a nation in need of change and sought to affect its transformation through the means of informal imperialism. Yet they vigorously disagreed whether this transformation should occur in religious, political, economic or social terms. Despite these differences, they all believed that Mexico could be reshaped in the image of the United States. Their views thus provided a powerful counter-narrative to persistent U.S. images of the Mexican people as irredeemable because of allegedly inherent inferiorities based on race, religion or culture.

The dissertation also examines the role of Mexican actors in attracting, resisting and altering U.S. informal imperialism. These Mexican actors included government officials who petitioned for U.S. assistance during the French Intervention (1862-67) and the Porfiriato (1876-1911); dissident Catholic priests who requested aid for the fledgling Protestant movement in Mexico; and Mexican liberal exiles from the repressive Díaz regime, who sought U.S. support in bringing a democratic government to Mexico.

More generally this dissertation challenges scholarly assessments of the United States as an isolationist nation during the mid-to-late nineteenth century, before the embrace of formal empire after the War of 1898. Though different groups of Americans would come to divergent conclusions about the foreign policy of the United States, a close analysis of U.S. efforts to reshape Mexico reveals an outward-looking and internationalist public that took seriously its self-image as a nation destined to transform the world.

Abstract Approved: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Thesis Supervisor  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title and Department  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Thesis Supervisor  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title and Department  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

A COUNTRY IN NEED OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTION: THE U.S. MISSION TO  
SHAPE AND TRANSFORM MEXICO, 1848-1911

by  
Michael Allen Ridge Jr.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the Doctor of  
Philosophy degree in History  
in the Graduate College of  
The University of Iowa

July 2012

Thesis Supervisors: Associate Professor Michaela Hoenicke-Moore  
Associate Professor Michel Gobat

Copyright by  
MICHAEL ALLEN RIDGE JR.  
2012  
All Rights Reserved

Graduate College  
The University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

---

PH.D. THESIS

---

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Michael Allen Ridge Jr.

has been approved by the Examining Committee  
for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy  
degree in History at the July 2012 graduation.

Thesis Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michaela Hoenicke-Moore, Thesis Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michel Gobat, Thesis Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Omar Valerio-Jimenez

\_\_\_\_\_  
Colin Gordon

\_\_\_\_\_  
Claire F. Fox

To my family and friends.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of the dissertation committee for their time and for their suggestions for revising this manuscript. I would like to thank professors Michaela Hoenicke-Moore, and Michel Gobat for serving as my thesis co-advisors, for reading numerous drafts of my work, and for providing valuable advice on this project. Likewise I would like to thank professors Omar Valerio-Jimenez, and Colin Gordon for serving on my committee, and providing valuable feedback, as well as serving on previous comps and prospectus committees. Thanks also to professor Claire Fox, for agreeing to serve on my dissertation at what was almost the last moment, and providing me with helpful suggestions.

I am grateful to the History Department and the Graduate College for awarding me the Jonathan Walton Fellowship, in conjunction with the Dean's Graduate Fellowship program. I would also like to thank the History Department for the opportunity to serve as a teaching assistant and graduate instructor for most of my years in the program, and especially for the opportunity to develop and design my own Issues courses. Likewise I am grateful to the History Department for the Laurence Lafore Fellowship, and the Lawrence Gelfand Fellowship which allowed me to conduct research in Washington D.C. and throughout the United States these past two summers. I would also like to extend a special thanks to the staff of the History Department, who served during my graduate years- Mary Strottman, Jean Aikin, Pat Goodwin, Barb Robb, and Sheri Sojka- who have provided me valuable assistance throughout my time at Iowa.

I also want to thank my family for their support through my years of graduate school. I am especially grateful to my parents Michael and Delia Ridge who encouraged me in my graduate studies and filled my visits home with numerous fishing trips,

journeys to used book stores, and delicious home-cooked meals. I would also like to thank my sister, Rebecca, and my brother-in-law Kevin for their encouragement, and for being gracious hosts on my visits to Oklahoma. Lastly I would like to thank my brother Stephen for allowing me to stay with him for several weeks these past few summers as I did research in Washington DC, and for introducing me to tourist sites around the DC and Baltimore areas.

I would like to thank my History Department colleagues who have commented on my work-in-progress, discussed scholarship and teaching, and have made life as a graduate student more enjoyable. Special acknowledgement should be given to Meghan Warner-Mettler, Court Weck, Valerie Vistain, Katherine Massouth, Matthew Conn, Josh Cochran, Sandra Lucia Castañeda, Gordie Lamb and Wilson Juárez.

I am grateful that I have had a close group of friends in the Latino community at the university, especially through the Latina/o Graduate Student Association. This organization allowed us to form a community in Iowa while we were away from our families, and for many of us, hundreds, if not thousands of miles, from our hometowns. I especially want to acknowledge Karla Alvarez, Leo Rodríguez, Ana Campos-Holland, Ian Holland, Amy Jo Marcano-Reik, Christina Bejarano, Rachel Casas, Celeste Campos-Castillo, Juan Castillo, Jackie Leung, Lorraine Gonzales-Montemayor and Rachel Carlson.

I was also privileged to serve in the Graduate Student Senate, as well as the Executive Council of Graduate and Professional Students, where I built close friendships. I especially want to acknowledge Tim Paschkewitz, Kristina Danielle Rogers, Meggie Aube, Janelle Beadle, Kim Lamon-Loperfido, James Skretta, and Steven Wieland.

I would like to send a special shout-out to the members of the Grill Crew (and affiliated members) who have provided distractions when I needed them, and moral support through my last years of graduate school: Zeferino Gomez, Lisa Lavadie-Gomez, Tim Gupton, Saurav Pandit, Matt Gibson, Drew McNeeley, and Natasha Altema-McNeeley. I would also like to send a special thank you to Samantha Cumley, who was always willing to listen to my problems, and give me sage advice, which I should have taken more often. Lastly I am also greatly indebted to Zef, Lisa, the boys and CC who have been like a second family to me during my time in Iowa City. I will miss you all.

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines U.S. views of Mexico from the end of the U.S.-Mexico War in 1848, to the end of the first phase of the Mexican Revolution in May 1911. During this period numerous Americans saw Mexico as a laboratory to test their ability to transform a country seemingly in need of guidance. Americans, however, struggled to define the role of the United States: whether it was solely to be a model for other nations to follow, or whether Americans should be actively involved in this process. In the years after the U.S. Civil War, a diverse group of Americans, especially missionaries, investors, and working-class activists, saw Mexico as a nation in need of change and sought to affect its transformation through the means of informal imperialism. Yet they vigorously disagreed whether this transformation should occur in religious, political, economic or social terms. Despite these differences, they all believed that Mexico could be reshaped in the image of the United States. Their views thus provided a powerful counter-narrative to persistent U.S. images of the Mexican people as irredeemable because of allegedly inherent inferiorities based on race, religion or culture.

The dissertation also examines the role of Mexican actors in attracting, resisting and altering U.S. informal imperialism. These Mexican actors included government officials who petitioned for U.S. assistance during the French Intervention (1862-67) and the Porfiriato (1876-1911); dissident Catholic priests who requested aid for the fledgling Protestant movement in Mexico; and Mexican liberal exiles from the repressive Díaz regime, who sought U.S. support in bringing a democratic government to Mexico.

More generally this dissertation challenges scholarly assessments of the United States as an isolationist nation during the mid-to-late nineteenth century, before the

embrace of formal empire after the War of 1898. Though different groups of Americans would come to divergent conclusions about the foreign policy of the United States, a close analysis of U.S. efforts to reshape Mexico reveals an outward-looking and internationalist public that took seriously its self-image as a nation destined to transform the world.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
The Mission to Mexico .....	7
U.S. Images of Mexico and the Mexican People.....	16
Organization.....	23
CHAPTER ONE: U.S. VIEWS OF THE WARS OF THE REFORM AND FRENCH INTERVENTION 1846-1867 .....	28
Protestantism and Republicanism .....	29
The U.S. War with Mexico .....	38
La Reforma .....	46
The French Intervention.....	69
Aftermath of the French Intervention .....	91
Conclusion .....	97
CHAPTER TWO: THE U.S. MISSIONARY MISSION TO MEXICO, 1848-1911 .....	99
Domestic and Foreign Missionary Efforts Aimed at Catholics .....	102
The “Reformation” in Mexico .....	114
U.S. Missions in Mexico after the French Intervention.....	130
Mexican Responses to U.S. Missionaries in Mexico.....	142
Conclusion: Conflicting “Missions” in Mexico.....	160
CHAPTER THREE: THE “MODEL REPUBLIC” CONFRONTS FEARS OF THE “MEXICANIZATION” OF THE UNITED STATES, 1861-1880 .....	170
The U.S. Civil War Threatens the “Model Republic” .....	174
U.S. Views of Mexico during the Restored Republic.....	186
U.S. Reconstruction and Fears of Conspiracy .....	194
The Disputed Election of 1876 .....	198
The Potter Committee and Fears of “Mexicanization” .....	208
Conclusion .....	216
CHAPTER FOUR: THE BEGINNINGS OF U.S. ECONOMIC EXPANSION INTO MEXICO, 1876-1882 .....	219
Mexican Revolts and Border Raids .....	221
Mexican Appeals for U.S. Capital .....	235
U.S. Responses to Mexican Promotion.....	246
Conclusion .....	266
CHAPTER FIVE: THE DÍAZ LEGEND AND U.S. MISSION TO MEXICO, 1883-1906.....	271

U.S. Capital and Mexican Railroads.....	275
Mexican Promotion and U.S. Trade with Mexico .....	286
The “Firm Hand” of Porfirio Díaz .....	296
U.S. Assessments of Mexican Progress .....	315
Díaz and U.S. Intervention in Latin America and the Philippines.....	337
Conclusion .....	345
CHAPTER SIX: THE LEFTIST AND LABOR CHALLENGE TO U.S.	
ECONOMIC EXPANSION INTO MEXICO, 1906-1911 .....	348
Responses to Mexican Capitalist Development.....	349
The PLM and Strikes at Cananea and Rio Blanco.....	356
Mexican Refugees in the United States .....	372
Working Class Criticisms Enter the Mainstream Discourse.....	389
The Coming of the Mexican Revolution .....	416
Conclusion .....	429
CONCLUSION.....	431
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	442

## INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines U.S. responses to and views of Mexico from the end of the U.S.-Mexico War in 1848 to the fall of the Porfirio Díaz dictatorship in May 1911 during the Mexican Revolution. My research is driven by two overarching themes- U.S. changing perceptions of Mexico, based on U.S. analysis of religious, cultural, and racial images of the Mexican people; and U.S. actions to fulfill its self-imposed mission to Mexico. Throughout this work I argue that these themes were related and mutually reinforcing, since understanding U.S. perceptions is key to understanding what Americans thought needed to be changed, how they went about changing it, and how they perceived their successes and failures in achieving their mission to Mexico.<sup>1</sup>

Drawing on a diverse range of U.S. primary sources ranging from newspapers and magazines to government documents, travel journals, and popular books, I argue that various groups of Americans saw Mexico as a laboratory to test their ability to transform a country seemingly in need of guidance. While some Americans considered U.S. republicanism to be unique and nontransferable, many more believed that the United States had a mission to transform the world in its image. However during the mid-to-late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Americans were deeply divided on religious, cultural, political, economic and diplomatic issues. Since Americans did not agree on

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this dissertation I use the term “American” to describe the United States or U.S. citizens though I recognize that there is some disagreement over the use of this term to signify only those from the United States, as opposed to all the inhabitants of the Americas.



what the United States was, or should become, they differed on how a reshaped Mexico in the U.S. image would appear.

This dissertation challenges scholarly assessments of the United States as an isolationist nation during the mid-to-late nineteenth century, before the embrace of formal empire after the War of 1898. Though different groups of Americans would come to divergent conclusions about the foreign policy of the United States, a close analysis of U.S. efforts to reshape Mexico reveals an outward-looking and internationalist public that took seriously its self-image as a nation destined to transform the world.

During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Americans struggled to define the role of the United States in the wider world, whether it was solely to be an example for other nations to follow, or whether Americans should be actively involved in this process. Historian Edward P. Crapol has argued that “coming to terms” with American empire and U.S. imperial history is the key to understanding the U.S. role in the world from the end of the Civil War to the end of the nineteenth century even before the advent of formal empire after 1898.<sup>2</sup> A focus beyond official agents of the state, and state actions in the form of wars, military alliances, and territorial expansion, and by looking at private nonstate actors, reveals a wider engagement with the outside world in the cultural, economic and social spheres.<sup>3</sup> In the years after the U.S. Civil War, a diverse

---

<sup>2</sup> Edward P. Crapol, “Coming to Terms with Empire: The Historiography of Late Nineteenth-Century American Foreign Relations,” *Paths to Power: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations to 1941*, ed. Michael J. Hogan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 95.

<sup>3</sup> Michael J. Hogan, “The ‘Next Big Thing’: The Future of Diplomatic History in a Global Age,” *Diplomatic History* 28:1 (January 2004): 1-21; Thomas Alan Schwartz, “Explaining the Cultural Turn-or Detour?” *Diplomatic History* 31:1 (January 2007): 143-147; Robert Griffith, “The Cultural Turn in Cold War Studies,” *Reviews in American*

group of Americans, especially missionaries, investors, and working-class activists, saw Mexico as a nation in need of change and sought to affect a transformation through the means of what has been described as informal imperialism, or informal empire.<sup>4</sup>

Building on the work of historians of U.S. economic, diplomatic and cultural foreign relations, I define “informal empire,” and “informal imperialism” as a situation where a stronger nation, in this case the United States, “imposes” or seeks to impose control over a weaker nation or group of people.<sup>5</sup> This control could be compelled either

---

*History* 29:1 (2001): 150-157. While there remain several definitions of the term “culture,” Michael J. Hogan and Thomas J. Patterson, writing about the intersection between diplomatic history and culture, has described it as a “system of symbols and meanings, including language, emotions, values, and myths that are embedded in everyday life.” Historians of U.S. in world affairs have often used culture to analyze power by looking at how U.S. officials have used language and symbols in an attempt to build consensus throughout the various stages of U.S. foreign policy. Practitioners of the new cultural-based diplomatic history have focused on how race, gender, sexuality, religion, family, and ideology shape the worldview of American policymakers and the decisions that they make.

<sup>4</sup> For discussions of the U.S. informal empire in Mexico and Latin America during this period see John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002); Alan Knight, “U.S. Imperialism/Hegemony and Latin American Resistance,” *Empire and Dissent: The United States and Latin America* ed. Fred Rosen (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2008), 24-52; Mark T. Gilderhus, “Forming an Informal Empire without Colonies: U.S.-Latin American Relations,” *Latin American Research Review* 40:3 (October 2005): 312-325; Matthew E.S. Butler, “Railroads, Commodities, and Informal Empire in Latin American History,” *Latin American Politics & Society* 53:1 (Spring 2011): 157-168.

<sup>5</sup> Joseph A. Fry, “Imperialism, American Style, 1890-1916,” *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered. 1890-1993* ed. Gordon Martel (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), 53; Joseph A. Fry, “In Search of an Orderly World,” *Modern American Diplomacy* edited John M. Carroll and George C. Herring (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1996), 2; Joseph A. Fry, “Phases of Empire: Late Nineteenth-Century U.S. Foreign Relations,” *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America* ed. Charles W. Calhoun (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1996), 262. For a historiographical discussion of informal empire see Paul A. Kramer, “Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States and the World,” *The American*

“directly or indirectly, partially or completely, by means that can range from the outright use of force through intimidation, dependency, inducement, and even inspiration.”<sup>6</sup>

Informal imperialism is distinguished from formal empire in that it is not based upon formal political control in the form of colonies.

While the United States did intervene militarily in Mexico during the 1846-1848 war and in 1914 and 1916-1917 during the Mexican Revolution and threatened force on other occasions, U.S. policymakers more often sought to use cooperative diplomacy, trade linkages and other enticements to accomplish its goals of providing for U.S. security and economic expansion in Mexico. Likewise U.S. private citizens such as businessmen, missionaries and tourists either consciously or subconsciously used what has been termed “soft-power,” which has been described as “an intrinsic influence wielded wherever global and local cultures meet by agents that operate out of the purview

---

*Historical Review* 116: 5 (December 2011): especially 1374-1378. The theme of informal empire was emphasized by the New Left, Wisconsin School historians in the 1960s, building on the arguments of William Appleman Williams. See William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (Cleveland; World Publishing Co., 1959); Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860–1898* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963); Lloyd C. Gardner, *Economic Aspects of New Deal Diplomacy* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964); Thomas J. Mc-Cormick, *China Market: America’s Quest for Informal Empire, 1893–1901* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1967); Marilyn Blatt Young, *The Rhetoric of Empire: American China Policy, 1895–1901* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

<sup>6</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *We Know Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (New York and Oxford: Clarendon Press, and Oxford University Press, 1997), 27; John Lewis Gaddis, *Surprise, Security and the American Experience* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 106. See also Mary Ann Heiss, “The Evolution of the Imperial Idea and U.S. National Identity,” *Diplomatic History* 26:4 (Fall 2002): 513.

of the state.”<sup>7</sup> Historian Frank A. Ninkovich notes that “hard power” could “never transform the world,” rather ideas about “cultural relations and cultural transformations were foundational to how Americans conceived of their nation’s global role.”<sup>8</sup>

Americans vigorously disagreed whether a U.S.-molded transformation of Mexico should occur in religious, political, economic or social terms, and what these changes would entail. Ricardo D. Salvatore has noted that the U.S. informal empire in Latin America was built on a “collection of diverse discourses, multiple mediators or agents and various and, at times contradictory representations.”<sup>9</sup> Building on Salvatore’s observations, this dissertation notes that a diverse group of Americans, viewed Mexico through “different eyes,” and therefore “textualized” the role of the United States in diverse ways.<sup>10</sup> Despite these differences, Americans agreed that Mexico needed to be reshaped in an image of the United States. Their views thus provided a powerful counter-narrative to persistent U.S. images of the Mexican people as irredeemable because of allegedly inherent inferiorities based on race, religion or culture or a combination of these.

While largely a U.S.-based project, the dissertation takes into account the complexity of Mexican views of the United States and the role diverse groups of

---

<sup>7</sup> Dennis Merrill, *Negotiating Paradise: U.S. Tourism and Empire in Twentieth Century Latin America* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 11-12.

<sup>8</sup> Frank A. Ninkovich, *Global Dawn: The Cultural Foundation of American Internationalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 4.

<sup>9</sup> Ricardo D. Salvatore, “The Enterprise of Knowledge: Representational Machines of Informal Empire,” *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the History of U.S.-Latin American Relations* ed. Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998), 70.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

Mexicans played in attracting, resisting and altering U.S. informal imperialism in Mexico. U.S. views of Mexico were frequently shaped by various Mexican actors who sought to influence United States policy and perceptions. These Mexican actors included diplomats and other government officials who petitioned for capital investment, and U.S. military and financial aid; dissident Catholic priests, who requested aid for the fledgling Protestant movement in Mexico; and Mexican liberal exiles from the repressive Díaz regime, who sought U.S. support in bringing a democratic government to Mexico.<sup>11</sup> In order to do so they often tried to coopt U.S. rhetoric, such as the United States as a “model republic,” the Monroe Doctrine, and even Manifest Destiny to appeal to the American self-image. These appeals, in the minds of Americans, helped to justify the U.S. involvement in Mexico and allowed Americans to claim that their actions were based on appeals for aid from the Mexican people giving their enterprises a sense of legitimacy.

This reveals not only the often collaborative nature of U.S. imperialism in Mexico, but a selective appreciation for Mexican opinion that was characteristic of the American enterprise into Mexico. Since Americans focused on appeals from Mexican actors supportive of their involvement, they tended to discount Mexican opposition to their presence, and their actions in Mexico. Americans were often well aware of Mexican opposition, such as Conservatives who opposed the incorporation of U.S. political and economic models, Mexican Catholics who opposed the actions of Protestant missionaries

---

<sup>11</sup> The PLM exiles who opposed the Díaz regime as well as U.S. domination of the Mexican economy received a receptive hearing among labor and socialist groups, but not by the much of the popular press, and were eventually arrested by the U.S. government.

in Mexico, popular sectors who opposed aspects of the U.S. “Americanizing” campaign, as well Mexican nationalists who opposed U.S. domination of important sectors of the Mexican economy. American commentators discounted dissenting Mexican voices, which usually included the majority of the Mexican people, attributing their views to irrationality, and a resistance to “progress” unlike the “enlightened” Mexicans who supported their presence. Though not all Americans encountered Mexico with pure and just motives, many sincerely believed that U.S. informal imperialism would bring benefits to the people of Mexico and trusted that most Mexicans would one day appreciate their efforts.<sup>12</sup> Yet implicit in the ideology of what might be termed the U.S. civilizing mission, was that Mexico was an inferior in need of transformation in the image of the United States.

#### The U.S. Mission to Mexico

I argue that U.S. domestic considerations, such as ideology, culture, and race were vital in determining the direction of U.S. perceptions of its mission to Mexico and the Mexican people.<sup>13</sup> Thomas W. Zeiler has stated that one significant framework in

---

<sup>12</sup> Joseph A. Fry makes the point that many Americans were sincere in their belief they could bring benefits as a result of imperialism. See “Imperialism, American Style,” 66.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of the debate over internal versus external influence in the history of U.S. foreign relations see Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Patterson, “Introduction,” *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, second edition eds., Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Patterson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 7; Robert J. McMahon, “Toward a Pluralist Vision: The Study of American Foreign Relations as International History and National History,” *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, second edition eds. Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Patterson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 45. In the larger historiography of Diplomatic History this focus on the connections between U.S. foreign policy and the domestic sphere were emphasized in the work of the revisionists, of whom the most important was William Appleman Williams. See discussion in Michael J.

diplomatic history has been a focus on *mentalités*, which are “ideas and ideology” that have shaped the U.S. response to the world.”<sup>14</sup> Of particular interest to this project are discourses concerning “American exceptionalism” and ideas of U.S. republicanism which often played a key role in defining the U.S. mission to Mexico. Until the consolidation of the Díaz regime in the mid-1880s, U.S. discussions of their mission to Mexico would be intertwined with debates over the nature of republican government. Throughout this entire period American analysis of Mexico would confront the subject of republicanism, and corresponding ideas of the “fitness for self-government.”

Since the early days of U.S. history many Americans have focused on the belief that the new country was chosen by God, for a special purpose.<sup>15</sup> This idea, often called “American exceptionalism” by historians, would lose some of its religious overtones as time elapsed, but would remain important as a “governing mythology” or what has been referred to as American “civil religion.”<sup>16</sup> Americans believed that their nation was

---

Hogan, “State of the Art: An Introduction,” *America and the World: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations Since 1941* edited by Michael J. Hogan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 16-17.

<sup>14</sup> Thomas W. Zeiler, “The Diplomatic History Bandwagon: A State of the Field,” *The Journal of American History* 95:4 (March 2009): 1056.

<sup>15</sup> Conrad Cherry, “Introduction” *God’s New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny* edited by Conrad Cherry (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 19; See also Anders Stephanson, *Manifest Destiny and the Empire of Right* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), 6-7; and Michael Adas, “From Settler Colony to Global Hegemon: Integrating the Exceptionalist Narrative of the American Experience into World History,” *American Historical Review* (December 2001): 1692.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., and Dorothy Ross, “Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty,” *American Historical Review* (June 1995): 656 (the quote is from Cherry). The concept of “American civil religion was originally discussed by Robert Neely Bellah, “Civil Religion in America,” *Journal of the Academy of the Arts and Sciences* 96:1 (Winter 1967): 1-21; see also Robert Neely Bellah, *The Broken*



“uniquely favored by God and shaped for the political and moral redemption of the world.”<sup>17</sup> Dorothy Ross has explained that ideas of exceptionalism entered into popular literary, religious and political discourse and was so “widely diffused that its premises often went unstated and its conclusions were merely celebrated.”<sup>18</sup>

While not always agreeing on the implications of this view, diverse groups of Americans viewed their nation as a model for others to follow, as what has been described as the “pilot society for the world.”<sup>19</sup> Through this, the U.S. experience was conceptualized as having a universality that if followed by other countries and peoples,

---

*Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). In recent years historians have carried on a vigorous debate over American exceptionalism as historiographical subject, usually revolving around discussions of whether the United States was/is an exceptional nation in terms of being especially exemplary and benevolent, or to what extent the United States is exceptional in terms of unique as compared to other nations, particularly those of Western Europe. My focus is on the historical ideology of exceptionalism, rather than the historiographical controversy.

<sup>17</sup> Nicholas Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 18. See also Trevor B. McCrisken, “Exceptionalism,” *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* Second Edition Volume 2 eds Alexander DeConde, Richard Dean Burns, and Fredrik Logevall (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 2002), 63; Robert J. McMahon, “The Republic as Empire: American Foreign policy in the ‘American Century’” *Perspectives on Modern America: Making Sense of the Twentieth Century* ed Harvard Sitkoff (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 83.

<sup>18</sup> Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 28. Ross does note that American exceptionalism did not “define agreement” as much as it stimulated conflict (29).

<sup>19</sup> Joyce Appleby, “Recovering America’s Historic Diversity: Beyond Exceptionalism,” *The Journal of American History* (September 1992): 426; Anders Stephanson, *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), xii; John Kane, *Between Virtue and Power: The Persistent Moral Dilemma of U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 21.



could bring them similar success. Americans viewed their nation as a model for other peoples yearning for self-government, which would eventually lead to the elimination of monarchies and other forms of government and the institution of republican governments throughout the world.

While the United States claimed a worldwide mission, it perceived for itself a special position in the Western Hemisphere.<sup>20</sup> In response to the independence of Mexico and other formerly Spanish colonies, U.S. officials hoped that these former colonies would create stable republics closely aligned with the United States. The Monroe administration further encouraged Latin American governments to adapt the political example of the United States, believing that republican governments and liberal trade principles were the only way for them to create stable governments.<sup>21</sup>

Beginning with the first unsuccessful transfer of power in Mexico in 1829, and increasing with continuing political problems in Mexico, U.S. critics became skeptical of Mexican capacity for self-government and by the 1830s most Americans had concluded that despite copying the U.S. model of government, republicanism had failed in Mexico. In the U.S. view Mexico had become a “disgrace” to North America, and republicanism in general.<sup>22</sup> These views also allowed Americans to justify the war with Mexico and the annexation of Mexican territory since in their eyes Mexico was not a true republic.

---

<sup>20</sup> Brian Loveman, *No Higher Law: American Foreign Policy and the Western Hemisphere Since 1776* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 4.

<sup>21</sup> Lewis, *The American Union*, 175-177, 196.

<sup>22</sup> See for instance “The Presidential Message on Mexico,” *Harper’s Weekly* (December 4, 1858). See also Mr. Buchanan’s Mexico Policy,” *Harper’s Weekly* (January 7, 1860).

During the antebellum period Americans continued to express frustration with the inability of Mexico to achieve similar success as the United States by following the U.S. example and had blamed the perceived cultural, religious and racial composition of the nation. At that time discussions of a potential mission to Mexico revolved around formal U.S. actions in the form of further annexation or the creation of a protectorate or military action to “restore order,” or during the French Intervention to expel the French from Mexico. Political divisions arising from sectional issues, especially the expansion of slavery led to U.S. government inaction despite rampant speculation about the future relations between the two countries. While Americans were confident in their general view of a U.S. mission to Mexico, these debates demonstrated indecisiveness as to what the perceived mission to Mexico was and how to accomplish it.

The U.S. Civil War threatened U.S. views of their nation as the “model republic” and corresponding beliefs in their mission to the world. In the minds of northern leaders, if the Union was permanently disintegrated, then the model republic would be transformed into the most prominent failure of republican government. Likewise the destruction of the Union would mean the destruction of hopes for republican governments throughout the world. These fears would be revived during the contested U.S. election of 1876 which led Americans to fear that the United States was again encountering political unrest in light of its previous experience during the Civil War. Even if the crisis did not lead to a dramatic military confrontation, political disorder threatened to be a prominent part of the political life of the Republic, leading many to associate their fears with the Mexican experience with political instability.

Americans sought to fulfill their mission to Mexico and other countries in complex ways during the late nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. While earlier Americans had seen their role as an example for other nations to emulate, American views of its mission had shifted to the idea that the United States should actively guide other nations down the same path to modernity and progress. The last decades of the nineteenth century also witnessed the emergence of the United States to great power status.<sup>23</sup> George C. Herring explains that in the years after the U.S. Civil War the “ideology and instruments that provided the basis for America’s global involvement in the twentieth century took form,” providing a transition period between the quest for a continental empire of the antebellum period to the colonial period of the early twentieth century.<sup>24</sup> John Mason Hart notes that U.S. economic and political leaders, led by a “elite group of financiers and industrialists, envisioned a greater American nation,” that would have “cultural, economic and political hegemony over the Caribbean, the Pacific, and Central and South America while offering an example of cultural, economic, and political success to the rest of the world.”<sup>25</sup>

Likewise U.S. views had shifted from a focus on formal government actions to what has been described as informal imperialism. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries it was private nonstate U.S. actors, such as traders, investors, missionaries, philanthropists, international societies and purveyors of mass

---

<sup>23</sup> Crapol, “Coming to Terms with Empire,” 99; Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, 265.

<sup>24</sup> Herring, *From Colony to Superpower*, 271. See also Ninkovich, *Global Dawn*, 1.

<sup>25</sup> Hart, *Empire and Revolution*, 2.

communications rather than government policymakers that largely shaped America's role in the world.<sup>26</sup> These groups of Americans were involved with new transnational flows, reflecting a larger engagement with the international community.<sup>27</sup> Ian Tyrell argues that these actors were part of a larger universe of "American cultural expansion" that would include tourists, popular culture and sporting groups.<sup>28</sup>

The first U.S. actors to seek Mexico's transformation were Protestant missionaries. After the Union victory in the Civil War, and the Mexican Liberal victory in the French Intervention, U.S. Protestants had viewed their mission to be guiding the Mexican people through a conversion to Protestantism. During the late 1860s and early 1870s American missionaries and other religious visitors to Mexico described a country receptive to the gospel, and on the verge of a wide-scale conversion to Protestantism. Protestant missionaries frequently espoused an ardent anti-Catholicism at the same time they stressed that the lives of Mexicans could be changed if they converted to Protestantism.<sup>29</sup> Likewise since they associated republicanism with Protestantism, they believed they were preparing the Mexican for a successful republican government.

---

<sup>26</sup> Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream*, 12.

<sup>27</sup> Ian Tyrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010), 15. For an earlier article advocating for a focus on transnational history see Ian Tyrell, "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *American Historical Review* 96:4 (October 1991): 1031-1055.

<sup>28</sup> Tyrell, *Reforming the World*, 15; 3-4.

<sup>29</sup> By the early 1880s, U.S. Protestant missionaries, while still describing Mexico as receptive to religious change and "redemption" began to temper their optimism about a rapid conversion. While missionaries and Protestant religious writers frequently were supportive of the development of Mexican resources through U.S. capital, they also critiqued the secularized mission to Mexico, which they viewed as empty and bound for

By the 1880s U.S. entrepreneurs became the main agents for the U.S. effort to transform Mexico. American capitalists expanded their investments in Mexico, particularly in railroads, and they and much of the secular press began to discuss a more secularized vision of the U.S. mission to Mexico in the form of a transfer of American capital, methods and ideas. While Americans had long believed in the superiority of their civilization as compared to Latin America, by the late nineteenth century this “superiority” was associated with the “tangible symbols of material progress.”<sup>30</sup> This vision focused on the transformation of Mexico through railroads and internal improvements, leading to the development of Mexico. U.S. economic and cultural expansion was undergirded by an ideology that Emily S. Rosenberg describes as “liberal-developmentalism” which included the belief that other nations should “replicate America’s own development experience,” along with support for “free or open access” for trade and investment.<sup>31</sup> U.S. business leaders who invested in enterprises in Mexico sought to remake the world in the “image and likeness of the United States,” by exporting advanced technologies and work methods, along with “longstanding American values”

---

failure unless these changes were accompanied by a true transformation in the Mexican people which could only come through the conversion of Mexico and an embrace of the ideals of Protestantism.

<sup>30</sup> James William Park, *Latin American Underdevelopment: A History of Perspectives in the United States* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 53; Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2000), 53.

<sup>31</sup> Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1982), 7. While Rosenberg work begins in 1890, much of her findings are also relevant for the period beginning after the Civil War.

such as individualism and competitiveness, a concern with the new and the “acquisitive values” of the new consumer society to other areas of the world, particularly Latin America.<sup>32</sup> Likewise American merchants and manufacturers would embrace a civilizing mission “through the sale of commodities” which they believed would help other nations progress on the same lines as the United States.<sup>33</sup>

The American view of mission had shifted since the early nineteenth century when it was largely concerned with spreading republican values, linked with democratic norms. Americans accepted the lack of republican norms in Mexico as necessary given the racial and cultural nature of the Mexican people, suggesting that they were not ready for republicanism on the model of U.S. institutions. By the end of the nineteenth century, the American press, politicians and many others frequently commented on the progress of Mexico, and the success of U.S. capital, methods, trade and leadership in transforming Mexico, in partnership with what they described as the wise leadership and stability brought on by the rule of Porfirio Díaz (1876-1911).

The third and last group of actors who sought the transformation of Mexico were socialist, labor and other leftist groups in the United States exposed the Díaz regime and challenged the consequences of U.S. economic expansion and the capitalist-based mission to Mexico. Rather than viewing the results of the expansion of U.S. capitalism into Mexico as a benevolent mission, working-class critics of the U.S. capitalist and

---

<sup>32</sup> Thomas F. O’Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 32.

<sup>33</sup> Mona Domosh, “Toward a Cultural Analysis of America’s Economic Empire in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers New Series* 29:4 (December 2004): 460.

industrial order viewed it as an expansion of the exploitation by many of the same trusts and capitalists with whom American workers had clashed for years. However rather than solely a critique of U.S. economic expansion and U.S. mission to Mexico, socialists and some in the labor movement articulated a new mission for Mexico which would come from their support of Mexican exiles associated with the Partido Liberal Mexicano (PLM), who advocated for democratic elections and social revolution in Mexico. Likewise after the beginning of the Revolution U.S. leftists mobilized to prevent the U.S. government from intervening to prevent the fall of the Díaz regime. While some labor and socialist writers suggested that the fall of Díaz dictatorship would result in modest progress at best, others hoped that the Mexican people would achieve a true social revolution similar to the one they envisioned for the United States.

#### U.S. Images of Mexico and the Mexican People

Images of Mexicans, Mexican-Americans and Latin Americans as inferiors would be conflated in a variety of mediums including fiction, film, travelogues and popular writing.<sup>34</sup> These perceptions are important for understanding how Americans would evaluate Mexico, and the particular strategies and actions various groups of Americans would undertake for the transformation of the Mexican people. These negative views represented the framework from which Americans discussed, analyzed, and interpreted Mexico and the Mexican people in all periods covered in this project. Americans would

---

<sup>34</sup> For a discussion of these views in different avenues see Park, *Latin American Underdevelopment*, 3, 53; Arthur G. Pettit, *Images of the Mexican American in Fiction and Film* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1980), xx; Markus Heide and Gabriele Pizarz-Ramírez, “Introduction: Inter-American Studies and Nineteenth-Century Literature,” *Amerikatudien/American Studies* 53:1 (2008): 8; Helmbrecht Breinig, “Invasive Methods: The Opening of Latin America in Nineteenth-Century U.S. Literature,” *Amerikatudien/American Studies* 53:1 (2008): 14.

frequently refer to negative characteristics when analyzing aspects of Mexican history, culture and customs. Frequently Americans who sought the transformation of Mexico confronted ethnocentric, racist and demeaning views and statements with regards to the Mexican people, by arguing that Mexico could be changed and transformed stating that negative characteristics of Mexicans were not inherent qualities.<sup>35</sup>

American perceptions of Mexicans grew out of “deeply rooted” attitudes in the Anglo-American cultural and intellectual tradition.<sup>36</sup> One of these attitudes was anti-Catholicism, as Americans extended their negative attitudes toward Catholic Spain, to Mexico and Latin America.<sup>37</sup> These beliefs have been loosely defined as the “Black Legend,” which linked Catholic Spain with the Inquisition, religious bigotry, and the often violent persecution of Protestants and Jews.<sup>38</sup> After inheriting these beliefs from earlier British attitudes, American intellectuals provided them with an American twist by creating a Spanish “other” to American exceptionalism. In this sense Spain could be positioned as an example of what would happen to a country that was the polar opposite

---

<sup>35</sup> Ninkovich, *Global Dawn*, 9.

<sup>36</sup> Raymund A. Paredes, “The Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiment in the United States,” *New Directions in Chicano Scholarship* (La Jolla: University of California Press, 1978), 139.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid; David J. Weber, “‘Scarce more than Apes.’ Historical Roots of Anglo American Stereotypes of Mexicans in the Border Region,” *New Spain’s Far Northern Frontier: Essays on Spain in the American West* edited by David J. Weber (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), 299-300.

<sup>38</sup> Richard L. Kagan, “From Noah to Moses: The Genesis of Historical Scholarship on Spain in the United States,” *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States* edited by Richard L. Kagan (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002), 22. For some historical examples of this type of thinking see *The Black Legend: Anti-Spanish Attitudes in the Old World and the New* edited by Charles Gibson (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971).



of the values that the United States professed to stand for, including, republicanism, liberty, and enlightenment.<sup>39</sup> These themes were linked as the origins of Catholicism in Mexico and Latin America became linked with the conquest of indigenous peoples by the Spanish conquistadores.<sup>40</sup> Anti-Catholicism therefore translated to Spain's colonial empire to describe Spain's imperial rule as uniquely cruel and brutal.<sup>41</sup>

The second deeply rooted American attitude was the conviction that Mexicans were members of an inferior race.<sup>42</sup> In racial terms, Mexicans and other Latin Americans were perceived as occupying a position midway up in the racial hierarchy above African Americans and Indians, but below whites.<sup>43</sup> This reflected not only Hispanophobia, but a

---

<sup>39</sup> Kagan, "From Noah to Moses," 22.

<sup>40</sup> Osvaldo F. Pardo, *The Origins of Mexican Catholicism: Nahua Rituals and Christian Sacraments in Sixteenth-Century Mexico* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), 1.

<sup>41</sup> Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan, "Introduction," *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires* ed. Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 1. Scholars such as Philip Wayne Powell disagrees with the idea that the Spanish conquest was any crueler than that of the other European powers. See *Tree of Hate: Propaganda and Prejudices Affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World* (New York and London: Basic Books, Inc, 1971). For a more general discussion of the Black Legend see *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires* ed. Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007). For a discussion of how Spanish commentators have viewed their nation and colonial empire see Henry Kamen, *Imagining Spain: Historical Myth & National Identity* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008).

<sup>42</sup> Paredes, "Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiment," 139, 158; Johnson, *Latin America in Caricature*, 10; Laura E. Gómez, *Manifest Destinies: The Making of the Mexican American Race* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2007), 62.

<sup>43</sup> Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987), 58.

sensationalist literature regarding the indigenous groups in Mexico and Latin America, emphasizing stories featuring accounts of cannibalism, human sacrifice and violence.<sup>44</sup> Of particular importance was the doctrine of miscegenation, “which held that the progeny of racially-different parents inherited the worst qualities of each.”<sup>45</sup> Historian Arnaldo De León notes that Anglo attitudes towards Mexicans are best symbolized by the word “greaser” which was a derogatory term to signify the mixed racial aspect of Mexicans in the mind of Anglos.<sup>46</sup> De León noted that Mexicans in Texas were often dehumanized to the point that they were described as no better than animals.<sup>47</sup> This dehumanization is evident in violence against the Mexicans perpetrated by Anglos in the form of organized violence from groups such as the Texas Rangers, and through the lynching of ethnic Mexicans. Researchers have documented 597 lynchings of Mexicans and Mexican Americans in the United States from 1848-1928.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Paredes, “Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiment,” 146-151. Paredes argues that these descriptions were part of a larger European tradition and were grounded in “distortion, fantasy, and simple confusion” (151).

<sup>45</sup> Paredes, “Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiment,” 158.

<sup>46</sup> Arnaldo De León, *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983), 16-17.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 67, 73.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 80, 87, 99; Mario T. García, “Porfirian Diplomacy and the Administration of Justice in Texas, 1877-1900,” *Aztlan* 16: 1-2 (1987), 20-21; Matt S. Meier and Margo Gutiérrez, *Encyclopedia of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000), 135-136. Figures are from William D. Carrigan and Clive Webb, “The Lynching of Persons of Mexican Origin or Descent in the United States, 1848 to 1928,” *Journal of Social History* 37:2 (Winter 2003): 413; William D. Carrigan and Clive Webb, “*Muerto por Unos Desconocidos* (Killed by Persons Unknown): Mob Violence against Blacks and Mexicans in Texas,” *Beyond Black & White: Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in the U.S. South and Southwest* eds Stephanie Cole & Alison M. Parker (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2004), 36. For a discussion of

Numerous scholars have noted the propensity for Anglo-Americans to juxtapose positive traits of whites with negative traits of Mexicans and Mexican Americans in a “binary opposition.”<sup>49</sup> The most common dichotomy was the presentation of the civilized Anglo as opposed to the darker skinned uncivilized “greaser.”<sup>50</sup> Many of these stereotypes revolved around myths and stereotypes of civilization and nature. Americans viewed themselves as the embodiment of the virtues of civilization. They saw themselves as having overcome and defied nature and viewed themselves as civilized, restrained, rational, calculating, mature and masculine. In this context Latin Americans were seen as being in a precivilized state, unable to transform their countries and properly use their resources. Mexicans, Mexican Americans and other Latin Americans were characterized in contradictory, though consistently negative ways: as primitive, passionate, emotional, intuitive, heedless, childlike, lazy, dishonest, corrupt, weak and effeminate, though with a particular love of violence, brutality and murder.<sup>51</sup>

---

violence towards Mexican immigrants during the first decades of the twentieth century see F. Arturo Rosales, *¡Pobre Raza! Violence, Justice and Mobilization Among México Lindo Immigrants, 1900-1936* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999).

<sup>49</sup> Markus Heide and Gabriele Pisarz-Ramírez, “Introduction: Inter-American Studies and Nineteenth-Century Literature,” *Amerikatudien/American Studies* 53:1 (2008): 6; De Leon, *They Called Them Greasers*, 21; Arthur G. Pettit, *Images of the Mexican American in Fiction and Film* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1980), xx.

<sup>50</sup> John-Michael Rivera, *The Emergence of Mexican America: Recovering Stories of Mexican Peoplehood in U.S. Culture* (New York and London: New York University Press, 2006), 55.

<sup>51</sup> Fredrick B. Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992), 1; 43; 49; 70; Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 59; Robinson, *Mexico and the Hispanic Southwest in American Literature*, ix, 33, 35, 38, 42, 56; De Leon, *They Called Them Greasers*, 24-29, 36, 39, 46, 63, 68, 70-71.

U.S. views of the Mexican people were hardened by the Texas Revolution and the U.S.-Mexico War of 1846-1848, which would create bitterness between the two nations, and in the United States the Mexican enemy was demonized and portrayed as evil and not worthy of respect.<sup>52</sup> This bitterness would remain in the background of U.S.-Mexican relations from the mid-nineteenth century onward. American supporters of the war and territorial expansion viewed it as part of America's Manifest Destiny, that is, the conviction that American territorial expansion was inevitable, and that it was the nation's "providential destiny" to extend throughout the entire continent.<sup>53</sup> By this point many in the United States had concluded that Mexicans were incapable of self-government for religious and racial reasons, and viewed the Mexicans in the Northern provinces as obstacles to their "Manifest Destiny."<sup>54</sup> Reginald Horsman, has noted the emphasis on the "American Anglo-Saxons as a separate, innately superior people who were destined to bring good government, commercial prosperity, and Christianity to the American continents and to the world."<sup>55</sup> An important part of this belief was the idea that the United States was to be a white republic; while white "races" would be absorbed into the

---

<sup>52</sup> Manuel G. Gonzales, *Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press, 2000), 83.

<sup>53</sup> Robert W. Johannsen, "Introduction," *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Expansionism*, eds. Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997), 3; David M. Pletcher, "Manifest Destiny," *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978), 526.

<sup>54</sup> I took this idea of Mexicans (and Native Americans) as obstacles to Manifest Destiny from Thomas R. Hietala, *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in late Jacksonian America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 152, 160.

<sup>55</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 1-2.

mass, nonwhite races would be excluded from membership in this republic.<sup>56</sup> Americans viewed their military success against the Mexican army as evidence of their racial superiority.<sup>57</sup> One of the leading U.S. scholars of the war, Robert W. Johannsen, has noted that American soldiers frequently perceived the Mexican people they encountered as uncivilized, and viewed Mexicans as “innately inferior to the vigorous and enterprising Anglo-Saxon.” Despite these views, however, the Mexican people were often regarded as “capable of improvement.”<sup>58</sup>

These images of Mexicans played a major role in discussions of the “fitness” of the Mexican people for self-government. These discussions revolved around three aspects. The first was whether the Mexican people were fit to govern themselves generally as a nation, the second was whether they were fit for self-government in terms of the republican form of government as opposed to a monarchy or another form of government, and lastly whether they would be fit to join the United States as what would probably be several states in the U.S. republic. During much of the nineteenth century Americans often concluded that Mexicans were unfit for all three aspects of self-government.

These views shifted by the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as Americans concluded that the Mexican people were unfit for inclusion into the United States as equal members of the republic; were fit to govern themselves as a nation- under

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>57</sup> Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezuma's: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 21.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 165-167.

the guiding hand of Porfirio Díaz; and they were unsure of when Mexico would be fit for true republican government. By the time that the U.S. government was willing to take decisive actions in the form of direct interventions and protectorates in the late nineteenth century, the issue of Mexico's perceived incapacity for self-government would be solved in the person of Porfirio Díaz, rather than formal U.S. actions such as annexation or a protectorate. Though Díaz would rule nominally under republican forms, he would frequently resort to repressive actions to silence dissenters and put down challenges to his rule. In this context, the majority of Americans would accept the rule of Díaz as best for Mexico, describing him as a "benevolent despot" who was finally providing Mexico with the "firm hand" that that nation and other Latin-Americans needed, since most Americans remained skeptical of their fitness for self-government and republicanism.

#### Organization

The first chapter explores popular U.S. discourses on Mexico from the end of the U.S.-Mexico War in 1848 to the end of the French Intervention in 1867. During this period the Mexican liberal government sought to disestablish the Catholic Church, resulting in a period of civil war in Mexico, known as *La Reforma*, which was followed by the attempt by the French emperor Napoleon III to institute a monarchy in Mexico. U.S. views of events in Mexico would be colored by two themes: anti-Catholicism and negative assessments of the prospects for Mexican republicanism based largely upon cultural and racial views of the Mexican people. While most Americans viewed the French actions in Mexico negatively, a minority supported the reign of Maximilian as the best hope for stability in Mexico and the development of Mexican resources, having concluded that republican government in that country had failed, and that Americans

were unwilling to annex Mexico or incorporate it as a protectorate. U.S. assessments of this time period would shape American narratives of Mexican history throughout the rest of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In describing the Wars of the Reform (1857-1861) and the French Intervention (1862-1867), most commentators would accept the story of a courageous fight for progress against the supporters of the Catholic Church, whose victory allowed Mexico to begin to join the ranks of modern progressive nations like the United States; however the skepticism of Mexican “fitness” for self-government would continue.

The second chapter examines the missionary mission to Mexico from 1848 to 1911, beginning with nascent attempts in the aftermath of the war. This was followed by discussions in the U.S. press about what was portrayed in the United States as a “Reformation” of Catholic priests leaving the Catholic Church and embracing Protestantism in the mid-1860s. While American Protestants rejoiced in these developments, the failure of these priests to create a strong Protestant movement emphasized the need of U.S. guidance in converting Mexico to Protestantism. In response, American Protestant denominations began sending missionaries to Mexico, with some reporting a nation on the verge of a mass conversion to Protestantism. This was to be the first step in the conversion of all of Latin America, as a part of a process that would result in the conversion of the entire world. While many analysts continued to view Mexico negatively, Protestant Americans who focused on these religious developments often expressed optimism for the future of the Mexican nation.

The third chapter analyzes the role that fears of unrest played in threatening the view of the United States as a model republic. These fears were revived in the aftermath

of the disputed 1876 U.S. election, which produced deep-seated fears in the United States about the future of the Union. In this context U.S. political partisans accused each other of “Mexicanization” and understood this trope to mean political disorder, instability, and a lack of respect for democratic norms. Coming less than a decade after the U.S. Civil War, potential renewed civil unrest in the United States threatened the U.S. self-image. Rather than Mexico transformed in the U.S. image, Americans feared that they were in danger of becoming like their pejorative views of Mexico. While Mexico itself was not the cause of these fears, it did embody what the U.S. could become in the minds of Americans.

The fourth chapter deals with the diplomatic and economic dimensions of U.S.-Mexican relations from the beginning of the Díaz revolt in 1876 to the inauguration of the first railroad line, built largely with U.S. capital, which linked Mexico and the United States in 1883. At this point ideas about the U.S. mission to Mexico were not well-developed. Likewise many U.S. investors were unconvinced that Mexico would be a suitable place for U.S. economic expansion. Because of long-standing negative perceptions of Mexico and the Mexican people, American investors and other analysts expected Mexico to prove its worthiness for U.S. capital and further U.S. attention. At the same time Porfirio Díaz and other Mexican officials discerned the importance of changing Mexico’s image to remove the stigma of past disorder and instability. Díaz successfully employed diplomatic agents, and friendly promoters who supported the image of a stable Mexico that welcomed U.S. investment which helped to increase U.S. interest and investment into Mexico.



Chapter five examines the dominant discourse in the U.S. public sphere regarding economic expansion. This period, from the beginning of Díaz's second term in 1884 to 1906, represented the culmination of the projects began in the early years of U.S. economic expansion and the dominant view in the U.S. discourse was of a progressing, modernizing Mexican nation. This progress was believed to have been enacted through a partnership between Mexican elites and American capitalists and investors, made possible through by what Americans described as the progressive leadership of Porfirio Díaz. Of special importance was the role of U.S. capital in Mexico, which in the eyes of American observers had made these great strides possible. Because of this Americans saw progress in Mexico as the fulfillment of U.S. mission in that nation. By the end of the nineteenth century most Americans accepted that the Díaz system of dictatorship under republican forms was the best system for Mexico. As such most American analysts accepted that Mexico was not ready to completely embrace the U.S. model of republican government.

The sixth chapter examines the first concentrated U.S. critique of the role of American capital in Mexico which challenged the widely held views of the success of the U.S. mission to Mexico. While most mainstream publications described U.S. economic expansion in self-congratulatory terms, labor and socialist critics would critique the effects of the expansion of U.S. capital as well as U.S. policy towards Mexico and other Latin American countries. Rather than viewing the results of the expansion of U.S. capitalism into Mexico as a benevolent mission, working-class critics of the U.S. capitalist and industrial order condemned the conditions of workers in U.S. and Mexican owned enterprises as well as repressive actions by the Díaz regime. Rather than solely a

critique of U.S. economic expansion and U.S. mission to Mexico, socialists and some in the labor movement articulated a new mission for Mexico which would come from their support of the Mexican Liberal Party (PLM), and after the beginning of the Revolution from mobilization to prevent the U.S. government from intervening in support of the Díaz regime. This they hoped would allow for a transformation of Mexico, not necessarily in the image of the United States, but in the image of what they hoped the United States would also someday become.

This dissertation shows that U.S. images of Mexico were too frequently based on prejudices, and chauvinism, which led to inaccurate portrayals of the Mexican people, while American views of its mission to Mexico were most often based on U.S. hopes, a misunderstanding of Mexican history, and misperceptions regarding Mexican political and social realities. In the words of the famous Mexican novelist and intellectual, Octavio Paz, “American have not looked for Mexico in Mexico; they have looked for their obsessions, enthusiasms, phobias, hopes, interests- and these are what they have found.”<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Octavio Paz, *The Labyrinth of Solitude and Other Writings* (New York: Grove Press, 1985), 358. Also quoted in Sidney Weintraub, *Un-Equal Partners: The United States and Mexico* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010), 1.

## CHAPTER ONE: U.S. VIEWS OF THE WARS OF THE REFORM AND FRENCH INTERVENTION IN MEXICO, 1846-1867

In the years after the U.S.-Mexico War (1846-1848), Americans debated events in Mexico in the context of conflicting visions of America's role in the Western Hemisphere during the period of Mexican history described as La Reforma (1857-1860) and the French Intervention (1861-1867). These years would shape U.S. views of Mexico and U.S. government policy toward that country at least until the beginning of the Mexican Revolution in 1911. The discussions of events in Mexico, and the U.S. role toward that country reflected confusion regarding the nature of U.S. republicanism in relation to the perceived mission of the United States to the rest of the world. During this period, U.S. discussions of its mission to Mexico largely revolved around formal actions by the U.S. government in the form of annexation, creating a protectorate, or military action to "restore order," defeat the Conservatives, or expel the French from Mexico. These debates also reflected the divided nature of the U.S. political environment during the antebellum and Civil War eras. This division led to U.S. government inaction despite rampant speculation about the future relations between the two countries and continuing discussions of events in Mexico. While Americans were confident in their general view of a U.S. mission to Mexico, these debates demonstrated indecisiveness as to what the perceived mission to Mexico was and how to accomplish it.

The two main focuses of mainstream U.S. discourses on Mexico during this period were moral support for the Mexican Liberal campaign to disestablish the Catholic Church, which was strongly colored by anti-Catholicism in the United States, and assessments of the prospects for Mexican republicanism based largely upon cultural and

racial views of the Mexican people. This chapter also complicates the story of U.S. views of the Church-State struggle in Mexico and of the French Intervention in Mexico. While most Americans viewed the French actions in Mexico negatively, a minority supported the reign of Maximilian as the best hope for stability in Mexico and the development of Mexican resources, having concluded that republican government in Mexico had failed. In the years after the end of the French Intervention the themes of the Church-State fight and the fitness of Mexico for republican government would merge in a popular discussion of Mexican history in the years of the Porfirio Díaz regime from 1876-1911.<sup>1</sup>

### Protestantism and Republicanism

Historians have emphasized the role that Protestantism has played in shaping the identity of Americans. In his discussion of the role of religion during Reconstruction and the Gilded Age, Edward J. Blum argues that the Protestant religion stood at the core of America's national identity, and suggests that religion in the mid to late nineteenth century was not just limited to churches, but also played a vital role in political meetings, and the popular press, as writers and public figures of all types used Protestant Christian typology to influence public opinion.<sup>2</sup> Likewise in her research on American textbooks in

---

<sup>1</sup> Díaz ruled from 1876-1880 and then from 1884-1911, a time period which is often called the "Porfiriato."

<sup>2</sup> Edward J. Blum, *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion and American Nationalism, 1865-1898* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 9-10. Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 62; Tracy Fessenden, *Culture and Redemption: Religion, the Secular, and American Literature* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007), 5. This is what William R. Hutchison would describe as the "Protestant ethos" in the United States. See William R. Hutchison, *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 60.

the nineteenth century, Ruth Elson found that they frequently referred to Protestant Christianity as the true religion and the United States as a Protestant country.<sup>3</sup>

This is not to suggest that American Protestants represented a unified group, as many analysts have described the variations between different Protestant groups in American history.<sup>4</sup> Nor should we ignore the presence of groups other than Protestants during this era, especially the growing Catholic demographic in nineteenth century America.<sup>5</sup> However even as Catholicism became the largest single denomination in the United States by the mid-nineteenth century, and a number of non-mainstream Protestant religions flourished, the Protestant tradition continued to play a dominant role in shaping U.S. identity.<sup>6</sup>

Even many secular newspapers and periodicals were openly anti-Catholic in both their editorial view and reporting.<sup>7</sup> In the early years of the republic the numbers of Catholics were so small that anti-Catholicism was usually confined to verbal attacks, but

---

<sup>3</sup> Elson, *Guardians of Tradition*, 46.

<sup>4</sup> Leo P. Ribuffo, "Religion," *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Volume 3 ed. Alexander De Conde and Frederick Logevall (NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2002), 371; R. Laurence Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), ix.

<sup>5</sup> By 1850 Roman Catholicism has become the largest single denomination, though as a total of the population Protestants still outnumbered Catholics by a large number. See Edwin Scott Gaustad, *A Religious History of America* New Revised Edition (New York: Harper Collins, 1990), 153. For a discussion of the changing religious demographics in the nineteenth Century see William M. Newman and Peter L. Halvorson *Atlas of American Religion: The Denominational Era, 1776-1990* (Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press, 2000), 18-51.

<sup>6</sup> Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America* (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963), 134.

<sup>7</sup> Lynn Bridgers, *The American Religious Experience: A Concise History* (Lanham, MD: Rowan Littlefield, 2006), 98.

distrust and hatred of Catholicism was an important part of Protestant American consciousness.<sup>8</sup> Beginning with the increase of foreign immigration, much of it from Catholic countries, this distrust would become more virulent, and would be visible in the anti-Catholic violence that came to mark the nativist movement.<sup>9</sup> One scholar argues that the average Protestant of the 1850s had been trained from birth to “hate Catholicism; his juvenile literature and school books had breathed a spirit of intolerance... he read novels, poems, gifts books, histories, travel accounts, and theological arguments which confirmed these beliefs.”<sup>10</sup> Historians who have looked at anti-Catholicism have suggested that this theme has been persistent through many different time periods in U. S. history, though it has varied in intensity.<sup>11</sup>

American Protestant thinkers in the early nineteenth century linked Protestantism and republicanism, believing that Protestantism created in its adherents the qualities necessary for the stable function of a republic, while Catholicism prepared its adherents

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 98.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. For analysis of the role of anti-Catholicism and its relation to the nativist violence in the 1850s see David Grimsted, *American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), especially 218-245.

<sup>10</sup> Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1938), 345. See also Paul A. Carter, *The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois Press, 1971), 182; and Jenny Franchot, *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), xviii.

<sup>11</sup> Justin Nordstrom, *Danger on the Doorstep: Anti-Catholicism and American Print Culture in the Progressive Era* (Norte Dame, IN: University of Norte Dame Press, 2006), 4; James P. McCartin, “Anti-Catholicism,” *Dictionary of American History* 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Volume 1 ed. Stanley I. Kutler (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 2003), 196; Andrew M Greeley, *An Ugly Little Secret: Anti-Catholicism in North America* (Kansas City: Sheed Andrews and McMeel, Inc, 1977), 17; Michael Schwartz, *The Persistent Prejudice: Anti-Catholicism in America* (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1984).

for a monarchy, by expecting blind obedience to a hierarchical priesthood. As such, according to this thinking, Protestantism was necessary to create citizens equipped for effective and stable self-government.<sup>12</sup> In the years after the American Revolution, Americans promoted republicanism, which entailed a nation without king or nobility or system of hereditary legal privileges and included a written constitution and representative government, to contrast their system to aristocratic or monarchical governments that were prevalent in Europe.<sup>13</sup>

Because of this linkage most Protestant American observers frequently blamed continuing instability in Mexico on the Catholic Church.<sup>14</sup> In addition to a general theme

---

<sup>12</sup> Michael Solomon, "Saving the 'Slaves of Kings and Priests': The United States, Manifest Destiny, and the Rhetoric of Anti-Catholicism." MA Thesis., Duquesne University, 2009. 53 For contemporary discussion of this theme see Edward Walker, *A Voice to America, or the Model Republic, its glory or its Fall* Third Edition (New York: Edward Walker, 1855), 352; "Religion in Mexico," *Christian Observer* 35: 4 (January 24, 1856), 14.

<sup>13</sup> Harry L. Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990), 42-43. Carl F. Kaestle, has found that the eventual acceptance of state common-school systems by American society was the result of the linkage between the values of republicanism, Protestantism and capitalist values dominant in American society within the nineteenth century. Carl F. Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1983), 76, 93. There would be aspects of republican thought that were different in the North and South in the antebellum period, particularly regarding slavery and related themes. While much of the terminology was the same, the meaning of some of the terms was different. In this section I will deal largely with the Northern conception of republicanism since it was one which survived the Civil War and came to be regarded as mainstream nationally in the post-war period.

<sup>14</sup> From the first republic in 1824 to the outbreak of the Wars of the Reform in 1857, Mexico had sixteen different presidents and thirty-three provisional national leaders, resulting in forty-nine different administrations in thirty-three years. Throughout this period critics in the United States and in Mexico would define this time as a period of "disorder" and civil unrest. More recently scholars have described this period as a time of struggle for local autonomy, municipal self-government, and democratic inclusion. See for instance, Donald Fithian Stevens, *Origins of Instability in Early Republican Mexico*

of anti-Catholicism, the Church in Mexico was frequently singled out as being uniquely evil. Protestant writers suggested that the Catholic Church in Mexico had “received and inherited much of the worst elements of what is perhaps the worst, the least spiritual type of Romanism in Europe” through its introduction by the Spanish empire.<sup>15</sup> A former missionary to Mexico would describe the Mexican Church as the “Darkest Romanism on earth!”<sup>16</sup> Protestant writers also pointed to the incorporation of the patterns of indigenous religions in the creation of what they would refer to as a hybrid religion which had lost the truths of the true Gospel.<sup>17</sup> This was described by one observer as, “Christianity,

---

(Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1991), 59; Timothy E. Anna, *Forging Mexico, 1821-1835* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 266; and Peter Guardino, *Peasants, Politics and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996).

<sup>15</sup> Albert Zabriskie Gray, *Mexico as it is, Being Notes of a Recent Tour in that Country with Some Practical Information for Travelers in the Direction, as also some study of the Church Question* (New York: E. P. Button & Co, 1878), 128.

<sup>16</sup> William Butler, *Mexico in Transition from The Power of Political Romanism to Civil and Religious Liberty* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892), 4. The theme of emphasizing the evils of the Mexican Catholic Church, especially the priests, was common. See for instance Henry Steele Sheldon, *History of the Christian Church: Volume V, The Modern Church* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1894), 362.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 11, 29. Later historians have described the missionary efforts of the Spanish Catholic priests as a complex negotiation, in which missionaries built on old patterns of indigenous religion to explain Catholicism to the indigenous peoples. Frequently this entailed the use of images and metaphors familiar to indigenous groups. Historians have suggested that the response of indigenous peoples reflected both accommodation and resistance. For instance, at times the adaptation of the worship of Catholic saints may have masked the worship of pre-Hispanic gods, while others were likely sincere converts who sought ways to adapt Catholic doctrines to their practices to make a uniquely New World version of the religion. Osvaldo F. Pardo, *The Origins of Mexican Catholicism: Nahua Rituals and Christian Sacraments in Sixteenth-Century Mexico* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), 9; Ondina E. González and Justo L. González, *Christianity in Latin America: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 54-58.



instead of fulfilling its mission of enlightening, converting, and sanctifying the natives was itself *converted*. Paganism was *baptized*, Christianity *Paganized*.”<sup>18</sup>

After Mexico’s independence from Spain, Roman Catholicism remained the official state religion in Mexico and other forms of worship were prohibited.<sup>19</sup> The 1824 Mexican Constitution stated that “The religion of the Mexican nation is and shall be perpetually the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman religion. The nation protects it with wise and just laws and prohibits the exercise of any other.”<sup>20</sup> On several occasions the Mexican government did discuss the possibility of legalizing tolerance for other religions but the Conservative governments, the Church and many of the more moderate Liberal politicians opposed opening Mexico up to Protestants and other sects.<sup>21</sup> Fears that

---

<sup>18</sup> Gorham D. Abbott, *Mexico and the United States: Their Mutual Relations and Common Interests* (New York: G. P. Putnam and Son, 1869), 69. See also, Sheldon, 362; William Newton Clark, *A Study of Christian Missions* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1900), 88; Robert F. Sample, *Beacon-Lights of the Reformation; or Romanism and the Reformers* Second Edition (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1889), 428; “Mission Work in Mexico,” *Southwestern Christian Advocate* (March 8, 1877); “Mexico, a Land Without Homes,” *Southwestern Christian Advocate* (October 12, 1876); Samuel A. Purdie, “A Macedonian Call,” *Friend’s Review* (January 3, 1880). This theme was often repeated about Catholicism in general as well in other places where the Catholic Church entered.

<sup>19</sup> Stanley C. Green, *The Mexican Republic: The First Decade, 1823-1832* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987), 79.

<sup>20</sup> Felipe Tena Ramirez, *Leyes fundamentales de México, 1808-1999* (México: Editorial Porrúa, 1999), 168.

<sup>21</sup> Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent, “Back to the Future: Racism and National Culture in U.S.-Mexican Relations,” *Common Border, Uncommon Paths: Race, Culture, and National Identity in U.S.-Mexican Relations* ed. Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997), 2; Brian F. Connaughton, *Clerical Ideology in a Revolutionary Age: The Guadalajara Church and the Idea of the Mexican Nation (1788-1853)* trans. Mark Alan Healey (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2003), 165; Wilfrid Hardy Callcott, *Church and State in Mexico, 1822-1857* (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1965), 259; Wilkins B. Winn, “The

different sects would divide the Mexican people, doubts that Protestants could be integrated into Mexican society and that Protestantism would corrupt Mexican society and disrupt public order prevented most of the Church and Conservative officials from supporting religious toleration.<sup>22</sup> From time to time, Protestant missionaries had attempted to proselytize or distribute Bibles, but each time they were quickly forced to withdraw.<sup>23</sup> Likewise on occasion there had been isolated dissenters who were accused of being Protestants and were tried by the Inquisition in Mexico, though no long-term Protestant movement emerged.

By the 1830s a majority of American commentators had concluded that republicanism in Mexico had failed. Mexico was described as a nation with a tyrannical government, and a corrupt people, who despite copying the U.S. model of government were not able to institute a true republican government.<sup>24</sup> Americans, who frequently

---

Efforts of the United States to Secure Religious Liberty in a Commercial Treaty with Mexico, 1825-1831," *The Americas* 28:3 (January 1972): 311-332. Some in the Church hierarchy argued that in places where there were a history of other religions cohabitating together, such as in Europe, toleration was acceptable. But in the case of Mexico, where there was only the "true" religion it made no sense for others to corrupt it. This discussion was brought up most frequently in conjunction with debates over how to increase immigration to Mexico. See David K. Burden, "Reform Before *La Reforma*: Liberals, Conservatives and the Debate over Immigration, 1846-1855," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 23:2 (Summer 2007): 283-316; Dieter Berninger, "Immigration and Religious Toleration: A Mexican Dilemma, 1821-1860," *The Americas* 32:4 (April 1976): 549-565.

<sup>22</sup> G. Baez Camargo and Kenneth G. Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico* (London & New York: World Dominion Press, 1935), 87. Susan Schroeder, "Father José María Mora, Liberalism, and the British and Foreign Bible Society in Nineteenth-Century Mexico," *The Americas* 50:3 (January 1994): 377-397.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Brian M. McGowan, "The Second Conquest of Mexico: American Volunteers, Republicanism, and the Mexican War." PhD diss., Tulane University. 2011. 52, 71.

looked at Mexico with a combination of disdain and compassion, often blamed the failure of republicanism in Mexico on the Catholic Church.<sup>25</sup> An article in the *Christian Observer* stated that since the Church in Mexico had no Protestantism to fear, resided in a land of rich natural resources, and the country had a “feeble race” it had had the finest opportunity to prosecute its measures which had “brought the church there to its highest perfection.” The results of the Catholic predominance in Mexico, the article suggested, was an almost total lack of education, few commercial enterprises or industry, little social refinement and moral purity, while civil liberty and public tranquility were unknown. All of this, the article claimed, was the attainment of the “grand objectives” of the Catholic Church.<sup>26</sup> This article is consistent with the larger theme in much of the nineteenth

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>26</sup> “Fruits of Popery in Mexico,” *Christian Observer* (April 19, 1860): 61; For similar themes see Phillip Young, *History of Mexico; Her Civil Wars, and Colonial and Revolutionary Annals; from the period of the Spanish Conquest, 1520, to the present time, 1847: Including an account of the War with the United States, its causes and Military Achievement* (Cincinnati: J.A. & U.P James, 1847), 211; William Dowe, “A Word about Mexico. Its History, Resources, and Destiny,” *Graham’s Magazine* XLV: 4 (October 1854): 334; William Hogan, *Popery! As it Was and as it Is. Also Auricular Confession; and Popish Nunneries* (Hartford: Silas Andrus & Son, 1854), 567-568; Isaac Kelso, *Danger in the Dark: A Tale of Intrigue and Priestcraft* (Philadelphia: H.M. Rulison, 1855), 242-243; Hollis Read, *The Hand of God in History; or Divine Providence Historically Illustrated in the Extension and Establishment of Christianity* (Hartford, CN: H.E. Robins and Co, 1856), 40-41; Henry C. Leonard, *A Sheaf from a Pastor’s Field*, (Boston: Abel Thompkins, 1856), 372; Robert A. Wilson, *Mexico: Its Peasants and its Priests; or Adventures and Historical Researches in Mexico and its Silver Mines during Parts of the Years 1851-52-53-54, with an Expose of the Fabulous Character of the Story of the Conquest of Mexico by Cortez* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1856), 319.

century literature about Catholicism: that the clergy and the Church leadership intentionally sought to keep its followers in a state of ignorance.<sup>27</sup>

In addition to the continuing influence of the Catholic Church, U.S. observers often cited Mexican racial inferiority, and the notion that the Mexican people, with their background in Spanish colonialism, needed to be educated to become successful citizens in a republic. Discussions of the future of the Mexican republic often revolved around the necessity of improving the moral quality of the Mexican people. This sometimes meant the use of immigration to improve the “racial quality” of the population, but frequently also included the introduction of U.S. and Western European models of education, government and practices, and Protestantism, sometimes through annexation to the United States.<sup>28</sup> Because of this, U.S. analysis of Mexico would be closely linked with larger themes of anti-Catholicism that were prevalent in American public discourses.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Elson, *Guardians of Tradition*, 51-52; Richard J. Carwardine, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1993), 200-201. See for instance, Rufus W. Clark, *Romanism in America* (Boston: J.E. Tilton and Company, 1859), 102; Josiah Strong, *Our Country: Its Possible Future and its Present Crisis* (New York: The Baker & Taylor, Co, 1891), 75-76; Gray, *Mexico as it is*, 129; Sample, *Beacon-Lights of the Reformation*, 432.

<sup>28</sup> “The Extension of the American Union,” *Burritt’s Citizen of the World* I: 5 (May 1855): 76-77; “Unity of Mexico and the United States,” *Burritt’s Citizen of the World* I:11 (November 1855): 171-172.

<sup>29</sup> Works that have looked at the role of anti-Catholicism in U.S. history include Billington, *The Protestant Crusade*; Ryan K. Smith, *Gothic Arches, Latin Crosses: Anti-Catholicism and American Church Designs in the Nineteenth Century* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006); Francis D. Cogliano, *No King, No Popery: Anti-Catholicism in Revolutionary New England* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1995); Jason K. Duncan, *Citizens or Papists? The Politics of Anti-Catholicism in New York* (NY: Fordham University Press, 2005), and Franchot, *Roads to Rome*.

### The U.S. War with Mexico

In the mid-1820s U.S. citizens, both legally and illegally, entered the northern Mexican territory of Texas, originally supported by the Mexican government which hoped to employ European and Anglo-American settlers as buffers against Indians and foreign powers.<sup>30</sup> This plan backfired as many of these American colonists favored annexation to the United States, and expressed frustration regarding the Mexican government's opposition to the extension of slavery into the region.<sup>31</sup> The Mexican government proved unable to prevent the flow of Americans in these regions because of poor central control of the region.<sup>32</sup> By 1834-35 Mexico was in the midst of a period of instability, culminating in a civil war between the federalists and the centralists. This instability increased local dissent in Texas and in 1836 predominantly American settlers in Texas revolted against the Mexico government. This revolt was successful and Texas operated as a separate republic, despite the refusal of the Mexican government to

---

<sup>30</sup> Robert A. Calvert and Arnaldo De Leon, *The History of Texas* (Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1990), 48.

<sup>31</sup> Randolph B. Campbell, *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821-1865* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1989), 10-34.

<sup>32</sup> Will Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 162-163.

recognize its secession.<sup>33</sup> Internal instability, external threats, and a lack of resources prevented Mexico from successfully subduing the rebellious province.<sup>34</sup>

The Texas revolt put Mexico and the United States on the path to war as American and Texas politicians sought to annex Texas while Mexico could not accede to the official loss of this territory without a war.<sup>35</sup> In 1845 Texas was admitted into the United States, thus increasing tensions between the two nations since most Mexicans were indignant that the United States would annex territory that they considered a part of their nation.<sup>36</sup> The Mexican Minister to the United States protested against this action and then left the United States; the American Minister to Mexico followed suit, and diplomatic relations were broken between the two nations. By this point many in the United States had concluded that Mexicans were incapable of self-government for religious, cultural and racial reasons, and viewed the Mexicans in the Northern provinces as obstacles to further expansion.<sup>37</sup> After clashes on contested territory, the U.S. Congress declared war on May 13, 1846, with the Mexican Congress following suit

---

<sup>33</sup> Virginia Guedea and Jaime E. Rodríguez O., “How Relations between Mexico and the United States Began,” *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations* eds. Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent (Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997), 39.

<sup>34</sup> Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, “The Colonization and Loss of Texas: A Mexican Perspective,” *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations* eds. Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent (Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997), 77.

<sup>35</sup> María del Rosario Rodríguez Díaz, “Mexico’s Vision of Manifest Destiny during the 1847 War,” *Journal of Popular Culture* 35 (Fall 2001): 43.

<sup>36</sup> Calvert and De Leon, *The History of Texas*, 94.

<sup>37</sup> Thomas R. Hietala, *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in late Jacksonian America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 152, 160.

shortly thereafter. One historian described the war mood in the United States as bordering on hysteria, especially after reports of early victories appeared in the newspapers.<sup>38</sup>

In the months leading up to the war the Mexican press was no less enthusiastic in favor of the War and opposing the U.S. vision of Manifest Destiny. Conservatives, in particular, viewed the American invasion as a threat to Catholicism and correspondingly to their vision of the Mexican nation and identity. The Protestant assumptions of superiority angered Conservatives and led to calls for Mexicans to fight to defend the Catholic faith.<sup>39</sup> Conservatives defined the war as that of civilization versus barbarism, and a crusade against Protestant infidels.<sup>40</sup> Some conservatives even unrealistically called for an aggressive campaign to bring Catholicism to the United States. Likewise Liberal Mexican newspapers tended to denounce ideas of Anglo-Saxon racial superiority, and viewed American expansionism as a threat to Hispanic culture in Mexico and called upon their countrymen to defend their homeland. When the American army descended on Mexico City in August 1847 the President of Mexico, General Antonio López de Santa Anna issued a declaration that God would protect the Mexican people and punish the invading Protestant soldiers.<sup>41</sup> As the American army approached, faithful Mexican

---

<sup>38</sup> Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Montezuma's*, 8, 11. This mania was discussed in "Home Spirit of the War: Or, Progress of the Military Mania at Home," *Advocate of Peace* 7:13 (Jan/ Feb 1848).

<sup>39</sup> Rodríguez Díaz, "Mexico's Vision of Manifest Destiny," 45.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> Cited in Edward H. Moseley, "The Religious Impact of the American Occupation of Mexico City, 1847-1848," *Militarists, Merchants and Missionaries: United States Expansion in Middle America* eds. Eugene R. Huck and Edward H. Moseley (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1970), 39.

Catholics flocked to churches to pray for divine intervention against the American invaders.<sup>42</sup>

Although the war was not without domestic critics, many American observers viewed it as a part of their Manifest Destiny, that is, the conviction that American territorial expansion was inevitable, and that it was the nation's "providential destiny" to extend throughout the entire continent. Historian Reginald Horsman, has noted the emphasis on the "American Anglo-Saxons as a separate, innately superior people who were destined to bring good government, commercial prosperity, and Christianity to the American continents and to the world."<sup>43</sup> An important part of this belief was the idea that the United States was to be a white republic; while white "races" would be absorbed into the mass, nonwhite races would be excluded from membership in this republic.<sup>44</sup>

Americans viewed their military success against the Mexican army as evidence of their racial superiority.<sup>45</sup> One of the leading U.S. scholars of the war, Robert W. Johannsen, has noted that American soldiers frequently perceived the Mexican people they encountered as uncivilized, and viewed Mexicans as "innately inferior to the vigorous and enterprising Anglo-Saxon." Another history of the war has explained that American supporters of the war, "wished to see Mexicans as inherently flawed, their

---

<sup>42</sup>Rodríguez Díaz, "Mexico's Vision of Manifest Destiny," 45.

<sup>43</sup> Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 1-2.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 189.

<sup>45</sup> Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Moctezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 21.



society sliding toward dissolution, thus creating an opening for Americans to take control.”<sup>46</sup>

However recent research has documented the complexity of U.S. views and actions during the U.S.- Mexico War. Historians such as Paul Foos have outlined numerous atrocities and abuses committed by U.S. soldiers, and volunteers, particularly those from Texas, in occupied territories, which he has described as a “hidden dirty war.”<sup>47</sup> He states that their “proclivity for racist, religious, or nationalist rationales for their crimes took up the language of manifest destiny, suffusing their criminal activity with the heroism and comradeship implicit in that cause.”<sup>48</sup>

At the same time Brian M. McGowan in extensive research into the recruitment campaigns during the War, in the available letters and journals of American volunteers, and in the U.S. “occupation press” in Mexico has noted that many believed they had a mission to spread republicanism to Mexico, either through annexation or the force of their example.<sup>49</sup> While accepting the concept of Mexican inferiority, many Americans believed that Mexicans were capable of improvement, and sought to aid them.<sup>50</sup> U.S.

---

<sup>46</sup> Paul Foos, *A Short, Offhand Killing Affair* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 3-4.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 125. For a general discussion of the atrocities see pgs. 113-137.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>49</sup> McGowan, “The Second Conquest of Mexico,” 82. A minority of Americans denounced these ideas suggesting that the United States was “striking down a Republic in embryo,” and was therefore hurting the cause of liberty and republicanism. See Matthew Davitian McDonough, “Manifestly Uncertain Destiny: The Debate Over American Expansionism, 1803-1848,” Ph.D. diss., Kansas State University Press, 2011. 267-268.

<sup>50</sup> Johannsen, *To the Halls of Montezumas*, 165-167.

volunteers acted with a “missionary intent” and hoped to teach Mexicans how to “cast off the shackles of tyranny,” with the hopes that they would adopt institutions, such as the freedom of the press, and freedom of religion as a first step to following the example of the United States.<sup>51</sup>

Despite the fact that the Polk administration did not make the war into an anti-Catholic crusade, many Americans saw the spread of Protestantism and the “liberation” from the Catholic Church as a part of this concept of Manifest Destiny.<sup>52</sup> John C. Pinheiro argues that the conflict between the Catholic Mexico and the largely Protestant United States helped to “hone the concept of American republicanism” as an ideology that included “Anglo-Saxonism and anti-Catholicism under the umbrella of Manifest Destiny.”<sup>53</sup> Because of the power of the Catholic Church in Mexico, many American soldiers and the press believed that the Church would have to be weakened or destroyed

---

<sup>51</sup> McGowan, “The Second Conquest of Mexico,” 151-157, 184-185.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 175. In fact Polk met with the Bishop from New York John Hughes and requested that he assign some Spanish-speaking Catholics priests to precede the army into Mexico who would reassure the population that their religion and Church would be secure. See Irving W. Levinson, *Wars within War: Mexican Guerillas, Domestic Elites, and the United States of America, 1846-1848* (Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press, 2005), 22. The outrage on the part of congressional nativists, convinced Hughes to withdraw his services. See Solomon, “Saving the ‘Slaves of Kings and Priests’” 93. More generally the nativist press and politicians were critical of Polk’s attempts to reach out to American and Mexican Catholics, as well as General Winfield Scott’s actions to reassure the majority Catholic population of Mexico, such as attending mass in Catholic Churches in Mexico. See John C. Pinheiro, “‘On Their Knees to Jesuits’: Nativist Conspiracy Theories and the Mexican War,” *Nineteenth-Century America: Essays in Honor of Paul H. Bergeron* eds. W. Todd Groce and Stephen V. Ash (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2005), 42-46.

<sup>53</sup> John C. Pinheiro, “Extending the Light and Blessings of Our Purer Faith”: Anti-Catholic Sentiment among American Soldiers in the U.S.-Mexican War,” *Journal of Popular Culture* (Fall 2001): 146.

and that Americans should introduce religious freedom for the Protestant faith to the nation.<sup>54</sup>

Soldiers, who entered Mexico as part of the U.S. invasion, would blame the chronic disorder and political difficulties in Mexico on the Catholic religion, and saw the introduction of Protestantism as necessary for the establishment of a free government.<sup>55</sup> This point was emphasized in a speech in Philadelphia at the end of 1847 by Commodore Robert F. Stockton, who served as commander of the U.S. naval forces in California. In this speech Stockton stated that Americans were duty-bound to serve as the trustees of the “priceless bond of civil and religious liberty.” This duty, he declared, meant that the United States should guarantee the “inestimable blessings” of this liberty for the people of Mexico, singling out the importance of allowing freedom for the Protestants in Mexico to worship freely.<sup>56</sup> Other ministers, including the chaplain for the United States army in

---

<sup>54</sup> Some Protestants disagreed that a war with Mexico would bring about religious change in Mexico. Likewise, as might be expected many Catholic writers disagreed with these ideas. See McDonough, “Manifestly Uncertain Destiny,” 251.

<sup>55</sup> Pinheiro, “Extending the Light and Blessings of Our Purer Faith”, 129-130, 140; *Volunteers: The Mexican War Journals of Private Richard Coulter and Sergeant Thomas Barclay, Company E, Second Pennsylvania Infantry* ed. Allen Peskin (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1991), 181, 194-196. Despite these views General Winfield Scott and other military leaders occupying Mexico prevented attacks on the Churches or the disruption of services, believing that showing respect for the Church would make the occupation easier. In fact Scott, and other officers and soldiers attended Mass to show they were not personally hostile to the Catholic Church. Timothy D. Johnson, *A Gallant Little Army: The Mexico City Campaign* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2007), 58.

<sup>56</sup> Robert F. Stockton, *Niles Register* 73 (January 22, 1848): 335. Reprinted in *Foreigners in Their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans* ed. David J. Weber (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003): 133-134. See also Blanche Marie McEniry, *American Catholics in the War with Mexico* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1937), 25.

Mexico, expressed similar views.<sup>57</sup> In addition to hopes for the introduction of religious tolerance for Protestants in Mexico, many contemporary U.S. observers saw the war as providing an opportunity for the proselytizing of Mexico.<sup>58</sup>

By early August 1847 more than 10,000 U.S. troops led by General Winfield Scott marched on Mexico City. On September 14, the city was captured. After months of negotiations representatives from both countries signed the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.<sup>59</sup> With this treaty Mexico ceded California, New Mexico (containing the present day states of New Mexico, Arizona, Utah and Nevada), and accepted the U.S. claim on Texas. In return the United States paid Mexico \$15 million for the territory and assumed damage claims of \$3.25 million.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Moseley, "The Religious Impact of the American Occupation of Mexico City," 40. One historian in looking at religious sentiment regarding the war suggested that there were strong differences between and within various denominations as to the justice of the war against Mexico. See Clayton Sumner Ellsworth, "The American Churches and the Mexican War," *The American Historical Review* 45:2 (January 1940): 301-326.

<sup>58</sup> This topic will be covered more in depth in Chapter 2.

<sup>59</sup> The military situation during the war was complex as the Mexican government faced not only the United States but a number of localized revolts, while Mexican groups fought a guerilla war against the United States and U.S. volunteers like the Texas Rangers were involved. See Levinson, *Wars within War*, 83.

<sup>60</sup> For recent interpretations of the Mexican-American War see *Dueling Eagles: Reinterpreting the U.S.-Mexican War, 1846-1848* eds. Richard V. Francaviglia and Douglas W. Richmond (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2000); Pedro Santoni, *Mexicans at Arms: Puro Federalists and the Politics of War, 1845-1848* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1996); Dean B. Makin, *Olive Branch and Sword: The United States and Mexico, 1845-1848* (Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Company, 1997); Robert W. Johannsen, *To the Halls of the Moctezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); *The View from Chapultepec: Mexican Writers on the Mexican American War* ed. Cecil Robinson (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1989); Carlos Bosch García, "El conflicto del siglo XIX con los Estados Unidos," *Relaciones*

Despite Protestant hopes, the aftermath of the war also did not bring about permanent religious toleration, the U.S. conception of civil liberty or the expansion of Protestantism in Mexico.<sup>61</sup> In fact John C. Pinheiro has argued that in addition to the racial issue, many Americans were concerned about Catholicism and religious concerns played an important role in influencing the decision of U.S. politicians not to annex more of Mexico. This, in effect, prevented the potential spread of Protestantism to the annexed territory and the possible conversion of the nation to Protestantism.<sup>62</sup> Since many Protestant groups were concerned about the increase in Catholic immigration, and whether the U.S. republic would be able to incorporate “questionable” groups from Europe, these fears influenced U.S. policymakers from seeking to annex other more populated parts of the Mexican nation in the aftermath of the war.<sup>63</sup>

---

*México-Estados Unidos: Una Vision Interdisciplinaria* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1981), 17-42.

<sup>61</sup> Some Protestants unsuccessfully advocated forcing Mexico to accept reciprocity of religion as a part of the treaty of peace. See “Protestants in Mexico,” *Episcopal Recorder* (March 4, 1848): 203; Samuel John Bayard and Robert Field Stockton, *A Sketch of the Life of Com. Robert F. Stockton* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1856), 182-183.

<sup>62</sup> John C. Pinheiro, “‘Religion Without Restriction’: Anti-Catholicism, All Mexico and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 23:1 (Spring 2003): 96.

<sup>63</sup> Solomon discusses this debate as well. See “Saving the ‘Slaves of Kings and Priests,’” 97-113.

### La Reforma

In the years after independence Mexican society was divided between different factions, who had distinct visions for the future of their nation.<sup>64</sup> As might be expected, these factions engaged in heated debates that frequently descended into revolts against the opposing group, encompassing such issues of state organization, methods of social control, state intervention in the economy, church-state relations, and their attitude toward the colonial experience and its relevance for the future of Mexico.<sup>65</sup> The largest factions were those of the Conservatives and the Liberals, who were further divided into moderate and more radical groups. In a general sense the Liberals saw the internal Mexican conflict as between the forces of “progress and reaction” while Conservatives described a fight between “anarchy and civilization.”<sup>66</sup> Mexican Conservatives wanted a state that would regulate social and economic life through a civil bureaucracy, a strong military and the Catholic Church, along with a social system that protected class differences. Conservatives sought a society based on social inequality, in which authority and tradition was predominant, identifying such a system with the Catholic Church.<sup>67</sup> Mexican Liberals generally agreed upon the principles of constitutionalism, freedom of

---

<sup>64</sup> Javier Rodríguez Piña, “Conservatives Contest the Meaning of Independence, 1846-1855,” *¡Viva México! ¡Viva La Independencia! Celebrations of September 16* ed. William H. Beezley and David E. Lorey (Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 2001), 101.

<sup>65</sup> Timothy E. Anna, *Forging Mexico, 1821-1835* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 264.

<sup>66</sup> Donald Fithian Stevens, *Origins of Instability in Early Republican Mexico* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1991), 28.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 29.

the press, freedom of association, and judicial equality, but moderates and radicals were split on the issues of the Spanish colonial past, social equality, and the role of the Catholic Church in Mexican society.<sup>68</sup>

The war with the United States would have major ramifications for Mexican society. One historian has argued that the war showed the weakness of the Mexican economy and political system, “highlighting the flaws in its social fabric and raised the specter” of further U.S. territorial expansion at Mexico’s expense.<sup>69</sup> Indeed many Mexicans feared that the very existence of Mexico as an independent nation was threatened.<sup>70</sup> One of the leading historians of nineteenth century Mexican political thought argued that this caused both Liberals and Conservatives to reassert their programs for “national salvation with increased vigor.”<sup>71</sup> Both Liberals and Conservatives expressed a sense of shame about their defeat, and the resulting loss of Mexican territory, which emphasized the lost promise of the Mexican nation.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> Paul Vanderwood, “Betterment for Whom? The Reform Period: 1855-1875,” *The Oxford History of Mexico* eds. Michael C. Meyer and Williams H. Beezley (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 371. See also Charles A. Hale, “The War with the United States and the Crisis in Mexican Thought,” *The Americas* 14:2 (October 1957), 153; Mark Wasserman, *Everyday Life and Politics in Nineteenth Century Mexico: Men, Women and War* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 99.

<sup>70</sup> Friedrich Katz, “The Liberal Republic and the Porfiriato,” *Mexico Since Independence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 49; Charles A. Hale, *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821-1853* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968), 11.

<sup>71</sup> Hale, “The War with the United States,” 173.

<sup>72</sup> Enrique Florescano, *National Narratives in Mexico: A History* trans. Nancy Hancock (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006), 276.



Prior to 1854 the Conservatives and their allies in the Mexican Catholic Church had been generally able to control the government, but had frequently clashed with Liberal opponents creating a situation of political unrest through much of Mexico's post-Independence history.<sup>73</sup> In 1855 the successful Revolution of Ayutla deposed Santa Anna and put the Liberals in power, creating an important watershed moment in Mexican history.<sup>74</sup> The Liberals quickly began La Reforma, based on anti-militarist and anti-clerical ideas. La Reforma would, for the first time, successfully challenge the dominant position of the Church in Mexican politics and society.<sup>75</sup> These laws culminated in the Constitution of 1857 which disestablished the Church while attempting to create a purely secular government.<sup>76</sup> The Liberals also believed in the necessity of economic

---

<sup>73</sup> Powell, "Priests and Peasants," 297; Christon I. Archer, "Discord Disjunction, and Reveries of Past and Future Glories: Mexico's First Decades of Independence, 1810-1853," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 16:1 (Winter 2000): 191.

<sup>74</sup> Guy P.C. Thomson, "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 10:3 (1991): 273. For the specific political goals see "Plan de Ayutla" and "Plan de Acapulco, Modificando el de Ayutla," in Francisco Zarco, *Historia del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente* (México: El Colegio de México, 1956), 7-12.

<sup>75</sup> Don M. Coerver, "From Confrontation to Conciliation: Church-State Relations in Mexico, 1867-1884," *Church-State Relations and Religious Liberty in Mexico: Historical & Contemporary Perspective* ed. Derek H. Davis. (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2002), 19.

<sup>76</sup>For a text of the 1857 Constitution see "Constitución Federal Vigente de 5 de Febrero de 1857, con sus adiciones y reformas hasta el fin del siglo XIX," in José M. Gamboa, *Leyes Constitucionales de México durante El Siglo XIX* (México: Oficina Tip. De la Secretaria De Fomento, 1901), 528-589. For conservative opposition to the 1857 Constitution see Clemente de Jesús Munguía *Defensa eclesiástica en el obispado de Michoacán desde 1855 hasta principios de 1858* (México: Imprenta de Vicente Segura, 1858), reprinted in *Historia Documental de México II* ed. Ernesto de la Torre Villar, Moisés Gonzalez Navarro and Stanley Ross (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), 291-292. The Constitutional Convention determined that the body was not ready to confront the question of religious tolerance, and opted not to accept amendments



modernization and saw the United States as its source of capital, technological advances, fiscal relief and protection against European intervention.<sup>77</sup>

The Reform Laws and the new Constitution divided Mexican society into two hostile factions of roughly equal strength.<sup>78</sup> While the Liberals were successful in overthrowing the Conservative regime, they had not succeeded in weakening the social and economic power of their opponents.<sup>79</sup> Conservative General Felix Zuloaga, with the blessing of the Church hierarchy, on December 17, 1857 announced the Plan de Tacubaya which called for a new Constitution.<sup>80</sup> This resistance led to civil war in

---

explicitly outlining it. For more on the Convention and debates over the religious tolerance question see Walter V. Scholes, "Church and State at the Mexican Constitutional Convention, 1856-1857," *The Americas* 4:2 (October 1947): 151-174. Juarez proclaimed complete freedom of religion in 1860.

<sup>77</sup> Donathon C. Olliff, *Reforma Mexico and the United States: A Search for Alternatives to Annexation, 1854-1861* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1981), 2-6.

<sup>78</sup> Brian Hamnett argues that the struggle between Conservatives and Liberals, also included a long-term struggle between the center and regions, and between the regions and the central government. See "Mexican Conservatives, Clericals, and Soldiers: the 'Traitor' Tomás Mejía through Reform and Empire, 1855-1867," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 20:2 (2001): 195.

<sup>79</sup> Liberals tended to be civilians and military officers who were under 40, mestizos and from the center and north of Mexico. Conservatives tended to be politicians, clergy and military officers, on average 10 years older than Liberals and included much of the urban rich, and were usually creoles. See Enrique Krauze, *Mexico Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996* trans. Hank Heifetz (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997), 156.

<sup>80</sup> "Félix Zuloaga: Plan de Tacubaya, 1857" in *México en el Siglo XIX: Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas* ed. Álvaro Matute (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), 296-297; Krauze, *Mexico Biography of Power*, 169. For more on the responses of the Catholic Church see James H. Lee, "Bishop Clemente Munguía and Clerical Resistance to the Mexican Reform, 1855-1857," *The Catholic Historical Review* 66:3 (July 1980): 374-391 and Robert J. Knowlton, "Some

Mexico, known as the War of the Reform which lasted until the end of 1860. While Mexico had endured numerous revolts and civil disturbances, La Reforma would dwarf all previous civil strife in the country.<sup>81</sup>

From the beginning of the Mexican civil war, U.S. officials in the State Department sympathized with the Mexican Liberals, and expressed the hope that they would be victorious in their fight against the Conservatives.<sup>82</sup> U.S. officials believed that the Liberals, along with the masses in Mexico, looked to the United States with “sincere friendship,” and Liberal leaders looked to the United States for guidance and as a model.<sup>83</sup> This was in contrast to the Conservative leaders who were portrayed as deeply hostile to the United States.<sup>84</sup>

---

Practical Effects of Clerical Opposition to the Mexican Reform, 1856-1860,” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* (May 1965): 246-256.

<sup>81</sup> Krauze, *Mexico Biography of Power*, 152.

<sup>82</sup> Cass to Churchwell, December 27, 1858, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831-1860*, ed. William R. Manning (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1937), 255; Cass to McLane, March 7, 1859, in *Ibid.*, 257-258. Hereafter cited as *DCUS*. See also Twyman to Cass, July 28, 1858, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Veracruz* Record Group 59, Microfilm Reel 7.

<sup>83</sup> Churchwell to Cass, February 8, 1859, *DUCS* 1025; and Gadsden to Marcy, May 18, 1855, *DUCS* 773, 776; Gadsden to Marcy, April 3, 1855, in *Ibid.*, 752; Forsyth to Marcy, October 25, 1856, in *Ibid.*, 850. See also Twyman to Cass, January 21, 1859, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Vera Cruz* Record Group 59, Microfilm Reel 7.

<sup>84</sup> Gadsden to Marcy, April 3, 1855, *DUCS* 750; Gadsden to Marcy, November 5, 1855, in *Ibid.*, 793. The U.S. Consul in Chihuahua warned that he believed that the property and perhaps the lives of foreign residents would be at risk if the Conservatives won the civil war. See Macmanus to Cass, July 12, 1859, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Chihuahua* Record Group 59 Microfilm Reel 1; Gadsden to Marcy, February 5, 1855, *DUCS* Quote is from Gadsden to Marcy, April 3, 1855, in *Ibid.*, 750.

In the minds of U.S. officials, Conservatives had aligned themselves with the representatives of the Pope and European nations who sought to undermine the spread of liberal and republican institutions and were therefore enemies of the United States.<sup>85</sup> A dispatch from a U.S. agent in Mexico believed that European Powers, “unfriendly to the extension of liberal principle on this continent have left nothing undone to encourage the rebellion of the Roman Catholic priests, in their efforts to put down and destroy all hope of Constitutional liberty or representative Government in Mexico.”<sup>86</sup> This was in conflict with the policy goals of the United States which supported the establishment of what they described as a free and stable government in Mexico based on liberal principles.<sup>87</sup>

The Liberals, led by President Benito Juárez, sought to punish the Church for its involvement in the rebellion.<sup>88</sup> During 1859-1860, the Liberal government announced laws nationalizing all of the Church’s property holdings, made marriage a civil union, abolished monastic orders, and declared the strict enforcement of the separation of church and state. On December 4, 1860 the government guaranteed the complete freedom of religious belief for the first time in Mexican history.<sup>89</sup> These laws, particularly the confiscation of Catholic Church property, were heralded in the United States as

---

<sup>85</sup> Gadsden to Marcy, November 26, 1855, *DUCS* 799; Gadsden to Marcy, January 18, 1856, *DUCS* 819; Gadsden to Marcy, November 17, 1855, *Ibid.*, 795.

<sup>86</sup> Churchwell to Cass, March 8, 1859, *DUCS* 1035.

<sup>87</sup> Cass to McLane, September 20, 1860, *DUCS* 292.

<sup>88</sup> Vanderwood, “Betterment for Whom?” 376.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.* “Juárez: Nacionalización de Bienes Eclesiásticos y Libertad de Cultos 1859 y 1860,” in *México en el Siglo XIX: Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas* ed. Álvaro Matute (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), 154-156.

monumental events in Mexican history. Several writers likened this as the equivalent of the President of the United States unilaterally abolishing slavery.<sup>90</sup>

The U.S. press originally viewed the civil war in Mexico as just the latest incident in what one article referred to as the “land of revolution.”<sup>91</sup> The *New York Times* expressed sympathy for Mexico, but also declared that the country presented a “pitiful spectacle.” Americans understood that one of the core issues of the unrest was the Mexican Liberal attempt to separate church and state, but were not optimistic about the chances for their ultimate success.<sup>92</sup> For the first two years of the Mexican Wars of the Reform the Liberals were on the defensive, frequently losing battles to the better trained, equipped and officered Conservative forces.<sup>93</sup> As the Mexican Liberals continued to struggle, U.S. pessimism mounted, causing the *New York Times* to declare that “Mexican liberty is dead,” that republican institutions have become an “empty sham,” and that the

---

<sup>90</sup> “A Revolution in Mexico,” *New York Times*, July 25, 1859; “Mexico,” *National Era* (August 4, 1859).

<sup>91</sup> “Revolutionists in Mexico,” *Christian Observer* 36:6 (February 5, 1857): 22. See also “Another Glimpse at Mexico,” *Flag of Our Union* 13:52 (December 25, 1858): 412; “The Mexican Draft,” *New York Daily Times*, November 13, 1855; “Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 27, 1858. President James Buchanan would express a similar sentiment in his State of the Union address in 1858. See, James Buchanan, “Second Annual Message,” (December 6, 1858), in *The State of the Union Messages of the Presidents, Volume I: 1790-1860* (New York: Chelsea House, 1966), 983.

<sup>92</sup> “Mexican Anarchy Again,” *New York Daily Times*, May 1, 1857; “Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 16, 1858.

<sup>93</sup> Michael C. Meyer, William L. Sherman and Susan M. Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History* Eighth Edition (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 335-336.

Mexican republic was falling apart.<sup>94</sup> In this context, Mexico was described by the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* as a nation “eternally at war” with itself.<sup>95</sup> Several newspapers and periodical articles concluded that self-rule in Mexico had failed and that there was no hope for redress.<sup>96</sup> A.K. Shepard, an American who had spent two years in Mexico, declared that the Mexican people were unfit for self-government and needed a strong ruler with almost absolute power who would act with integrity and honesty and would exercise this power for the good of the people. He argued, “Twaddle about Republicanism is all very well, but when people are not fit for it, other forms of government must be adopted.”<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> “Mexico and Washington,” *New York Times*, February 19, 1858. See also “Our Foreign Policy,” *Harper’s Weekly* (May 16, 1857); “Religion in Mexico,” *Christian Observer* (January 24, 1856). “The Condition of Mexico,” *New York Herald*, October 17, 1859; “The Republic Fallen,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, November 16, 1857; “Mexico- The Protectorate,” *Sandusky Commercial Register*, April 22, 1858; “Mexico, the ‘Sick Man’ of the Western Continent-Progress of the Disease,” *Sandusky Commercial Register*, May 21, 1858; “Poor Mexico!” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, June 18, 1858; “Mexico Still Going It,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, June 29, 1858; “The United States and Mexico,” *Daily Missouri Republican*, December 9, 1858; “Unhappy Mexico,” *Wooster Republican*, June 16, 1859.

<sup>95</sup> “Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 12, 1859.

<sup>96</sup> “Mexico-What is to Become of Her?” *New York Times*, February 23, 1858; “The Republic South of Us,” *New York Times*, February 24, 1858; “Mexico and the Mexicans,” *The Weekly Wisconsin Patriot*, August 6, 1859; “Mexico-What is to Become of It?” *Daily Missouri Republican*, August 18, 1858; “The Sick Man of America,” *New York Times*, August 22, 1860; “The Last Days of Mexico,” *Littell’s Living Age* (October 22, 1859); “The Fate of Mexico,” *The United States Democratic Review* (May 1858). One article prematurely hoped that Revolutions were done in Mexico, before the Church revolted against the Liberal Reforms. See “Colonization of Mexico,” *Scientific American* (October 11, 1856).

<sup>97</sup> A.K. Shepard, *The Land of the Aztecs; or Two Years in Mexico* (Albany: Weed, Parsons & Co, 1859), 98. See also “Mexico,” *Graham’s Magazine* XLVIII: 2 (February 1856): 175.

Because of these views Americans debated how and to what extent the United States should get involved in Mexican affairs. The Buchanan administration consistently sought to use the Mexican civil war as a pretext for the annexation of Mexican territory, and unsuccessfully asked Congress for the authority to send an armed force into Mexico, ostensibly to help the Liberals, but in reality as a pretext for occupation and annexation.<sup>98</sup> The influential national news magazine *Harper's Weekly* described the dilemma that the United States faced in confronting the Mexican situation. In the view of the editors there had never been a party in the United States which had claimed that the U.S. had the right to “interfere in the local affairs of our neighbors, or even to pronounce opinions upon the policy they chose to pursue in the administration of their public business.” At the same time *Harper's* unequivocally stated that the United States ought to be the “leading power in the Western World, to exercise a commanding influence, by the force of our example and public sentiment, over the affairs of all the states of the continent of America.”<sup>99</sup> These contradictory views in the same editorial reflect U.S. confusion in how to implement the abstract notion of U.S. mission in response to changing events in Mexico during the period.

However other American commentators, some with ties to the Mexican Liberal party, portrayed the actions of the Liberals as evidence of Mexican progress. Edward E. Dunbar, a businessman who spent 12 years in Mexico, published a series of articles in

---

<sup>98</sup> Binder, *James Buchanan and the American Empire*, 247-248. Because of the predominance of sectional issues, Northern Senators saw Buchanan's action as an attempt by Democrats to extend territory for slaveholding.

<sup>99</sup> “Ought the United States to Intervene in Mexico?” *Harper's Weekly* (March 13, 1858).

1860 sympathetic to the plight of the Mexican Liberals.<sup>100</sup> Dunbar suggested that civil strife in Mexican history was due to unsuccessful attempts to “break the chains” of Church power that had ruled the country since the Spanish colonization.<sup>101</sup> In Dunbar’s description the current civil war in Mexico was due to an attempt to strike at the “diseased and rotten foundation of Mexican nationality,” and to attack the “deep-seated evils” existing in Mexico.<sup>102</sup> The Liberals, he argued, were fighting for healthy and vigorous progress, while the Conservatives were making “wild and savage efforts” to continue the oppression of the past.<sup>103</sup> Since the Mexican Liberals sought to induce U.S.

---

<sup>100</sup> Dunbar was also an occasional *New York Times* correspondent whose promotional work on behalf of Mexico was subsidized by the Mexican Liberal government. See Olliff, *Reforma Mexico and the United States*, 145.

<sup>101</sup> Edward E. Dunbar, *The Mexican Papers* No. 1 (August 15, 1860): 5-6. For a similar, though often more subdued statements see, “Mexican Affairs,” *New York Daily Times*, December 20, 1855; “The Clergy in Mexico,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (May 8, 1856); “Mexican Politics,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 29, 1857; “The News from Mexico,” *The New York Herald*, July 15, 1856; “From Mexico,” *New York Daily Times*, July 19, 1856; “The Mexican Priesthood,” *New York Evangelist*, August 14, 1856; “Important from Mexico-Our Relations with that Republic,” *New York Herald*, May 4, 1858; Several articles discuss the involvement of the Pope seeking to prevent the long term implementation of the Laws of the Reform. See “Romanism in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (February 7, 1856); “The Pope Interfering with the Churches on the American Continent,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (January 29, 1857); “Mexico and the Catholic Church,” *Farmer’s Cabinet*, May 25, 1857.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.* For more subdued statement of support for the actions of the Liberals see “The Present State of Mexico,” *Littell’s Living Age* (October 27, 1855); “Our Mexican Policy,” *Kalamazoo Gazette*, December 31, 1858; “Good News from Mexico,” *Chicago Press and Tribune*, July 28, 1859; “Church Property in Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, July 27, 1859; “Real Estate and Church Property in Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, August 18, 1859.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.* For similar, though more subdued sentiments see, “The United States and Mexico,” *New York Daily Times*, September 11, 1855; “The Church in Mexico,” *Boston Investigator*, June 11, 1856; “Toleration in Mexico,” *Saturday Evening Post* (August 9, 1856); “Mexico,” *New York Daily Times*, December 23, 1856; “New Plan for Annexing Cuba to the United States,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 18, 1857; “Mexico and



trade and investment into Mexico, another writer Carlos Butterfield, explained that a victory of the Liberal party was necessary for the U.S. to build up trade and investment in Mexico, where Americans would find a “magnificent field for our enterprise, industry and capital.” In Butterfield’s view, a Liberal victory would allow the principles of liberty to be developed under the care of the United States, and Mexico would become a “faithful friend and ally,” while a Conservative victory could lead to war with Mexico, and possibly European powers as well.<sup>104</sup>

In light of continuing difficulties, Mexican Liberals sought aid from the United States in the form of loans, weapons and a protectorate. The willingness of the Mexican Liberal leaders to accept a U.S. protectorate reflects the desperation of their situation. From early 1859 to mid-1860 the Liberal cause at times seemed “hopeless,” and they sought to secure “at almost any price, a guarantee of American moral, economic, and military support as its only visible hope for survival.”<sup>105</sup> At the same time, the Liberals were well aware of the dangers of courting the United States and often expressed deep

---

Our Relations with Mexico- Manifest Destiny,” *The New York Herald*, March 30, 1858; “Church Property in Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, July 27, 1859; “Mexican Affairs,” *Chicago Press and Tribune*, April 28, 1860; *Mexico: Its Present Government, and its Political Parties* (Washington, D.C.: Lemuel Towers, 1860), 2, 14,18; *Mexico. No 2. Historical and Financial Items* (N.P.: Friends of Mexico, 1866), 1; George E. Church, *Mexico. Its Revolutions: Are They Evidences of Retrogression or of Progress?* (New York: Baker & Goodwin, 1866), 44.

<sup>104</sup> Carlos Butterfield, *United States and Mexico: Commerce, Trade, and Postal Facilities Between the Two Countries. Statistics of Mexico*. (New York: JAH Hasbrouck & Co, 1861), 159. Butterfield was an American living in Mexico with close ties to the Liberal government and sought to promote a mail-steamer service between the U.S. and Mexico. See Olliff, *Reforma Mexico and the United States*, 54-55.

<sup>105</sup> Alfredo Rolando Andrade, “Mexican Liberalism and the United States During the Era of La Reforma: A History of Attitudes and Policy, 1855-1861.” PhD diss., The University of Oklahoma, 1975. 24-25.



concerns of being “absorbed by the Colossus of the North,” though these usually came in the form of sealed letters, or private discussions, but were not expressed publically.<sup>106</sup>

Mexican fears were well-founded as in the years between the end of the U.S.-Mexico War and the U.S. Civil War, American proposals and discussion of investment in Mexico usually had territorial expansion as their ultimate goal.<sup>107</sup> Despite these concerns, in April 1859 the Liberals and U.S. representatives signed the McLane-Ocampo Treaty, which would have made Mexico a protectorate of the United States and given the U.S. the ability to intervene in Mexican affairs, as well as providing for reciprocal trade and allowing the U.S. to build and protect railroads in Mexico.<sup>108</sup> The U.S. press debated the merits of a protectorate, as well as the possibility of outright annexation of Mexican territory.<sup>109</sup> In a manner similar to discussions around the time of the U.S. war with Mexico, a series of editorials in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* described the absorption of Mexico as part of the “Manifest Destiny” of the United States, which would happen

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 45-48; 150.

<sup>107</sup> David M. Pletcher, *The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment: American Economic Expansion in the Hemisphere, 1865-1900* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 1998), 79.

<sup>108</sup> Frederick Moore Binder, *James Buchanan and the American Empire* (London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994), 249-250; Olliff, *Reforma Mexico and the United States*, 7.

<sup>109</sup> One article written in the form of a letter to Mexico, ended with the statement, “...you must make progress, or you will be absorbed by a more energetic race.” “The Republics of Mexico and the United States,” *DeBow’s Review* (October 1856). This was also the assessment of the U.S. Consul in Minatitlan. See Allen to Cass, January 1, 1859, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Minatitlan* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 1. Other articles that advocated annexation include, “The Mexican Revolution,” *The New York Herald*, April 12, 1858; “Mexico-Her Evils and Their Remedy,” *The New York Herald*, May 13, 1858.

within the next ten years resulting in the improvement of Mexico “under Anglo-Saxon influence and energy.”<sup>110</sup> A similar sentiment was expressed by the San Francisco *Evening Bulletin* which stated flatly that “the American continent had been given to Republican America by the Creator.”<sup>111</sup>

Most viewed a direct move toward annexation as unlikely, but saw a protectorate as a potential first step to the future annexation of Mexican territory. A *Harper’s Weekly* editorial acknowledged that the time was not ripe for the incorporation of Mexico into the United States, but stated that the U.S. should begin “taking preparatory steps toward that consummation.” The editorial writer stated that Mexican “anarchy” caused “positive injury” to the United States by damaging the “prestige” of republican institutions, setting a poor example for the Southern states in the United States, threatened the investments of Americans in Mexico and hurt potential trade opportunities.<sup>112</sup> *The New York Times*

---

<sup>110</sup> “The Absorption of Mexico,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 7, 1858. See also “Spain, Mexico and the United States,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, April 23, 1858; “Mexico and the Future,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, June 3, 1858; “Mexico, Cuba and the United States,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, August 3, 1858; “The United States and Mexico,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, August 9, 1858. See also “Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, December 7, 1857; “Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, March 26, 1860. The paper was vague as to how this annexation would take place and while suggesting it would be good for Mexico, seemed unsure how beneficial it would be for the United States. This theme of U.S. occupation of Mexico being beneficial for Mexico, but possibly not the U.S. would be discussed later in the context of what the U.S. policy should be toward Mexico after a potential French withdrawal in “Shall We Have War?” *Baltimore Sun*, November 27, 1865.

<sup>111</sup> “What is to Become of Mexico?” *Evening Bulletin*, June 16, 1858. See also “Annexation of Mexico,” *Evening Bulletin*, October 6, 1858.

<sup>112</sup> “The Condition of Mexico,” *Harper’s Weekly* (April 3, 1858). The New York-based magazine made this claim of Mexico providing a poor example to the southern states on several occasions. See also, “Ought the United States to Intervene in Mexico?” *Harper’s Weekly* (March 13, 1858).

consistently argued for a U.S. protectorate as the only hope for Mexico.<sup>113</sup> It went as far to suggest that the United States had originally erred by not retaining control of the country after the U.S.-Mexico War.<sup>114</sup> While acknowledging that the U.S. had mistreated Mexico during the war, the *Times* suggested a U.S. protectorate could make up for it by providing aid and support.<sup>115</sup>

Most American commentators accepted the idea that republican government in Mexico had failed, and that any hope of redress would have to come from outside the country. Because of this they worried that if the United States did not take decisive action, European powers would fill the void thereby violating the Monroe Doctrine, and threatening the position of the United States in the Western Hemisphere.<sup>116</sup> *Harper's*

---

<sup>113</sup> "Mexico-What is to Become of Her?" *New York Times*, February 23, 1858; "Mexico and the Tribune," *New York Times*, April 20, 1858; "The Necessity for a Mexican Protectorate" *New York Times*, May 4, 1858; "The Mexican Question," *New York Times*, May 19, 1858; "Mexico-What is to Become of It?" *New York Times*, August 14, 1858. See also, "What Shall We Do with Mexico?" *Daily Evening Bulletin*, May 26, 1859; "Mexico," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, August 12, 1859. Another article suggested that annexation was coming, but needed time for Mexico to be ripe for such an action. See "Annexation of Mexico-The Pear Ripening," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, October 6, 1858.

<sup>114</sup> "The Necessity of a Mexican Protectorate," *New York Times*, May 4, 1858. See also "The State of Mexico," *Wisconsin Daily Patriot*, January 12, 1860.

<sup>115</sup> "How To Tranquilize Mexico," *New York Times*, August 6, 1859. President Buchanan would express a similar sentiment, suggesting that the only hope for Mexico was U.S. intervention. See, James Buchanan, "Third Annual Address," (December 19, 1859), in *The State of the Union Messages of the Presidents, Volume I: 1790-1860* (New York: Chelsea House, 1966), 1016. See also James Buchanan, "Fourth Annual Address," in *Ibid.*, 1044.

<sup>116</sup> "Mexico," *Baltimore Sun*, April 26, 1859. See also "Mexican Matters," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, May 20, 1858; "An American Protectorate Over Mexico," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, November 30, 1858; "What Shall We Do with Mexico?" *Evening Bulletin*, May 26, 1859; "Stirring News from Mexico," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, March 21, 1860; "The War in Mexico," *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, March 26, 1860.

*Weekly* argued that the Monroe Doctrine conferred both “privileges” and “responsibilities,” and that if the U.S. did not “save Mexico” then it should not object if other nations did so.<sup>117</sup> Other media sources were less enthusiastic. *Russell’s Magazine* argued that the United States should not become involved in Mexico, both because of the enormity of the problems in Mexico and the fact that the United States was not lacking in challenges domestically.<sup>118</sup>

Like earlier debates over the annexation of Mexican territory, ideas of race would play a complex role in shaping the debate over the U.S. role in Mexico.<sup>119</sup> Several articles speculated about the difficulties that the U.S. would have in Mexico, especially because of the racial composition of its population. This composition included what was often described as the “restless and turbulent Spanish race,” the “backward and ignorant Indian races,” and the “mixed race.” Some suggested had inherited the worst qualities of both reflecting anti-Spanish, anti-Indian and anti-miscegenation prejudices in the United States.<sup>120</sup> Others expressed dismay that a protectorate would lead to annexation and this

---

<sup>117</sup> “Protection to United States Citizens Abroad,” *Harper’s Weekly* (January 1, 1859). See also “Mexico,” *Harper’s Weekly* (January 8, 1859).

<sup>118</sup> “Mexico,” *Russell’s Magazine* 3:4 (July 1858). See also “ST. P. “Mexico and the Protectorate,” *The Nassau Literary Magazine*,” 19:7 (May 1859); “Our Relations Toward Mexico,” *Daily Missouri Republican*, December 01, 1858; “The President and Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, May 21, 1859; “The United States and Mexico,” *Sandusky Commercial Register*, September 24, 1859.

<sup>119</sup> See for instance, Thomas R. Hietala, *Manifest Design*; and Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny* for discussions of the role of race in U.S. decisions regarding annexation during the war with Mexico.

<sup>120</sup> “The Mexican Question,” *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine* (March 1859); “The Fate of Mexico,” *The United States Democratic Review* (May 1858). In his defense of the Mexican Liberals Dunbar suggests that because Juarez is a full

would result in bringing what they believed were racially inferior Mexicans into the U.S. Republic. One editorial blamed much of Mexico's problems on the inferiority of the Mexican "racial stock" and expressed dismay over the possibility of a "large number of perfidious Spaniards and half-breed Indians" being admitted to U.S. congressional bodies.<sup>121</sup> A strongly worded editorial in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* argued that those in favor of a protectorate were careless of the "higher interests" of the United States. It asked, "Shall we take Mexico, and her Spaniards, niggers, licentiousness, ignorance and all, and make them a part of the Republic?" The *Tribune* suggested that Mexicans would corrupt democratic institutions, thereby endangering the national existence and opposed their entrance as either equals or dependents into the United States.<sup>122</sup>

A writer in *The United States Democratic Review* accepted the premise of Mexican racial inferiority, but believed that annexing Mexico would have different results, suggesting the United States should take control over Mexico, "and wheel her into the train of the world's progress." The article stated that this was part of the destiny

---

blooded Indian and because of the number of indigenous people in Mexico, that many Americans denounce them unfairly. See Dunbar, *The Mexican Papers no 1* 96-97; 122-125.

<sup>121</sup> "Mexican Protectorate," *Russell's Magazine* 4:1 (October 1858). For a similar description of Mexicans see "Mexico," *Farmer's Cabinet*, February 17, 1858. Articles that opposed a protectorate and annexation because of racial concerns include, "The Mexican Question," *The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine* (March 1859); "The Fate of Mexico," *The United States Democratic Review* (May 1858). "Mexican Protectorate," *Russell's Magazine* 4:1 (October 1858); "Mexico," *Farmer's Cabinet*, February 17, 1858; "Protectorate Over Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 19, 1858; *The New York Daily Tribune*, February 27, 1860; "Protectorate Over Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 19, 1858; *The New York Daily Tribune*, February 27, 1860.

<sup>122</sup> "Protectorate Over Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 19, 1858. For a similar description see *The New York Daily Tribune*, February 27, 1860.

given by the Almighty for the United States to rule over the whole “Spanish American world” as well as the rest of the Western Hemisphere, declaring that, “No other system of government exists on the earth that has the vitality, power, elasticity, sagacity, adoption, or even stability, to do this Herculean work.”<sup>123</sup>

As discussed previously Americans viewed the United States as a model republic, and had hoped that Mexico and other Latin American countries would follow its example. In their view Mexico hitherto represented the failure of republicanism and was thus in the need of U.S. guidance.<sup>124</sup> Or as *The United States Democratic Review* put it, Mexico, had “blasphemed the holy name of Liberty” with its continual revolutions and unrest. But the editorialist firmly believed that annexation would result in the emancipation from despotism and anarchy, which would in the long-term benefit the whole world.<sup>125</sup> Because of the predominance of sectional issues, Northern Senators saw the attempted creation of a protectorate as an attempt by Democrats to extend territory for slaveholding, and refused to support either the protectorate or moves leading to the annexation of Mexican territory.<sup>126</sup>

Contrary to U.S. predictions, Liberals were able to take control of the country and defeat the Conservatives. The War slowly began to turn in the favor of the Liberals in

---

<sup>123</sup> “The Fate of Mexico,” *The United States Democratic Review* (May 1858).

<sup>124</sup> See for instance “The Presidential Message on Mexico,” *Harper’s Weekly* (December 4, 1858). See also Mr. Buchanan’s Mexico Policy,” *Harper’s Weekly* (January 7, 1860). However by mid-1860 the editors at *Harper’s* became convinced that the U.S. should allow Mexicans to work out their problems for themselves.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 250.

1859, and the United States government responded by officially recognizing the Liberal government. After a series of military victories in 1860, the Liberal Army captured Mexico City and Juárez entered the capital on New Year's Day 1861.<sup>127</sup> In the wake of their defeat much of the Church hierarchy was exiled to Europe and other parts of Latin America.<sup>128</sup>

In the aftermath of debates over if and how the United States might intervene in Mexico, Americans expressed pleasure that despite the failure of the United States to intervene, Mexico appeared to have solved its biggest problem- the role of the Catholic Church in its society- without U.S. involvement, and saw this as strong evidence of Mexican progress.<sup>129</sup> The *New York Times* expressed gratification over the Liberal victory and expected that Mexico was about to enter a new era of peace and prosperity, while an article in the *New York Evangelist* described the victory as an overthrow of the Catholic tyranny in the nation.<sup>130</sup> Since the victory was won without intervention from

---

<sup>127</sup> Manuel Cambre, *La Guerra de tres años* (Guadalajara: Imprenta y Encuadernación de José Cabrera, 1904) reprinted in *Historia Documental de México II* eds. Ernesto de la Torre Villar, Moisés Gonzalez Navarro and Stanley Ross (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México 1964), 301-302. For Juárez' statement on re-entering México City see, "Proclama de Juárez al Volver a la Ciudad de México," *Benito Juárez: Documentos, Discursos y Correspondencia IV* ed. Jorge L. Tamayo (México: Secretaria del Patrimonio Nacional, 1965), 136-138.

<sup>128</sup> Paul V. Murray, *The Catholic Church in Mexico: Historical Essays for the General Reader Volume I (1519-1910)* (Mexico: Editorial E.P.M., 1965), 182-184.

<sup>129</sup> See for instance, "Interesting News from Mexico," *New York Herald*, January 30, 1860.

<sup>130</sup> "The Liberal Triumph in Mexico," *New York Times*, January 9, 1861; "Order and Liberty in Mexico," *New York Evangelist* (March 28, 1861). See also "A Mexican Manifesto," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 14, 1861. For earlier similar views of the Mexican civil war see "The Struggle between Church and State in Mexico," *The New York Herald*, March 7, 1860; "The Decline of Mexico and its Dangers for Us," *The New*



the United States, the *Times* asserted that “The moral position that country now occupies must command the respect of the world,” with the defeat of the Catholic Church resulting in a “nation born to liberty!”<sup>131</sup> The *Times* further expressed satisfaction with the reform program of the Liberals, especially the banishment of Church officials, as evidence of a bright future for the Mexican Republic.<sup>132</sup> This corresponds to the larger themes of Protestant teleology which linked progress to religious development, and in this narrative the Catholic Church was the “primitive” past that Protestantism leaves behind as societies progress.<sup>133</sup>

Mexico’s perceived rejection of the Catholic Church was interpreted as placing the nation on the right road to a progressive future, providing a useful narrative of Mexican history in the eyes of American commentators. While many had viewed Mexico as a turbulent, disorderly nation, constantly at war with itself, with little hope for self-improvement, this new narrative emphasized the long difficult struggle to remove the vestiges of the colonial past and the evils of the dominance of the Church.<sup>134</sup> In this

---

*York Herald*, April 5, 1860. Later articles would be more subdued and discuss the challenges with internal disorder that the Republic still faced. See “Triumph of the Liberal Cause in Mexico,” *The New York Herald*, January 9, 1861; “The Mexican Anarchy,” *New York Times*, September 15, 1861.

<sup>131</sup> “Our Policy towards Mexico,” *New York Times*, January 17, 1861.

<sup>132</sup> “Matters in Mexico,” *New York Times* (March 7, 1861). See also “Mexico,” *Columbus Crisis*, February 21, 1861; “Energetic Measures of the Constitutional Government in Mexico,” *The New York Herald*, February 22, 1861.

<sup>133</sup> Susan M. Griffin, *Anti-Catholicism and Nineteenth Century Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 5.

<sup>134</sup> “The Mexican Enigma,” *The Independent* (May 12, 1864). For similar themes by Mexican Liberals see “Address of Colonel Manuel Balbontin,” *Proceedings of a Meeting of Citizens of New York to Express Sympathy and Respect for the Mexican*



interpretation, Mexico had been successful in its quest to achieve liberty, and was set to begin a new era after crushing the power of the Church.<sup>135</sup> Because of these changes Americans now hoped that Mexico would be able to embrace the example of the United States and institute a true republic government, economic prosperity, and trade linkages with the United States.

U.S. government officials likewise expressed their pleasure over the victory by the Mexican Liberals and their hopes for the creation of a stable government which adhered to republican principles.<sup>136</sup> Shortly before Lincoln's inauguration the Mexican *chargés d'affaires* to the United States, Matías Romero met with the future president and stated that the Liberal government sought to maintain the "most intimate" and "friendly" relations with the United States. He declared, "Mexico wants to adopt the same principles of liberty and progress which are followed here, travelling the same path to arrive at the

---

*Republican Exiles* (New York: John A. Gray & Green, Printers, 1865), 34-39 and "Speech of the Honorable Matias Romero," *Ibid.*, 43-45.

<sup>135</sup> "Mexico," *The Barre Gazette*, February 22, 1861. U.S. officials also expressed pleasure at the success of the Mexican Liberals. See Cass to McLane, September 20, 1860, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831-1860*, ed. William R. Manning (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1937): 288. See also Black to U.S. State Department, January 15, 1861, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Mexico City* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 6; Pickett to Cass, January 21, 1861, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Veracruz* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 8.

<sup>136</sup> Cass to McLane, September 20, 1860, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831-1860*, ed. William R. Manning (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1937): 288. See also Black to U.S. State Department, January 15, 1861, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Mexico City* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 6; Pickett to Cass, January 21, 1861, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Veracruz* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 8.

grandeur and unequalled prosperity currently enjoyed in the United States.”<sup>137</sup> The U.S. Secretary of State William H. Seward, in his instructions to the new U.S. Minister to Mexico, expressed the hope that Mexico’s experiences with disorder were coming to an end and suggested that the world was deeply interested in the development of Mexican resources as well as having a high respect for the “simple virtues and heroism of her people, and, above all, their inextinguishable love of civil liberty.”<sup>138</sup> However if Mexico was just taking a respite from disorder, then Seward was deeply concerned that the nation would provide an enticing temptation to those looking to take advantage of the situation.<sup>139</sup>

At the same time that Mexico seemed to be entering a period of peace, the U.S. government and the American press became preoccupied with the potential for civil unrest in the United States after the election of Abraham Lincoln in 1860, and the threat of secession from the Southern states. While Americans had been used to looking at the disorder and anarchy in Mexico as a contrast to their orderly system of government, now the roles were reversed as the U.S. entered into a period of Civil War while Mexico had ended its internal conflict.<sup>140</sup> An 1858 editorial in the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* had

---

<sup>137</sup> Reprinted in *Mexican Lobby: Matías Romero in Washington, 1861-1867* ed and trans. Thomas D. Schoonover (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 2.

<sup>138</sup> Seward to Corwin, April 6, 1861 *Foreign Relations of the United States 1861* (Washington D.C.: GPO, 1862), 67.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, and Frederick W. Seward, *Seward at Washington, Senator and Secretary of State: A Memoir of His Life, with Selections from His Letters, 1846-1861* (New York: Derby and Miller, 1891), 542.

<sup>140</sup> “Great Events at Hand!” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, February 4, 1861.

speculated that “Providence” had given the United States “hapless Mexico” as a “constant, instructive, and admonitory contrast,” yet now it appeared that the United States was going down the same road that they had frequently disparaged Mexico for travelling.<sup>141</sup> The *Weekly Wisconsin Patriot* (Madison) stated, “Let the history of Mexico, of the central states and the South American States solve this problem, by the gory examples they have strewn along the highway of their living deaths.”<sup>142</sup> Despite these concerns the U.S. did enter a period of destructive Civil War which threatened the existence of the republic, that Americans believed was the birth-place of freedom and a model for the rest of the world.<sup>143</sup> Secretary of State Seward, speaking for himself and President Lincoln, expressed a measure of embarrassment at the internal troubles in the United States, acknowledging that republican governments in the United States and Mexico were encountering tough times, but suggested they, never for a moment, doubted that “the republican system is to pass safely through all ordeals and prove a permanent success in our own country, and so commended to adoption by all other nations.”<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> “Another Revolution in Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, January 16, 1858. This is a reprint of Forney’s Press.

Other articles that express this fear include, “The Great National Crisis,” *Baltimore Sun*, December 8, 1860; “Platform Versus Union,” *Weekly Wisconsin Patriot*, February 9, 1861; “Interior View of Mexico,” *The Crisis*, February 21, 1861; “The Foreign Ministers at Washington,” *Weekly Wisconsin Patriot*, May 1, 1861.

<sup>142</sup> “Will You or Won’t You,” *Weekly Wisconsin Patriot*, February 9, 1861. One editorial suggested that the coming of civil strife in the U.S. was creating more sympathy for the plight of the Mexican people. See “New Difficulties in Mexico,” *St Alban’s Daily Messenger*, August 24, 1861.

<sup>143</sup> “Foreign Intervention,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, May 14, 1862.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 69, and Seward, *Seward at Washington*, 542.

### The French Intervention

As the Liberal government attempted to rebuild the country it faced enormous financial pressure. Juárez gave priority to internal reconstruction in the aftermath of the civil war, which resulted in the decision to suspend payment on foreign debts for the next two years.<sup>145</sup> In response France, England and Spain signed the Tripartite Convention in London agreeing to military intervention in Mexico to guarantee the repayment of debts.<sup>146</sup> While originally the powers disavowed any interest for conquest or the occupation of Mexico, it soon became clear that the French Emperor, Napoleon III, had larger designs on Mexico. Napoleon III sought to spread the French empire to Mexico, taking advantage of U.S. preoccupation with the American Civil War.<sup>147</sup> He saw

---

<sup>145</sup> For the internal Mexican discussion of the suspension of the debt see, “Arreglo de la Hacienda Pública Suspensión del Pago de la Deuda Exterior,” in *Benito Juárez: Documentos, Discursos y Correspondencia IV* ed. Jorge L. Tamayo (México: Secretaria del Patrimonio Nacional, 1965), 625-805. Manuel María de Zamacona, “Circular al Cuerpo Diplomático Explicado La Ley de Suspensión de Pagos,” (julio 29, 1861), in *Benito Juárez: Documentos, Discursos y Correspondencia IV* ed. Jorge L. Tamayo (México: Secretaria del Patrimonio Nacional, 1965), 651-655.

<sup>146</sup> Brian Hamnet, *A Concise History of Mexico* Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006): 163. For a text of the agreement see “La Convencion de Londres 1861” in *México en el Siglo XIX: Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas* ed. Álvaro Matute (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), 507-509. While U.S. officials were not pleased with the events, they did accept the premise that European powers had a right to make war nations in the Western Hemisphere as well as intervene because of grievances, but did not have the right to permanently occupy parts of the country or force a change of government by force. See Cass to McLane, April 28, 1860, *DUCS* 285; McLane to Roy de La Reintrie, December 7, 1860, in *Ibid.*, 1233; Seward to Dayton, June 21, 1862, *FRUS* 1862 (Washington D.C.: GPO, 1862), 354-355.

<sup>147</sup> Henry Blumenthal, *A Reappraisal of Franco-American Relations, 1830-1871* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 169; D.P. Cook, *The North, the South and the Powers, 1861-1865* (New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, 1974), 54-55.

intervention in Mexico as an opportunity to check the potential power of the United States and to form an empire based on the substitution of monarchies adhering to Latin and Catholic traditions.<sup>148</sup> As such he was initially supported by much of the exiled Mexican Church hierarchy and many Mexican Conservatives.<sup>149</sup>

U.S. officials saw the French actions in Mexico as a direct challenge to the Monroe Doctrine and to the long-term security of the United States in the Western Hemisphere which they believed depended on the stability of republican government in Latin America, and an absence of European imperialism.<sup>150</sup> Unlike most European

---

<sup>148</sup> Colin M. MacLachlan and William H. Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo: A History of Greater Mexico* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999), 63; Thomas David Schoonover, *Dollars over Dominion: The Triumph of Liberalism in Mexican-United States Relations, 1861-1867* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 141; Alicia Hernandez Chavez, *Mexico: A Brief History*, 149.

<sup>149</sup> Murray, *The Catholic Church in Mexico*, 196.

<sup>150</sup> Schoonover, *Dollars over Dominion*, xviii; Alfred Jackson Hanna and Kathryn Abbey Hanna, *Napoleon III and Mexico: American Triumph Over Monarchy* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971), 121. Generally by the early 1830s Southerners remained harsh critics of Mexico's inability to create political stability. In the years after the Mexican-American War, Southerners were often the strongest advocates for territorial expansion into Mexico as a way to provide slave states to balance non slave ones in the U.S. Midwest and West. Southern advocates of this expansion emphasized the "unfitness" of Mexico and the Mexican people for republicanism as a justification for further annexation. During the Civil War. Confederate diplomats sought to effect an alliance first with the French government and later with the Maximilian regime but were unable to do so amid French fears that recognition of the Confederacy or an alliance of any kind would provoke the North and may lead to Union actions against the Intervention/Empire. Sarah E. Cornell, "Americans in the U.S. South and Mexico: A Transnational History of Race, Slavery, and Freedom, 1810-1910." PhD. diss., New York University, 2008. 190-224. Scott A. Silverstone, *Divided Union: The Politics of War in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 2004), 241; Justin Horton, "The Second Lost Cause: Post-National Confederate Imperialism in the Americas." MA Thesis, East Tennessee State University, 2007. 22-26. Frank Lawrence Owsley Sr., *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America* Third Edition revised by Harriet Chappell Owsley (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008), 508; Joseph A. Fry, *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South*

nations the U.S. refused to recognize diplomatic representatives from the Mexican Empire and continued to recognize the Liberal government of Benito Juárez.<sup>151</sup> The U.S. State Department communicated its displeasure regarding the French actions in Mexico while at the same time seeking to dissuade the French from recognizing or aligning with the Confederacy.<sup>152</sup> U.S. policy was to be neutral, while at the same time expressing its sympathies with the republican government in Mexico, and general opposition to the overthrow of republics in favor of monarchies.<sup>153</sup>

While U.S. writers blamed Mexico's turbulent past for the French Intervention,<sup>154</sup> most, tended to express sympathy, as well as a special kinship with their "sister Republic" which they viewed as a victim to an unjust invasion.<sup>155</sup> One writer explained,

---

*and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), 99-100; Dean B. Makin, *One War at a Time: The International Dimensions of the American Civil War* (Washington DC: Brassey's, 1999), 227-229.

<sup>151</sup> Robert H. Duncan, "For the Good of the Country: State and Nation Building during Maximilian's Mexican Empire, 1864-1867." PhD diss., University of California at Irvine, 2001. 35-36.

<sup>152</sup> J. Fred Rippy, *The United States and Mexico* (New York: F.S. Crofts & Co, 1931), 259; Henry W. Temple, "William H. Seward," *The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy* Volume VII ed. Samuel Flagg Bemis (New York: Copper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963), 106-107; Thomas A. Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People* 6<sup>th</sup> Edition (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964), 352.

<sup>153</sup> Albert Joseph Griffin Jr., "Intelligence Versus Impulse: William H. Seward and the Threat of War with France over Mexico, 1861-1867." PhD diss. University of New Hampshire, 2003. 8, 42.

<sup>154</sup> "European Coalition Against Mexico," *The Independent* (January 9, 1862); *New York Observer and Chronicle* (August 6, 1863); A Citizen of California, *Mexico and the United States: An American View of the Mexican Question* (San Francisco: H.H. Bancroft and Company, 1866), 4, 8.

<sup>155</sup> "Mexico," *Saturday Evening Post* (February 1, 1862); "The French in Mexico," *The Daily Palladium*, January 26, 1863; "Mexico Spirit of the People," *New*

“Mexico demands our warmest sympathies. Never was there a more unjust or arrogant invasion than that of the French.”<sup>156</sup> Americans also expressed anger that the French and other powers had taken advantage of the U.S. Civil War, as well as frustration that the United States could not respond more forcefully in its self-appointed role as protector of Latin America to aid Mexico, but with the expectation, that the U.S. would eventually get involved when the Southern rebellion was defeated.<sup>157</sup> The *Kalamazoo Gazette* (Michigan) described the Intervention as a humiliation for the United States because of its inability to protect the Monroe Doctrine.<sup>158</sup> This anger was illustrated by a series of editorials in *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper* that described the traditional role of the United States as that of the protector of the Latin American republics, and frustration that the U.S. was not able to come to the aid of Mexico militarily.<sup>159</sup> The newspaper declared

---

*York Times*, January 29, 1863; “The French in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (February 5, 1863); “The French in Mexico,” *Hartford Daily Courant*, April 25, 1863; *The United States Service Magazine* 1:1 (January 1864); Vine Wright Kingsley, *French Intervention in America; or, A Review of La France, Le Mexique, Et Les Etats-Confederes* (New York: C.B. Richardson, 1863), 6.

<sup>156</sup> *The United States Service Magazine* 1:1 (January 1864). See also, Church, 83.

<sup>157</sup> See for instance, “Mexico,” *Jackson Citizen* [Michigan], December 19, 1861; “France and Mexico,” *The Independent* (October 23, 1862); “Revolutions in Mexico,” *North American and U.S. Gazette*, October 17, 1862; “France and Mexico,” *Chicago Tribune*, May 1, 1864; “Mexican Affairs in Congress,” *New York Times*, January 21, 1863; “Mexico,” *Centralia Sentinel* [Illinois], March 16, 1865.

<sup>158</sup> *Kalamazoo Gazette*, February 14, 1862.

<sup>159</sup> “The Monroe Doctrine,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, February 1, 1862; “The Conspiracy against Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, May 24, 1862.



that the U.S. would never accept the existence of a French-supported monarchy in Mexico, and would take steps to intervene once the Civil War was concluded.<sup>160</sup>

Despite a general antipathy toward the attack on republican institutions, some Americans continued to express skepticism about the nature and future of Mexican republican institutions. One article argued that these institutions were an import into Mexico and not a development of popular genius or popular sympathies, which contributed to the failure of republicanism in Mexico.<sup>161</sup> A later article in the same magazine was more explicit declaring that the Mexican people are “utterly unfit for a republican form of government,” and lamenting that even the close example of the United States was not enough to induce Mexico to uphold republican institutions.<sup>162</sup>

When discussing the potential European invasion of Mexico, the *Chicago Tribune* expressed the expectation that it was unlikely that Mexico would provide much resistance.<sup>163</sup> Contrary to expectations, Mexicans strongly resisted the French Army thus

---

<sup>160</sup> “A Warning to France,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, July 5, 1862. For similar sentiments see “France and the United States,” *Daily Trenton State Gazette*, September 10, 1863; “Mexican Affairs,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, May 6, 1865.

<sup>161</sup> “Maximilian and Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (April 2, 1864).

<sup>162</sup> “The Mexican Puzzle,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (December 15, 1866). The article did express the opinion the U.S. public would not accept a monarchy in Mexico, and advised a future American protectorate for the nation. A similar sentiment is expressed in “The Conquest of Mexico by France,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* (August 1864). See also, “General Grant and Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (December 9, 1865).

<sup>163</sup> “Will the Mexicans Resist the Tri-Partite Invasion?,” *Chicago Tribune*, January 18, 1862. See also “The intervention in Mexico,” *Sandusky Daily Commercial Register*, February 17, 1862.



eliciting praise in the United States. One writer declared, “the Mexican people united against an external foe are a power of no mean strength.”<sup>164</sup> Many articles and editorials stressed the patriotism and bravery of the Mexican patriots in their fight against the French.<sup>165</sup> Although many Americans had been used to thinking of Mexico as divided and weak, the resistance toward the French revealed to some commentators a “nobler side” of her character, as Mexicans united to fight against the external invader.<sup>166</sup>

Several commentators suggested that the Mexican people were unlikely to ever accept the yoke of the French.<sup>167</sup>

Some Americans even expressed the expectation that Mexico would defeat the French and expel them from the Western Hemisphere, or at least hold out until the United States would be able to intervene. After several Mexican victories, the *New York Times* suggested that the French invasion would soon be pronounced a failure. While this event was never expected by the U.S. public, it was declared to be the result of the “unity, patriotism and courage of the Mexican people.” Further the *Times* speculated that the

---

<sup>164</sup> *Boston Daily Advertiser*, February 18, 1862. An article in *Littell’s Living Age* suggested that past civil wars and disturbances have trained Mexico to be able to resist the enemies. (August 2, 1862). This is reprint from the *Examiner*. A similar theme can be found at “The French in Mexico,” *North American and U.S. Gazette*, July 24, 1862.

<sup>165</sup> See for instance, *The United States Service Magazine* 1:1 (January 1864); “Mexico,” *The Independent* (June 26, 1862); “A Bully Whipped,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, June 21, 1862; “Mexican Affairs,” *New York Times*, January 22, 1863; “The French in Mexico,” *The Daily Palladium*, January 26, 1863.

<sup>166</sup> *Boston Daily Advertiser*, June 16, 1863.

<sup>167</sup> “Mexico,” *New York Times*, October 1, 1863; “The French Invasion of Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, July 2, 1863; “The Mexican Throne,” *Hartford Daily Courant*, September 3, 1863; “The French Invasion of Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, September 7, 1863; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, January 7, 1865; “Mexico: Its Recent History and Present Conditions,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 14, 1866.

invasion had awakened the Mexican people, who refused to compromise their national honor. The Mexican resistance, the writer argued, should result in the admiration of the world and to some degree correct the “mistaken public opinion which has always prevailed relative to Mexico.”<sup>168</sup> Many Americans viewed the French as seeking to crush “popular liberty” in Mexico and attempting to impose a monarchy on the Mexican people, something the Mexican people were bravely resisting.<sup>169</sup> The *New York Times* expressed the opinion that Mexican resistance would “cement their love” for republican institutions.<sup>170</sup>

In the stories of a united Mexico, the Catholic clergy and Conservatives exiles were singled out as the exceptions to this theme of unity and patriotism. Napoleon III had been influenced by the lobbying of a small group of Mexican monarchist exiles, along with clergy exiled from the country during the War of the Reform in his decision to

---

<sup>168</sup> “Does the War Promote a Pro-Slavery Reaction?” *New York Times*, January 31, 1863. See also “The French in Mexico,” *The Daily Palladium* [New Haven, CN], January 20, 1863; “France and Mexico,” *North American and United States Gazette*, May 14, 1862.

<sup>169</sup> “The Allies in Mexico,” *Circular* (March 6, 1862). See also, “The Present Position of Napoleon the Third in Europe,” *The New York Herald*, July 2, 1863; “The Fall of Queretaro,” *M’Kean Miner* [Pennsylvania], May 25, 1867; “Provincial Consolidation,” *The Bangor Daily Whig and Courier*, January 4, 1867.

<sup>170</sup> “Mexico Spirit of their People,” *New York Times*, January 29, 1863. “France and Mexico,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, October 3, 1862. See also, “Maximilian’s Acceptance of the Mexican Crown,” *New York Times*, September 2, 1863. Despite a general antipathy toward the attack on republican institutions, some Americans however continued to express skepticism about the nature and future of Mexican republican institutions. See for instance, “Maximilian and Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (April 2, 1864). “The Mexican Puzzle,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (December 15, 1866). “The Conquest of Mexico by France,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* (August 1864). See also, “General Grant and Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (December 9, 1865).

intervene in Mexican affairs.<sup>171</sup> While not all Conservatives supported the Empire, and some fought against the French, others supported the monarchy as did a large number of the Catholic clergy, at least initially.<sup>172</sup> In fact many of the leading figures of the Mexican Catholic Church, who had fled Mexico after the defeat of the Conservative Party, returned with Maximilian in 1863.<sup>173</sup>

Based on these facts, the press in the United States viewed the French Intervention and Empire through the lens of religion, playing on several popular tropes in anti-Catholic literature. Articles in U.S. periodicals and newspapers emphasized the fact that the “Church Party,” which was to blame for Mexico’s past struggles with “anarchy,” had invited and supported the French Intervention.<sup>174</sup> This idea was also espoused by the

---

<sup>171</sup> Brian Hamnett, *Juárez* (London and New York: Longman, 1993), 169. Robert H. Duncan suggests that it was logical that this lobbying would find a receptive hearing, since most Europeans were under some type of monarchy. See “For the Good of the Country,” 24.

<sup>172</sup> Duncan, “For the Good of the Country,” 89.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 172; Julie A. Efrani, *The Paradox of the Mexican State: Rereading Sovereignty from Independence to NAFTA*. Boulder, CO and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1995), 22; Jack Autrey Dabbs, *The French Army in Mexico, 1861-1867* (The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1963), 78.

<sup>174</sup> “The Mexican Empire,” *Harper’s Weekly* (September 12, 1863). See also “Speech of the Honorable Matias Romero,” *Proceedings of a Meeting of Citizens of New York to Express Sympathy and Respect for the Mexican Republican Exiles* (New York: John A. Gray & Green, Printers, 1865), 45-46, 48; “Mexico in Arms,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, February 8, 1862; “Important from Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, June 30, 1863; “The Condition of Mexico,” *The Independent* (February 18, 1864). For other similar sentiments see, “An Empire Proclaimed in Mexico,” *The Albion, A Journal of News, Politics, and Literature* (August 1, 1863); “Mexico,” *Chicago Tribune*, October 2, 1863; “The Mexican Enigma,” *The Independent* (May 12, 1864); “Our Foreign Relations,” *Chicago Tribune*, July 28, 1863; “The Key to the Continent,” *The New Englander* LXXXVIII (July 1864), 526; Senor M. Romero,” *New York Times*, October 3, 1867; “The Plot of the Mexican Drama,” *Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature* 6:5 (November 1867); Ardell Murray, “The Mexican Question,” *The*

U.S. Secretary of State, who stated that the cause of the Intervention was “a conspiracy of Mexicans against the independence and freedom of their own country.”<sup>175</sup> Protestant Americans accepted this interpretation of the French Intervention, because it corresponded to the popular idea in Protestant literature that Catholics posed a dire threat to the U.S. Republic because their loyalties were to the Roman Catholic Church not to the nation. Therefore events in Mexico seemed to confirm this fear.<sup>176</sup> One Protestant periodical even incorrectly entertained the idea that the Catholic Archbishop of New York, John Hughes, instigated the French invasion of Mexico during a visit to Europe.<sup>177</sup>

---

*Independent* (January 14, 1866); “The Mexican Question,” *Hillsdale Standard*, April 24, 1866. This charge would be repeated in many discussions of Mexico and the Church throughout the nineteenth century. See for instance, *Baptist Home Missions in North America* (New York: Baptist Home Mission Rooms, 1883); 492; John McClintock and James Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890), 203; Sheldon, *History of the Christian Church*, 358-359; “Mexico and the Mexicans,” *The International Review* (March 1878).

<sup>175</sup> Seward to Adams, May 3, 1864, *FRUS* 1864: I 723. Mexican diplomats, particularly the Minister to the United States, Matias Romero stressed the role that the Church played in inviting and supporting the Intervention and empire. See Romero to Seward, March 28, 1865, *FRUS* 1865-1866 587.

<sup>176</sup> See for instance discussions in John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925* (New Brunswick, N. J., Rutgers University Press, 1955), 77; Donald L. Kinzer, *An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), 17; Elson, *Guardians of Tradition*, 47; Franchot, *Roads to Rome*, 13, Carwardine, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*, 202. For some contemporary discussions of this theme in anti-Catholic literature see Kelso, *Danger in the Dark*, 226-252; Clark, *Romanism in America*, 94.

<sup>177</sup> “Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIV: 2 (February 1863): 53. Hughes went to France on a mission from the President and the Secretary of State to discourage France from recognizing the Confederacy. See Serge Gavronsky, *The French Liberal Opposition and the American Civil War*. New York: Humanities Press, 1968), 102; Henry Blumenthal, *A Reappraisal of Franco-American Relations, 1830-1871*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 131; Daniel B. Carroll, *Henri Mercier and the American Civil War* (Princeton: Princeton

The U.S. press portrayed the French emperor, Napoleon III, as a strong supporter of Catholicism who had the direct support of the Pope for this enterprise. The Pope was reportedly anxiously watching the events in Mexico and was purported to be ecstatic over French victories.<sup>178</sup> U.S. writers perceived the French actions as an attempt by the Church to overturn the progress that Mexico had made towards liberalism and freedom of religion, and to reassert the Catholic dominance in Mexico.<sup>179</sup> The *Chicago Tribune* took up a similar theme by suggesting that the Intervention was a league between the Mexican Church hierarchy and the French “for the utter extermination of Civil Liberty in Mexico.”<sup>180</sup> This rhetoric corresponded to the persistent fear by many U.S. Protestants that Roman Catholic priests were receiving instructions from Rome in a plot to subject

---

University Press, 1971), 131; D.P. Crook, *The North, the South and the Great Powers* (New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, 1974), 97.

<sup>178</sup> Thomas Shepard Goodwin, *The Natural History of Secession, or Despotism and Democracy at Necessary, Eternal, Exterminating War* (New York: John Bradburn, 1864), 229; “The Fate of Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (July 9, 1863); “Papal Intervention,” *The Independent* (August 20, 1863); “The Emperor and the Pope,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union XIV*: 10 (October 1863): 315-316; “The Plot of the Mexican Drama,” *Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature* 6:5 (November 1867). For a letter to Maximilian from the Pope expressing pleasure at his ascension to the Mexican throne and the hope for his government including the revocation of the laws against the Church see, Pius IX to Maximilian, October 18, 1864, *FRUS* 1865-1866 588-590.

<sup>179</sup> “The French in Mexico,” *The Albion, A Journal of News, Politics, and Literature* (May 10, 1862); “The Mexican Enigma,” *The Independent* (May 12, 1864); “The Monroe Doctrine,” *New Englander* (October 1863).

<sup>180</sup> “Our Foreign Relations,” *Chicago Tribune*, July 28, 1863. The Mexican Liberal exile Francisco Zarco expressed a similar view in a meeting to express sympathy for the Mexican cause. See “Speech of Senor Zarco,” *Proceedings of a Meeting of Citizens of New York to Express Sympathy and Respect for the Mexican Republican Exiles* (New York: John A. Gray & Green, Printers, 1865), 14-15.

the United States to “popish despotism.”<sup>181</sup> The fact that the Austrian Prince Maximilian was Catholic, had consulted with Church leaders, and sought the Pope’s blessing in a private meeting before he took the Mexican throne, seemed to support these fears.<sup>182</sup>

Americans speculated that the French Intervention was a direct threat to Protestantism and republicanism in the United States, a view that had deep roots in the American understanding of its relationship with European monarchies. Since the early days of the Republic, Americans had believed that European monarchies were hostile to the U.S. republic and would try to threaten its existence.<sup>183</sup> An article in the *Christian Advocate and Journal* suggested that the French move was a “flank movement” on the United States which sought to take advantage of the U.S. Civil War. It speculated that this intervention could spread to Central and South America and then directly threaten the United States.<sup>184</sup> Other analysts described the intervention as an attempt to shape the

---

<sup>181</sup> David Brion Davis, “Some Themes of Counter-Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic, and Anti-Mormon Literature,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, 47: 2 (September 1960): 205.

<sup>182</sup> Jasper Ridley, *Maximilian and Juarez* (New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1992), 76. These fears existed since the beginning of the American republic. See Duncan, *Citizens or Papists*, xvi.

<sup>183</sup> James E. Lewis Jr., *The American Union and the Problem of Neighborhood: The United States and the Collapse of the Spanish Empire, 1783-1829* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 75 and 164-165. This view played a role in the original announcement of the Monroe Doctrine. See Eldon Kenworthy, *America/Americas: Myth in the Making of U.S. Toward Latin America* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 18.

<sup>184</sup> “Mexico,” *Christian Advocate and Journal* (February 27, 1862). See also “Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald and Wesleyan Journal* (March 5, 1862). Some articles used the flanking analogy or focus on the danger to the U.S. without specifically identifying Catholicism as the root. See “Napoleonic Ideas,” *The Independent* (September 10, 1863); “European Designs in America,” *Chicago Tribune*, August 4, 1863; “The French in Mexico,” *North American and US Gazette*, July 24, 1862; “Our Relations with France,”



affairs of the United States which was a direct assault on U.S. democracy and an endeavor to destroy Protestantism on the North American continent.<sup>185</sup> An editorial in the *Wisconsin Daily Patriot* suggested that European monarchies had long been plotting against democratic institutions in the Western Hemisphere, and the action in Mexico was the first step in their designs, which would next threaten the United States.<sup>186</sup> The creation of the monarchy in Mexico was particularly vexing to expansion-minded Americans who feared that a successful monarchy there would prevent the future territorial expansion of the United States that many still considered to be the manifest destiny of the U.S.<sup>187</sup>

---

*New York Times*, August 29, 1863; "News from Mexico," *New York Herald*, August 31, 1863.

<sup>185</sup> "The Unholy Alliance against Republican Institutions in America," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, January 18, 1862; "The Conspiracy against Mexico," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, May 24, 1862; "Mexico," *Christian Advocate and Journal* (June 30, 1864); "Foreign Intervention," *The Independent* (July 9, 1863); "City Religious Press," *New York Evangelist* (May 19, 1864); "The New Papal Mission," *Circular* (May 23, 1864); "Mexico and Rome," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, June 6, 1864; C.B. Boynton, *The Four Great Powers: England, France, Russia and America; Their Policy, Resources, and Probable Future* (Cincinnati: C.F. Vest & Co, 1866), 501-502; "Speech of Dr. Leavitt," *Proceedings of a Meeting of Citizens of New York to Express Sympathy and Respect for the Mexican Republican Exiles* (New York: John A. Gray & Green, Printers, 1865), 7. Mexican liberals also portrayed the Intervention in a similar way, with Mexican resistance described as a defense of all American nationalities which were now threatened by the French and on which the "fate of the continent" rested. See "Speech of Senor Zarco," *Proceedings of a Meeting of Citizens of New York to Express Sympathy and Respect for the Mexican Republican Exiles* (New York: John A. Gray & Green, Printers, 1865), 10, 19.

<sup>186</sup> "The Dangers About Us," *Wisconsin Daily Patriot*, August 1, 1863. For similar views see "Our French-Mexican Relations," *Harper's Weekly* (December 9, 1865).

<sup>187</sup> "Mexican Intervention," *Sandusky Daily Commercial Register*, December 7, 1861; "Just Before Us," *Daily Commercial Register*, March 5, 1862; "The Plots that Europe is Hatching Against Us," *The Crisis* [Columbus, OH], September 30, 1863;

While many discussions emphasized the dangers that Catholic immigrants held for the institutions and values of the United States, this literature also described the dangers from without as well as within.<sup>188</sup> Ralph Henry Gabriel has shown that throughout much of American history the “ogre” for American democracy was perceived to be the Roman Catholic Church and the ecclesiastical hierarchy.<sup>189</sup> Of special importance was the belief that European monarchs sought to use the Roman Catholic religion to undermine republican institutions and democracy, which they despised and to turn the United States into a monarchy.<sup>190</sup> During this time period the Vatican aligned with monarchical and anti-republican regimes, and Pope Pius IX came out strongly against modernity, republicanism and liberalism, defining these trends as errors and heresies, which helped to increase these fears among American Protestants.<sup>191</sup>

---

“Probabilities of a Collision on the Rio Grande,” *Sandusky Daily Commercial Register*, August 4, 1865.

<sup>188</sup> See for instance Billington, *The Protestant Crusade*, 24-25; and Thomas T. McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Norte Dame, IN: University of Norte Dame Press, 1969), 208. For discussions of attempts by some American Catholics to adapt their religion to the U.S. cultural including democracy and republicanism see Philip Gleason, “American Catholics and Liberalism, 1789-1960,” *Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American Public Philosophy* eds. R. Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 45-75; Michael Zoller, *Washington and Rome: Catholicism in American Culture* trans. Steven Rendall and Albert Wimmer (Norte Dame, IN: University of Norte Dame Press, 1999).

<sup>189</sup> Ralph Henry Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* Third Edition with Robert H. Walker (New York and Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1986), 54. See also, “The French in Mexico,” *Philadelphia North American and United States Gazette* (July 24, 1862); “The Imperial Speech,” *The Nation* (February 15, 1866): 198.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, 55; Nordstrom, 27, 30. For expressions of similar fears see “A Monarchy in Mexico,” *Sandusky Daily Commercial Register*, March 3, 1862.

<sup>191</sup> Martin E. Marty, “Religion in Nineteenth-Century America,” *Encyclopedia of the United States in the Nineteenth Century* ed. Paul Finkelman (New York: Charles



French military leaders announced the creation of the Second Empire on June 12, 1862, though the resistance from Juárez and Mexican Liberals would continue.<sup>192</sup> In June 1863 the French occupied Mexico City forcing Juárez and the Liberal government to flee. Several commentators expressed shock at the turn of events, especially in light of their assessment of Mexican resistance shortly before.<sup>193</sup> The French occupation of the capital disillusioned the *New York Times* which had been optimistic for the Mexican resistance several months before. An editorial suggested, “There is probably no other State in the world calling itself civilized, that could have been so easily overrun by a handful of foreign troops as Mexico has been.”<sup>194</sup> The French and their Mexican allies would control the principal cities and ports beginning in the summer of 1863. Yet the Mexican Liberal forces continued fighting, and the French imperial forces were never able to pacify the countryside, or retain control of territory once the main body of troops left.<sup>195</sup>

---

Scribner’s Sons, 2001), 98. For one example of this trend see “Quanta Cura: Encyclical of Pope Pius IX Condemning Current Errors,” (December 8, 1864) in *The Papal Encyclopedia, 1740-1878* ed. Claudia Carlen (Wilmington: McGrath Publishing Company, 1981), 381-385 and the annex to the encyclical “Syllabus of Errors,” *The Papacy: An Encyclopedia* Volume 3 ed. Philippe Levillain (New York and London: Routledge, 2002), 1472-1475.

<sup>192</sup> The First Empire was founded by Agustín de Inturbide and lasted only eight months from 1822-1823.

<sup>193</sup> “Startling From Mexico,” *The Independent* (June 4, 1863).

<sup>194</sup> “The Troubles of the New Mexican Empire,” *New York Times*, September 14, 1864. The *Times* did express the faint hope that Mexico could yet still regroup to expel the French, but was pessimistic.

<sup>195</sup> Hamnett, *A Concise History of Mexico*, 165. At one point Maximilian’s troops were able to establish authority over all but four of Mexico’s 24 states and territories. Only Guerrero, Chihuahua, Sonora and Baja California, consisting of about 7% of the population were not occupied. See Ridley, *Maximilian and Juarez*, 186.

On June 16, 1863, the French commander in Mexico convened a junta consisting of Conservative “Notables,” many of whom had opposed La Reforma. The junta blamed Mexico’s continued problems on republican institutions, and created a Catholic monarchy, choosing Ferdinand Maximilian of the Austrian ruling family as Emperor of Mexico.<sup>196</sup>

Contrary to expectations, Maximilian sought to govern Mexico as a moderate liberal constitutional monarch. He and his advisors drafted a liberal constitution which prohibited debt peonage, provided for equality under the law and sought to undertake an economic modernization program. Maximilian’s government provided generous aid for highway projects, port improvements and canals, in addition to promoting the adaptation of foreign technologies, and credit for artisans, industry, merchants and farmers.<sup>197</sup>

Maximilian’s views were liberal on the Church-State question. Contrary to the expectations of the Mexican Church leadership and the Vatican he did not repeal the reform laws, nor outlaw religious tolerance, thus alienating many Church leaders whom originally supported him.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>196</sup> “Ofrecimiento de la Corona a Maximiliano,” in *México en el Siglo XIX: Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas* ed. Álvaro Matute (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972), 157-158; Junta of Conservative Notables, “Offer of the Crown to Maximilian,” in *The Mexico Reader: History, Culture, Politics* eds. Gilbert M. Joseph and Timothy J. Henderson (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 263-264.

<sup>197</sup> Colin M. Maclachlan and William H. Beezley, *Mexico’s Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 96.

<sup>198</sup> Meyer, Deeds and Sherman, *The Course of Mexico History*, 344. U.S. newspapers did acknowledge that contrary to the expectations of the Catholic Church, the French army and later Maximilian elected not to restore confiscated property to the Catholic Church, and did not prohibit religions other than Catholicism from operating within Mexico. See for instance, “Mexico,” *Chicago Tribune*, December 24, 1863; “The

In light of these facts a minority of Americans began to suggest that Mexico might be better off under the rule of Maximilian than it had been under its previous republics. An article in *The Atlantic Monthly* noted the promise that Mexico had been afforded by geographic advantages and natural resources and stated that in the 1820s Mexico, with the exception of the United States, had offered the best promise in the Western Hemisphere for future growth and prosperity. Since its independence, however, Mexico had been the “blankest failure of the century.”<sup>199</sup> The author noted that the American people opposed the French Intervention in Mexico because of its traditional diplomatic policy, but suggested that Maximilian’s rule may result in progress for Mexico and allow that country to take its place in the “galaxy of nations.”<sup>200</sup> Those who provided at least mild support for the actions of the French did so because of their belief that the Mexican republic had failed and that the Mexican people were unfit for self-government having continually descended into a situation of anarchy.<sup>201</sup>

---

Conquest of Mexico,” *North American and US Gazette*, March 15, 1864; “The Situation in Mexico,” *New York Times*, August 28, 1864. The U.S. Consuls in Mexico also reported the relationship between the supporters of the Empire and the Catholic Church. See Lott to Seward, March 31, 1865, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Tehuantepec* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 1; Otterbourg to Seward, December 1, 1866, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Mexico City* Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 6.

<sup>199</sup> “Mexico,” *The Atlantic Monthly* XIV: LXXXI (July 1864): 51-53. The author cites the disunited state of the population, a general ignorance, the “racial stock” of the people, and the “party-spirit” in Mexico as causes. For another article that accepts the premise of the geographic position and resources of Mexico, but opposes the French actions see “The Key to the Continent,” *The New Englander* LXXXVIII (July 1864): 517-539.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*, 63.

<sup>201</sup> A.K. Shephard, “The New Empire of Mexico,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* 51 (July 1864): 21-23; Andrew Ten Book, “The House of Hapsburg

Because of this belief several commentators suggested that a constitutional monarchy might provide what Mexico needed, for it would act as a “schoolmaster” to eventual self-government.<sup>202</sup> Some argued that Mexico needed outside help, and since the U.S. had neglected its mission by not instituting a protectorate or annexation, it should not prevent the French from doing so, if they were able to provide benefits to the nation.<sup>203</sup> Others suggested that the disorderly Mexico that had existed since its independence was of no benefit to the United States, and that Americans should support Maximilian in the hopes that he would make Mexico into a productive nation, thereby allowing Americans to profit through trade and commerce with Mexico.<sup>204</sup> In a 1867 book sympathetic to the French actions, Henry M. Flint emphasized the progress that Maximilian had wrought in Mexico. He argued that Maximilian had done more for the prosperity of Mexico, as well as the enlightenment of the Mexican people, than had been

---

in America,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* 52 (May 1865): 372; T.M.J., “Conquest of Mexico by France,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* 51 (August 1864): 108; D.A. Wasson, “Shall We Make War upon Maximilian?,” *The Friend of Progress* 1: 10 (August 1865): 290-291; Henry M. Flint, *Mexico Under Maximilian* (Philadelphia: National Publishing Company, 1867), 33.

<sup>202</sup> D.A. Wasson, “Shall We Make War upon Maximilian?,” *The Friend of Progress* 1: 10 (August 1865): 292.

<sup>203</sup> T.M.J., “Conquest of Mexico by France,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* 51 (August 1864): 108-109; “Mexico and the Fenians-France and England,” *De Bow’s Review* I (May 1866): 521; Andrew Ten Book, “The House of Hapsburg in America,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* 52 (May 1865): 372; D.A. Wasson, “Shall We Make War upon Maximilian?,” *The Friend of Progress* 1: 10 (August 1865): 293.

<sup>204</sup> Andrew Ten Book, “The House of Hapsburg in America,” *The Merchant’s Magazine and Commercial Review* 52 (May 1865): 373.

accomplished in the previous decades under republican governments.<sup>205</sup> He declared that the liberal constitutional monarchy in Mexico was succeeding in raising Mexico to a “respectable rank” among the nations of the world.<sup>206</sup>

As in earlier times some articles viewed the French Empire in racial terms. One analyst suggested that Mexico’s problems revolved around the Spanish acceptance of the “practical application of the doctrine of human brotherhood and the equality of all humankind,” which had resulted in racial mixture and the resulting mixed races.<sup>207</sup> One article in *The Old Guard*, a New York periodical, that supported the Confederacy and the principle of white supremacy, expressed doubt about the capacity of “mongrel republics” like Mexico to have a successful republic government. The article described “mongrelism” as a disease which would soon die out together with the mixed races of Mexico, and other parts of the world. The article counseled both the United States and the Confederacy to recognize the French Empire to preserve order, “while mongrelism is dying out,” and things fell into place for the expansion of white democracy over the continent.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>205</sup> Henry M. Flint, *Mexico Under Maximilian* (Philadelphia: National Publishing Company, 1867), 6. Flint in his introduction noted that his views were likely to be unpopular, but decried what he described as the theme, in the wake of the U.S. Civil War that expressing divergent views constituted disloyalty. Flint also criticized the decision of Lincoln to wage war on the South as well as the Reconstruction policy of the radical Republicans (6-9).

<sup>206</sup> Ibid.

<sup>207</sup> “The Anglo-Saxon and the Negro,” *The Round Table. A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (October 14, 1865).

<sup>208</sup> “The Downfall of the Republic of Mexico,” *The Old Guard* (February 1865). For another article expressing the opinion that the Mexican race would die out and be

Still most Americans opposed the French actions in Mexico. After the end of the U.S. Civil War the American public began to pressure the government to follow a stronger policy toward the French Intervention.<sup>209</sup> These sentiments were shaped by the effective lobbying of the Mexican agent in the United States, Matías Romero, who used the press, public speeches, political contacts, and socializing with wealthy and powerful Americans in order to gain support for the Mexican cause.<sup>210</sup> By 1865 Romero was acquainted with President Lincoln, Secretary of State Seward, Union General Ulysses S. Grant, and every prominent Radical Republican leader, tirelessly “composing dozens of dispatches, notes, editorials, and speeches setting forth Mexico’s plight and its varied resources.”<sup>211</sup> With the approval of the U.S. government, Romero and other Mexican agents also sold Mexican bonds to U.S. investors in Boston, Hartford, Philadelphia, New York, San Francisco, Washington DC and other U.S. cities, totaling at least \$16-18 million. The Mexican Liberal government used these funds to buy arms and other supplies they desperately needed. While partially motivated by sympathy toward

---

replaced by Anglo-Saxons, see “Mexico-What it is Worth,” *Zion’s Herald and Wesleyan Journal* (November 18, 1863).

<sup>209</sup> “Maximilian and His Empire,” *The Land We Love* IV: II (February 1867): 233-243; “France and the United States,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, July 29, 1865. See also Rippey, *The United States and Mexico*, 273; Temple, “William H. Seward,” 109.

<sup>210</sup> Thomas D. Schoonover, *Mexican Lobby: Matías Romero in Washington, 1861-1867* ed and trans. Thomas D. Schoonover (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 1.

<sup>211</sup> Pletcher, *The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment*, 80.

Mexico's plight, they also believed that a Liberal victory would "restore a potentially rich and subordinate republican trading partner."<sup>212</sup>

Since the beginning of the French Intervention, many Americans had cited the Monroe Doctrine and U.S. support for republican governments in the Western Hemisphere with the expectation that the government would take stronger actions when it was able to.<sup>213</sup> For instance George E. Church, who had close ties with Romero and Mexican Liberals, stated that Mexico was fighting the "great battle of republicanism against imperialism," which was an "indirect insult" to the United States. He chided the United States for turning a deaf ear to the appeals of the Mexican Liberal government to a common enemy, declaring, "Shame! shame! that we as a people look on quietly and see Mexico fight the battle of both North and South America."<sup>214</sup> By the summer of 1864 supporters of the Monroe Doctrine formed numerous "organized, popular, vocal and moneyed" associations in cities throughout the United States becoming a "national force"

---

<sup>212</sup> John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 17.

<sup>213</sup> See for instance Joshua Leavitt, *The Monroe Doctrine* (New York: Sinclair Tousey, 1863); *Arguments in Favor of the Enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine* (New Orleans: Era Book and Job Office, 1864); General G. Cluseret, *Mexico, and the Solidarity of Nations* (New York: Blackwell, 1866), 107-109. Several pamphlets that opposed the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine include, R.H. Wendover, *Views on the Monroe Doctrine* (St Louis: George Knapp & Co., 1865); George Francis Train, *Showing up the Monroe Doctrine. War with Mexico and France is the Death of Irish Nationality* (Washington: Constitutional Union Print, 1866).

<sup>214</sup> George E. Church, *Mexico. Its Revolutions: Are They Evidences of Retrogression or of Progress?* (New York: Baker and Godwin, 1866), 83. See also "The Great Meeting to Endorse the Monroe Doctrine," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, January 27, 1866; "The Monroe Doctrine Before the People," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, January 27, 1866; "How Far we May Help our Friends," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, May 5, 1866.

in the U.S. public sphere.<sup>215</sup> In March 1864 Romero's lobbying campaign influenced the U.S. Congress to pass a unanimous resolution condemning the French Intervention in Mexico.<sup>216</sup> The resolution, which was also a critique of the Mexican policy of the Lincoln administration, stated, "The Congress of the United States are unwilling by silence to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the republic of Mexico, and that they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge any monarchical Government erected on the ruins of any republican Government in America under the auspices of any European power."<sup>217</sup>

Secretary of State Seward, however, remained committed to his goal of gaining the withdrawal of the French without U.S. military intervention. One analyst has described Seward's policy as pushing Napoleon "gently with one hand, while courteously showing him the door with the other."<sup>218</sup> Seward began to increase his communications with the French Minister in Washington, and his instructions to the Ministers in France. In November 1865 he notified the French representatives that he viewed the French intervention as "disallowable and impracticable," and by February he asked for a specific

---

<sup>215</sup> Schoonover, *Dollars over Dominion*, 172

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>218</sup> Bailey, *A Diplomatic History of the American People*, 354.



date of withdrawal of the French forces from Mexico causing the French government to become increasingly concerned with escalating U.S. diplomatic pressure.<sup>219</sup>

By 1866 a number of factors including increasing costs, the military threat from Prussia, French domestic opposition and pressure from the United States, influenced the decision of the French government to end the Intervention in Mexico.<sup>220</sup> Having alienated much of Mexican society, Maximilian was unable to continue in power following the French withdrawal. In May 1867 Maximilian and his top Mexican generals were captured by Juárez's forces. Despite international pleas for the amnesty of the Austrian Archduke, Juárez gave the order to execute Maximilian, which was carried out on June 19 as a "clear expression of Mexico's diplomatic posture that no further aggression would be tolerated."<sup>221</sup> Juárez triumphantly returned to Mexico City on July 15, 1867 and proclaimed the victory of the Mexican Republic.<sup>222</sup>

The fall of Maximilian completed the political defeat of the Church in Mexico, and restored Juárez to the Presidency of the Republic, thereby putting political power into the hands of Liberals and marking the final defeat of the Conservative forces in

---

<sup>219</sup> Julius W. Pratt, *A History of United States Foreign Policy* Third Edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 175; Blumenthal, *A Reappraisal of Franco-American Relations*, 173. Earlier the U.S. Consul in Manzanillo had reported that a great many Mexicans expected that U.S. would eventually help Mexicans force out the French and restore the Republic. See Blake to Seward, January 28, 1864, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Manzanillo*, Record Group 59, Microfilm, Reel 1.

<sup>220</sup> Hamnett, *A Concise History of Mexico*, 169.

<sup>221</sup> Hernandez Chavez, *Mexico: A Brief History*, 162.

<sup>222</sup> "Manifestó de Benito Juárez al Volver a la Capital de la Republica," in *Benito Juárez: Documentos, Discursos y Correspondencia XII* ed. Jorge L. Tamayo (México: Secretaria del Patrimonio Nacional, 1967), 248-250.

Mexico.<sup>223</sup> With the end of the Wars of the Reform and the French Intervention most Mexicans hoped for peace and order to replace the revolutions and unrest of the recent past.

#### Aftermath of the Defeat of the French

In the aftermath of the French Intervention some commentators still held to the original view of the Mexican struggle against the Catholic Church from the pre-French Intervention period.<sup>224</sup> One of the strongest statements came from Gorham D. Abbot, a Congregationalist minister and educator, in a widely reviewed and cited book published in 1869, entitled *Mexico and the United States; Their Mutual Relations and Common Interests*. In this work Abbot likened the Mexican Liberal struggle to that of George Washington and the founders of the U.S. republic, who were not only “fighting for themselves, but for all mankind.”<sup>225</sup> This fight was part of the cause of civil and religious

---

<sup>223</sup> Coerver, “From Confrontation to Conciliation,” 21; Rodríguez Piña, “Conservatives Contest the Meaning of Independence,” 102; Charles A. Truxillo, *By the Sword and the Cross: The Historical Evolution of the Catholic World Monarchy in Spain and the New World, 1492-1825* (Westport, CN and London: Greenwood Press, 2001), 110. After the defeat of the Conservatives and the Church, Juárez embarked on a more moderate policy toward the Church, considering that most of the work of the Reform had been completed. See Karl Schmitt, “Church and State in Mexico: A Corporatist Relationship,” *The Americas* 40:3 (January 1984): 369.

<sup>224</sup> See for instance articles in the religious press, “Mexico Delivered!” *The Independent* (May 30, 1867); “The Future of Mexico,” *The Independent* (August 22, 1867); “Miscellaneous,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIX: 7 (July 1868): 250; “Facts Concerning Mexico that Every American Citizen Should Know” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXI: 11 (November 1870): 330-333.

<sup>225</sup> Gorham D. Abbott, *Mexico and the United States; Their Mutual Relations and Common Interests* (New York: G.P. Putnam & Son, 1869), iv and 43.

liberty, for which Abbot claimed all humanity longed for.<sup>226</sup> The Mexican patriots had made common cause with the “friends of freedom” around the world and the Mexican victory, according to Abbot, was a “grand and heroic exhibition of self-sacrifice and suffering for the fundamental principles of modern civilization.”<sup>227</sup> Abbot stated that the Mexican people had been unfairly maligned. While the wars of the reform had resulted in a number of acts of barbarism, he argued that it was not inconsistent with other struggles for religious and civil liberty in Europe in the past. While there still remained the danger of new attempts to overthrow the republic, Abbot suggested that the world had good reasons to be optimistic for the future of Mexico. “The reconstruction of a government, the regeneration of a race, the establishment of a new and mighty People, in the very centre of the great modern movements of commerce and civilization, is worthy of all their labors, their sacrifices and their woes.”<sup>228</sup>

In light of previous disappointments with Mexico most of the commentary in the U.S. press was decidedly less optimistic about the future for Mexico. In contrast to the praise many of these periodicals expressed after the Liberal victory in late 1860, most writers downplayed the Mexican victory and expected the country to descend once more into chaos and disorder. This pessimism was the result of a deep disillusionment toward the Mexican republic and its people, and skepticism as to their capacity for self-government. The *New York Times*, which had been previously optimistic about Mexican

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., 56.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid., 57.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid., 391. See also book review of Abbot’s book in “Mexico and the United States,” *Putnam’s Magazine* III: XVII (May 1869): 618-619.

prospects, declared Mexico to be a “hopeless republic,” that was about to descend into its regular condition of anarchy, suggesting that there are as many causes for revolution in Mexico as there are Mexicans.<sup>229</sup> Once again the American press expressed skepticism as to the fitness of the Mexican people for self-government.<sup>230</sup> The execution of Maximilian was taken as evidence that Mexico had a population of bloodthirsty individuals incapable of self-government.<sup>231</sup> In the ensuing months several writers suggested that Mexico would have been better off if it had stayed under French control. An editorial in the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* suggested that “civilization under despotism is to be preferred to a semi-barbarism under a demoralized republic.”<sup>232</sup> An article in *The*

---

<sup>229</sup> “The Long Peace in Mexico,” *New York Times*, December 5, 1867. See also, “The Old Mexican Complaint,” *Baltimore Sun*, June 20, 1866; “Mexico and Hayti,” *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, May 31, 1867; “The Maximilian Tragedy,” *Daily Iowa State Register*, July 11, 1867; “Mexico,” *Chicago Tribune*, June 11, 1867; “Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, June 29, 1867; “Mexico Redivivus,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (August 10, 1867); “Mexico is Mexico Again,” *The Galveston News*, July 30, 1867.

<sup>230</sup> “Mexico and Mexican Affairs,” *The Southern Review* II:4 (October 1867): 390, 394; “The Tortures of Monarchies,” *The Guardian* XVIII:7 (July 1867): 227; “Maximilian and Mexico,” *Freedom’s Champion* [Atchison, KS], May 23, 1867.

<sup>231</sup> “The Murder of Maximilian,” *New York Times*, July 2, 1867; “Territorial Expansion-Mexico and British America,” *New York Times*, July 17, 1867; “Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, June 29, 1867; “Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (June 22, 1867); “Execution of Maximilian,” *The Waukesha Freeman* [Wisconsin], July 4, 1867; *The Dubuque Herald*, July 15, 1867; *The Dubuque Herald*, November 21, 1867. Editorials that at least mildly supported the decision include, *Harpers New Monthly Magazine* CCVIII: XXXV (September 1867): 530; “The Emperor Maximilian,” *The Ladies’ Repository* XXVII (September 1867): 522; “The Shooting of Maximilian,” *Daily Miner’s Register*, June 8, 1867; “The Catastrophe in Mexico,” *Philadelphia North American and United States Gazette*, July 1, 1867; “Did Maximilian Deserve Death?” *Cleveland Herald*, July 3, 1867.

<sup>232</sup> “The Fate of Mexico,” *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* 4:100 (May 25, 1867): 646. Similar sentiments can be found in “Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday*

*Southern Review* suggested that Juárez was warring for anarchy, while Maximilian had been fighting for order and civilization in Mexico.<sup>233</sup>

While many of these articles mentioned the perceived semi-civilized state of the Mexican people, some explicitly blamed the racial nature of the Mexican people for their pessimism about the future of Mexico. One article in the magazine *The Round Table* stated that “even the most extremist democrat will scarcely contend that such principals are adaptable to all races without regard to their situation or present stage of development.”<sup>234</sup> Another article in the same periodical elaborated, “...no people on earth, reputed civilized, are utterly and irredeemably disreputable as the Mexicans. They are not bloodthirsty, cowardly, and indolent alone, but liars and thieves as well. Nor are these qualities confined, as some would have it, to the lower classes.”<sup>235</sup> As was common in U.S. discussions of Mexicans, analysts blamed Mexico’s racial composition, lamenting the “fact” that Mexico lacked “pure blood” an element that the U.S. supposedly had in abundance.<sup>236</sup> An article in *The Dubuque Herald* suggested that the only remedy for Mexico’s ills was the complete subjugation or extermination of the Mexican race and

---

*Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (June 22, 1867); “A Glimpse at Mexico,” *Ballou’s Monthly Magazine* XXV: 4 (April 1867): 266.

<sup>233</sup> “Mexico and Mexican Affairs,” *The Southern Review* II:4 (October 1867): 407.

<sup>234</sup> “Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (June 22, 1867).

<sup>235</sup> “Mexico and the Filibusters,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (July 27, 1867).

<sup>236</sup> “Mexico Redivivus,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (August 10, 1867). For similar sentiments see “The Mongrel Republics of America,” *The Old Guard* (September 1867).

intervention from outside the country.<sup>237</sup> Likewise numerous U.S. governors and senators from all regions of the United States made similar statements emphasizing the U.S. mission to spread progress and civilization, at the same time emphasizing the Mexican racial inferiority. Historian John Mason Hart has described this as a “major step in the transition of racism from a domestic setting to one of international relations.”<sup>238</sup>

These negative articles frequently failed to highlight the church-state struggle in Mexico. An editorial in *The Nation* explained that Juárez owed his undeserved good reputation in the U.S. to his opposition to the “priest party, for which every good American has a traditional hatred,” as well as to his perceived good intentions and to the fact that the French sought to discredit and overthrow republicanism in Mexico.<sup>239</sup> The article concluded, “During the whole of the revolting farce there has not been the slightest idea of what republican liberty means.”<sup>240</sup> Others again cited the perceived racial qualities of Mexicans for their pessimism. One article stated that “even the most extremist democrat will scarcely contend that such principles are adaptable to all races without regard to their situation or present stage of development.”<sup>241</sup>

---

<sup>237</sup> “Outrages in Mexico,” *The Dubuque Herald*, August 11, 1867.

<sup>238</sup> Hart, *Empire and Revolution*, 41-42.

<sup>239</sup> “The Mexican Moral,” *The Nation* V: 107 (July 18, 1867): 52. *The Nation* however had previously made clear that they were not in favor of U.S. involvement in Mexico, given the massive work of reconstruction that the United States faced. See, “The Mexican Affair,” *The Nation* III: 74 (November 29, 1866): 432.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid.

<sup>241</sup> “Mexico,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (June 22, 1867). See also “Mexico and the Filibusters,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (July 27, 1867). “Mexico Redivivus,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance,*

As they had for over a decade, American writers again confronted the idea of the U.S. future mission to Mexico. The *Baltimore Sun* suggested that only U.S. leadership would be able to stabilize Mexico and other Latin American republics, while several other writers advocated that the U.S. intervene in Mexican affairs, through either a protectorate or the annexation of Mexican territory as the only hope for Mexico.<sup>242</sup>

Colonel Albert S. Evans, who travelled with former Secretary of State William S. Seward to Mexico in 1869-1870, was cautiously optimistic about the future of the Mexican republic, but warned his readers that Mexico could very easily descend into anarchy and disorder once again. He predicted that a few more general revolutions would “render all hope of the establishment of a permanent government in Mexico, by the Mexicans themselves, out of the question.” If this happened, Evans declared, the United States “would be driven, against the will of our people” to intervene in Mexican affairs in aiding Mexico in establishing an independent and stable government and developing its abundant resources. Evans stated, “Try to disguise it as we may, the United States stand

---

*Literature, Society* (August 10, 1867); “The Mongrel Republics of America,” *The Old Guard* (September 1867); “Outrages in Mexico,” *The Dubuque Herald*, August 11, 1867; “Maximilian and Mexico,” *Freedom’s Champion* [Kansas], May 23, 1867.

<sup>242</sup> “The Mexicans and Maximilian,” *Baltimore Sun*, July 3, 1867; “Mexico,” *Chicago Tribune*, June 21, 1867; “‘A Sort of Protectorate’ Wanted for Mexico,” *New York Times*, June 23, 1867; “Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, June 29, 1867; “Mexico,” *Salt Lake Daily Telegraph*, July 21, 1867; “The Two Great Powers of the Future II: America” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (August 24, 1867); “The Future of Mexico,” *The Daily News and Herald* [Savannah, GA], August 6, 1867; “Mexico and the Filibusters,” *The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society* (July 27, 1867); “Mexico: Its Present and its Future,” *Scott’s Monthly Magazine* IV: 2 (August 1867): 632-633.



in the position of God-father to Mexico, and we are morally responsible for her future.”<sup>243</sup>

Despite these discussions of the future annexation of Mexico, in the decades after the U.S. Civil War, Americans would utilize informal imperialism rather than formal annexation of Mexican territory to fulfill their perceived mission to Mexico. In the late 1860s, the Mexican economy had collapsed because of the decade of war encompassing the Wars of the Reform and the French Intervention. Juárez continued to face numerous localized revolts, the Mexican government was deeply indebted, European governments had broken diplomatic relations as a result of the Maximilian execution and Mexican capitalists were reluctant to invest in the Mexican economy. Because of these facts, the Mexican Liberals would again look to the United States for capital investment. Likewise the religious changes brought on by the Mexican reform would catch the interest of American Protestants who would view Mexico as a stepping stone for their mission to provide for the conversion of the world to Protestantism.

### Conclusion

By the end of the nineteenth century two views expressed at the end of the French Intervention would be merged to create the dominant image of Mexico in U.S. popular discourse. On the one hand, in describing the Wars of the Reform and the French Intervention, commentators would accept the story of a courageous fight for progress

---

<sup>243</sup> Albert S. Evans, *Our Sister Republic: A Gala Trip Through Tropical Mexico in 1869-70. Adventure and Sight-Seeing in the Land of the Aztecs, with Picturesque Descriptions of the Country and the People, and Reminiscences of the Empire and its Downfall* (Hartford, CN: Columbian Book Company, 1870), 403. Evans worked on a number of newspapers in San Francisco, as well as serving as a correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune*, and other major newspapers and magazines such as *Atlantic Monthly*, and *Overland Monthly*.



against the Catholic Church hierarchy and the French army. This victory allowed Mexico to join the ranks of modern progressive nations like the United States.<sup>244</sup> On the other hand, the general perceptions of the Mexican people had not changed. By the time that the U.S. government was willing to take decisive actions in the form of direct interventions and protectorates in the late nineteenth century, the issue of Mexico's perceived incapacity for self-government would be solved in the person of Porfirio Díaz, rather than formal U.S. actions such as annexation or a protectorate. Though Díaz would rule nominally under republican forms, he would frequently resort to repressive actions to silence dissenters and put down challenges to his rule. The majority of Americans would accept the rule of Díaz as best for Mexico, describing him as a "benevolent despot" who was finally providing Mexico with the "firm hand" that that nation and other Latin-Americans needed, since most Americans remained skeptical of their fitness for self-government and republicanism. At the same time Americans shifted their focus largely away from discussions of formal governmental actions, toward informal imperialism through cultural, religious, and economic expansion.

---

<sup>244</sup> See for instance, *Ferguson's Anecdotal Guide to Mexico* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1876), 51-52; Howard Conkling, *Mexico and the Mexicans or, Notes of Travel in the Winter and Spring of 1883* (New York: Taintor Brothers, Merrill & Co, 1883), 58-65; William Butler, *Mexico in Transition from the Power of Political Romanism to Civil and Religious Liberty* Fourth Edition (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892), 281-282; John W. Butler, *Sketches of Mexico* (Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1894), 272-314.

## CHAPTER TWO: THE U.S. MISSIONARY MISSION TO MEXICO, 1848-1911

After the decree of religious tolerance by the Liberal government in 1860, the religious and secular press in the United States expressed the hope that Mexico would not only reject the establishment of the Catholic Church, but would embrace Protestantism as well. Protestant observers in the United States viewed this decree as not only a rejection of the Mexican church hierarchy, but possibly of Catholicism itself. By the mid-1860s stories began appearing in the U.S. press about a religious “Reformation” in Mexico in which former Catholic priests and lay people had turned away from the Catholic Church and were embracing the rudiments of Protestant theology and practice. Even though a small number of missionaries had already entered Mexico, most American discussions of these developments focused on the embrace of religious Protestantism as something Mexicans would work out for themselves. These stories were reinforced by entreaties by former priests and Mexican converts requesting the assistance from Protestant denominations in the United States, both for missionaries to teach them the ways of Protestantism, and for literature and financial support. In addition to these letters, some of former priests and lay converts visited churches in the United States to appeal for American aid.

Influenced by these requests, and by the Liberal decree of religious freedom in Mexico, Protestant denominations in the United States increased financial support and the number of missionaries to Mexico. During this period, Americans looked abroad for opportunities to spread their values and to satisfy their sense of mission, a theme which

has often been linked to earlier ideas of Manifest Destiny.<sup>1</sup> While in the years before the Civil War this term would most often be used to describe territorial expansion, after the Civil War it would take other connotations, such as the expansion of U.S. capital and values through the means of informal imperialism.

The advent of religious freedom in Mexico, thereby opening the door for missionaries, corresponded to an increased U.S. interest in the missionary enterprise in Catholic lands, and was related to a general increased interest in both home and foreign missions during the post-Civil War period.<sup>2</sup> This trend was also related to what one historian described as the “bumptious spirit of nationalism” that became evident after the end of the Civil War.<sup>3</sup> This spirit was closely related to an American sense of mission, which would later be manifested in colonial expansion at the very end of the nineteenth century, but was evident earlier in the expansion of missionaries and economic expansion in the years after the Civil War.<sup>4</sup> Because of the lack of capital for investments abroad because of Reconstruction, much of the focus of this mission during the early period from

---

<sup>1</sup> George C. Herring links these themes together. See Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 251.

<sup>2</sup> Wendy J. Deichmann Edwards, “Forging an Ideology for American Missions: Josiah Strong and Manifest Destiny,” *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy*, ed. Wilbert R. Shenk (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 169.

<sup>3</sup> Kenton J. Clymer, *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898-1916: An Inquiry Into the American Colonial Mentality* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 11.

<sup>4</sup> For arguments linking American missionary and economic expansion see Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982).

1865-1876 revolved around the sending of missionaries to Mexico. Many Americans linked the spread of Protestantism as the first step to the adaptation of other values such as modernity, progress and development.

During the late 1860s and early 1870s American missionaries and other religious visitors to Mexico described a country receptive to the gospel, and on the verge of a wide-scale conversion to Protestantism. Protestant missionaries frequently espoused an ardent anti-Catholicism at the same time they stressed that the lives of Mexicans could be changed if they were converted to what they believed to be the true religion. While these missionaries did speak chauvinistically of Mexico, and emphasized negative stereotypes about the Mexican people, they also portrayed them as capable of redemption and often described Mexico as rapidly moving along the path of order, progress and stability. Since skeptical Americans often described the Mexican people as unredeemable for racial or cultural reasons, missionaries challenged this idea by their stories of the redemption of Mexican converts and reports supportive of the Liberal governments and the progress in Mexico. U.S. missionaries therefore played an important role in shaping a different image than the prevalent picture of Mexico as a land of instability, and disorder that was resistant to the values of “progress” and “modernity.” In this way the image of Mexico presented by missionaries, the religious press and many observers looking at religious aspects of that nation, though based on U.S. hopes, a misunderstanding of Mexican history, and misperceptions regarding Mexican political and social realities, also provided a positive counter-image to many negative discourses of Mexico.

By the early 1890s, U.S. Protestant missionaries, while still describing Mexico as receptive to religious change and “redemption” began to temper their optimism about a

rapid conversion. At the same time American capitalists had begun to expand their investments in Mexico, particularly in railroads, and they and much of the secular press began to discuss a more secularized vision of the U.S. mission to Mexico. This vision focused on the transformation of Mexico through railroads and internal improvements, leading to the development of Mexico on the model of the United States. While missionaries and Protestant religious writers frequently were supportive of the development of Mexican resources through U.S. capital, they also critiqued the secularized mission to Mexico, which they viewed as empty and bound for failure unless these changes were accompanied by a true transformation in the Mexican people which could only come through the conversion of Mexico and an embrace of the ideals of Protestantism.

These two themes- U.S. changing images of Mexico, based on American analysis of religious change in Mexico, and U.S. actions to fulfill its mission to the larger world through the introduction and support of missionaries to Mexico- would be related and mutually reinforcing. The positive belief in the potential religious redemption of Mexico and positive results of La Reforma in Mexico shaped the positive image of Mexico as a nation receptive for U.S. mission. This in turn allowed American Protestants to view Mexico as a place for the fulfillment of U.S. mission and a way for them to affect the transformation of that nation in the U.S. image.

#### Domestic and Foreign Missionary Efforts Aimed at Catholics

The U.S. missionary enterprise in Mexico had its roots in the U.S. invasion during the U.S.-Mexico War. As discussed in the previous chapter, despite their misgivings about the War itself, many Protestants believed that the war was providing an opportunity

for the proselytizing of Mexico as well as a mission to spread U.S. civil and religious liberty to Mexico.<sup>5</sup> A writer in the *Preacher* suggested that despite the calamity that had befallen Mexico from the war, it “has also been her greatest good” because of the introduction of the “pure gospel” in that land.<sup>6</sup> Likewise the *Presbyterian Advocate* quoted a chaplain in Matamoros who said, “It has struck me very forcibly that this is the way that the Lord designs to have all this priest ridden, ignorant and unhappy country evangelized.”<sup>7</sup> In the midst of the war, *The Southern Baptist Missionary Journal* printed and recommended a letter they had received entitled “A Lover of Mexico.” The unnamed writer suggested that Christians should be fighting a different kind of war in Mexico, one in which they could fight with a clear conscience. This would be a war against the “despotism of sin and of vice” which “tyrannizes the bodies and souls of men.” The writer stated that it was time to give the Mexicans the Bible, tracts and Sunday schools, thereby converting them to Protestantism and, through this conversion, teaching them about U.S. civil institutions. If this happened, the writer suggested, American Christians could make Mexicans “a free, a happy people.”<sup>8</sup> During the War, W.H. Norris, an agent

---

<sup>5</sup> For a discussion of the differing views of Protestant denominations regarding the war with Mexico see Richard J. Carwardine, *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), 143-147. Ellsworth notes that the Catholic press in the United States opposed the use of the war to proselytize Mexico see “The American Churches and the Mexican War,” 302.

<sup>6</sup> *Preacher*, July 21, 1847, quoted in Ted C. Hinckley, “American Anti-Catholicism during the Mexican War,” *Pacific Historical Review* 31:2 (May 1962): 123.

<sup>7</sup> *Presbyterian Advocate* (August 5, 1846), quoted in Hinckley, “American Anti-Catholicism during the Mexican War,” 124.

<sup>8</sup> “Mexico,” *The Southern Baptist Missionary Journal* II:5 (October 1847): 128. About a year before the Missions Board for the Southern Baptist Convention had stated that it was time for American Christians to pray for the opening of the field of Mexico.

from the American Bible Society would accompany the United States Army and with the assistance of soldiers and officers distributed Spanish language Bibles to the Mexican people in the areas under U.S. occupation.<sup>9</sup> A captain in the U.S. Army at the time expressed his hope that the introduction of the Scriptures to Mexico, would act as the leaven that would with God's blessing "leaven the whole."<sup>10</sup>

Several Protestant publications suggested that the U.S. victory had shaken the Catholic foundations of Mexico and had made the people receptive to the Protestant message. A Presbyterian missionary periodical stated that Mexico had not received unmitigated injury from the war with the United States since new ideas "have been infused amongst her people," and had created discontent with the "despotism and corruption" of the Mexican priesthood.<sup>11</sup> Some Protestants unsuccessfully advocated that the U.S. government force Mexico to accept reciprocity of religion, thereby protecting

---

The Board suggested that churches pray that the war would end quickly, and that God's Providence would "overrule the calamity for the furtherance of his kingdom." While the Board elected not to divert resources from the mission fields in China and one soon to be commenced in Africa, it did resolve to direct preliminary inquiries to the field of Mexico and Latin America to be prepared when those fields were opened. See "Mexico and South America," *The Southern Baptist Missionary Journal* I:4 (September 1846): 93-94.

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Holdigh, "Mexico Again," *Christian Advocate* (March 17, 1870); Camargo and Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico*, 87.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted in William Butler, *Mexico in Transition from The Power of Political Romanism to Civil and Religious Liberty* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892), 92.

<sup>11</sup> "A Brief View of the Missionary Field," *The Foreign Missionary Chronicle* XVII: 1 (January 1849): 18. See also *The American Protestant* IV: 6 (November 1848): 179.

Protestants, including missionaries in Mexico, as a part of the treaty of peace.<sup>12</sup> In the aftermath of the War, Mexican laws prevented Protestant missionaries from legally operating in the country, thereby preventing U.S. Protestants from taking advantage of this perceived opportunity.

As Mexico faded from the headlines in the United States, the burden for the religious condition of Mexico that was sparked by the war continued to have an effect on some American Protestants who continued to pray that Mexico would soon be opened to the missionary enterprise and its people converted. Moreover the war did provide American Protestants with a new mission field- that of the new territories annexed from Mexico through the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.<sup>13</sup> Even those Protestants who had originally opposed the war saw expansion into the Southwest as a part of “God’s plan for the Anglo-Saxon” and the Protestant missionaries to the Southwest sought to convert the ethnic Mexican communities to the Protestantism to “disseminate the social, economic, and political values” which they considered important for the new U.S. citizens.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> See “Protestants in Mexico,” *Episcopal Recorder* (March 4, 1848): 203; Samuel John Bayard and Robert Field Stockton, *A Sketch of the Life of Com. Robert F. Stockton* (New York: Derby & Jackson, 1856), 182-183.

<sup>13</sup> Juan Francisco Martínez, *Sea La Luz: The Making of Mexican Protestantism in the American Southwest, 1829-1900* (Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press, 2006), 2.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 12-13; 45. Martínez explains that despite these lofty goals Protestant mission efforts in the Southwest did not usher in a major mission effort, as most of the newly Mexican American communities resisted these attempts and continued to embrace the Catholic Church. By 1900 there were 150 Spanish language Protestant churches in the Southwest with about 5,632 adult church members. See *Ibid.*, 3. For more on the Mexican American resistance see *¡Presente! U.S. Latino Catholics from Colonial Origins to the Present*. Edited by Timothy Matovina and Gerald E. Poyo. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000), 45-89.



The incorporation of large numbers of Spanish-speaking Catholics into the United States in the Southwest after the Mexican-American War led some Protestant groups to link the conversion of Mexican-Americans and those in Mexico. In addition to the need to reach the new Mexican Americans, Protestants viewed this enterprise as a potential way to reach Mexico. Because of the porous nature of the Southwestern border, Protestant missionaries could reach Mexicans who might return to Mexico as well as giving them the opportunity to practice evangelization skills that they might put into place when the field in Mexico was opened.<sup>15</sup>

In defiance of Mexican laws, some U.S. missionaries in the borderlands made short-term excursions into Mexico to distribute Bibles and religious literature and to preach the gospel.<sup>16</sup> One of the most influential of these individuals was Melinda Rankin, a Presbyterian, who is often regarded as the first missionary to the country of Mexico.<sup>17</sup> During the U.S.-Mexico War, Rankin was living in Mississippi and was impressed by stories of U.S. soldiers returning from Mexico of the “moral destitution” that was prevalent in Mexico burdened her heart for the field.<sup>18</sup> Rankin was especially concerned because of the geographical proximity of Mexico and the fact that Protestantism, which

---

<sup>15</sup> Martínez, *Sea La Luz*, 24, 33-36.

<sup>16</sup> One missionary, Ramon Monsalvatge began ministering in San Antonio in 1848 teaching Mexican children, and making excursions to Mexico. See, “San Antonio de Bexar,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* I: 2 (February 1850): 82. Monsalvatge would later minister to other nations in Latin America.

<sup>17</sup> “The Missionaries in Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, February 24, 1898; Pablo A. Deiros, “Rankin, Melinda,” *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishers, 1999), 558.

<sup>18</sup> Melinda Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans, A Narrative of Missionary Labor* (Cincinnati: Chase & Hall, Publishers, 1875), 21.

Rankin identifies as true Christianity, had not been introduced there, which she described as a “dark” region.<sup>19</sup> For Rankin the history of disorder and revolution in Mexico was related to the fact that Protestantism was absent from the nation. She believed that the “honor of American Christianity” demanded that some effort should immediately be made to evangelize the new American territories and Mexico itself.<sup>20</sup> Rankin proceeded to write to various mission boards and numerous churches in hopes of enlisting interest, but received no response. She thus decided to go herself to do what she could for the religious “enlightenment” of Mexico’s “long-neglected people.”<sup>21</sup>

Since missionaries were barred from entering Mexico, Rankin went to Brownsville on the U.S. side of the Texas-Mexico border. There she started a school for children of Mexican descent, which she also used as a means to spread her faith, and she would become involved in the distribution of Bibles on the Mexico side of the border. Rankin viewed her work as a beginning that would hopefully blossom as Mexico opened to Protestant missionaries and American churches became burdened with the need for the Mexican field.<sup>22</sup>

In 1853 Rankin received news that several Catholic priests and nuns from France had come to Brownsville to establish a convent to educate the youth of the Rio Grande Valley, which would serve as a direct competition to her work. In response Rankin

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 23.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Melinda Rankin, *Texas in 1850* (Boston: Damrell & Moore, 1852), 56-57; 150; 176. Rankin hoped that if Texas could be converted the progress of Texas would cause Mexicans to yield to the “superiority” of Protestantism (55).

decided that she would travel in the U.S. to raise money from the Protestant churches in the United States to combat this convent and to construct a building that would be equal to theirs. She reported that she left quite convinced of prompt and efficient aid from American Christians.<sup>23</sup>

However Rankin described her disappointment at the response that she got from American Protestants. She found that anti-Mexican sentiment was strong and provided great barriers to her success. She wrote, “The Sentiment was expressed by many, that ‘the Mexicans were a people just fit to be exterminated from the earth.’” She reported that even some clergy suggested that it would be better to send “bullets and gunpowder to Mexico than Bibles.”<sup>24</sup> Rankin responded to these statements with the answer that the Mexicans were the type of people that Jesus had come to save. She reported that even many of those who gave to the work did so with the sentiment of, “We do not care for the Mexicans, but seeing you so devoted to their cause, we will give something for *your* sake.”<sup>25</sup> This anti-Mexican sentiment is not surprising coming about five years after the end of the U.S.-Mexican War. In the aftermath of the war, one historian writes, “Mexican became an epithet in the national lexicon” as Americans stressed their “treacherous”

---

<sup>23</sup> Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 43-44.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 51-52. Italics in original. A history of the American Bible Society refers to this impulse in the years after the Mexican American War as a “certain stubborn prejudice.” See Henry Otis Dwight *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society, Volume 1* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), 220.

nature as part of the description of the war as a fight between good and evil.<sup>26</sup> Likewise numerous other authors have described the virulent anti-Mexican sentiments in the United States in the decades after the end of the war.<sup>27</sup>

While Rankin eventually received enough support for the work, she described that the bitterest part of her early experience was the skepticism among many of the American people as to her work with the Mexican people.<sup>28</sup> Her biggest critics were not Catholics, but rather Protestant Christians who would question her with statements such as, “What good can we do for such a hopeless race?” Rankin would reply that the gospel was the “antidote” for all the moral evils the Mexican people exhibited. She wrote that her zeal and efforts for the Mexican people were regarded as a type of insanity. Rankin stated that she dreaded encountering an American Protestant more than she did a Catholic priest. At times, Rankin reported, she almost staggered under the weight of this criticism of her efforts on behalf of the “poor, despised Mexicans.”<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> Michael Scott Van Wagenen, “Remembering the Forgotten War: Memory and the United States-Mexican War, 1848-2008.” PhD diss., The University of Utah, 2009. 37-38.

<sup>27</sup> See for instance Raymund A. Paredes, “The Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiment in the United States,” *New Directions in Chicano Scholarship* (La Jolla: University of California Press, 1978), 139-165; David J. Weber, “‘Scarce more than Apes.’ Historical Roots of Anglo American Stereotypes of Mexicans in the Border Region,” *New Spain’s Far Northern Frontier: Essays on Spain in the American West*, ed. David J. Weber (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), 295-307; Arthur G. Pettit, *Images of the Mexican American in Fiction and Film* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 1980); Arnoldo De Leon, *They Called Them Greasers* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983).

<sup>28</sup> Rankin also experienced some opposition because her actions were not “becoming” for a lady, though others supported her fund raising activities. See J.E. Rankin, “A New England Woman,” *The Granite Monthly* XVI: 4 (April 1894): 250.

<sup>29</sup> Rankin, *Twenty Years among the Mexicans*, 58-59.

By 1852 Melinda Rankin had begun her ministry to the ethnic Mexicans living in south Texas on the Mexican border.<sup>30</sup> In 1855 she contacted the American Foreign and Christian Union (AFCU) to send a colporteur to circulate Bibles and other religious literature on the Mexican frontier.<sup>31</sup> Rankin in a letter stated, “I fully believe that God will not open the door of Mexico to Protestant laborers until we do what we can for those within our present sphere of influence.”<sup>32</sup> The AFCU agreed that this was a worthy enterprise and sought to find a man to fill the need. However after seeking for some time, they concluded they would be unable to provide a Christian Spanish-speaking man. In response Rankin requested that the AFCU provide her the means to hire an assistant teacher for her school for Mexican children, and she would distribute Bibles and Christian literature herself. In 1856 the AFCU granted her request and she began her work in Texas and in Mexico, and in the first three years she distributed 500 Bibles and New Testaments and over 70,000 pages of religious tracts.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> For a discussion of the missionary endeavors in the Borderlands region see Ed Sylvest, “Bordering Cultures and the Origins of Hispanic Protestant Christianity,” *¿Protestantes? Protestants: Hispanic Christianity within Mainline Traditions*, ed. David Maldonado Jr., (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), esp. 34-37; and Daisy L. Machado, “Women and Religion in the Borderlands,” *Encyclopedia of Women and Religion in North America Volume III*, ed. Rosemary Skinner Keller and Rosemary Radford Ruether (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006), 1134-1140.

<sup>31</sup> “A Voice from the Rio Grande,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VI: 8 (August 1855): 371.

<sup>32</sup> Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 67.

<sup>33</sup> *The American Christian Record: Containing the History, Confession of Faith and Statistics of the Religious Denomination in the United States and Europe; A List of All Clergymen with the Post Office Addresses, Etc., Etc., Etc.* (New York: W.R.C. Clark & Meeker, 1860), 363.

The expansion of American missionaries into Mexico would be closely linked to these missionary efforts towards ethnic Mexican Catholic communities in the Southwest and Catholic immigrants throughout the United States. Because of increasing numbers of Catholics in the United States, many Protestant leaders viewed the home missionary enterprise as a response to a challenge from Rome.<sup>34</sup> Of particular importance was the work of the American and Foreign Christian Union (AFCU). The AFCU was founded in 1849 with the object of converting Roman Catholics to Protestantism, both in the home field of the United States, and abroad. One contemporary article on the history of the AFCU described Catholics as the “great middle field” between the Protestant world and that lying outside Christianity.<sup>35</sup> The AFCU was made up of and supported by churches and individuals of various denominations including the Presbyterian, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodist and Lutheran Churches.<sup>36</sup> At the 1856 Annual Meeting of the American and Foreign Christian Union, a speaker suggested that “it was evident to all

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 234-235. For more on this competition between Catholic and Protestant Home Missionary organizations see Ray A. Billington, “Anti-Catholic Propaganda and the Home Missionary Movement, 1800-1860,” *The Missouri Valley Historical Review* 22:3 (December 1935): 361-384.

<sup>35</sup> “A Brief Sketch of the American and Foreign Christian Union,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIX: 9 (September 1867): 261. See also, “Questions Answered in Regard to the American and Foreign Christian Union,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VI: 8 (August 1855): 353-359.

<sup>36</sup> The AFCU was founded as a union of three existing societies- the American Protestant Society, which directed its efforts toward American Catholics; the Christian Alliance, which directed its efforts toward Italian Catholics, both in Italy and the United States; and the Foreign Evangelical Society which supported missionaries and groups working for the conversion of Catholics in both predominantly Catholic and non-Catholic countries. See Susan Meier, “Guide to the Records of the American and Foreign Christian Union, 1851-1884,” n.d., [<http://dlib.nyu.edu/findingaids/html/archives/afcu.html>] (17 November 2008).

that a growing defection was taking place from the ranks of the Romanists in this whole country,” though he warned that this was not inevitable, and that this opportunity could be lost if Protestants did not take action.<sup>37</sup> This perceived development influenced the blending of home and foreign missionary enterprises to Catholics, centering on a general effort to convert the Roman Catholic world to Protestantism.<sup>38</sup> At the 1856 annual meeting, the members passed a resolution which expressed optimism that not only would the United States would be protected from the spread of Catholicism, but that the nation would send out missionaries to “Papal lands” to affect their conversion.<sup>39</sup>

The Board of Directors for the Union in their 1856 annual report explained why they believed that expansion to Catholic countries would be effective. First they suggested that “Papal power” had been greatly reduced using Mexico as an example, which in their view had seen a weakening of Catholicism through the Laws of the Reform.<sup>40</sup> The Board also noted a dramatic shift in Protestant public opinion with regards

---

<sup>37</sup> “Annual Meeting,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 6 (June 1856): 165; “Dr Sunderland’s Speech,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 7 (July 1856): 207. Despite this rhetoric R. Scott Appleby finds that over the long term the conversion of Catholic immigrants to Protestantism was much slower than anticipated, and hoped see “Missons and the Making of America: Religious Competition for Souls and Citizens,” *Minority Faiths and the American Protestant Mainstream* ed. Jonathan D. Sarna. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998): 254.

<sup>38</sup> See for instance, “Summons to American Protestants,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VIII: 1 (January 1857): 7.

<sup>39</sup> “Annual Meeting,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 6 (June 1856): 166.

<sup>40</sup> “Seventh Annual Report,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 6 (June 1856): 174-175. See also “Summons to American Protestants,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VIII: 1

to Catholicism. In the past Protestant efforts to convert Catholics had stagnated. Now God had “stirred up” the minds of Protestants throughout the world to their duty of seeking the overthrow of Catholicism. This trend was evident in the United States as well, the Board of Directors speculated, because of an “awakening interest” due to increased contact that Protestants had with the growing numbers of Catholic immigrants in the United States.<sup>41</sup> In response increasing numbers of Protestant denominations directed their attention to work of missions among Catholics.<sup>42</sup>

Writers suggested that missions to Mexico and other Catholic countries were important because the “whole system of the Papacy” provided the most formidable barrier to the spread of the “Gospel.” Protestant missionaries reported that they continually encountered peoples who were influenced by receiving what they viewed as incorrect Christian doctrines from the Catholic Church, which hindered their ability to

---

(January 1857): 9. See also, “Eighth Annual Report,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VIII: 6 (June 1857): 193.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 176. See also, “Summons to American Protestants,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 11 (November 1856): 331.

<sup>42</sup> “Seventh Annual Report,” *The Christian World*, 177. An article entitled, “Summons to American Protestants” states, “In every section of the nation, east and west, north and south, there are multitudes who look upon the Papal world as a missionary field of the highest interest and importance. ‘This is the Lord’s doing, it is marvelous in our eyes.’” “Summons to American Protestants,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 11 (November 1856): 332-333. For later justifications of continued presence in Catholic lands by U.S. missionaries see, Harlan P. Beach, *A Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions Volume 1: Geography* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1901), 53-54; Hubert W. Brown, *Latin America: The Pagans The Papists The Patriots The Protestants and the Present Problem* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1901), 13-14.



convert their populations.<sup>43</sup> The author argued that the Catholic Church was approaching another crisis which would shake its foundation, and therefore it was time for Protestants to “unite in putting forth a strong and extended effort to turn the whole force of Gospel truth” against the Roman Church.<sup>44</sup> For the first twenty years of its existence the AFCU would be the only interdenominational mission board to operate regularly into Mexico, thereby providing much of the early thrust of these missions as well as much of the information to other religious journals about the religious condition in Mexico.<sup>45</sup>

### The “Reformation in Mexico”

In addition to general support for the Mexican Liberal reforms during the late 1850s and early 1860s, many Protestants saw deeper implications in the disestablishment

---

<sup>43</sup> “Summons to American Protestants,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* VII: 11 (November 1856): 329-330. See also, “American and Foreign Christian Union,” *The Independent* (May 14, 1857); “American and Foreign Christian Union,” *The Independent* (May 20, 1858).

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 12-13. See also, “Light in Spanish America,” *The Missionary Magazine* (August 1859). Another later article suggested that the reason that Roman Catholicism remained strong in these countries was due to Protestant apathy. “The Triumph of the Reformation,” *The Independent* (November 7, 1867).

<sup>45</sup> The American Bible Society, as well as other Bible societies would occasionally send a colporteur into Mexico for short periods of time. In 1868, as discussed later, the Protestant Episcopal Church would be involved in the direct support of the indigenous Mexican mission movement the Church of Jesus and would send a missionary to aid the movement, Henry C. Riley. Riley would also work with the AFCU and be supported by them for a time. By the early 1870s individual Protestant denominations would begin sending and supporting their own missions in Mexico, and other places and would cut funding for the AFCU. By 1873 the AFCU had withdrawn from the foreign field, and many of the formerly AFCU missionaries became affiliated with and supported by particular denominations. Meier, “Guide to the Records of the American and Foreign Christian Union, 1851-1884,” n.d., [http://dlib.nyu.edu/findingsaids/html/archives/afcu.html] (17 November 2008). For an article expressing disappointment about the entrance of individual denominations into Mexico see “The Presbyterian Board of Missions-Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXIV: 1 (January 1872): 14-16.

of the Catholic Church, concluding that the hold of the Catholic Church on Mexico had been weakened and Mexicans might be ready to embrace Protestantism.<sup>46</sup> An article in the national magazine, the *Christian Observer*, expressed the opinion that despotism, revolution and anarchy would continue to be prevalent in Mexico until changes were made in the religious condition of the country.<sup>47</sup> Other observers saw the expansion of Protestantism as an inevitable effect of the Liberal anti-clerical tendencies.<sup>48</sup>

As discussed in the previous chapter, many Protestant writers in the United States linked Protestantism with progress and Catholicism with a past that needed to be abandoned for a society to progress.<sup>49</sup> Adherents viewed the missionary enterprise in the nineteenth century as a step toward achieving a universal religious unity, and the means through which God would bring about the conversion of the whole world.<sup>50</sup> Closely related to this theme was the Protestant interpretation of recent history which saw world events as part of this same process. Many Protestant theologians and writers viewed the

---

<sup>46</sup> "Spanish America," *New York Evangelist* (June 28, 1855). Other articles suggested that Catholicism was receding. See "Roman Catholic," *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 14, 1867); Melinda Rankin, "Miss Rankin in Mexico," *New York Observer and Chronicle* (April 29, 1869); William Butler, "American and Foreign Christian Union," *Christian Advocate* (March 3, 1870); JHB "Protestant Efforts for Mexico," *New York Evangelist* (April 25, 1872); "The Protestant Frontier," *Christian Advocate* (August 8, 1872); "The First Year of Our Mexican Mission," *The Methodist Quarterly Review* (April 1875).

<sup>47</sup> "Revolutionists in Mexico," *Christian Observer* (February 5, 1857).

<sup>48</sup> "Mexico Moving," *Flag of Our Union* (March 13, 1858).

<sup>49</sup> See for instance, "Protestantism and Romanism," *New York Evangelist* (January 10, 1856); "The Protestant Frontier," *Christian Advocate* (August 8, 1872).

<sup>50</sup> Monica I. Orozco, "Protestant Missionaries, Mexican Liberals, Nationalism and the Issue of Cultural Incorporation of Indigenous People in Mexico, 1870-1900." PhD diss., University of California at Santa Barbara, 1999. 49.

fact that formerly powerful Catholic powers such as Spain, France and Austria were on the decline, while predominantly Protestant nations such as England, Germany and the United States were ascendant as evidence of a trend in world history.<sup>51</sup> While one manifestation of this ascendancy of Protestantism was expected to be the conversion of “heathen” areas, such as Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, many also viewed Catholic areas as fields for conversion.

One observer suggested that Romanism had had free reign in Mexico with poor results, but the future was with Protestantism expanding into areas that had been formerly predominately Catholic. If this were to happen as predicted, Mexico would be filled with evangelical churches, schools and colleges and various institutions of learning. Under the influence of Protestant Christianity, many believed a population would appear who understood and respected republican governments and these governments would be a benefit to the people rather than an affliction as they had been through much of its history.<sup>52</sup> Likewise the inexhaustible riches of Mexico’s natural resources would be developed, and prosperity would coexist with religious and political enlightenment.<sup>53</sup>

As discussed previously, the victories of the Liberal Party, led by Benito Juárez were applauded in the United States, and were viewed as an act of progress to break the

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>52</sup> “Extinction of Races,” *New York Evangelist* (August 7, 1856). See also “Light Advancing in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (November 17, 1859); See “The Religious Movement in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (September 15, 1870), and “Facts Concerning Mexico that Every American Citizen Should Know,” *Christian Advocate* (November 24, 1870), for a similar discussions.

<sup>53</sup> “Extinction of Races,” *New York Evangelist* (August 7, 1856). For similar sentiment about the effects of Protestantism for Mexico see “Union with Mexico,” *New York Daily Times* (December 5, 1855). This article however suggests that U.S. annexation is the best way to accomplish this goal, rather than religious change within Mexico itself.

hold of the Catholic Church. With the decrees of religious freedom, a writer in the national magazine, *The Independent*, asserted that Providence was speaking “in a voice of thunder” to the “genuine” Christian churches of the world that the mission field of Mexico was ready for a great harvest, and now was the time to send laborers into the field.<sup>54</sup> At the same time, however, missionary expansion into Mexico would be hindered by the Civil War in the United States and the French Intervention in Mexico. Those who were burdened for the religious field of Mexico hoped for the victory of the Mexican Liberal forces against the French Intervention.<sup>55</sup> At a time when the United States was powerless to intervene militarily, an article in the Presbyterian *New York Evangelist* suggested that Christians should instead pray that God would “rouse” the Mexican people to defeat the forces of the French, Maximilian and the Mexican Catholic Church. The article stated that since it appeared that God intended to allow the empire to be established in Mexico, at least for a time, Protestant Christians should hope and pray for its short life. Because of the great need for the gospel in Mexico, the author entreated Christians to pray that God would open the doors of Mexico by overriding political events which seemed to be preventing the spread of the gospel.<sup>56</sup> The eventual victory of

---

<sup>54</sup> “Texas and Mexico,” *The Independent* (March 21, 1861). See also Hannah More Johnson, *About Mexico, Past and Present* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1887), 373.

<sup>55</sup> As discussed in an earlier chapter many Protestants in the United States perceived the French Intervention to be part of a plot on the part of Papal powers and the Mexican Church to reestablish the former position of the Church.

<sup>56</sup> “The Condition of Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (December 10, 1863). Another article written at about the same time argued that whatever political changes come out of the crisis in Mexico, the deeper need was religious, and to be accomplished by ridding the nation of Catholic influences, whatever the political outcome might be. See “Mexico,” *Christian Advocate and Journal* (December 10, 1863).

the Liberal government over the French and their Mexican allies was therefore heralded as the work of Providence.<sup>57</sup> Many articles focused on the anticipated future role of Protestantism in allowing republicanism to thrive in Mexico, and acknowledged that it was the victory of republicanism in the form of the Mexican Liberals, which had allowed for religious freedom, including the ability of Protestants to operate in Mexico.<sup>58</sup>

While the political future of Mexico was still in doubt, religious events in Mexico would get wide coverage in the U.S. press. The promulgation of the Laws of the Reform and the Constitution of 1857 led to a schism within the Mexican Catholic Church between those who believed that the new Constitution was not incompatible with Catholic faith and others who viewed it as a serious threat to the Catholic foundation of Mexico.<sup>59</sup> The majority of the Mexican Catholic Church hierarchy rebelled against the civil government in opposition to the Liberal reforms embodied in the new Constitution. Catholic Church doctrine and practice held that the bishops of Mexican Church, under authority of the Pontiff, formulated the appropriate Catholic response to the Constitution. The Mexican Church hierarchy denounced the Constitution and denied the sacraments to those who swore allegiance to the new Constitution and refused to recant.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> “The Religious Movement in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (September 15, 1870).

<sup>58</sup> “Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (February 29, 1872).

<sup>59</sup> David Allen Gilbert, “‘Long Live the True Religion!’: contesting the Meaning of Catholicism in the Mexican Reforma (1855-1860).” PhD diss., University of Iowa, 2003. 227.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 227-228.

Many Liberals continued to believe in the Catholic faith and some priests defied the Mexican Roman Catholic Church hierarchy by supporting the Constitution. Of the priests who supported the Constitution, in 1859 a smaller number officially sought to establish a Catholic Church independent of the existing Mexican Church hierarchy, becoming known as the “Constitutionalist Fathers.”<sup>61</sup> Also in 1859 a doctor by the name of Julio Mallet Prevost celebrated communion in Zacatecas outside of the Mexican Roman Catholic Church. This was believed to have been the first Protestant ceremony in the country.<sup>62</sup> Shortly after this, Prevost expanded his work, with small pockets of this version of Protestantism existing in some villages in the region.

In 1861 Father Ramon Lozano, a priest in Tamaulipas, separated from the Mexican Catholic Church and published provisional statutes for the organization of national church based on “Biblical principles.” Though this church was not affiliated with the Mexican Catholic Church, it was not at this time conceptualized as Protestant.<sup>63</sup> Lozano referred to this Church as being Catholic, Apostolic, and Mexican, and emphasized that the faith, sacraments, practices and ceremonies would continue to be

---

<sup>61</sup> Deborah J. Baldwin, *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution: Missionaries, Ministers, and Social Change* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 14.

<sup>62</sup> G. Baez Camargo and Kenneth G. Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico* (London & New York: World Dominion Press, 1935), 87-88. Prevost was an American who had served in the U.S. Army during the war with Mexico, and returned to pursue mining in Zacatecas. See Daniel James Young, “The Cincinnati Plan and the National Presbyterian Church of Mexico: A Brief Study of Relations Between American Mission Boards and Mexican Protestant Churches During the Mexican Revolution.” Master’s Thesis. The University of Texas at El Paso, 2006. 11.

<sup>63</sup> Baldwin, *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution*, 15. See also Samuel A. Purdie, “The Evangelical Priest,” *Friend’s Review* (December 13, 1879); and Samuel A. Purdie, “The Evangelical Priest,” *Friend’s Review* (December 20, 1879).

Catholic.<sup>64</sup> Other priests throughout the country also rebelled against the Mexican Church hierarchy, and in 1864, several of these groups agreed to unify, creating the “Church of Jesus” which began services in that same year.<sup>65</sup> As might be expected, the Mexican Church hierarchy, and conservative newspapers rejected the actions of the renegade priests and the Church leadership excommunicated them. The Archbishop of Mexico Lázaro de la Garza y Ballesteros and others would denounce the reform priests as a “synagogue of Satan” for their support of the Constitution and insubordination toward the hierarchy.<sup>66</sup>

In response President Juárez expressed appreciation for the Church of Jesus and named it the government’s agency for the reform of the Mexican Catholic Church.<sup>67</sup> Members of the Liberal government continued to state that they were not anti-Catholic, and offered financial support for the priests that would lose financial support by leaving the Mexican Catholic Church.<sup>68</sup> Despite this moral support, the financial situation of the Mexican Liberal government was such that it could provide little financial support for the new reformed Church. Since the Liberal government was in no position to offer support,

---

<sup>64</sup> John Steven Rice, “Evangelical Episcopalians and the Church of Jesus in Mexico, 1857-1906.” Master’s Thesis. University of Texas, Pan American, 2000. 29. Lozano opposed the celibacy of the priesthood and supported civil marriage.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Joel Morales Cruz, “The Origins of Mexican Protestantism: Catholic Pluralism, Enlightenment Religion and the *Iglesia de Jesus* Movement in Nineteenth-Century Mexico (1859-1872).” PhD diss., The Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 2009. 150.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> Rice, “Evangelical Episcopalians,” 28-29.

the reform priests looked to the United States for financial support along with doctrinal and ecclesiastical guidance.

In 1865 Manuel Aguilar, one of the original Constitutionalist Fathers, sent a letter to the American Episcopal Church requesting assistance and shortly thereafter a group of three priests visited churches in the United States to request support for the new “reformed” Church in Mexico.<sup>69</sup> In a letter to Protestants in the United States, one of the Mexican leaders of this movement, Juan N. Enriquez Orestes, described the factors that led him to leave the Mexican Catholic Church. Appealing to the anti-Catholicism of his readers, he described the “abuses, wickedness, infamy, cruelty and tyranny” of the Mexican Church hierarchy and castigated the Church leadership for its involvement in the French Intervention which he suggested that it supported in order to “satisfy their vengeance and reconquer their privileges and wealth.”<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> *Spirit of Missions: Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church XXX* (July 1865): 257; Camargo and Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico* 88. The Mexican reform churches chose to appeal to the Episcopal Church, rather than other Protestant groups, because the Episcopal Church was viewed as retaining the “apostolic succession” from the previous association that its hierarchy had enjoyed through the Catholic Church. The Church of Jesus hoped that the Episcopal Church would consecrate a bishop for them, thereby restoring them under apostolic succession that they believe they had lost with their break from the Mexican Catholic Church. Morales Cruz, “The Origins of Mexican Protestantism,” 3. Apostolic succession refers to the doctrine that the contemporary bishops are traceable to the original twelve apostles from the New Testament. The Episcopal Church claimed apostolic succession through its original association with the Anglican Church (the Church of England), which was believed to retain this succession through its association with the Roman Catholic Church before the split in the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Without this succession the Church of Jesus believed they would not be able to ordain priests.

<sup>70</sup> “The Good Work in Mexico,” *The Congregationalist* (July 29, 1864). For more discussion of Juan N. Enriquez Orestes, including a translated letter from a prominent Mexican Liberal Ignacio M. Altamirano, see “The Religious Reformation in Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union XVI*: 11 (November 1865): 330-331.



During their visit to the United States these former Mexican priests appeared at Protestant gatherings. They sought not only to enlist the cooperation of Protestant denominations to spread the gospel to Mexico but also to gain knowledge about Protestant practices in the United States.<sup>71</sup> Members of the Protestant churches in the United States were especially interested in what these priests had to say, since it was the first time that reformed Catholic priests had appeared in Protestant churches as representatives from any Latin American country.<sup>72</sup> Articles in the religious press expressed sympathy with the cause of the Mexican reformers, with one article describing them as “intelligent, sincere, and devoted.”<sup>73</sup>

U.S. religious commentators were concerned as to what extent the Mexican priests accepted and understood the “truths of the gospel.” In fact the Mexican priests declined to say Mass with their Episcopal hosts and espoused doctrinal beliefs that were different than the Episcopal leaders.<sup>74</sup> One writer in a U.S. religious periodical suggested that the Mexican priests might not yet be true believers, but that the scenes described in

---

<sup>71</sup> “Interesting Visitors from Mexico,” *The Independent* (February 2, 1865).

<sup>72</sup> “Reception of Mexican Reformers,” *New York Evangelist* (May 4, 1865). For excerpts and reports of these speeches see, “Religious Reformation in the Mexican States,” *The Independent* (March 23, 1865); “Reception of the Reformed Mexican Priests,” *New York Evangelists* (March 16, 1865); “The Reformed Mexican Church,” *New York Evangelist* (March 30, 1865); “Annual Meeting of the Society,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XVI: 6 (June 1865): 162.

<sup>73</sup> “Interesting Visitors from Mexico,” *The Independent* (February 2, 1865). See also, “Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XVI: 4 (April 1865): 123.

<sup>74</sup> Morales Cruz, “The Origins of Mexican Protestantism,” 158. Specifically this was regarding whether the Host during Mass was symbolic of the Body and Blood of Christ, or whether it was the sacrifice itself.

Mexico were reminiscent of the Reformation of the Catholic Church in Europe.<sup>75</sup> A statement on behalf of clergymen of various Protestant denominations in support of the Mexican reformers expressed pleasure that this action was the result of largely internal processes within the Mexican Catholic Church and suggested that this was the beginning of a “great work of evangelization” in Catholic countries.<sup>76</sup> As such they believed that the events in Mexico would provide the first step in a much larger goal of the widespread conversion of Catholics.

U.S. Protestant ministers responded to the former priests by “warmly recommending them to the fraternal interest and prayers of Christians,” and frequently repeated the conviction that the religious cause in Mexico deserved the interest of U.S. Protestants.<sup>77</sup> The same article suggested that once Maximilian was driven from Mexico, then a vigorous movement would be made for the “spiritual reformation” of Mexico.<sup>78</sup> This idea of a “Reformation” in Mexico would be a persistent theme in discussions of changes in Mexico. One article in the Methodist magazine, *Zion’s Herald*, declared that with generous aid from American Christians and churches, “the best informed persons

---

<sup>75</sup> “Religious Reformation in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (February 23, 1865). See also Alfred C. Roe, “The Evangelical Movement in Mexico,” *Christian Union* (August 13, 1870); and Alfred Lee, “The Reformation in Mexico,” *American Church Review* (October 1, 1875).

<sup>76</sup> “Religious Reformation in the Mexican States,” *The Independent* (March 23, 1865). For a similar sentiment see, “Maxwell Phillips, “From the City of Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (March 27, 1873).

<sup>77</sup> “Reception of the Reformed Mexican Priests,” *New York Evangelists* (March 16, 1865).

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.* Similar sentiment was expressed in “Mexico, Prospects of Protestantism,” *Methodist Quarterly Review* (January 1866).

believe that in a very few years Mexico will become a Protestant and flourishing Republic.”<sup>79</sup>

In the mid-1860s and the early 1870s numerous reports continued to circulate in U.S. publications about these Catholic priests who had renounced Rome and were working for the reformation of the Mexican Church. An article in the Episcopal magazine, *The Spirit of Missions* described them as standing firm “in their opposition to Rome, and in their efforts to induce their people to throw off all her corruptions, and embrace the simple truth of the Gospel.”<sup>80</sup> In the years after the restoration of the Mexican Republic, other priests followed the lead of the first reformers who had originally broken with the Church during the Wars of the Reform and the Intervention.

One of these priests was Manuel Aguas, whose story would be well-publicized in the U.S. religious press.<sup>81</sup> Aguas, in a letter asking for support from Protestant churches in

---

<sup>79</sup> J H B “The Religious Reformation in Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (June 16, 1870). This article was reprinted in “The Religious Reformation in Mexico,” *The Missionary Magazine* (October 1870).

<sup>80</sup> “The Mexican Reformers,” *The Spirit of Missions: Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church XXXII* (August 1867): 595. See also “The Reformation in Mexico,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 23, 1865); “The Bible in Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union XVII*: 2 (February 1866): 59; “The Evangelization of the Spanish Race,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union XVII*: 4 (April 1866): 109-110; “Editorial,” *Spirit of Missions: Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church XXXI* (March 1866): 134-135; and A J Park, “Letter from Northern Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (July 14, 1870). For a later discussion of this “reformation” see Samuel A. Purdie, *Memories of Angela Aguilar de Mascorro: And Sketches of the Friends’ Mexican Mission* (Chicago: Publishing Association of Friends, 1885), 27-30.

<sup>81</sup> *The Reformation in Mexico* (Hartford, CN: Junior Auxiliary Publishing Co., 1894), 6. See also John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Mexico: Personal Reminiscences, Present Conditions and Future Outlook* (New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1918), 52. Other discussions of the stories of Mexican priests and lay converts in English religious periodicals can be found in “The

the United States, described Mexico as unfortunate since it had not enjoyed the blessings of the “true religion.” He described how that despite being a priest, he was in spiritual blindness, because he believed he was opposed to the true Christianity. He explained that he constantly lacked peace and doubted his salvation, and lived in this condition until he read a gospel pamphlet sent from the United States. After reading this pamphlet, he “rejected the errors of Romanism” and began to study Protestantism, aided through the instruction of a Protestant missionary in the area.<sup>82</sup> Aguas stated that the number of “true Christians” was growing enormously in Mexico, and the light of the Gospel was continuing to grow brighter.<sup>83</sup> Aguas expected the religious movement to “spread the Gospel in its purity far and wide throughout the nation, and lead to a great reformation in the Catholic Church.”<sup>84</sup> He further appealed to the prevailing belief of the conversion of the whole world, and described Mexico as the key to the conversion of Latin American countries, a theme similar to that expressed by Protestant publications in the United States.<sup>85</sup>

---

Movement in Mexico,” *The Churchman* Volume 1 (1880): 43-46; and *Proceedings of the General Conference of Foreign Missions* (London: John F. Shaw, 1878): 88-90.

<sup>82</sup> Manuel Aguas, “Letter from Manuel Aguas,” (New York: T. Whittaker Publisher and Bookseller, 1874), 4. The letter was originally written in 1871. For a more detailed expression of his conversion see, Manuel Aguas, “Letter from a Converted Mexican Priest,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XII: 8 (August 1871): 248-255. See also “Mexico,” *81<sup>st</sup> Annual Report of the Religious Tract Society* (1880): 215-216.

<sup>83</sup> Aguas, “Letter from Manuel Aguas,” 5-6.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 8. This hope was expressed by U.S. articles as well. See also, J H B, “The Religious Reformation in Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (June 16, 1870); “The Reformation in Mexico,” *The Missionary Magazine* (October 1870).

In the following years, these developments in Mexico would be embraced by many in the United States as evidence that Mexico was experiencing a breakthrough that would lead to the wide-scale introduction of Protestantism in the nation and a rejection of Roman Catholicism.<sup>86</sup> An article in the *New York Evangelist* described the events in Mexico as “Light is breaking in Mexico.”<sup>87</sup> This was widely defined as a “Reformation” in Mexico, and would be compared to the Protestant Reformation in Europe led by Martin Luther.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> See for instance, “The Protestant Movement in Mexico,” *New York Times* (May 21, 1876); “The Scriptures in Mexico,” *The Congregationalist* (November 17, 1865); “The Religious Question in Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XVIII: 5 (May 1867): 140; “Missionary Items,” *Reformed Church Messenger* (July 14, 1869); “Missionary News,” *The Independent* (June 10, 1869); “Religious Progress in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (October 14, 1869); “The Reformation in Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXI: 6 (June 1870): 162-164; “Address by Rev. Henry C. Riley,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXI: 6 (June 1870): 186-187; “Central Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXII:11 (November 1871): 366; *The Reformation in Mexico* (Hartford, CN: Junior Auxiliary Publishing Co., 1894), 10. See also religious publications published outside the U.S. including H. H. Fairall, “The Reformation in Mexico,” *The Methodist Visitor* Second Volume (London: Elliot Stock, 1873); *Church Bells* Volume V (London: W. Wells Gardner, Publishers, 1875).

<sup>87</sup> “A Loud Call from Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (April 8, 1869). See also, “Juarez. The President of Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XV:11 (November 1864): 333; “Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin* (March 14, 1873); Crescent, “Mexico,” *Southwestern Advocate* (July 17, 1873); “Mexico,” *Southwestern Advocate* (July 30, 1874).

<sup>88</sup> “The Religious Reformation in Mexico,” *The Missionary Magazine* (October 1870). See also, Melinda Rankin, “Letter from Miss Rankin,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XV:10 (October 1864): 315; “The Religious Revolution in Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XVII:1 (January 1866): 11-12; “The City of Mexico-a Mission Begun,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XX:6 (June 1869): 179-180; “Evangelizing Mexico,” *New York Times* (May 30, 1870); “Southern Methodists in

Many interested American Protestants focused on their role in providing guidance to shape this reformation.<sup>89</sup> An article in *The Spirit of Missions*, published by the Episcopal Church stated that the converted priests did not understand and accept all aspects of Protestantism, and therefore needed the guidance and instruction which their church was best qualified to give. The article expressed joy that the converts appeared willing to learn, suggesting, “Surely we would greatly fail in our duty if we leave them to themselves or influence them to turn others less qualified.”<sup>90</sup>

By 1868 Henry C. Riley, an Episcopalian minister, went to Mexico to work with the Church of Jesus. By 1872 the Church of Jesus entered into a “covenant” with the Episcopal Church in the United States, which described the Mexican Church as a foreign Church that should receive the “nursing care” of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.<sup>91</sup> In a report to the Episcopal American Church Missionary Society, Riley described the Mexican Church of Jesus as a “younger sister” and hoped that the U.S.

---

Mexico,” *Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger* (April 22, 1873).

<sup>89</sup> Gilbert Haven was a Methodist Bishop sent to Mexico to survey the field described one service he attended as a protest against Catholicism, but not much beyond the first principles of this protest. See Gilbert Haven, “A Sabbath in Pachuca,” *Zion’s Herald* (March 6, 1873). For a later article emphasizing the need for U.S. guidance to the missions in Mexico see, Edward W. Gilman, “Mission Work in Mexico,” *The Congregationalist and Boston Recorder* (April 19, 1879).

<sup>90</sup> “Present Claims of Mexico,” *The Spirit of Missions: Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church XXVIII* (July 1864): 178. See also, “The Bible in Mexico,” *The Missionary Magazine* (April 1866).

<sup>91</sup> Baldwin, *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution*, 16.

Episcopal Church would provide assistance as an older sibling would do.<sup>92</sup> Another article suggested that it was within the power of American Christians to assist the Mexican reformers to change the religious condition of the Mexican people, and help the Mexican reformers to turn their country into a Protestant nation.<sup>93</sup>

This story of the beginning of Protestantism in Mexico as a Reformation would be repeated in many books and articles on religion in Mexico that were published in the United States from the mid-late nineteenth to the early twentieth century.<sup>94</sup> The views of the religious press would shape American views of religious events in Mexico during these years. However by the mid-1870s the story of the Reformation would merge with that of the missionary enterprise by American Protestant denominations, and most discussions of the hoped-for future of Mexico would espouse the need for U.S. missionaries, rather than an internal reformation among the Mexicans themselves. In an 1872 analysis of the Mexican mission field, Joseph Emerson, suggested that the success of the “reforming priests” had been modest at best. Emerson doubted the ability of priests- who had been trained in Catholicism- to become leaders in a Protestant movement. He suggested that the “organizing minds” must be from Protestant lands, with

---

<sup>92</sup> “Report of Rev. H. Chauncey Riley,” *Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Church Missionary Society* (New York: American Church Missionary Society, 1873), 28.

<sup>93</sup> “Mexico Church Confiscations-Their Extent and Resulting Consequences,” *Christian Advocate* (May 5, 1870).

<sup>94</sup> See for instance, *Ferguson’s Anecdotal Guide to Mexico* (New York: Lange, Little and Co, 1876), 54-59.



the eventual increases of native laborers from the common classes and native preachers trained in Protestant institutions.<sup>95</sup>

While earlier analysis of the “Reformation” in Mexico had been based on a misunderstanding of the complexity of the Mexican reform movement. Many of the dissident priests remained loyal to Catholic doctrine and refused to convert to Protestantism. While former priests such as Manuel Aguas left the Mexican Catholic Church and embraced Protestantism, others such as one of the original Constitutional Fathers, Juan Orestes, distanced himself from the Protestantism of Aguas, and continued to view their efforts as a reform movement within the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>96</sup> In a recent study of the Church of Jesus, Joel Morales Cruz argues that for some of these dissident priests, rejecting Roman Catholicism was “unthinkable,” however much they sought to reform the Mexican Church.<sup>97</sup> Even the Mexican priests who embraced Protestantism disagreed with the direction the Church of Jesus was taking in becoming a dependent mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Joseph Emerson, “Mexico as a Missionary Field,” *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (March 1872). For a similar sentiment see Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 196. A later article suggested that the missionary enterprise in the United States should help the Mexican churches along, until they would be able to “go alone.” *The Mexican Episcopal Church* (New York: Provisional Committee on Church Work in Mexico, 1894), 6.

<sup>96</sup> Morales Cruz, “The Origins of Mexican Protestantism,” 178.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 178-179.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 180. Others expressed resentment over the introduction of missionaries from rival U.S. Protestant denominations, such as the Methodists and Presbyterians, since they envisioned the Church of Jesus as the only Protestant Church in Mexico. Rice, “Evangelical Episcopalians,” 66; Morales Cruz, “The Origins of Mexican Protestantism,” 180. For a contemporary discussion of the concerns of one of these priests, Augustin



By the mid-1880s the Church of Jesus had split into two camps, the *Cuerpo Eclesiástico* (Ecclesiastical Body), which wanted the Church to come under the direct authority of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, and the Independent Mexican Church which continued to request greater autonomy.<sup>99</sup> In 1886 the U.S. Episcopal Church recognized the *Cuerpo Eclesiástico* as the official Church of Jesus. In the early twentieth century Mexican clergy affiliated with the Church of Jesus continued to request greater autonomy. In 1901 the U.S. Episcopal Church hierarchy rejected the request from the Church of Jesus to consecrate three bishops for Mexico, which would have made the Church independent. In 1906 the Church of Jesus was absorbed by the mission of the Episcopal Church which was created to minister to the English-speaking congregations in Mexico, thus officially ending the hopes for an independent national Mexican Church.<sup>100</sup> By this time hopes for the conversion of Mexico to Protestantism had long since shifted from an indigenous Mexican movement to Protestant missionaries sent from the United States.

#### U.S. Missions in Mexico after the French Intervention

By the late 1850s several missionaries had begun operating in various areas in Mexico. In 1860 Melinda Rankin explained her reasons for working in the field, writing “I fully believe that *hundreds*, nay *thousands* of the priest-bound people of Mexico are

---

Palacios, who feared American missionaries would become involved in politics see John W. Butler, “Palacios, the Converted Priest,” *Zion’s Herald* (March 31, 1881).

<sup>99</sup> Morales Cruz, “The Origins of Mexican Protestantism,” 182.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 182-183. See also, Marvin James Penton, “Mexico’s Reformation: A History of Mexican Protestantism from its Inception to the Present.” PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1965. 84.

groaning under their spiritual bondage, and would most joyfully accept that freedom wherewith Christ makes people free. A glorious door is *now opened*, and *many missionaries are needed* to scatter the seeds of divine truth upon this hitherto neglected soil.”<sup>101</sup> Because of the increased demand for Bibles, she requested that another missionary group, the American Bible Society, send a full time agent to labor in the border area and Mexico.<sup>102</sup> Their first agent was B.P. Thompson who traveled in Northern Mexico distributing the Scriptures. While at Cadereyta, about thirty miles from Monterrey, Thompson encountered a man who had received a Bible and was well-acquainted with many of its teachings. In March of 1861 this Mexican national, his son, and another Mexican man traveled with Thompson to Brownsville, Texas and were received into a Protestant Church, heralded as one the first Mexicans to publicly profess the Protestant faith.<sup>103</sup> Rankin recounted that this proved that a Mexican “*could be otherwise than a Catholic,*” and was followed by other conversions. These conversions gave Rankin particular joy since Mexicans had long been regarded by many mainstream Protestant denominations as “beyond the reach of a pure Christianity.”<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> “Mission on the Rio Grande, at Brownsville, Texas-Miss Rankin,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XI: 2 (February 1860): 54. Italics in original.

<sup>102</sup> Dwight *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society, Volume 1*, 220. For more information about the early evangelistic efforts of the American Bible Society see also Henry Otis Dwight *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society, Volume II* (New York: The Macmillian, Company, 1916), 299-302.

<sup>103</sup> “The Mexican Mission,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XII: 8 (August 1861): 237.

<sup>104</sup> Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 88-89. Italics in original. For earlier discussions of critics of the ability of Mexicans to be converted see, “Spanish Mission on the Rio Grande-Miss Rankin,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign*

Shortly afterward Thompson was replaced by James Hickey, a Baptist Minister, working with the American Bible Society, who distributed Bibles and tracts, and worked at evangelization. Hickey invited Thomas Westrup, an English Anglican, to become the pastor of a church recently organized by those who were converted by Hickey's ministering.<sup>105</sup> On June 30, 1864 Baptist missionaries in Monterrey established the first organized evangelical church in Mexico.<sup>106</sup> While other churches expressed sympathy with the need to expand to Mexico, they delayed doing so, because of the unsettled nature of the political situation as well as the Civil War in the United States. One article in the *New York Evangelist* expressed the expectation that the time would come when the Protestant Churches of the United States could no longer ignore the loud calls for help, which were constantly coming from "nominal Christian lands."<sup>107</sup> Mexico appeared to be the most inviting field, in the event that the Liberal government would be able to defeat the French Intervention and Liberals were expected to welcome and protect Protestant missionaries.<sup>108</sup> For this reason *The Christian World* advised its readers that they should pray for the defeat of the Empire and the ultimate success of the Mexican Liberals.<sup>109</sup>

---

*and Christian Union* X: 10 (October 1859): 329; "Mexico-Her Revolutions," *Ibid.*, XVII: 3 (March 1866): 71, 73.

<sup>105</sup> Baldwin, *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution*, 21.

<sup>106</sup> Camargo and Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico*, 88-89.

<sup>107</sup> "Mexico, Central and South American as a Missionary Field," *New York Evangelist* (June 11, 1863). Another article expressed frustration at the delay in the United States entering the field. See Geo Duffield, "Religious Reformation in Mexico," *New York Evangelist* (March 9, 1865).

<sup>108</sup> "Mexico, Central and South American as a Missionary Field," *New York Evangelist* (June 11, 1863). See also, "The Bible in Mexico," *New York Evangelist*

While, as discussed in the previous chapter, many Americans expressed skepticism about the future of Mexico, those who focused on the religious changes brought on by the Reform and French Intervention viewed Mexican potential positively. The missionary enterprise in Mexico would benefit from this shift in the aftermath of the expulsion of the French in 1867.<sup>110</sup> Melinda Rankin, who worked for the evangelization of Mexico for twenty years, noted this difference. While earlier she had reported the hostility that she witnessed in her attempts to raise funds to minister to Mexicans, now she reported that she perceived an “improved state of feeling toward Mexico.”<sup>111</sup> In her 1875 autobiography, she expressed the joy she felt over the state of the field. When she first began her labors no one else was willing to take an interest in what was seen as the hopeless field of Mexico. She recounts, “I thought of the times I had turned and wept, because no one appeared to care for the souls of the poor Mexicans.”<sup>112</sup> In contrast, she

---

(November 2, 1865). “Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIV: 6 (June 1863): 166-167.

<sup>109</sup> “Mexico and Central America,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIV: 1 (January 1863): 4-5.

<sup>110</sup> For four years in a row the AFCU Annual Meeting passed resolutions calling for increased efforts in Mexico and other parts of Latin America. See “Annual Meeting of the Society,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIII: 6 (June 1862): 162; “Annual Meeting of the Society,” *Ibid.*, XIV: 6 (June 1863): 163; “Annual Meeting of the Society,” *Ibid.*, XV: 6 (June 1864): 165-166; “Annual Meeting of the Society,” *Ibid.*, XVI: 6 (June 1865): 162.

<sup>111</sup> Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 130.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

happily noted that numerous denominations and mission boards were working for the conversion of Mexico.<sup>113</sup>

As mentioned earlier, Henry C. Riley, an Episcopal minister, came to Mexico in 1868 as a missionary supported by the American Foreign and Christian Union to work with the Church of Jesus in Mexico City. Riley reported that the converts in Mexico City were following Protestant forms as far as they were able and emphasized his role in instructing them in doctrine and practices. In a short time the Church of Jesus in Mexico City requested funds from the United States in order to purchase the Church of San Francisco, formerly one of the largest Catholic churches in the City, which had been confiscated by the Liberal government during the Wars of the Reform. In a short time they were able to purchase the church, which, they hoped, would become the permanent center of a vibrant movement in the Republic of Mexico.<sup>114</sup>

In the aftermath of the Liberal victory in Mexico, other Protestant groups began to look to Mexico as a field for foreign missions.<sup>115</sup> An article in the *New York Evangelist*

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> *The Mexican Missionary Association: Its Origin and Work* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1871), 7-8. In 1876 the Methodist Church in Mexico City built a church of stone, not of adobe in order to symbolize that the Protestant religion would be a permanent part of Mexico. See *Zion's Herald* (August 17, 1876).

<sup>115</sup> For an interesting discussion see, "The 'Church of Jesus' in Mexico," *Christian Advocate* (June 9, 1870). See also "The Gospel in Mexico," *New York Observer and Chronicle* (April 15, 1869). In 1871 one of the oldest missionary sending agencies, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions agreed to enter Mexico and other "nominally Christian lands." William E. Strong, *The Story of the American Board: An Account of the First Hundred Years of The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1910), 290; *Sixty-First Annual Report of the American Board of the Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston: Riverside Press, 1871): xxi-xxii and *Sixty-*

described how, since the overthrow of the French Intervention, Mexico had made great strides in becoming a nation. While great changes had been made, greater still needed to be made in Mexico, and for these “she appeals to us by her mute misery and by the lips of her most patriotic and eloquent sons, for help.”<sup>116</sup> While other commentators focused on the economic, political and social needs of the nation, this article argued that the real need of Mexico was the Gospel, which was the “fountain of social as well as political well-being.”<sup>117</sup>

Many writers described a general urgency to the mission field in Mexico.<sup>118</sup> This was related to the doctrine of premillennialism that informed much of the Protestant missionary enterprise throughout much of the nineteenth century enterprise and later.<sup>119</sup> This doctrine held that Christ’s coming was imminent and that Christians should work to convert the world before this happened or non-believers would be lost forever.

---

*Third Annual Report of the Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston: Riverside Press, 1873): xxviii-xxix.

<sup>116</sup> “What is Doing in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (July 7, 1870).

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.* For a similar sentiment see, Gilbert Haven, “Good Bye to Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (April 24, 1873).

<sup>118</sup> One book suggested that a new light was breaking in Mexico, but a delay would risk everything. See Arthur T. Pierson, *The Crisis of Missions: or the Voice Out of the Cloud* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1886), 146. See also the report of message of a clergyman in the *Brooklyn Eagle*, November 15, 1878.

<sup>119</sup> For more on the role of premillennialism and the U.S. missions enterprise see Ian Tyrrell, *Reforming the World: The Creation of America’s Moral Empire* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010), 52.

Many articles also stressed the receptiveness of the Mexican field to the Gospel as preached by Protestants if they would take advantage of the opportunity.<sup>120</sup> In a letter from Mexico, Methodist missionary, William Butler stated the belief that there was no greater opportunity than that which was offered in Mexico.<sup>121</sup> Other writers speculated about a quick conversion of the country if larger numbers of American Protestant missionaries came to Mexico.<sup>122</sup> For instance a missionary from the Friends' mission described Mexico as "white unto harvest," and quoted a scripture describing the field as, "the harvest truly is plentiful, and the laborers are few."<sup>123</sup> In the 1870s numerous Protestant denominations entered Mexico including the Society of Friends, the Northern Baptist Church, the Northern Presbyterian Church, the Congregational Church, the Northern and Southern Methodist Churches, the Southern Presbyterian Church, and the

---

<sup>120</sup> "The Gospel in Mexico," *The Missionary Magazine* (April 1870). For similar sentiments see, "Mexico: How to Help Her," *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 28, 1867); "Evangelization of Spanish America," *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XVI: 12 (December 1865): 359; "Mexico," *Ibid.*, XXII: 2 (February 1871): 61-62; "The Church in Mexico," *American Church Review* (January 1876); *Baptist Missionary Magazine* (October 1879); *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (May 1879).

<sup>121</sup> William Butler, "Letter from Mexico," *Zion's Herald* (September 17, 1874); See also Samuel A. Purdie, *Friend's Review* (March 30, 1872).

<sup>122</sup> "The Gospel in Mexico," *New York Observer and Chronicle* (October 8, 1868); "Evangelization in Mexico," *Christian Advocate* (September 22, 1870). For a similar sentiment see, Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 144; Samuel W. Barnum, *Romanism as it is: An Exposition of the Roman Catholic System, for the American People...* (Hartford, CN: Connecticut Publishing Company, 1882), 687.

<sup>123</sup> J.S.W., "Friend's Mexican Mission," *Friend's Review* (July 31, 1875). This comes from Matthew 9:37, King James Version. See also Samuel P. Craver, "Mexico," *Zion's Herald* (May 18, 1876); "Mexico," *Baptist Missionary Magazine* (January 1878); Samuel A. Purdie, "Mission Work in Mexico," *Friend's Review* (May 22, 1880).

Associate Reformed Church.<sup>124</sup> In 1880 the Southern Baptist Church officially entered the nation when the church in Monterrey became an official mission.<sup>125</sup> While there were early instances of competition between the missions of different Protestant sects, eventually they agreed to divide Mexico into districts and “allocating each sect a market share- a sort of religious cartel.”<sup>126</sup>

American missionaries and commentators in the U.S. religious press often used similar imagery as those espousing economic or cultural expansion to Mexico and Latin America to describe the mission enterprise to Mexico. In an address to the Michigan State Convention of the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, Reverend M.H. Pettit described the missionary enterprise as the “New Conquest of Mexico.” Contrasting it to the original Spanish Conquest in the fifteenth century, Pettit stated that this new conquest was to bring the Mexican people “under the spiritual reign of Christ.” While the results of the Spanish conquest, in Pettit’s view, were oppression and ignorance, that of the new Protestant conquest would be “enlightenment,” along with the “uplifting” and

---

<sup>124</sup> Camargo and Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico*, 89. Other groups that would enter Mexico later would include the Disciples of Christ, Nazarenes, Seventh Day Adventists, and Pentecostals. For a request for missionaries see “The Protestant Movement in Mexico,” *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, June 7, 1870. By this point the AFCU lost support as interdenominational missions gave way to individual denominational mission efforts. See Eugene O. Porter, “The Beginning of the Protestant Movement in Mexico,” *The Historian* 3 (Autumn 1940): 19.

<sup>125</sup> “Mission in Mexico,” *Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists Volume II* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1958), 855.

<sup>126</sup> William Schell Jr., *Integral Outsiders: The American Colony in Mexico City, 1876-1911* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2001), 60. See also Joseph Barnard Romney, “American Interests in Mexico: Development and Impact During the Rule of Porfirio Díaz, 1876-1911.” PhD diss., University of Utah, 1969, 147.



“purifying of the people.”<sup>127</sup> Frequently the discussions in the religious press reflected a rehabilitation of the image of the U.S.-Mexican War in their collective memory. In this new conception it was the U.S. military invasion, during which chaplains and missionaries accompanying the troops had distributed Bibles and tracts, which prepared the way for the Protestant mission movement which would begin in the 1860s.<sup>128</sup> M.W. Stryker, a Presbyterian Reverend and professor used a similar imagery suggesting that “Now is the time to pour in forces for a new Mexican war, but not now *against* Mexico, but for her.” Stryker declared that it was time for Protestants to “tell our neighbors the secret of the great things God has done for us, that, desiring to copy our prosperity, they may appreciate its foundation in the wealth of Him in whom, richer than all silver and gold of Mexico’s mines, are ‘hid all the treasures of the knowledge and wisdom of God.’”<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> “The New Conquest of the Mexico,” *The Baptist Home Mission Monthly* XVII: 3 (March 1895), 80-81. This theme corresponds to the discourses of a “Second Conquest” of Mexico during the U.S. war with Mexico. See Brian M. McGowan, “The Second Conquest of Mexico: American Volunteers, Republicanism and the Mexican War.” PhD diss., University of Utah, 2009.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 81. This view was iterated in some form- linking the U.S. invasion to either the roots of Protestantism, or the Liberal Reform of the late 1850s or both. See Arthur Pierson, *The Crisis of Missions, or the Voice Out of the Cloud* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1886), 144; D.F. Watkins, “Mexico,” *The Independent* (April 16, 1891); “Our Next-Door Neighbor,” *The Independent* (February 18, 1892); Francis E. Clark and Harriet A. Clark, *The Gospel in Latin Lands; Outline Studies of Protestant Work in the Latin Countries of Europe and America* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1909), 191; Mrs A. T. Graybill, “Mission Work in Mexico,” *Christian Observer* (February 23, 1910).

<sup>129</sup> M.W. Stryker, “Missions in Mexico,” *Historical Sketches of the Missions Under the Care of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church* Third Edition (Philadelphia: Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society, 1891), 153.

Many Protestant commentators suggested that the United States had a special duty to spread Protestantism to Mexico.<sup>130</sup> This was expressed in one article which stated the “surely no country has a greater claim upon us than Mexico. It is part of the same continent. It is our neighbor, and it has the same government as our own country.”<sup>131</sup> Part of this special claim was due to the closer relationship that Mexico was believed to have with the U.S. at some point in the future. Missionaries sought to avoid discussions of a potential U.S. annexation of Mexico, but often discussed closer economic, cultural and religious relations between the two countries. The same article suggested that Mexico’s

---

<sup>130</sup> “Texas: Mexico,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (April 26, 1860); “Duty of Evangelizing Our Own Continent-Claims of the Spanish Population,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* X:5 (May 1859): 136-137; “A Woman in Mexico,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 2, 1865); “Mexican Evangelization,” *Christian Advocate* (February 20, 1873); George F. Flichtner, *Some Facts About Mexico* (New York: NP, 1891), 14; *The Mexican Missionary Association, Its Origin and Work* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1871), 5; “Monthly Concert-Mexico,” *The Preacher and Homiletic Monthly* (1880-1881): 288; “Mexico,” *The Missionary: A Monthly Journal, Issued on Behalf of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* (March 1890), 93.

<sup>131</sup> “Prayer for Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (December 10, 1863). For similar sentiments see, “Let Us Go Up and Possess It,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XIX: 4 (November 1868): 362-363; Facts of To-Day in Mexico,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XX: 4 (April 1869): 122; “Protestantism in Mexico,” *The Independent* (November 3, 1870); “Mexico,” *The Missionary: A Monthly Journal, issued in Behalf of the Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States* XXIII: 3 (March 1890): 93.

destiny was “intimately connected” with that of the United States.<sup>132</sup> This idea would continue to be important as the United States and Mexico grew closer economically.<sup>133</sup>

Some religious commentators cited the Monroe Doctrine as a way to explain this special duty and as a justification for the special claim that Mexico had on the United States. The American religious leader, Robert E. Speer, stated that Christians should read the Monroe Doctrine as a “missionary declaration.” Speer suggested that while the whole world was the field for all Christian nations, there were special fields for each. While the United States had taken the responsibility for “maintaining the independence of Latin America from European aggressions, so also the United States should provide to its neighbors “the only secret of stability and strength for a free nation,” which was a “pure faith and a Bible for all.”<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> “Prayer for Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (December 10, 1863). For similar sentiment see, “Joseph Emerson, “Mexico as a Missionary Field,” *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (March 1872); and “What is Doing in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (July 7, 1870).

<sup>133</sup> See “A Short History of the Mexico Methodist Episcopal Mission,” *Gospel in All Lands* (August 1897): 374.

<sup>134</sup> Robert E. Speer, “Mexico, Her Needs and Our Duty,” *Missionary Review of the World* XIX: 3 (March 1906), 177-178. For more on Robert E. Speer and his role in the U.S. missions movement see John F. Piper, “The Development of the Missionary Ideas of Robert E. Speer,” *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy* ed. Wilbert R. Shenk (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 261-280. Others who cite the Monroe Doctrine include Samuel P. Craver, “Mexico as a Mission Field,” *Missionary Review of the World* XVIII: 3 (March 1895), 202; William Wallace, “Mexico,” *The Student Missionary Appeal: Addresses at the Third International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions Held at Cleveland, Ohio, February 23-27, 1898* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1898), 279. For similar views, though not citing the Monroe Doctrine explicitly see “The Mexico of To-Day,” *Zion’s Herald* (July 6, 1887).

Others linked the missionary enterprise to Mexico to the idea of “Manifest Destiny.” One of these was Henry Ward Beecher, one of the most influential Protestant ministers of the era, who linked the field of Mexico to earlier ideas of Manifest Destiny. He stated that the Manifest Destiny of contemporary Protestant was to “carry the Bible and the school to the lands around us, beginning at the nearest... We must do what we can to aid the people of Mexico in their upward struggles for freedom and enlightenment.”<sup>135</sup> Many in the United States saw missionaries as providing the basis for republicanism and progress in Mexico and other parts of Latin America.<sup>136</sup> This was expressed by an article in the *New York Times* which looked for the redemption and regeneration of Mexico as a result of the spread of the gospel.<sup>137</sup> Since most agreed that having republican governments in the hemisphere was important for the security of the United States, U.S. missionaries were therefore helping to carry out an important foreign policy task.

This special interest in Mexico, as alluded to before, was also due to the special position the nation held in Latin America and the belief that with its successful conversion Mexico would send out Mexican converts to be missionaries throughout the

---

<sup>135</sup> “Rev. Henry Ward Beecher on Mexican Evangelization,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXIV: 1 (January 1873): 23.

<sup>136</sup> “Sabbath Schools as a Political Power in Mexico, South America, and other Catholic Countries,” *Ibid.*, XVII: 4 (April 1866): 112. See also, “Mexican Episcopal Church,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 9, 1876). For a later discussions of this view see, G. B. Winton, *A New Era in Old Mexico* (Nashville, TN: Publishing House Methodist Episcopal Church, 1905), 137, 187-188; Jasper T. Moses, *Today in the Land of Tomorrow: Sketches of Life in Mexico* (Indianapolis, IN: The Christian Woman’s Board of Missions, 1907), 17-18.

<sup>137</sup> “Ordination of a Baptist Minister- An Evangelist for Mexico,” *New York Times* (April 4, 1870).

rest of Latin America and would be the key to the conversion of the Spanish-speaking world.<sup>138</sup> Thus Mexico was to be the first step in the American destiny to spread Protestantism to all of Latin America.

### Mexican Responses to U.S. Missionaries in Mexico

The missionary effort and conversions of Mexicans provoked a dramatic struggle between the Mexican Catholic Church and Protestant missionaries and their Mexican converts.<sup>139</sup> As discussed previously, the 1824 Mexican Constitution established Roman Catholicism the religion of the country and Mexican laws forbade other sects from operating in Mexico. On several occasions in the intervening decades, the Mexican government had considered the issue of religious toleration, and had declined to change its laws.<sup>140</sup> The 1857 Constitutional Convention, which disestablished the Roman

---

<sup>138</sup> See for instance, "Mexican Evangelization," *Christian Advocate* (February 20, 1873); "City of Mexico-Rev. H. C. Riley," *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXI: 3 (March 1870): 85; "Missionary Work, Progress, Etc," *Ibid.*, XXII: 10 (October 1871): 325; Herman Dyer, Albert Zabriskie Gray, Manuel Aguas and Alfred Lee, *The Mexican Branch of the Church, Described by Eye Witnesses* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1876), 25; John W. Butler, "Mexican Evangelization," *Christian Advocate* (February 20, 1873); John W. Butler, John W. Butler, *Sketches of Mexico* (Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1894), 304. This is also discussed in "How Mexico is Being Taken," *Brooklyn Eagle*, October 6, 1876.

<sup>139</sup> *Twelfth Annual Report of the American Church Missionary Society* (New York: American Church Missionary Society, 1871): 33. On at least one occasion, Manuel Aguas and Augustin Palacios, who were converted priests sought to debate Catholic priests, over the topic of idolatry in the Catholic Church. While the Catholic priests originally accepted the challenge they eventually declined. For a translation of the addresses of Aguas and Palacios see "Addresses of Two Converted Romish Priests, Manuel Aguas and Augustin Palacios," *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXII: 11 (November 1871): 344-350.

<sup>140</sup> While the Church leadership and the Conservatives opposed toleration most Mexicans did as well. Even many Liberals who intellectually supported the idea of toleration, were not Protestants themselves though they were often described as such as a smear by their opponents. Many did not wish that Mexico would be changed from a

Catholic Church, did not legalize religious tolerance, though it did disestablish the Catholic Church as the official religion of Mexico. In fact, many of the Mexican Liberal delegates openly expressed their belief that the Mexican people wanted only the Catholic religion and the Convention received petitions from throughout the nation opposing the proposed article legalizing religious tolerance. As previously discussed, in 1860, Juárez published a decree authorizing toleration for non-Catholic groups, and even though many of the Liberal government leaders supported this, it was not popular with much of the population, especially in rural areas.<sup>141</sup>

In addition to support for an alternative to the hierarchy of the Mexican Catholic Church, President Juárez, other members of the government and intellectuals sought to provide protection for missionaries in Mexico. In a much quoted statement, President Benito Juárez declared, “Upon the development of Protestantism depends the future happiness and prosperity of my nation.”<sup>142</sup> Likewise many Liberals believed that Protestantism was more modern than Catholicism.<sup>143</sup> Juárez was quoted as expressing his

---

Catholic country. See Dieter Berninger, “Immigration and Religious Toleration: A Mexican Dilemma, 1821-1860,” *The Americas* 32:4 (April 1976): 549-565; and David K. Burden, “Before *La Reforma*: Liberals, Conservatives and the Debate over Immigration, 1846-1855,” *Mexican Studies* 23:2 (Summer 2007): 283-316, for some of these debates.

<sup>141</sup> Walter V. Scholes, “Church and State at the Mexican Constitutional Convention, 1856-1857,” *The Americas* 4:2 (October 1947): 165-169. Scholes reports that the Convention did receive a smaller number of petitions favoring the article. See also Wilfrid Hardy Callcott, *Church and State in Mexico, 1822-1857* (New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1965), 291-292.

<sup>142</sup> William Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, 252-253; John W. Butler, *Sketches of Mexico* (Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1894), 299; John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 35; Brown, *Latin America*, 171-172.

<sup>143</sup> Orozco, “Protestant Missionaries, Mexican Liberals,” 46-47.

hope that Protestantism would help Mexicans to “read rather than light candles.”<sup>144</sup> While earlier, Juárez and members of the Liberal government had sought to use the Church of Jesus to provide an alternative to the Mexican Catholic Church, by the early 1870s Juárez and other Liberal politicians and intellectuals began to look to Protestant missionaries to provide this alternative.<sup>145</sup> At the same Protestant missionaries associated themselves with the Liberal agenda and supported both the Juárez and later the Díaz governments.<sup>146</sup>

The possible introduction of Protestantism was part of a larger debate among Mexican intellectuals as to the incorporation of Mexico’s indigenous communities into the nation. One of the leading Mexican intellectuals during the Porfiriato, Justo Sierra, hoped that Protestantism might be able to instill what he considered modern values among the indigenous population in Mexico.<sup>147</sup> Another Mexican intellectual, Ignacio Manuel Altamirano, on the occasion of the consecration of a new Protestant church in Mexico City, discussed his belief that Protestantism developed democratic sentiment

---

<sup>144</sup> Justo Sierra, *Evolución política del pueblo mexicano* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1957), 369. This work was originally published in 1901.

<sup>145</sup> Rice, “Evangelical Episcopalians,” 69. See also Jean-Pierre Bastian, *Los Disidentes: sociedades protestantes y revolución en México, 1872-1911* (México: El Colegio de México, 1989), 79. Bastian identifies other supporters of the expansion of Protestantism including Jose Maria Vigil and Ignacio Altamirano.

<sup>146</sup> Michael Andrew Fry, “The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1873-1919.” Master’s Thesis. University of Calgary, 2009. 10.

<sup>147</sup> Orozco, “Protestant Missionaries, Mexican Liberals,” 2.



necessary for republicanism better than Catholicism.<sup>148</sup> Matías Romero, who after serving as Minister to the United States, served as Secretary of the Treasury from 1867-1872, supported the introduction of Protestants in order to “diminish the evils of the political domination and abuses of the clergy in Mexico,” by providing the Catholic Church with competition.<sup>149</sup> Romero and Juárez played important roles in helping the Church of Jesus purchase its first building, originally a Catholic Church building confiscated by the government in the Wars of the Reform.<sup>150</sup>

The Mexican Catholic Church hierarchy continued its opposition to the introduction of Protestantism and Protestant missionaries into Mexico. The Church hierarchy viewed Protestantism as heresy, which alienated its adherents from God and separated them from the true Church. The Catholic Church had used continuing fears of U.S. imperialism to oppose closer economic, religious, and cultural relations with the United States since the end of the U.S.-Mexico War and these suspicions also served to undermine the work of American missionaries in Mexico. These suspicions were exacerbated by periodic discussions in the U.S. public sphere about the possible annexation of Mexican territory, or the absorption of Mexico into the United States. These discussions increased continuing fears and produced outrage in the Mexican press,

---

<sup>148</sup> Ignacio Manuel Altamirano, “A Protestant Church,” Enclosure in Nelson to Fish, Mexico, April 29, 1871, *FRUS 1871-1872*, 638-639.

<sup>149</sup> Matias Romero, *Coffee and India Rubber Culture in Mexico: Preceded by Geographical and Statistical Notes on Mexico* (New York and London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1898), 95-96.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 96-97. See also, *Brooklyn Eagle* (June 25, 1879).



and among officials and intellectuals in Mexico.<sup>151</sup> Priests often alleged that Protestant missionaries were secretly working as agents for the U.S. government to try to affect the annexation of Mexico.<sup>152</sup> One U.S. missionary acknowledged that those who oppose Protestantism are “astute enough to try to show that it is but the handmaid of Anglo-Saxon aggressiveness.”<sup>153</sup> More generally Catholic priests identified U.S. missionaries with a new cultural invasion from the United States which would separate Mexicans from Catholicism, which they viewed as an important part of Mexican identity and opposed Protestant missionaries using nationalist and patriotic arguments.<sup>154</sup> One Protestant missionary to Mexico reported frequently encountering the sentiment such “The United States conquered us in 1847 and now they are trying to work the same game, but with peaceable means, and these missionaries are here to conquer the country for the greater American Republic.”<sup>155</sup> One Presbyterian missionary emphatically stated that these

---

<sup>151</sup> Orozco, “Protestant Missionaries, Mexican Liberals,” 14. I deal with discussions of annexation in the 1850s and 1860s in more detail in chapter 1, and later discussions in chapter 5.

<sup>152</sup> John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Mexico: Personal Reminiscences, Present Conditions and Future Outlook* (New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1918), 53-54. See also, Samuel A. Purdie, “The Mission Outlook in Mexico,” *Friends’ Review* (November 10, 1883); Johnson, *About Mexico*, 393; John W. Butler, “Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (July 22, 1885); “Day in the Churches,” *The Morning Oregonian*, July 23, 1895; James G. Dale, *Mexico and Our Mission (Associate Reformed Presbyterian)* (Lebanon, PA: Sowers Printing Company, 1910), 192-194.

<sup>153</sup> Brown, *Latin America*, 254.

<sup>154</sup> Jean Pierre Bastian, *Protestantismo y sociedad en México* (México: Casa Unida de Publicaciones, 1983), 77.

<sup>155</sup> James B. Rodgers, “Peculiar Difficulties and Special Problems of the South American Field,” *The Student Missionary Appeal: Addresses at the Third International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions Held at Cleveland*,

suspicious worked “havoc” on the missionary enterprise in Mexico.<sup>156</sup> Mexicans who converted to Protestantism were therefore often portrayed as traitors to their own country.<sup>157</sup> One historian suggests that while the missionaries viewed the attacks against them as persecution by ignorant, fanatical Catholics,” many of the people involved probably viewed themselves as “Mexican patriots and staunch defenders of their faith.”<sup>158</sup> As such U.S. Protestant missionaries had to work hard to alleviate these fears and prove that they were not American spies or agents for Mexican annexation and were friends to Mexico.<sup>159</sup>

Opposition from Mexican Catholics was also exacerbated by the virulent anti-Catholicism from the Protestant missionaries and some Mexican converts. Protestant missionaries believed that they had to disprove Catholic Church doctrine as false in order reach the Mexico people. Protestants in Mexico frequently denounced the Catholic Church as “pagan and false and responsible for the poverty and ignorance in Mexico” in sermons and publication circulated in Mexico.<sup>160</sup> Historian William Schell Jr. notes that Protestant “zealots” exacerbated Catholic ill will in Mexico. Perhaps the most vivid

---

*Ohio, February 23-27, 1898* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1898), 290. Rodgers was recounting conversations with William Wallace, who was a Presbyterian missionary in Mexico City.

<sup>156</sup> Dale, *Mexico and Our Mission*, 194.

<sup>157</sup> John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Mexico*, 54.

<sup>158</sup> Fry, “The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” 11.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, 61, 64. Fry analyzes the articles in the Methodist Spanish-language magazine *El Abogado Cristiano Ilustrado* published in Mexico, and notes a number of articles from Methodists defending their loyalties and fighting the perception that the missionaries were American spies.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, 61, 65, 81. Quote is from page 81.

example of this were actions by the Evangelical Alliance of Protestant missionaries which published a highly critical pamphlet in response to the 1895 treaty between the Vatican and Mexico reestablishing diplomatic relations, in which the Vatican also recognized that the Virgin of Guadalupe was a “genuine manifestation of the Holy Mother.” The Protestant missionaries planned to distribute the pamphlet and to potentially disrupt the ceremony, until dissuaded by American diplomats and the U.S. business community in Mexico City.<sup>161</sup>

In the early years of the missionary enterprise Protestant workers in Mexico reported ostracism and persecution, including pressure from local priests or merchants not to sell or rent meeting houses to missionaries and converts, the loss of jobs for converts, and a refusal of merchants to sell food or other necessities to them. This also included threats of violence to encourage the missionaries to leave or in the case of the converts to get them to renounce Protestantism.<sup>162</sup>

---

<sup>161</sup> Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 61. For converge which emphasizes the disruptive nature of the plans of the Evangelical Alliance see “Religious Trouble in Mexico,” *The Daily Inter-Ocean*, September 4, 1895; “Evangelical Alliance,” *The Two Republics*, September 25, 1895; “Mexican Homes Will Be Opened Wide,” *The Mexican Herald*, September 26, 1895; “Religion and Diplomacy,” *New York Times*, October 10, 1895. For a discussion of the way in which the Protestant missionaries viewed their actions and the Virgin of Guadalupe see W.H. Sloan, “The Great Act of Idolatry Consummated,” *The Baptist Home Mission Monthly* XVLL:12 (December 1895), 437-439.

<sup>162</sup> Baldwin, *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution*, 25-26; Camargo and Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico*, 90. Articles that talk about these type of actions include, Melinda Rankin, “Mexican Evangelization,” *The Missionary Magazine* (January 1866); A J P “Religious Efforts in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (April 29, 1869); Gilbert Haven, “The Sacred City of Mexico,” *Christian Advocate* (March 27, 1873); *Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Church Missionary Society* (New York: American Church Missionary Society, 1873): 10-11; Isaac R. Worcester, *Historical Sketch of the Missions of the American Board in Papal Lands* (Boston: American Board, 1879), 26.

While many in the Catholic Church leadership stated that they would use only peaceful means to combat Protestantism in Mexico, in practice this would not always be the case in certain areas of the country.<sup>163</sup> With the increase of missionaries and converts, reports of persecution in Mexico from Catholic priests and the people grew in number and intensity, particularly in the states of Jalisco and Guerrero in central Mexico. In 1873 John L. Stephens, an American missionary in Western Mexico, went to Aqualulco, a town about 90 miles from Guadalajara, in the state of Jalisco. Stephens and another missionary David Watkins moved their ministry into the area, and founded a newspaper which attacked the Catholic Church and the clergy.<sup>164</sup> The Catholic priests and many of their parishioners in the area were angered by his presence and some of the inroads he was making among the local populace, and the verbal attacks the missionaries made on the local clergy. One of the priests preached a fiery sermon denouncing the presence and actions of the Protestant mission.<sup>165</sup> On March 2, the Stephens' home was attacked by an angry mob of over 200 persons shouting, "Long live the curate, death to the Protestants." Stephens was brutally attacked, beaten to death, and his body was badly mutilated. The mob also burned all his books, including his Bible.<sup>166</sup> Many in the United States were

---

<sup>163</sup> Wilfrid Hardy Calcott, *Liberalism in Mexico, 1857-1929* (Hamden, CN: Archon Books, 1965), 98.

<sup>164</sup> Daniel Cosío Villegas, *Historia Moderna de México: La República Restaurada* Vol. 3 (Mexico: Editorial Hermes, 1970), 367-368. The basic facts of the case were printed in the official government organ, *Diario Oficial* and were translated in the "The Stephens Murder Case," *The Two Republics* (March 15, 1874), which was an English language paper in Mexico City catering to the American colony.

<sup>165</sup> Cosío Villegas, *Historia Moderna de México*, 367.

<sup>166</sup> *Sixty-Fourth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston: Riverside Press, 1874): 94-95. For other descriptions and

outraged about the murder of Stevens. One editorial writer declared his murder an act worthy of the dark ages, suggesting that the Mexican people were “fit for nothing but a sin-offering to Satan, and should be rooted out to give place to a race susceptible of improvement” thereby reflecting long-standing skepticism about the Mexican people.<sup>167</sup> However, most American observers were less abrasive and did not believe that attacks such as this would prevent the spread of Protestantism in Mexico. A later article suggested that the efforts of Protestant missionaries would not be thwarted by persecution,<sup>168</sup> and others declared that the “blood of the martyrs’ is the seed of the church,”<sup>169</sup> thereby linking the deaths of Stephens and other Mexican converts to those

---

discussions of the attack on Stephens see *Boston Investigator*, March 18, 1874; “Brutal Murder of an American Missionary in Mexico,” *Bangor Daily Whig & Courier*, March 18, 1874; “The Murdered Missionary,” *Inter Ocean*, May 1, 1874; “A California Missionary Assassinated in Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, March 21, 1874; “Further Roman Catholic Excesses in Mexico,” *Inter Ocean*, March 23, 1874; “Trouble in Mexico,” *The Hinds County Gazette* [Raymond, MS], March 25, 1874. See also Foster to Fish, Mexico, March 7, 1874, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1874-1875* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1875), 734 (hereafter *FRUS*); Watkins to Foster, Guadalajara, March 4, 1874, *FRUS, 1874-1875*, 735.

<sup>167</sup> “The Massacre of a Boston Missionary in Mexico,” *Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger*, March 20, 1874.

<sup>168</sup> “Our Mission Work,” *Western Christian Advocate* (February 11, 1880).

<sup>169</sup> *Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston: Riverside Press, 1875): xli, and 72. See also *Sixty-Fourth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (Boston: Riverside Press, 1874): 96; Gardiner Spring Plumley, *The Presbyterian Church Throughout the World: From the Earliest Times to the Present Times, in a Series of Biographical and Historical Sketches* (New York: DeWitt C. Lent & Co., 1875), 783; “More Encouraging Words from Mexico,” *Christian Advocate* (September 2, 1875); “The Blood of the Martyrs in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (January 6, 1876); “Annual Meeting of the American Board,” *New York Evangelist* (October 12, 1876); *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (November 1876); “Reports of the Missions” *Sixty-Sixth Annual Report of the*

who had suffered for their faith in the early days of the New Testament Church and those who were martyred during the Protestant Reformation. One article in *The Independent* suggested that these martyrs were evidence of the progress of the Protestant religion in Mexico, and the fears of the Catholic Church hierarchy.<sup>170</sup>

There would be continued conflict, and the threat of violence between Catholics and the Protestant missionaries and converts in Mexico. The congregation of another U.S. missionary operating in Acapulco, M. N. Hutchinson, was attacked by rioters carrying machetes and rifles. Five members of the congregation were killed and eleven others were injured. Hutchinson, who was not at the meeting because of illness, fled and took refuge on an American ship in the harbor.<sup>171</sup>

Shortly after the violence in Acapulco, Hutchinson spoke at a meeting of Protestants of various denominations in San Francisco, California, organized for the

---

*American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (1876): xxxix; Purdie, *Memories of Angela Aguilar de Mascorro*, 51; Strong, *The Story of the American Board*, 304.

<sup>170</sup> *The Independent* (July 13, 1876).

<sup>171</sup> Foster to Fish, Mexico, January 30, 1875, *FRUS 1875-1876*, 855-859; "Mexico," *New York Times* (February 6, 1875); "Mexico, A Presbyterian Church as Acapulco Attacked by a Mob," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, February 6, 1875; "Another Missionary Mobbed in Mexico," *The Galveston Daily News*, February 9, 1875; "Bloody Barbarism," *The Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, February 20, 1875; "Murderous Fanaticism," *Inter Ocean*, February 20, 1875; "Another Massacre in Mexico," *The Congregationalist* (March 4, 1875); "The Religious Disturbances in Mexico," *Boston Investigator*, March 17, 1875; "The Massacre of Protestants at Acapulco," *Independent Statesman* [Concord, NH], March 25, 1875. For other stories of violence against Mexican congregations see, "Persecution of Protestants in Mexico," *Boston Investigator*, January 12, 1870; "City of Mexico," *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXII: 12 (December 1871): 393-394; "Central Mexico," *Ibid.*, XXIV: 2 (February 1873): 54-55; Protestants Massacred while at Worship in San Pedro, Mexico," *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, August 16, 1873; John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Mexico* 105-107.

purpose of supporting “civil and religious liberty,” that would be covered by the mainstream press in San Francisco and in newspapers and the religious press throughout the United States. At this meeting Hutchinson showed the crowd a hymnbook from his church in Acapulco, which reportedly still had some of the blood of those attacked by the mob. One reporter stated that, “A perceptible shudder ran through the audience. Handkerchiefs were placed to feminine eyes; men’s eyes suddenly became moist, cries of ‘Oh, oh!’ and sobs were distinctly audible.” The report stated that the auditorium appeared to be moved by an “absorbing and uncontrollable emotion.” Hutchinson implored the crowd for forbearance and not to blame Mexico for this action. He suggested that the Mexican republic demanded their sympathy and stated that those in power in the country were doing their best to secure civil and religious liberty. Hutchinson told the crowd that he had been personally assured by the President of Mexico that he was making every effort to secure this liberty, despite local opposition in certain areas.<sup>172</sup> After Hutchinson’s address, another speaker presented a resolution, expressing sympathy for the Mexican President and Congress in their struggle against “Jesuitism” and the establishment of civil and religious freedom. The resolution, adopted by those at the meeting, also requested that the U.S. President direct the Minister in Mexico to help Mexican authorities to bring the perpetrators to justice.<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> “A War of Creeds,” *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, February 23, 1875.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.* For another description of the meeting see, “The Acapulco Massacre,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, February 15, 1875. In response to the violence several Mexican members of the Acapulco congregation fled to San Francisco, and some of them began to work among the Spanish speaking residents in California. See “Mexican Refugees in California,” *Friend’s Review* (May 1, 1875).



Most often the victims of violence were Mexican converts, and one estimate suggested that fifty-eight Protestants killed in Mexico for their faith between 1873 and 1892, only one of which was an American.<sup>174</sup> Most often violence or the threat of violence was directed at Mexicans who had converted to Protestantism rather than towards American missionaries directly as in the case of the anti-Protestant riots at Irapuato, Guanajuato in 1898.<sup>175</sup> American Protestants viewed this violence as instigated by Mexican priests as part of an attempt to keep their hold over the people of Mexico and regain any ground they may have lost to Protestantism.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> William Butler, *Mexico in Transition from The Power of Political Romanism to Civil and Religious Liberty* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892), 301. For discussions of some of these incidents see, Primitivo Rodriguez, "Translations of Extracts from a Report Presented by one of the Missionaries," *Friend's Review* (November 1, 1873); "Mexico," *New York Evangelist* (February 26, 1874); "The Massacre at Acapulco," *New York Observer and Chronicle* (March 4, 1875); "Another Martyr in Mexico," *New York Evangelist* (June 8, 1876); "Have We Protection for United States Citizens in Mexico?" *New York Evangelist* (June 29, 1876); "Mission to Western Mexico," *Sixty-Eighth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (1878): 104; "Another Massacre of Missionaries in Mexico," *Christian Advocate* (October 23, 1879); "A Helper Murdered by Romanists," *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (November 1880); "Letter from Mrs. Watkins," *Life and Light for Women XI* (1881): 226-227; *The Reformation in Mexico* (Hartford, CN: Junior Auxiliary Publishing, Co, 1894), 13; Johnson, *About Mexico*, 389.

<sup>175</sup> Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 61; "Those Missionaries," *The Two Republics*, October 4, 1898. For a discussion of other actions against Mexican Protestants in the late nineteenth century see W. E. Vanderbilt, "Protestant Missions in Mexico," *The Urgent Business of the Church: Address Delivered Before the Fourth International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions Toronto, Canada, February 26-March 2, 1902* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1902), 444.

<sup>176</sup> For discussions of the role of priests in persecution see, "Religious Fanaticism Resulting in Bloodshed," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, August 25, 1871; "Mexico, Riot and Bloodshed," *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, August 26, 1871; *The Weekly Arizona Miner*, September 16, 1871; "Mexico," *Boston Investigator*, February 14, 1872; *Inter Ocean*, March 17, 1874; "A Protestant Minister Murdered by a Mob in Mexico," *Daily Evening*



U.S diplomats vigorously protested attacks on American missionaries, placing them within the context of their commitment to protect U.S. citizens abroad.<sup>177</sup> U.S. officials sought assurances that the local and federal governments were doing all that they could to prevent similar incidents from occurring in the future.<sup>178</sup> While often the religious press focused on a Mexico receptive to the gospel, U.S. diplomatic agents reported widespread opposition to the missionaries from much of the Mexican populace, which corresponds to earlier discussions of the introduction of religious tolerance in Mexico, which were often opposed by much of the Mexican lower classes.<sup>179</sup>

In response to the Stephens' murder six U.S. Protestant missionaries in the Mexico City area approached the U.S. Minister to Mexico, Thomas H. Nelson, about setting up a meeting with the President of the Republic of Mexico, Sebastián Lerdo de

---

*Bulletin*, March 17, 1874; "The Outrage in Mexico," *Daily Rocky Mountain News*, March 21, 1874; *The Congregationalist*, May 7, 1874; Samuel W. Barnum, *Romanism as it is: An Exposition of the Roman Catholic System, for the American People...* (Hartford, CN: Connecticut Publishing Company, 1882), 700; *Southwestern Christian Advocate* (February 26, 1880); "Mexico," *Christian Advocate* (November 23, 1876); William Butler, "Letter from Mexico," *Christian Advocate* (March 29, 1877); John W. Butler, "Mexico," *Zion's Herald* (August 14, 1879); "The Progress of Mexico," *The Gospel in All Lands* (February 1888): 81.

<sup>177</sup> James Brown Scott, "The Government of the United States and American Foreign Missionaries," *The American Journal of International Law* 6:1 (January 1912): 70-85.

<sup>178</sup> Foster to Fish, Mexico, April 15, 1874, *FRUS 1874-1875*, 744; Foster to Fish, Mexico, January 30, 1875, *FRUS 1875-1876*, 857. For an article critical of the actions of missionaries in Mexico, as well as criticism of the perceived negativity that U.S. diplomats held toward Catholicism in Mexico see, "How We are Misrepresented Abroad," *The Catholic World: A Monthly Magazine of General Literature and Science* (April 1876).

<sup>179</sup> John A. Sutter, Jr., Acapulco, September 30, 1875, *Report Upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1875* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1876): 1138.

Tejada, to express their concerns over safety in the country. Nelson reported that President Lerdo made an “earnest and energetic reply which was completely satisfactory” to the missionaries. Lerdo stated that the Mexican Constitution guaranteed toleration for all religions and that his government was committed to providing for their protection. He did acknowledge that the “fanaticism of other forms of religion might excite popular disturbances against Protestants,” but he was sure that all the “enlightened classes” favored complete toleration. Lerdo went on to tell the missionaries that he viewed their efforts as working for the enlightenment of the public.<sup>180</sup>

Several months later, in the aftermath of the riots in Acapulco, the new U.S. Minister to Mexico, John W. Foster met with the Mexican Secretary of Relations, José M. Lafragua and expressed strong displeasure at the events in Acapulco, as well as the lack of punishment of those who had committed these outrages. In response, Lafragua responded that the federal government had done all that they could legally do, and that it was the local authorities who had not adequately punished those involved.<sup>181</sup> Foster

---

<sup>180</sup> Memorandum, Nelson to Fish, Mexico, April 26, 1873, *FRUS 1873-1874*, 667-668; see also Foster to Fish, Mexico, April 15, 1874, *FRUS 1874-1875*, 744. For a discussion of this meeting in the religious press, see “The President Promises Protection,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXIV: 6 (June 1873): 184-185. This corresponded to an increase in tension between Lerdo and the Catholic Church leadership. After the expulsion of the French Juárez had conducted a more conciliatory policy toward the Church, while Lerdo sought to strictly enforce the Laws of the Reform, and codified them into the new Constitution in 1873-1874. The Church hierarchy also criticized what they perceived as the support for Protestant missionaries. See Frank Averill Knapp, Jr., *The Life of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, 1823-1889: A Study in Influence and Obscurity* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 214-222.

<sup>181</sup> This difficulty mirrored the difficulty that the U.S. government had in punishing those who committed violence toward Mexican citizens in the United States. In many of these instances the U.S. government would respond to Mexican diplomatic inquiries that they were unable to guarantee punishment because that was the duty of local and state officials who were often reluctant to punish the perpetrators. See Mario T.

responded that if they were not assured of protection, missionaries and other Americans including businessmen would be compelled to leave the country, thus threatening one of the goals of the regime which was to increase American investment in the country.

Lafragua responded by describing the “ignorant character” of the Indians in the south of Mexico, where these disturbances had occurred.<sup>182</sup> Foster acknowledged this fact, and perhaps was thinking of U.S. policy toward its own indigenous population, suggested that Mexico undertake measures that would “strike them with terror, and teach them in a forcible manner the necessity of toleration, and obedience to law and order.”<sup>183</sup>

In the aftermath of these attacks the Mexican government would continue to make an effort to protect American missionaries and Protestants in Mexico. Intellectually many Mexican Liberals supported the concept of religious toleration and believed that it was an important component of a modern civilized nation.<sup>184</sup> As such, they considered religious-inspired violence an embarrassment to Mexico. Likewise violence toward foreigners, and toward Mexican converts to a lesser extent, potentially caused problems with the United States government and hurt Mexico’s goal to be treated as a modern nation worthy as being treated as an equal. Particularly during the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz (1876-

---

García, “Porfirian Diplomacy and the Administration of Justice in Texas, 1877-1900,” *Aztlan* 16: 1-2 (1987), 1-25.

<sup>182</sup> Foster to Fish, Mexico, January 30, 1875, *FRUS 1875-1876*, 857. This document is a description of the meeting between Foster and Lafragua.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>184</sup> Bastian, *Protestantismo y Sociedad en Mexico*, 78.

1911),<sup>185</sup> the government sought to promote Mexico as a place safe for foreign trade and investment as well as for immigration, and violence toward foreigners hurt this goal. Likewise Díaz believed that providing support and protection for foreign missionaries would make a good impression on them, thereby creating goodwill with the American public and U.S. officials.<sup>186</sup> This strategy would prove successful as the Mexican government would be frequently praised in the religious press and in missionary reports from the field, and from the popular press as well as supportive of the missionary enterprise and providing protection to missionaries.<sup>187</sup>

Despite the commitment on the part of the Mexican governments to protect Protestants in Mexico, the role of missionaries would not be uncontroversial, even among

---

<sup>185</sup> Most periodization of Mexican history refers to this as the Porfiriato, though it does include a period from 1880-1884, in which Manuel Gonzales served as President. After 1884, Díaz would be continuously “reelected” until he was deposed by the Mexican Revolution in May of 1911.

<sup>186</sup> Robert D. Conger, “Porfirio Díaz and the Church Hierarchy, 1876-1911.” PhD diss., The University of New Mexico, 1985. 53.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid., 52-60. See for instance, “Mexico,” *The Congregationalist* (December 29, 1865); “Missionary News,” *The Independent* (February 3, 1870); “City of Mexico,” *Friend’s Review* (September 20, 1873); “Latest Mexican Advances,” *New York Evangelist* (February 26, 1874); *Inter Ocean*, May 2, 1874; Arthur Pierson, *The Voice of Missions, or the Voice out of the Cloud* (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1886), 145; John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Mission*, 89; William Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, 304-305. This was also noted by Catholic publications in the United States who expressed resentment over the perceived persecution of the Catholic Church in Mexico. See, J.A. Birkhaeuser, *History of the Church, From the First Establishment to our Own Times, Sixth Edition* (New York and Cincinnati: F.R. Pustet, 1898), 731; *The Pilgrim of Our Lady Martyrs* (Troy, NY: Catholic Protectory for St. Joseph’s Church, 1902), 137. In addition to the federal government, local governments also provided protection to the Protestant missions. See Riley to Nelson, Mexico, November 15, 1871, *FRUS 1872-1873*, 352; J.D. Eaton, “Bible Scenes in a Land without a Bible,” *Mission Stories of Many Lands: A Book for Young People* (Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1885), 347; John Wesley Butler, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Mission*, 103.

Mexican Liberals. Matías Romero, who served as Mexican Minister to the United States, among other high level positions in the Mexican government, expressed feelings of ambiguity toward Protestant missions in Mexico. Though he did support the creation of an alternative to the Mexican Church, he explained that he had never had a favorable opinion of mission work in Mexico. For him, the proper missionary enterprise was in “heathen” lands, while Mexico was a Christian country. While he believed there remained room for the improvement of the Mexican Catholic Church, Mexico was therefore, in his view, not a proper place for the missionary enterprise.<sup>188</sup> Likewise in late 1899 the Mexican Vice President, Ignacio Mariscal created outrage among the Protestants in Mexico, when he wrote an article in the U.S. magazine *The Independent* in which he expressed skepticism about the claims of increasing conversions to Protestantism. Mariscal claimed that many of these conversions were based on individuals seeking financial gain, and flatly stated, “Practically the country is as Catholic as it ever was.”<sup>189</sup>

As discussed earlier, Liberals such as Justo Sierra had hoped that Protestant missionaries might be able to help the Mexican indigenous population become

---

<sup>188</sup> Romero, *Coffee and India Rubber Culture in Mexico*, 95-96.

<sup>189</sup> Don I. Mariscal, “The Mexico of To-Day,” *The Independent* LI: 2659 (November 16, 1899), 3061. Mariscal’s statement provoked denunciations among Protestant missionaries and Mexican converts who denied bribing Mexicans to convert, a charge commonly repeated by the Catholic Press and other critics of Protestant missionaries in Mexico. For a sampling of these rebuttals see “Mexican Protestants,” *The Independent* LI: 2663 (December 14, 1899), 3385; Hubert W. Brown, “Is Protestantism a Failure in Mexico?” *New York Evangelist* (February 1, 1900): 1; Pedro Flores Valderrama, “The Protestant Christians of Mexico,” *The Missionary Review of the World* XXIII: 3 (March 1900), 195-197; H. Forrester, Letter to the Editor, “The Mexican Episcopal Church,” *The Churchman* (June 2, 1900): 680.

“modernized” at the same time that he was apprehensive about the conversion of significant numbers of other classes to Protestantism.<sup>190</sup> However Sierra’s ideas conflicted with the ideology of the Protestant missionary movement. This ideology had as its goal the conversion of the entire world, and with regards to Mexico, sought the conversion of all of Mexican society, and especially targeted the Mexican middle class.<sup>191</sup> As such Sierra feared that a significant portion of Mexican society would be converted to Protestantism. If this happened Sierra feared that it would split the Mexican population and prevent the consolidation of Mexican society. He feared that Mexican converts would feel a loyalty to the United States, becoming a tool of cultural imperialism thereby threatening Mexican sovereignty.<sup>192</sup>

Despite these ambiguities from many sectors of Mexican society, Protestant missionaries received many expressions of support from Mexicans who embraced Protestantism, which in the eyes of the missionaries, reaffirmed their purpose in Mexico.<sup>193</sup> Likewise Protestant denominations received appeals from Mexicans requesting their assistance, similar to those originally sent from the dissident Mexican priests in the late 1860s. These sentiments are exemplified in an 1889 statement from

---

<sup>190</sup> Orozco, “Protestant Missionaries, Mexican Liberals,” 45.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 47; 175.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, 4; 46-47.

<sup>193</sup> For a sampling of the sources that cite the appeals from Mexico and Latin America see A.T. Graybill, “Progress in Mexico,” *The Missionary Review of the World* XIII: 10 (October 1900): 803; James S. Dennis, *Foreign Missions After a Century* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1893), 141-142; Robert E. Speer, “The Spiritual Claims of Latin America Upon the United States and Canada,” *Students and the Present Missionary Crisis* (New York: Student Volunteer Missionary Movement for Foreign Missions, 1910), 100.

Mexican Protestant clergymen to the American missionaries in Mexico. The Mexican clergymen expressed the “most lively gratitude” for what missionaries had accomplished in Mexico, such as building churches, operating orphanages, schools, seminaries and printing offices. They further declared that the Protestant enterprise was only making the first advances “towards rescuing Mexico from a state of paganism as dark and as sad as that of any other of those countries which are not even nominally Christian.” The Mexican Protestants stated, “We Therefore beseech you by the tender mercies of God that you may continue aiding us more and more each day, until we can say that all of beautiful Mexico belongs to the King of glory, Christ our Savior!”<sup>194</sup> While conversions did not come as quickly or easily as missionaries originally expected there were numerous conversions and lives changed which provided encouragement to those engaged in mission work and justification for their mission in Mexico.

#### Conclusion: Conflicting “Missions” in Mexico

While the missionary enterprise and U.S. economic expansion abroad would frequently be linked as part of the same phenomenon, missionaries and capitalists had a complex relationship in Mexico, resulting largely from contradictory views towards their respective mission to Mexico.<sup>195</sup> While many Americans who came to Mexico remained

---

<sup>194</sup> “Evangelical Alliance of Mexico,” *The Gospel in All Lands* (March 1889): 127-128; Evangelical Alliance of Mexico,” *Evangelical Christendom* (May 1, 1889): 143. The statement was also excerpted in Hubert W. Brown, “A Retrospect,” *The Church at Home and Abroad VII* (March 1890): 234-235; and *The Fifty-Third Annual Report of the Board of Foreign Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (New York: Mission House, 1890), 156-157. For similar statements see Justo M. Euroza, “The Utility of Protestant Missions in My Native Land,” *The Missionary Review of the World XVIII*: 11 (November 1895): 841-844.

<sup>195</sup> Gilbert G. Gonzáles describes the actions of Protestant missionaries as complementary of the capitalist mission. As the preceding discussion suggests, I argue



Protestants and attended either the English-language services, or missionary churches, others converted to Catholicism often for marital and business reasons, or through conversions of faith.<sup>196</sup> Capitalists frequently tried to avoid involvement in religion and politics, because unrest or disorder could potentially hurt the business climate and create a general anti-Americanism that could hurt their investments. In 1884, during the time when American investment in Mexico was expanding dramatically, the newspaper for the American colony in Mexico City printed a letter to the editor dealing with “Protestantism in Mexico” by Gerard Martin.<sup>197</sup> This letter stated that Protestant missionaries had angered the Catholic Church hierarchy, and that opposition to U.S. capital and railroads was the result of fears over the expansion of Protestantism. Martin described the efforts of missionaries as overzealous and “exceedingly premature,” and stated that in addition to hurting their own cause, they had indirectly harmed the growing interests of American capital in Mexico.<sup>198</sup> Americans interested in Mexican development also criticized the anti-Catholicism of the Protestant missionaries in Mexico. An editorial in *The Two Republics* stated that if U.S. missionaries in Mexico would exercise the “proper amount

---

that their relations and goals were more complex. For González discussion see *Culture of Empire: American Writers, Mexico, and Mexican Immigrants, 1880-1930* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 94-96.

<sup>196</sup> Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 61-62.

<sup>197</sup> Martin appears to have been an American involved in the capitalist enterprise in Mexico.

<sup>198</sup> Gerard Martin, “A Contributor’s Opinion on the Effects of Protestantism in Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, July 8, 1884. For a rejoinder from Methodist missionary Samuel P. Craver see *The Two Republics*, July 11, 1884. Craver blames increasing Mexican concerns on the railways, and the actions of Americans in Mexico. See also S.P. Craver, “The Present Condition of Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald*, January 21, 1885.



of conservatism and good sense” they would create fewer hard feelings towards them in Mexico.<sup>199</sup> These hard feelings would often be projected on all Americans in Mexico which had the potential to hurt U.S. investments. The editorial argued, “Nothing is made in the way of advancement by ridiculing the Catholic worship and deriding the saints. Respect begets respect and abuse likewise calls for a similar payment.”<sup>200</sup> Despite these concerns many U.S. capitalists in Mexico supported the missionary movement financially, and often allowed missionaries to hold services on company property and encouraged their Mexican workers to attend.<sup>201</sup>

In general missionaries were complimentary of the changes brought on by the expansion of U.S. capital into Mexico, describing the effects in ways that mirrored the dominant discourse in the U.S. public sphere and were frequently supportive of this mission to help in the development of Mexico.<sup>202</sup> The Methodist Bishop R.S. Foster stated that the coming of the railways would help to infuse Mexico with “modern thought and enterprise which would help to “hasten the day of Mexico’s redemption” if Christians would furnish the means to complete this work.<sup>203</sup> Likewise Protestant

---

<sup>199</sup> “Missionaryism,” *The Two Republics*, October 15, 1898.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid. For other views critical of the American missions in Mexico see Emily Pierce, “American Missionaries in Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Sunday Magazine* XVIII: 2 (August 1885): 98-103.

<sup>201</sup> Fry, “The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” 11, 31-32.

<sup>202</sup> For some sentiments to this effect see William Butler, “Mexico and Her New Life,” *Zion’s Herald* (December 16, 1880).

<sup>203</sup> Bishop R.S. Foster, “Letter from Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (July 6, 1887). One missionary D.F. Watkins was involved in both missionary work and mining seeing both enterprises as compatible with each other. See “Missions and Mines,” *The Two Republics*, August 18, 1898.

missionaries established missions along the railroad lines and viewed the railway as beneficial in the expected “rapid advance of the gospel army.”<sup>204</sup>

Yet the missionary vision of a transformed Mexico differed from that of American capitalists, the secular press, and much of those writing popular histories during the period. An 1891 article in *The Missionary Review of the World* noted that Mexico was “awakening to the superiority” of American civilization, and had been seeking closer relations, signaling that it was time to “turn the tide” in the affairs of Mexico. The writer stated that the issue was whether “avarice and ambition shall conquer Mexico in the interests of trade and traffic, or the spirit of the Gospel shall impel laborers to till the opening fields for Christ.”<sup>205</sup>

The Protestant professor and clergyman, M.W. Stryker stated that U.S. Protestants needed to outdo the zeal of capitalists to bring Mexico to that “which is without price.”<sup>206</sup> Stryker was referring to what one historian describes as “radical conversion to Jesus Christ,” wherein individuals would realize their fullest potential through a “personal relationship with Jesus Christ and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>207</sup> Protestants believed that Mexicans would become “enlightened” as they became converted and

---

<sup>204</sup> Vanderbilt, “Protestant Missions in Mexico,” 440. For more on the use of rail lines and the missionary Enterprise see Bastian, *Protestantismo y sociedad en México*, 87-89; Fry, “The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” 32.

<sup>205</sup> “The Land of the Aztecs,” *The Missionary Review of the World* XIV: 3 (March 1891): 229. For similar views see Stryker, “Missions in Mexico,” 139.

<sup>206</sup> Stryker, “Missions in Mexico,” 139.

<sup>207</sup> Paul Barton, *Hispanic Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006), 28.

“were educated formally and informally by Protestant teachers and preachers.”<sup>208</sup> In addition to proselytizing Protestant missionaries sought to combat vice, especially in the form of drunkenness, as well as to promote their view of morality, frequently through education and the distribution of religious literature.<sup>209</sup> One of the most prominent of these writers was William Butler, founder of the Methodist mission in Mexico, who, in 1892, published a widely-cited book entitled *Mexico in Transition: From the Power of Political Romanism to Civil and Religious Liberty* in which he continued to utilize the popular theme of an expected rapid conversion of Mexico from the 1860s. Butler declared that the struggles of Juárez and the Mexican Liberals had transformed Mexico from the most “priest-ridden” country on earth,” to the most free of Catholic lands.<sup>210</sup> The next step, in Butler’s view, was a rapid conversion to Protestantism.<sup>211</sup> Butler viewed this conversion as a forgone conclusion and looked forward to the day when Mexico would “aid gloriously in the redemption” of Central and South America.<sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 29. See also Fry, “The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” 77.

<sup>209</sup> Fry, “The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church,” 25, 72.

<sup>210</sup> Butler, *Mexico in Transition*, xi, 280-282. This is similar to a view expressed by Gilbert Haven in an earlier work. In 1875 Haven suggested that Mexico had made great progress, largely through the “leavening” power of Protestantism. See *Our Next Door Neighbor: A Winter in Mexico* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1875), 439. Melinda Rankin also expressed faith in the ultimate triumph of Protestantism. Rankin, *Twenty Years Among the Mexicans*, 205, 214. For another work with a similar view that cites Butler, see James Marcus King, *Facing the Twentieth Century: Our Country, Its Power and Peril* (New York: American Union League Society, 1899), 255.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., 300.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid. Butler stated, “Erelong the States beyond, who imitate her example, will receive her missionaries, who, using the same melodious language, will speak to those millions and thus consummate the evangelization of Spanish America.”

By the early twentieth century U.S. missionaries to Mexico expressed a more subdued view of the Mexican field. In a work published in 1901, the missionary, Hubert W. Brown, noted that advances that Mexico and Latin America had been made, but acknowledged the slowness of the progress of Protestantism in the nation. Unlike earlier missionaries he referred to work in the field in Mexico as a “slow, laborious, plodding.” Likewise, unlike earlier times, when missionaries were the subject of intense persecution, Brown described that they now encountered an “indifference” which was “harder to conquer than open antagonism.”<sup>213</sup> This theme was expressed by another missionary, James G. Dale who explained that “Mexico is a hard field. Roman Catholicism intrenched (*sic*) there, faces about like the lion of Gibraltar and refuses to be driven from his lair. Every inch of vantage ground has to be fought over, and won by a struggle unto blood that tries the stoutest hearts.”<sup>214</sup> There was a defensive character to Dale’s work as

---

<sup>213</sup> Brown, *Latin America*, 230. By 1880 some missionaries had reported a lessening of persecution in Mexico. See “Mission to Western Mexico,” *Sixty-Ninth Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (1879): 97. Brown did hope for a new awakening in Mexico and Latin America. On a general increase in toleration of Protestants in Mexico see Brown, 260. Others however remained optimistic. See Harlan P. Beach, “Mexico,” *A Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions: Volume 1, Geography* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1901), 65-66.

<sup>214</sup> Dale, *Mexico and Our Mission*, 204-205. Another problem sometimes discussed was the problem with vice in Mexico, which made it difficult for Protestantism to take hold over the people, as well as the related problem of some new converts returning to the habits of the past, or to Catholicism. See for example, “Western Mexico, Call for Bibles,” *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (April 1876); “Friend’s Mexican Mission,” *The Friend’s Review* (May 12, 1877); “Western Mexico, Progress of the Work,” *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (February 1878); “Letters from the Missions, Mission to Western Mexico,” *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the*

he answered critics' comments about the work in Mexico. While he acknowledged that conversions in Mexico have been slow, especially compared to those in other parts of the world, he suggested that some shades of light in the dark night in Mexico.<sup>215</sup> He still remained optimistic about the long-term conversion of Mexico, but suggested that the foundation has been laid, and now American churches needed to be patient for the raising of the structure. Dale did however argue that Protestant churches provide enough missionaries and resources to evangelize Mexico within the next generation, in keeping with Protestant premillennial thought.<sup>216</sup>

By the beginning of the Mexican Revolution, the vision of a Protestant mission had yet to come to fruition. In 1910 it is estimated that fewer than two percent of the nation professed to be Protestants.<sup>217</sup> Still missionaries played an important role in Mexico during this period. In 1907 one missionary magazine reported that there were 187 Protestant missionaries, 207 Mexican preachers, and 267 teachers and Mexican helpers. Protestant sects claimed over 22,000 members, with a Protestant population of between 60,000 and 111,000.<sup>218</sup> Though Protestants still made up a small percentage of the population, they did have a wider impact on education in Mexico. By 1910 Protestant

---

*American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (September 1878); Samuel P. Craver, "Weapons of Warfare," *Zion's Herald* (January 17, 1878).

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 206.

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 208, 228. This rhetoric was part of the larger goal of the Protestant mission movement in the United States to evangelize the world in one generation (258).

<sup>217</sup> Baldwin, 178.

<sup>218</sup> "Protestants in Mexico," *The Missionary Review of the World* XXX: 8 (August 1907), 630.

missionaries had established over 600 schools and a number of teacher-training institutes to train teachers for those schools with over 20,000 pupils enrolled.<sup>219</sup> By one estimate Protestant missionaries had distributed over two hundred million pages of religious literature by 1903.<sup>220</sup>

Missionaries worried that while Mexico seemed to be embracing U.S. civilization, but too often this was divorced from religion.<sup>221</sup> This was related to a fear of secularism, on the part of missionaries and Protestant writers speculating that because of their experience with the Catholic Church, Mexicans might respond by rejecting religion altogether and several commented on the increasing numbers of “infidels,” and atheists in Mexico.<sup>222</sup> One author described this danger, “Secularism, the danger of this age, must be boldly faced, for if the tyranny of hierarchs is exchanged only for the self-rule of infidelity, the last state of Mexico will be worse than the first, and anarchy will return.”<sup>223</sup>

---

<sup>219</sup> Mark A. Noll, *The Old Religion in a New World: The History of North American Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002), 221; Romney, “American Interests in Mexico,” 147.

<sup>220</sup> Amos R. Wells, *Into All the World* (Boston and Chicago: United Society of Christian Endeavor, 1903), 141.

<sup>221</sup> Vanderbilt, “Protestant Missions in Mexico,” 444.

<sup>222</sup> “Western Mexico,” *The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions* (February 1874). See also, Isaac R. Worcester, *Historical Sketch of the Missions of the American Board in Papal Lands* (Boston: American Board, 1879), 20; George B. Winton, “Roman Catholicism,” *Religions of Missions Fields, as Viewed by Protestant Missionaries* (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1905), 278; Strong, *The Story of the American Board*, 4

<sup>223</sup> Stryker, “Missions in Mexico,” 147. For a similar sentiment see, Melinda Rankin, “Mexico as a Mission Field,” *The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union* XXII: 7 (July 1871): 216-217.

Part of the reason for the lack of progress in the views of Protestant religious writers, was because U.S. Protestants had not been “equal to the opportunity.” While U.S. capitalists had been aggressive in exploring and developing Mexican resources, Protestants had been slow to work for the evangelization of this “needy people.”<sup>224</sup>

Protestant missionaries in Mexico were also frequently critical of American capitalists and American residents in Mexico whose actions they believed hindered their efforts in transforming Mexico. In the section of his book describing the difficulties of mission work in Mexico, the Presbyterian missionary, James G. Dale cited the “presence of the American population.”<sup>225</sup> Dale stated that capitalists came to Mexico to make money, and in so doing they have ignored the “high virtues of America’s best manhood.” Dale stated that Americans in Mexico had “done little to recommend Christianity” in Mexico, bluntly stating that “thousands live lives of moral shame and follow tricks of trade that would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every true American.”<sup>226</sup> Dale stated that Mexicans viewed all Americans as representatives of Protestantism, and critics used American behavior in Mexico to suggest that that was a “sample of what the United States, with its boasted evangelical religion, can do for men.”<sup>227</sup>

Perhaps the strongest statement came from the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Mexico, Henry D. Aves, writing in the context of the Mexican Revolution in April 1911.

---

<sup>224</sup> Grapho, “Mexico as Opportunity,” *Zion’s Herald* (March 3, 1909); Grapho, “Mexico as Opportunity,” *Christian Observer* (March 10, 1909). For similar views see E.A. Bishop, “An Interesting Day in Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (March 30, 1910).

<sup>225</sup> Dale, *Mexico and Our Mission*, 195.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, 195-196. See also Baldwin, *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution*, 57.

<sup>227</sup> Dale, *Mexico and Our Mission*, 196.

Aves stated that Americans were continually focused on the part they had played in the development of the natural resources of Mexico- “the railways built, the mines and forests opened, the oil, rubber, and fiber industries planted, the water-power harnessed, the irrigation plants established,” all of which he conceded. However for Aves the interest that they had shown in the welfare of Mexico as a nation had been “sadly small.” In Aves words, Americans had invested in a few mission chapels, schools and hospitals as well as a couple of branches of the YMCA, but beyond this there was little to “remind the Mexican that his robust and prosperous brother beyond the Rio Grande has any interest in his personal welfare.” Aves therefore hoped that the Revolution that Mexico was then going through would allow Americans to see the need to help Mexico to develop more than just resources, and focus also on the moral, social and educational help.<sup>228</sup> For Aves and other Protestant religious observers, the revolution showed the failure of the secular development-centered mission to Mexico without providing for the deeper and more fundamental religious and social changes to the Mexican people.

---

<sup>228</sup> “‘Our Neighbor’ in Mexico,” *The Literary Digest* XLII: 16 (April 22, 1911). This article featured excerpts and comment from Aves’ article which originally appeared in the *Churchman*.



CHAPTER THREE: THE “MODEL REPUBLIC” CONFRONTS  
FEARS OF “MEXICANIZATION, 1861-1880

During much of the nineteenth century, U.S. writers and politicians used Mexico’s turbulent history to draw contrasts between themselves and the Mexican people, in ways that emphasized the superiority of American institutions, religion, and population. Because of this, when the United States encountered a serious political crisis in 1876, political partisans from across the political spectrum placed Mexico in the position of “other” and used that nation as a discursive prop to embody domestic fears brought on by the experiences of Civil War and Reconstruction. While U.S. political partisans accused each other of “Mexicanization,” and defended themselves against these charges, Americans of all stripes accepted the premise behind what Mexicanization stood for- political disorder, instability, a lack of respect for democratic norms and expressed fears that the United States was in danger of becoming like this negative image of Mexico.

The first part of this chapter analyzes the role that sectionalism and Civil War played in threatening the view of the United States as a model republic. In minds of northern leaders, if the Union was permanently disintegrated, than the model republic would be transformed into the most prominent example of the failure of the republican governments, following those of Mexico and Latin America. While the Union forces were victorious in the war, in the aftermath Americans, North and South, and from both political parties worried that the war had “settled nothing,” that the Republic was still in

danger.<sup>1</sup> Americans feared, in the words of historian Mark Wahlgren Summers, a revolution that would overturn republican government leading to a “civil war bloodier than the one through which the states had already passed.”<sup>2</sup>

These fears provided the context for the 1876 electoral crisis which led Americans to fear that the United States was again encountering political unrest. Even if the crisis did not lead to a dramatic military confrontation, political disorder threatened to be a prominent part of the political life of the Republic, leading many to associate their fears with the Mexican experience with political instability. As they confronted these fears political partisans in the United States sought to associate their opponents with the Mexicans by labeling them as “Mexicanizers,” those who sought the “Mexicanization” of the United States, or those who sought to create “another Mexico” in the nation.<sup>3</sup> As such Mexico was used as a trope with which U.S. politicians and supporters of both parties could label their opponents as they confronted fears about the immediate political future of the United States.<sup>4</sup> While this practice would continue to a smaller degree for the next

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark Wahlgren Summers, *A Dangerous Stir: Fear, Paranoia and the Making of Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>3</sup> As such the 1876 election corresponds to what Daniel T. Rodgers has referred to as a “historical moment in which the basic metaphors of politics were up for grabs,” though the term “Mexicanizer” (and its forms) does not have the long term saliency that other terms do in American political history. See Daniel T. Rodgers, *Contested Truths: Keywords in American Politics since Independence* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987), 11-12.

<sup>4</sup> For research on the use of metaphors see Barry Brummett, “Social Issues in Disguise: An Introduction to Sneaky Rhetoric,” *Uncovering Hidden Rhetorics: Social Issues in Disguise* edited by Barry Brummett (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008), 5; George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 5; and Charles Forceville, “Metaphor,” *Encyclopedia*

several decades, it was most intense during the period of 1876-1880. The issue would change slightly over this four-year period, from one in which the election itself was in dispute to the issue of the potential removal of President Hayes several years later. Still throughout the whole period Mexico was consistently rhetorically associated with disorder, instability, and a lack of respect for constitutional forms and the rule of law, even though the specific issues changed.<sup>5</sup>

In the midst of the 1876 electoral crisis, a leading American journal of opinion, *The Nation*, devoted an editorial to the theme of “Mexicanization.”<sup>6</sup> The editorialist acknowledged that nearly every newspaper had recently expressed the determination to prevent the Mexicanization of the nation, and that charges of Mexicanization were widespread. The editorial noted that a common definition of Mexicanization as the “use of armed force to decide political contests or legal disputes, or to set aside the result of elections, or settle conflicting claims to power or authority.”<sup>7</sup> While not explicitly rejecting this view, *The Nation* suggested that rather than solely being these acts, Mexicanization was in a larger sense a state of mind. Frequent fights over elected offices

---

*of Semiotics* edited by Paul Bouissac (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 411-412.

<sup>5</sup> This corresponds to the importance of consistency and systematicity which Brummett argues are important in discussions of metaphors.

<sup>6</sup> Mark Wahlgren Summers, *The Press Gang: Newspapers & Politics, 1865-1878* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 9.

<sup>7</sup> “What is ‘Mexicanization?’” *The Nation* (December 21, 1876): 365. For a similar description of Mexicanization see John C. Hurd, *The Theory of Our National Existence as Shown by the Action of the Government of the United States Since 1861* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1881), 526. Another article linked Mexicanization with the disregard for the law and “a free indulgence of partisanship.” See “The Situation,” *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, December 15, 1876.

were the symptoms in the “last and most aggravated stage” of Mexicanization.<sup>8</sup> Confronting the reality of the failure of Reconstruction in the South, especially in preventing political violence, the article expressed the opinion that the entire South had existed in a state of Mexicanization since the end of the Civil War. While many in the North had hoped that the values of order and legality would diffuse from the North under the occupation, instead not only has the South not been changed, but it appeared that by “nursing and manipulating” the South, the rest of the country may have caught this disease of Mexicanization as well.<sup>9</sup> This editorial reflected concerns that the U.S. political system may have sustained permanent damage from the American experience of sectionalism, Civil War, and the attempted Reconstruction of the South.

The meaning of Mexicanization would be elastic throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to include such diverse topics as civil wars, revolutions, election fraud, economic fears, and the misuse of governmental power.<sup>10</sup> These fears also emanated from diverse sources such as race, sectionalism, class, and partisan divides in

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid. Other articles compared election irregularities, or problems with partisanship in the United States to those of Mexico. See “The Pleasant Aspect of the Crisis,” *The Nation* (December 28, 1876): 378; “A National Returning Board,” *The Athens Messenger*, January 25, 1877; Edwards Bryant, “President Hayes Policy,” *The Christian Recorder* (May 24, 1877); “Senator Morton’s Letter,” *The Independent* (May 31, 1877); Joseph Cook, *Transcendentalism with Preludes on Current Events* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Co, 1877), 85-86.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 366.

<sup>10</sup> During the 1896 election when the issue of “free silver” became a major plank in the platform of Democratic candidate William Jennings Bryan’s campaign, opponents used the term Mexicanization to describe how free silver would degrade the U.S. economy to the level of Mexico which was on the silver standard at that time. In chapter 6 I briefly discuss the use of the term Mexicanization in the context of socialist criticisms of actions by the government, which they linked to those of the Díaz dictatorship in Mexico.

the U.S. The main actors in this chapter- politicians and partisan supporters from both parties, used the medium of the popular press as a way to express their fears for the political future of the republic by linking their opponents to popular negative portrayals of Mexico, accusing each other of seeking to create “another Mexico in the United States,” or of using “Mexican tactics” as opposed to acceptable “American” political tactics. As such negative views of Mexico mirrored American fears for their own country.

### The U.S. Civil War threatens the “Model Republic”

Since the early days of U.S. history, Americans have believed that their nation had been chosen by God, often described as Providence, for a special mission to the world.<sup>11</sup> This belief would provide American policymakers, intellectuals and citizens with a sense of purpose and would dramatically affect the worldview of the United States in both its internal and foreign affairs.<sup>12</sup> While not always agreeing on the implications of this view, diverse groups of Americans viewed their nation as a model for others to follow, as what has been described as the “pilot society for the world.”<sup>13</sup> Through this,

---

<sup>11</sup> Nicholas Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 18. See also Trevor B. McCrisken, “Exceptionalism,” *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* Second Edition Volume 2 eds Alexander DeConde, Richard Dean Burns, and Fredrik Logevall (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 2002), 63; Robert J. McMahon, “The Republic as Empire: American Foreign policy in the ‘American Century’” *Perspectives on Modern America: Making Sense of the Twentieth Century* ed Harvard Sitkoff (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 83.

<sup>12</sup> David Ryan, *US Foreign Policy in World History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 15. See also Brian Klunk, *Consensus and the American Mission* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986), 1.

<sup>13</sup> Joyce Appleby, “Recovering America’s Historic Diversity: Beyond Exceptionalism,” *The Journal of American History* (September 1992): 426; Anders

the U.S. experience was conceptualized as having a universality that if followed by other countries and peoples, could bring them similar success.

This idea was linked to the U.S. experience with republican government, often described as “self-government.” Historian William L. Barney has described republicanism during this time period as “a political ideology and a cultural vision of what might be termed the good society,” which comprised a dominant cluster of attitudes and beliefs that was at the “core of national self-expression in the nineteenth century.”<sup>14</sup> In the years after the American Revolution Americans described republicanism to contrast their system to aristocratic or monarchical governments that were prevalent in Europe. This entailed a nation without king, nobility or system of hereditary legal privileges and included a written constitution and representative government.<sup>15</sup> Americans viewed their nation as a model for other peoples yearning for self-government, which would eventually lead to the elimination of monarchies and other forms of government and the institution of republican governments throughout the world.

Yet by the antebellum period it was not clear to Americans, North and South, whether the “model republic” would endure. American politicians confronted the status of slavery in the new territories gained from the War with Mexico, exacerbating

---

Stephanson, *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), xii; John Kane, *Between Virtue and Power: The Persistent Moral Dilemma of U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 21.

<sup>14</sup> William L. Barney, *The Passage of the Republic: An Interdisciplinary History of Nineteenth-Century America* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1987), 1. See also page 121.

<sup>15</sup> Harry L. Watson, *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990), 42-43.

sectionalist divisions. In 1850 in the midst of these tensions the leading southern Senator, John C. Calhoun from South Carolina, in his final speech to Congress warned that northerners were destroying the “equilibrium” of sectional interests upon which southern interests depended upon for “true equality in the Union.” Calhoun warned that unless permanent guarantees were put in place to restore that equilibrium, or a balance between slave and free states, any compromises would simply postpone the “final day of reckoning” for the Republic.<sup>16</sup> Congress passed the Compromise of 1850 opening the territories of Nevada and Utah to slavery thereby outraging many Northerners.<sup>17</sup> The debate over the Compromise of 1850 served to popularize secession as a constitutional right and placed southern Unionism on a conditional basis as southerners claimed the “right to secede if Congress made any hostile move against slavery anywhere in the Union.”<sup>18</sup>

In the midst of continuing debates over the status of western territories, Congress in 1854 repealed the ban on slavery west of Missouri which included all or portions of Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, Colorado, Montana and Idaho. The historian Paul Finkelman notes that, “In the space of four years the vision of a

---

<sup>16</sup> William L. Barney, *Battleground for the Union: The Era of the Civil War and Reconstruction, 1848-1877* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1990), 42. Calhoun’s speech was read by Virginia Senator James Mann. Calhoun, who was too physically weak to deliver the speech himself, died soon afterward.

<sup>17</sup> The compromise also “created a federal law enforcement presence in every county in the North to help catch fugitive slaves,” gave Texas a large parcel of land that had been part of New Mexico, admitted California into the Union as a slave state and banned the public slave trade in the District of Columbia. See Paul Finkelman, “Introduction: A Disastrous Decade,” *Congress and the Crisis of the 1850s* eds. Paul Finkelman and Donald R. Kennon (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2012), 12-13.

<sup>18</sup> Barney, *Battleground for the Union*, 45.

free United States had been replaced by a nation where slavery could spread across the nation, and where the free states could become a minority.”<sup>19</sup> This act provoked indignation among northerners who believed this Act would allow slavery to expand into the fertile regions of the Midwest and preventing the expansion of free agriculture to the region.<sup>20</sup>

In the midst of fears of disunion and sectional strife in the United States, a New York book publisher, Edward Walker, selected several different writers to contribute to a book which he described as “devoted to the national interests,” entitled *A Voice to America; The Model Republic, its Glory, or its Fall*.<sup>21</sup> The widely-reviewed, book, which had a strong nativist, and anti-Catholic focus, embraced the view of the United States as the model Republic, stating that the U.S. had risen to a height of “physical strength” and “moral power” than has ever been occupied by “any nation in the world.”<sup>22</sup> The

---

<sup>19</sup> Finkelman, “Introduction: A Disastrous Decade,” 13.

<sup>20</sup> Barney, *Battleground for the Union*, 67. Illinois Senator Stephen A. Douglas who engineered the compromise bill believed slavery was unsuited to the climate of the region, and so saw the repeal of the legal ban on slavery as unimportant.

<sup>21</sup> See *A Voice to America; or, The Model Republic, its Glory, or its Fall: With A Review of the Causes of the Decline and Failure of the Republics of South America, Mexico, and of the Old World; Applied to the Present Crisis in the United States* Second Edition (New York: Edward Walker, 1855). The publisher in the introduction references these writers but does not name them in the book. Other sources identify Thomas B. Thorpe and Frederick Saunders as the principal authors.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 13-14. David H. Bennett has used this book as one of his sources in his analysis of the nativist movement and the far right in U.S. history. See David H. Bennett, *The Party of Fear: The American Far Right from Nativism to the Militia Movement* Revised and Updated (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995). The book was a justification of the views of the American Party also known as the “Know Nothings.” Several reviews suggested it should be read by every American and were supportive of the book. See “Literary Notices,” *The Masonic Review* XIV: 2 (November 1855): 130; “New Publications,” *Western Literary Messenger* XXV: III (November



introduction stated that the “destiny” of the United States was to show what was possible under free and enlightened laws, with a people “self-governed and self-controlling.”<sup>23</sup> To draw a context one chapter dealt with the failure of republicanism in Mexico and other parts of Latin America which the writers claimed provided a stunning contrast to the success of the United States. The writers blamed the failure of republican governments in Mexico on factors such as the colonial structure of Spain, its “Aztec roots,” the quality of the Mexican people and the role of the Catholic Church and suggested that these failures could teach the American people the “fearful consequences of intestine broils,” as these countries fell “lower and lower in the scale of civilization.”<sup>24</sup>

*A Voice to America* cautioned Americans not to forget their “destiny” and the “invaluable trust” that previous generations had committed to them as an example to the rest of the world, and warned that “above all things,” *sectionalism* was the worst enemy known to the republic.”<sup>25</sup> The writers asserted that if Americans would reject internal strife which threatened to tear the country apart they would be able to achieve a “glorious victory” for the “regeneration of man” and the “happiness of the universe.”<sup>26</sup> In the

---

1855): 142; “New Publications,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 22, 1855): 370; “Books for Sons of America,” *Valley Farmer* 7 (September 1855): 394; “Literary Notices,” *The Knickerbocker* XLVI: 5 (November 1855): 517. For negative reviews of the book see “Book Notices,” *The United States Democratic Review* (October 1855): 348; “A Voice to America,” *The Independent* (December 20, 1855): 410.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 24.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 354.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 378. Italics in original.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 362.

minds of the writers the United States was the “final hope of the world,” and if the world could no longer hope in the United States, then all hope was “in vain.”<sup>27</sup>

Contrary to this desire, tensions between the North and South increased after the Kansas-Nebraska Act, exacerbated by a “mini-civil war” between pro- and anti-slavery supporters in Kansas, the caning of abolitionist Senator Charles Sumner in the U.S. Senate, and the Supreme Court’s *Dred Scott* decision in 1857.<sup>28</sup> Sectional partisans on each side had “come to see their opponents in terms of antislavery or proslavery conspiracies intended to degrade the interests, rights and honor of citizens in the other region.”<sup>29</sup> Rather than viewing their political opponents as rival interests having “equal claims to public favor,” Americans tended to view politics as a competition between right and wrong, and to see their opponents as threats to their liberty.<sup>30</sup>

By 1860 the candidate for the newly-formed Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, with strictly Northern support, won the presidency with 40% of the popular vote on a platform which opposed the further expansion of slavery in the United States. Between the election and Lincoln’s inauguration the southern states internally debated, and publicly threatened secession, with South Carolina being the first to secede from the Union on December 20, 1860.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 377.

<sup>28</sup> Shearer Davis Bowman, *At the Precipice: Americans North and South during the Secession Crisis* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 2.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 3. For similar views see Lorman A. Ratner and Dwight L. Teeter, Jr., *Fanatics and Fire-eaters: Newspapers and the Coming of the Civil War* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 117-118.

<sup>30</sup> Watson, *Liberty and Power*, 47.

In the aftermath of the secession of South Carolina and several other states, prominent politicians sought to find a compromise to save the Union. The most influential was Stephen A. Douglas, Senator from Illinois and the Northern Democrat nominee for President in 1860, who had received 29% of the popular vote in the recent election.<sup>31</sup> Douglas began a campaign to try to save the Union and in addition to lobbying Lincoln and the congressional Republicans to compromise with the South, Douglas also urged the South “to remain in the Union and to defend their rights under the Constitution, instead of rushing madly into revolution and disunion.”<sup>32</sup> In one speech, Douglas warned that if southerners embraced a new system of resistance by “sword and bayonet” over the ballot box then the “history of the United States is already written in the history of Mexico.”<sup>33</sup> Douglas reminded his listeners that “Mexico is now a bye-word for every man to scoff at,” because Mexicans were unable to maintain their government “founded upon the great principles of self-government and constitutional liberty,” and instead used

---

<sup>31</sup> During the 1860 election the Democratic Party split between its northern and southern branches. John C. Breckinridge of Kentucky received 18% of the popular votes but received 72 electoral votes to just 12 for Douglas.

<sup>32</sup> Matthew Norman, “Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, the Model Republic and the Right of Revolution, 1848-61,” *Politics and Culture of the Civil War Era: Essays in Honor of Robert W. Johannsen* edited by Daniel McDonough and Kenneth W. Noe (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006), 172. For more on Douglas’ campaign see Robert W. Johannsen, *Stephen A. Douglas* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997), 774-874.

<sup>33</sup> *The Rebellion Record: A Diary of American Events, with Documentary Narrative, Illustrative Incidents, Poetry, etc.* First Volume ed. Frank Moore (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1861), 41. Douglas was speaking in Wheeling, Virginia (soon to be West Virginia), and made similar references during the campaign. See “Secession the Theory and Practice of Mexico,” *Lowell Daily Citizen and News* [Massachusetts], May 2, 1861.

the force of arms to resist the constituted authorities.<sup>34</sup> In a similar vein the Governor of Texas Sam Houston, sought to dissuade fellow Texans from seceding by pointing to the example of Mexico and the results of a disregard for the norms of constitutional government.<sup>35</sup> The efforts of Douglas and Houston proved unsuccessful as ultimately eleven southern states seceded from the Union to form the Confederate States of America. In the aftermath of these events the remainder of the country was left with the “stunned realization that America’s unique experiment in self-government whose example was to have inspired the overthrow of monarchy and the spread of republican principles throughout the world, was imploding.”<sup>36</sup>

In response Lincoln who continued to believe that the United States had a providential mission to the world, would justify the decision for war against the Confederacy to save the Union and to preserve the nation as the “model republic” for the

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Houston to Texas House of Representatives, December 30, 1859, *State Gazette Appendix, Containing Debates in the House of Representatives of the Eighth Legislature of the State of Texas* Volume IV (Austin: John Marshall & Co., State Printers, 1860), 179-183. Houston’s letter was in response to a communication from South Carolina seeking support for secession, even before the election of Lincoln. Houston would reiterate these themes during the secession crisis. See T.R. Fehrenbach, *Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans* Updated Edition (Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2000), 342. Houston ultimately was removed from office after refusing to take the Confederate oath of office after the secession of Texas. For more on Houston’s campaign see James L. Haley, *Houston* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 369-392.

<sup>36</sup> Russell McClintock, *Lincoln and the Decision for War: The Northern Response to Secession* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 1. See also Phillip Shaw Paludan, *The Presidency of Abraham Lincoln* (Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 1994), 6.

rest of the world.<sup>37</sup> Lincoln, in his first inaugural address declared that acts of violence against the authority of the United States were “insurrectionary, or revolutionary” and described secession to be the “essence of anarchy.”<sup>38</sup> After the Confederate bombardment of Fort Sumter, Lincoln stated in his war message that he had no choice but to “call out the war power of the Government and so resist force employed for its destruction by force for its preservation.” Lincoln asserted that the issue involved more than just the fate of the United States. Instead the issues facing the U.S. would show the world whether a constitutional republic, or democracy, could maintain its territorial integrity against its domestic foes. If the Union fell, in Lincoln’s words, it would “practically put an end to free government upon the earth.”<sup>39</sup>

U.S. Secretary of State William H. Seward in his communications with U.S. diplomats reiterated the theme of the role of the United States as the model republic, and placed the struggle with the Confederacy in the context of the U.S. mission to the world. In a communication with the U.S. Minister to Great Britain, Charles Francis Adams, Secretary of State, William H. Seward, stated that in the opinion of the President, the

---

<sup>37</sup>Guyatt, *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876*, 261; Norman, “Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, the Model Republic and the Right of Revolution, 155, 166. Quote is from Norman. Guyatt explains that like northern Republicans many southerners also believed that God favored their side and saw Providence as working in the creation of the Confederacy (259, 263).

<sup>38</sup> Abraham Lincoln, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents: Prepared Under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing of the House and Senate, Pursuant to an Act of the Fifty-Second Congress of the United States IV comp.*, and ed. James D. Richardson (Washington: Bureau of National Literature, 1897), 3210. Source hereafter cited as *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*.

<sup>39</sup>Abraham Lincoln, Special Session Message, July 4, 1861, *Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, 3224.

actions of the southern states, were leading directly to anarchy, “as similar movements in similar circumstances have already resulted in Spanish America, and especially Mexico.”<sup>40</sup> In his communication with the U.S. Minister to Mexico, Seward suggested that the revolutionary spirit of Mexico seemed to have crossed the border, in an attempt to overthrow the authority of the U.S. government in the southern states.<sup>41</sup> Seward expressed a measure of embarrassment at the internal troubles in the United States, and acknowledged that republican governments in the United States, and Mexico, were encountering difficult times, but suggested that President Lincoln, never for a moment doubted that “the republican system is to pass safely through all ordeals and prove a permanent success in our own country, and so commended to adoption by all other nations,” though republican governments were currently facing numerous difficulties and embarrassments.<sup>42</sup> In his communication with the U.S. Minister to Austria Seward provided an even starker picture of what he viewed was at stake in the Civil War stating, “The Union is, moreover, the chief security for the stability of nations. When this experiment of self-government shall have failed for want of wisdom and virtue enough, either at home or abroad, to preserve it or permit it to exist, the people of other countries may well despair and lose the patience they have practiced so long under different systems in the expectation that the influence it was slowly exercising would ultimately

---

<sup>40</sup> Seward to Adams, April 10, 1861, *Message of the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Thirty-Seventh Congress*, Volume 1 House of Representatives Ex.Doc. 37<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1861), 74. Hereafter cited as *Message of the President of the United States*.

<sup>41</sup> Seward to Corwin, April 6, 1861, *Ibid.*, 66.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.

bring them to the enjoyment of the rights of self-government. When that patience disappears, anarchy must come upon the earth.”<sup>43</sup> To prevent the permanent disintegration of the Union, Lincoln ordered the Union forces to defeat the Rebels in a war that would last for nearly four years, in a conflict that ultimately cost over 600,000 lives.

Throughout the conflict Republicans continually doubted the loyalty of northern Democrats particularly the “Copperheads” or Peace Democrats who sought to end the bloodshed, and who criticized the Lincoln administration’s handling of the war effort.<sup>44</sup> Republican politicians and newspapers consistently worried about an “army of traitors” in the North who were ready to support the Confederacy, particularly Democrats who had supported slavery and been allied with southern politicians before the war.<sup>45</sup> In 1864, the Northern magazine, *Atlantic Monthly*, accused the Democratic Party of promoting the “Mexicanization” of the country, in response to the Democratic Party election platform calling for a negotiated end to the War, even without a return of the southern states to the Union. The *Monthly* linked a divided and weakened United States to the position of Mexico, which at the time was under the French occupation. If the North accepted the

---

<sup>43</sup> Seward to Burlingame, April 13, 1861, *Ibid.*, 188.

<sup>44</sup> During the secession crisis Northern Democrats tried to save the Union through negotiation and compromise and tried to dissuade Lincoln from using coercion to preserve the Union. After the outbreak of the War most supported the war effort, though frequently they expressed opposition to Lincoln’s wartime measures, such as conscription, the limiting of civil liberties and the expansion of the power of the federal government. See Edward L. Gambill, *Conservative Ordeal: Northern Democrats and Reconstruction, 1865-1868* (Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1981), 3-19; Mark E. Neely, Jr., *The Last Best Hope of Earth: Abraham Lincoln and the Promise of America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 159-161.

<sup>45</sup> Summers, *A Dangerous Stir*, 32.

end of the war on these terms, the editorial stated that the United States should be occupied by a foreign power, in a way similar to Mexico in order to restore order.<sup>46</sup> This editorial addressed fears that a permanent dissolution of the Union would result in the United States remaining in a weakened position similar to Mexico inviting the danger of foreign intervention. In the wake of the surrender of Confederate forces in April of 1865, Republicans remained unconvinced that Democrats, in both the North and the South would be willing to accept the changes brought on by the Union victory and Reconstruction policy, particularly political rights for the freed former slaves. Southern Democrats, and many of their northern supporters, conversely viewed the Union peace terms as repugnant and feared that Republicans, particularly Radical Republicans in Congress, would seek to undermine the rights and freedoms they had enjoyed in the pre-Civil War Union.<sup>47</sup> These fears would provide the backdrop to continuing fears throughout the Reconstruction period, that would coalesce in the contested election of

---

<sup>46</sup> “The Twentieth Presidential Election,” *The Atlantic Monthly* XIV (November 1864): 634. For an overview of the salient points of the 1864 campaign see the Democratic campaign pamphlet “An Address to the People of the United States and Particularly to the People of the States Which Adhere to the Federal Government,” in *The American Party Battle: Election Campaign Pamphlets 1828-1876: Volume 2, 1854-1876* ed. Joel H. Silbey (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999), 153-185, and “‘Union’ on Dis-Union Principles! The Chicago Platform, McCellan’s Letter of Acceptance, and Pendelton’s Haskin Letter, Reviewed and Exposed. A Speech Delivered by Abraham Wakeman of New York, at Greenfield Hill, Conn., Nov. 3, 1864,” in *Ibid.*, 186-220. In the wake of the Union victory over the Confederate forces one history of the war explicitly described the rebellion as Mexicanization. See John William Draper, *History of the American Civil War Volume II* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1868), 47; and John William Draper, *History of the American Civil War Volume III* (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1870), 645.

<sup>47</sup> Summers, *A Dangerous Stir*, 47, 67. Quote is from 67.



1876 in which Americans of both parties would use the trope of Mexicanization to describe their fears.

### U.S. Views of Mexico during the Restored Republic

As discussed in previous chapters, Americans had mixed assessments as to the future for republican government in Mexico at the end of the French Intervention in 1867. Shortly after reentering the Mexican capital after the expulsion of the French, Juárez called for new elections and in October 1867 was elected to a third term. The Juárez administration directed its energies toward modernizing the economy and transforming the Mexican educational system.<sup>48</sup> While the Restored Republic did lead to lasting reforms and changes to Mexican society, such as a stronger state, and a permanent defeat of the monarchists, Mexico remained divided and continued to experience political instability.<sup>49</sup> While the power of the Conservatives had been decisively broken by the defeat of the French Intervention, many Conservatives still were active in Mexican politics and opposed changes brought on by the Liberal government. Likewise after the defeat of the French, infighting within the Liberal Party led to revolts against the Juárez regime by different Liberal factions.<sup>50</sup> As in earlier time periods, regional or local leaders fought against the expanded power of the central government, often resorting to armed

---

<sup>48</sup> Meyer and Sherman, *The Course of Mexican History*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, 404.

<sup>49</sup> Paul Vanderwood, "Betterment for Whom? The Reform Period: 1855-1875," *The Oxford History of Mexico* edited by Michael C. Meyer and William H. Beezley (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 395-396.

<sup>50</sup> Enrique Krauze, *Mexico Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996* translated by Hank Heifetz (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997), 199.

resistance. Likewise Mexican indigenous groups and mestizo villages resisted the loss of their traditional lands and their autonomy. Between 1867 and 1874 there were twenty-four uprisings of different scales, led by local *caudillos* and often supported by various branches of the state governments, including a 1871 failed national uprising by Liberal General Porfirio Díaz.<sup>51</sup> As in previous decades, dispatches from U.S. consuls and diplomats, as well as from correspondents and newspaper reports from Mexico, provided a picture of disorder, unrest, and continual revolution in the struggling republic.

After Juárez's successor Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada announced that he would once again be running for the presidency of Mexico, Díaz launched a second revolution, citing the principle of no presidential reelection, as well as other accusations against the regime.<sup>52</sup> Since 1868 the newspapers from throughout the United States had covered numerous what were described as attempted revolts and a general disorder in Mexico.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> Alicia Hernandez Chavez, *Mexico: A Brief History* trans. Andy Klatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 157. For discussions of some of these smaller scale revolts see John A. Sutter Jr., "Acapulco," *Annual Report on the Commercial Relations Between the United States and Foreign Nations* [Hereafter cited as *ARCR*] (1872) (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1873), 678-679; A. Willard, "Guymas," *Ibid.*, 686, 693; David Turner, "La Paz," *Ibid.*, 698; A. Willard, "Guaymas," *ARCR* (1873) 833; Isaac Sisson, "Mazatlan," *Ibid.*, 839-840; Marlin F. Hatch, "Merida and Progreso," *Ibid.*, 842; John A. Sutter Jr., "Acapulco," *ARCR* (1875) 1136; John A. Sutter Jr., "Acapulco," *ARCR* (1876); 752-753.

<sup>52</sup> For the plan see "Plan de Tuxtepec" and the Plan de Tuxtepec en Palo Blanco," *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz: Memorias y Documentos* (Mexico: Insituto de Historia de la Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, 1951), 96-100. For an English translation see "Plan of Tuxtepec, revised at Palo Blanco," *The Political Plans of Mexico* eds. Thomas B. Davis and Amado Ricon Virulegio (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987), 567-569.

<sup>53</sup> For some articles representative of the discussion of disorder in Mexico see "Mexico," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, January 3, 1868; "Interesting News from Mexico," *North American and United States Gazette*, January 3, 1868; "From Mexico," *Daily National Intelligencer*, January 4, 1868; "Letter from the City of Mexico," *Daily Evening*

One 1871 newspaper expressed exasperation with Mexico's experience with political turbulence, stating that, "It has not been our fortune during that time to read a paragraph of news from Mexico in which some insurrection or attempt at revolution in some city or

---

*Bulletin*, January 6, 1868; "News from Mexico," *Bangor Daily Whig & Courier*, January 24, 1868; "Mexico," *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, February 4, 1868; "From Mexico, Another Revolution," *Daily National Intelligencer*, February 10, 1868; "Letter from Mexico, A Reign of Disorder," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, April 11, 1868; "Mexico, the Latest Revolutionary Outbreaks," *New York Times*, February 20, 1868; "Interesting from Mexico," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, July 10, 1868; "Mexico, Another Revolution Anticipated," *New York Times*, January 16, 1869; "Mexico, Discontent Against Juárez-Open Rebellion Anticipated," *Daily National Intelligencer*, January 18, 1869; "Coming Trouble in Mexico," *Semi-Weekly Wisconsin*, January 23, 1869; "Affairs in Mexico," *Semi-Weekly Wisconsin*, February 23, 1869; "Mexico is Breaking out with the Fever of Revolution Again," *Morning Republican* [Little Rock, AR], February 27, 1869; "Civil War in Mexico," *Newark Advocate*, April 9, 1869; "A General Revolution in Mexico," *The Hinds County Gazette* [Raymond, MS], April 21, 1869; "Mexico, Revolutionary Movements in Various States," *New York Times*, January 18, 1870; "Mexico as it is," *North American and United States Gazette*, February 3, 1870; "Mexico-Juarez Gone Up," *Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger*, February 8, 1870; "Mexico," *Chicago Tribune*, February 15, 1870; "Mexico," *Chicago Tribune*, February 17, 1870; "Mexico, More Generals Pronounced," *Morning Republican*, February 15, 1870; "Trouble in Mexico," *Newark Advocate*, February 18, 1870; "Revolution in Mexico," *Titusville Herald*, November 9, 1870; "Another Mexican Revolution," *Newport Daily News*, April 21, 1871; "From Mexico," *The Petersburg Index*, May 7, 1871; "The Impending Revolution in Mexico," *New York Times*, May 31, 1871; "The Impending Revolution in Mexico," *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, June 3, 1871; "Mexico," *The Daily Patriot*, August 1, 1871; *Vermont Watchman and Journal*, August 9, 1871; "Mexico," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, August 31, 1871; *The Indiana Progress*, October 12, 1871; "The Revolution in Mexico," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, October 26, 1871; *The Cedar Rapids Times*, November 30, 1871; "The Revolution in Mexico Gaining Strength," *Bangor Daily Whig & Courier*, November 22, 1871; "The Civil War in Mexico," *The Atlanta Daily Sun*, January 6, 1872; "Anarchy in Mexico," *The Atlanta Daily Sun*, January 10, 1872; "Mexico-The Revolution Becoming Alarming," *The Ohio Democrat*, February 2, 1872; "The Situation in Mexico," *The Atlanta Daily Sun*, April 10, 1872; *The Farmer's Cabinet*, August 7, 1872; *Daily Central City Register*, October 3, 1872; "Revolution Imminent," *Sandusky Daily Register*, July 29, 1873; "Mexico, A Revolution Imminent in Nuevo Leon," *The Daily Cleveland Herald*, July 29, 1873; "Mexico, Rumored Revolutionary Movement by General Rocha," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, September 17, 1873; "Mexico," *Daily Arkansas Gazette*, September 21, 1873; "Mexico, More Signs of Trouble," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, October 6, 1873; "Mexico," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, December 8, 1873; "Mexico," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, February 9, 1874..

state was not engaging the attention of the government.”<sup>54</sup> One theme in the newspaper reporting on the revolutionary unrest in Mexico during the Restored Republic was disappointment that Mexico had not achieved political stability in the aftermath of the defeat of the French Intervention.<sup>55</sup> Throughout much of 1876 and 1877 the Díaz revolt was therefore described as just the latest manifestation of this supposed Mexican obsession with revolution.<sup>56</sup> One San Francisco paper maintained, “Surely no nation on

---

<sup>54</sup> “Mexico,” *The Hawaiian Gazette*, June 14, 1871. For similar views see “Mexico,” *The Janesville Gazette*, February 29, 1872.

<sup>55</sup> For articles discussing disillusionment with the lost hope after the end of the French Intervention see, “What will Become of Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, February 10, 1868; “Condition of Mexico,” *Bangor Daily Whig & Courier*, December 24, 1868; “Mexico,” *Bangor Daily Whig & Courier*, January 7, 1869. Articles that discuss the chronic nature of disorder in Mexico include, *The Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, January 7, 1868; “Mexico,” *The Daily Miners’ Register* [Central City, CO], February 9, 1868; “Mexico,” *Vermont Chronicle*, February 22, 1868; “The Latest Intelligence from Mexico,” *The Charleston Courier*, March 17, 1868; “Mexico-The Old Story,” *New York Times*, May 22, 1868, also reprinted in “Mexico-The Old Story,” *Bangor Daily Whig & Courier*, June 10, 1868; “Unfortunate Mexico,” *Rock County Recorder Weekly*, March 19, 1870; “Mexico,” *The Janesville Gazette*, November 14, 1870; “Unhappy Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, December 2, 1871; “Mexico,” *Daily Arkansas Gazette*, January 11, 1872; “Mexico Sick, Very Sick,” *The Hinds County Gazette*, January 17, 1872; “Persecuted Mexico,” *The Atlanta Daily Sun*, January 28, 1872; “The Mexican Muddle,” *The New York Times*, April 18, 1872.

<sup>56</sup> See for instance, “Letter from Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, January 25, 1876; “Letter from Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, March 22, 1876; “Letter from Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, May 2, 1876; “Mexico’s Miseries,” *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, July 3, 1876; “Letter from the City of Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, October 7, 1876; “Two Presidents,” *New York Times*, November 24, 1876; “The Mexican Trouble,” *The Denton Journal*, January 6, 1877; *The Janesville Gazette*, August 9, 1877. The *Chicago Tribune* referred to the troops of Díaz as a “lawless mob.” See “Mexico,” *Chicago Tribune*, April 12, 1876; “A City of Beggars,” *The Youth’s Companion* (May 26, 1870); “Mexico and the Mexicans” *The Youth’s Companion* (December 21, 1871); “Affairs in Mexico,” *Prairie Farmer* (December 30, 1871); “Our Relations with Mexico,” *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine* (July 1873); *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, March 25, 1876; “The Mexican Revolution,” *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, April 7, 1876; “Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (May 18, 1876); “Revolution in Mexico,” *Advocate of Peace* (May 1876); *New York Evangelist* (April 6, 1876); “A Republic in

this earth, up to this day, has ever attempted in such a willful and obstinate manner its own destruction, regardless of any sense whatsoever of honor, morality or self-respect.”<sup>57</sup>

By the mid-1870s there was general agreement in the U.S. press about the degraded political condition of Mexico which would be exemplified in a number of jokes and quips at the expense of the Mexican people in the U.S. public sphere. An article in *The New York Times* quipped that Mexico should exhibit “revolution” at the 1876 U.S. Centennial Exhibition since that appeared to be the country’s main industry.<sup>58</sup> An Iowa paper likened Mexico to the earth because it had a revolution “every twenty-four hours,”<sup>59</sup> while another quipped that closer communication between the two countries would allow Americans to keep up with Mexico’s “daily revolutions,” and a California newspaper suggested that a “year without revolution in Mexico, or an attempted one, at least, would be like a summer without rain in other countries.”<sup>60</sup>

---

Chaos,” *New York Times*, January 30, 1877; *Newport Daily News*, May 24, 1877; *Prairie Farmer* (August 4, 1877).

<sup>57</sup> “Mexico,” *Daily Alta California*, May 1, 1876. A few articles expressed opposition to some of the actions of the Lerdo regime, and provided at least mild support for the revolution. See, “The Revolution in Mexico,” *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, December 14, 1876; “The Revolution Against the Rule of Tejada,” *The Helena Independent*, October 19, 1876; John H. Young, “Ishmael in Mexico,” *The Cambridge City Tribune*, July 1, 1876.

<sup>58</sup> “Mexico at the Centennial,” *New York Times*, April 1, 1876. For similar quips about Mexico “raising revolutions” see *Ft Wayne Daily Gazette*, May 10, 1878.

<sup>59</sup> *Northern Vindicator* [Estherville, Iowa], February 17, 1872. For similar sentiments see *Spirit Lake Beacon*, October 1, 1874; *Newport Daily News*, October 9, 1874; “Mexico,” *Weekly Nevada State Journal*, March 3, 1877; “Smiles” *New Brunswick Daily Times*, March 4, 1880.

<sup>60</sup> “A Revolution in Mexico,” *The Fresno Republican*, July 26, 1879. This is a reprint from the *Examiner and Chronicle*.

For many analysts the continued revolutionary outbreaks emphasized the helpless condition of the Mexican people. A satirical article in the *New York Times* entitled “Mexico for the Monkeys” suggested that the only hope for the country was to train Mexican monkeys to read and write and take over the government. This was necessary because, the human population “was incapable of anything commendable,” but also because they refused to die out despite warfare, disease and the situation of “popular anarchy” that had continuously engulfed the country.<sup>61</sup> This negative understanding of Mexico’s political affairs led to the conclusion that the Mexican people were unfit for republican government.<sup>62</sup> One Iowa newspaper suggested that Mexico needed a revolution, not of war, but of an influx of “people who have some idea of self-government,” along with railroads, manufacturers and “men who will work.”<sup>63</sup> This reflected continuing sentiments that the Mexican people might be irredeemable and therefore needed outside help in order to put its affairs in order, which corresponds to discussions of U.S. intervention in the form of annexation or a protectorate from earlier periods.

---

<sup>61</sup> “Mexico for the Monkeys,” *New York Times*, January 20, 1877.

<sup>62</sup> *Daily Central City Register*, April 18, 1869; “Another Mexican Expedition,” *The Dubuque Daily Herald*, January 15, 1869; “The Revolution in Mexico,” *The Weekly Arizonian*, March 19, 1870; “Mexico,” *Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture*, November 25, 1871; “Mexico,” *The Albion*, July 27, 1872; “Mexico,” *The Albion*, November 1, 1873; “Revolution in Mexico-A Warning,” *Daily Arkansas Gazette*, December 10, 1876; *Weekly Nevada State Journal*, March 3, 1877.

<sup>63</sup> “Distracted Mexico,” *Northern Vindicator*, August 5, 1871. An article in *The Fort Wayne Daily Gazette* expressed similar views about the Mexico’s unfitness for a republic, but stated that a republic needs a high “state of civilization,” and acknowledged that the U.S. has struggled with this as well.



In Mexico, the forces of Porfirio Díaz were able to garner support in various parts of the nation, and by November of 1876 he was able to militarily defeat Lerdo's forces and occupy the capital in Mexico City. Shortly thereafter Díaz took over the office of President.<sup>64</sup> While Americans would later celebrate the "firm hand" of Díaz in reigning in the perceived revolutionary instincts of the Mexican people, in the 1870s, most viewed his position as insecure. Historian Paul Garner has argued that in his first administration Díaz appeared "destined to share the experience, and even the fate, of all previous nineteenth-century governments, plagued by the continuation of the domestic political conflicts and international hostilities which had characterized most of Mexico's independent history."<sup>65</sup>

U.S. observers speculated that the Díaz regime would not last long and that the country would again descend into revolution and chaos.<sup>66</sup> Despite decades of discussion of disorder in Mexico, U.S. observers alleged that the country was possibly in the most lawless and helpless situation that it had ever been in.<sup>67</sup> Newspapers and magazines in the United States periodically commented on these revolts or rumored revolts throughout the

---

<sup>64</sup> See "Proclamation of General Porfirio Díaz as President of Mexico," Enclosure in *FRUS* (1877), 385-386.

<sup>65</sup> Paul Garner, *Porfirio Díaz* (London: Longman, 2001), 68.

<sup>66</sup> "Civil War in Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 6, 1876. See also "The Mexican Revolution," *The Indiana Democrat* [Pennsylvania], February 8, 1877; *The Reno Evening Gazette*, August 18, 1876; *Burlington Hawk Eye*, February 8, 1877; "Mexico, More Revolution Predicted," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 24, 1877; *Christian Union* (March 7, 1877); "Foreign Reaction Against Díaz," *Daily Arkansas Gazette*, April 8, 1877. The quote is from the *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, April 9, 1877.

<sup>67</sup> "News," *Ohio Farmer* (January 6, 1877); "Latest from Mexico," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, February 6, 1877; "A Republic in Chaos," *New York Times*, January 30, 1877.

rest of Díaz's first term. This speculation got more intense as his term was coming to end in 1880, and several rivals sought to gain the presidency.<sup>68</sup> As such Mexico would provide a convenient metaphor for disorder, revolution and a lack of respect for democratic norms for political partisans on both sides to use in the aftermath of the contested 1876 election in the United States.

---

<sup>68</sup> See for instance, *The Palo Alto Pilot*, April 19, 1877; "Samuel P. Craver, "Letter from Mexico," *Southwestern Christian Advocate* (June 14, 1877); *Prairie Farmer* (August 4, 1877); "Mexico Forever," *The Ohio Democrat*, May 9, 1878; "The Uneasy Mexican Watching His Time," *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, July 9, 1878; "Latest Foreign News," *Christian Advocate* (May 9, 1878); "The Republic of Mexico," *New York Times*, July 8, 1878; *Brooklyn Eagle*, July 8, 1878; "Mexico, Rumors of Revolution," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 25, 1878; "Mexico, Another Revolution," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 17, 1879; "Mexico, The Revolution," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 19, 1879; "New Phases of Mexican Politics," *New York Times*, June 20, 1879; "Díaz in Danger," *St Louis Globe Democrat*, June 20, 1879; "The Outlook," *Christian Union* (June 25, 1879); "Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 2, 1879; *Waterloo Courier*, August 6, 1879; "An Ominous Quiet In Mexico," *Daily Nevada State Journal*, August 16, 1879; *The Farmer's Cabinet*, September 9, 1879; "Mexico, Another Revolution," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, October 14, 1879; "A Pending Revolution," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, November 6, 1879; "A Mexican Scheme," *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, November 7, 1879; "Unhappy Mexico," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, November 7, 1879; "Mexico, Another Revolution Brewing," *Daily Arkansas Gazette*, November 7, 1879; "Mexico: Another Revolution Hatching," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 7, 1879; "Mexico, Another Revolution," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 18, 1879; "Mexico, Latest Revolutions," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 28, 1879; "The Insurrection in Mexico," *New York Times*, November 28, 1879; "Revolutionary Mexico," *The Weekly Arizona Miner*, December 5, 1879; "Mexico's Annual Revolution," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, December 24, 1879; "Formidable Uprising in Mexico," *New York Times*, January 7, 1880; "Mexico, Another Revolution," *Chicago Daily Inter-Ocean*, January 7, 1880; "Still Troubled Mexico," *Galveston Daily News*, January 7, 1880; "Mexican Affairs," *Petersburg Index-Appeal*, January 8, 1880; "Mexico's Approaching Trouble," *Union County Journal*, February 24, 1880; "Mexico, Another Revolution Hatching," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 16, 1880; "Mexico, More Revolution," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 4, 1880; "Mexico's Disordered Affairs; Revolts in Various Parts of the Country," *New York Times*, August 4, 1880; "Mexico's Disturbed Condition," *New York Times*, August 6, 1880; "Mexico's Political Troubles," *New York Times*, August 24, 1880; "Mexico's Disorganized State," *New York Times*, September 9, 1880; "The Mexican Problem," *Titusville Morning Herald*, September 9, 1880; *Reno Evening Gazette*, November 11, 1880.



U.S. Reconstruction and Fears of Conspiracy in the United States

After the Union victory in the Civil War, Republican leaders viewed themselves as the saviors of the Union and believed that they had the opportunity to forge a new Republic, which conversely would reward them with election victories for the foreseeable future.<sup>69</sup> Republicans had recognized that their party had been strictly regionally based before the Civil War, and in the aftermath of the Civil War sought to create a competitive Republican Party in the southern states that were then under the control of the federal government.<sup>70</sup> In the first part of Reconstruction this goal seemed to be working, as Republican parties, with strong support from African-American voters, were able to command a majority of support in many of the former Confederate states.<sup>71</sup>

However white southerners still had strong resentments against the Republican Party from the Civil War and these sentiments would continue to be strong throughout the rest of the nineteenth century and beyond.<sup>72</sup> By 1874 the Democratic Party had regained control in all former Confederate states except South Carolina, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Florida, often relying on a system of white supremacy, and the

---

<sup>69</sup> Charles W. Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic: The Republican Party and the Southern Question, 1869-1900* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 3.

<sup>70</sup> Michael Les Benedict, "The Politics of Reconstruction," *American Political History: Essays on the State of the Discipline* eds. John F. Marszalek and Wilson D. Miscamble (Norte Dame and London: University of Norte Dame Press, 1997), 58.

<sup>71</sup> Barney, *Battleground for the Union*, 276. Barney explains that African-American voters made up 40% of the population in the reconstructed South, while southern Republicans made up 20-25% of the voters.

<sup>72</sup> Mark D. Brewer and Jeffry M. Stonecash, *Dynamics of American Political Parties* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 36-37.

corresponding widespread suppression of black votes.<sup>73</sup> Beginning in the late 1860s organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan acted in concert with southern Democrats, incorporating violence against black voters and officeholders as well as white Republicans throughout the South.<sup>74</sup> Southern election seasons in 1875-1877 were marred by riots and violence against Republicans and African-Americans as part of a coordinated political strategy by the state and local Democratic parties.<sup>75</sup> By the 1876 election Republican leaders were convinced that the South was lost to their cause and in most areas refused to intervene to prevent politically and racially-motivated violence, emboldening southern Democratic politicians.

Republicans expressed concerns whether the southern Democratic parties would be willing to accept the changes to the country as a result of the Civil War, and it quickly became evident that elite southerners were committed to preserving as much as the pre-Civil War order as they could, which included resistance to equal rights for African-Americans.<sup>76</sup> The rejuvenation of the Democratic Party in the South reawakened a persistent fear of the power of the South as a voting bloc and the disproportionate power, in Republican eyes, that the region had been able to wield in the antebellum period.

---

<sup>73</sup> Ari Hoogenboom, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1988), 19. See also Stanley P. Hirshson, *Farewell to the Bloody Shirt: Northern Republicans & the Southern Negro, 1877-1893* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962), 22; Barney, *Battleground for the Union* 276. Barney also suggests that southern state Republican Parties also lacked unity and ideological coherence hurting their long-term viability (276).

<sup>74</sup> Alexander Keyssar, *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States* Revised Edition (New York: Basic Books, 2009), 84.

<sup>75</sup> Barney, *Battleground for the Union*, 318.

<sup>76</sup> Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic*, 3-4.

A revived southern Democratic Party also corresponded to increased Northern support for the Party, owing largely to the dismal economic situation of the nation, along with disillusionment with corruption in the Grant administration. In 1873 Jay Cooke & Company, the largest bank in the United States collapsed, igniting a severe depression that lasted until at least 1878.<sup>77</sup> This context provided one of the most dramatic political upheavals in the history of the U.S. Congress.<sup>78</sup> In the 1874 election the Democrat Party made the largest single gain by any party in any nineteenth-century congressional election, turning a 110 seat House Republican majority into a sixty seat Democratic majority, and almost taking the Senate. Republicans also suffered in state and local elections.<sup>79</sup> This election also coincided with the “redemption” of former Confederate states back under the control of the Democratic Party.

For northern Republicans a revived Democratic Party represented a threat to the American Republic, as the Democratic Party appeared poised to once again become the majority party in the nation.<sup>80</sup> Republicans continued to blame the Democrats for their

---

<sup>77</sup> Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1865-1877* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), 512; Michael F. Holt, *By One Vote: The Disputed Presidential Election of 1876* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2008), 10. By 1874 urban unemployment had risen dramatically, numerous businesses had failed, and bitter labor disputes were common throughout the nation. Farmers were affected adversely and instituted new forms of agrarian protest in the form of the Grange and other organizations.

<sup>78</sup> George H. Mayer, *The Republican Party, 1854-1966* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 187.

<sup>79</sup> Barney, *Battleground for the Union*, 314. The Democratic Party also benefited in northern areas through support from traditional Democratic constituencies such as urban workers, immigrants and many Catholics.

<sup>80</sup> Leon Friedman, “The Democratic Party, 1860-1884,” *History of U.S. Political Parties, Volume II 1860-1910: The Gilded Age of Politics* edited by Arthur Schlesinger

pre-war support for the South and the institution of slavery, the Civil War, and the Northern Democratic ambivalence in support of the war effort.<sup>81</sup> Republicans commented that while not every Democrat was a rebel, “every rebel was a Democrat.”<sup>82</sup> Republican leaders viewed a potential Democratic victory in 1876 as a victory for the Confederacy,<sup>83</sup> and the 1876 Republican platform explicitly charged the Democratic Party as “being the same in character and spirit as when it sympathized with treason.”<sup>84</sup> While the Republican strategy did constitute what has often been called “waving the bloody shirt,” Republican leaders communicated the same fears in private as they did in their political rhetoric, with the Republican candidate Rutherford B. Hayes expressing at one point that it was not safe “to allow the Rebellion to come into power.”<sup>85</sup> Northern Republicans

---

Jr., (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1973), 893. Throughout the nineteenth century the Western States were staunchly Republican, the Southern states staunchly Democrat while the Northeast and Midwest tended to be split with a slight Republican advantage.

<sup>81</sup> Joel Silbey, *The American Political Nation, 1838-1893* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 217.

<sup>82</sup> Friedman, “The Democratic Party, 1860-1884,” 886.

<sup>83</sup> Holt, *By One Vote*, 48. Democrats anticipated this tactic and tried to defuse it by declaring sectional issues as “permanently settled” by the Civil War, and condemned Republican to reignite sectional tensions as a way to divert attention from Republican failures. See *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>84</sup> *Proceedings of the Republican National Convention Held at Cincinnati, Ohio* (Concord, NH: Republican Press Association, 1876), 57. The Republican Party also released campaign pamphlets discussing the dangers of a Democratic Party victory, some with titles such as *A Democratic Counter Rebellion: Conquering the Union They Failed to Destroy* and *The Rebel South Victorious*. See Calhoun, 101.

<sup>85</sup> Quoted in Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic*, 100; Holt, *By One Vote*, 124. The Republicans also discussed other issues such as currency reform, and civil service reform, but made the South their primary campaign issue. Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic*, 101. The Democratic candidate Samuel J. Tilden made political corruption and

hated the thought that over 300,000 Union soldiers had died during the War, in order to hand the republic over to Confederate Democrats to “rule and revel in.”<sup>86</sup> Republican Party leaders were convinced that the country’s well-being and potentially its survival depended on preventing the Democratic Party, with its strong support in the former Confederate states, from taking power.<sup>87</sup> Because of these fears Republican Party leaders would take drastic actions to prevent the election of a Democratic president. These actions and the Democratic response would provide a test of the foundation of the Republic second only to the Civil War, as the U.S. entered into a new period of political uncertainty and confronted the threat of civil unrest.<sup>88</sup>

#### The Disputed Election of 1876

In the months leading up to the voting many analysts were uneasy about the results of the election which most predicted to be extremely close.<sup>89</sup> In a widely reprinted address right before the election, Republican newspaperman, Murat Halstead, accused the Democratic Party of threatening a disputed Presidential election which “would reduce the

---

the economic depression the main issues for his campaign. Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution*, 568. Democrats also denounced the tactics of “waving the bloody shirt” though they recognized its effectiveness. See Benedict, “The Politics of Reconstruction,” 87, 92.

<sup>86</sup> Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic*, 106.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

<sup>88</sup> Calhoun, *Conceiving a New Republic*, 105-106; Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution*, 575.

<sup>89</sup> A little over a year before the election *The Helena Daily Independent* expressed the fear that the U.S. was following a similar course to that of Mexico, which it suggested had long had problems with corruption and political inefficiency. See *The Helena Daily Independent*, September 2, 1875.

American republic to the grade of Mexico.”<sup>90</sup> Halstead cited the return to home rule for many of the southern states and alleged that whites in the South, would use force and intimidation to prevent Blacks from voting and Republicans from winning in these states. Halstead argued that the disputes between the Houses of Congress, states and political parties made a close political election a danger to the republic. He expressed fears of another civil war if the Electoral College count hinged on a Southern state, where the state would vote Democratic in the Electoral College because of the role of intimidation of southern guns and bayonets. Meanwhile politicians in Washington would be at each other’s throats letting slip the “dogs of war.”<sup>91</sup> Halstead associated this situation with Mexico, and cited that nation as an example for what could happen to the United States.<sup>92</sup> In Halstead’s view this could result in the ruin of the U.S. republic.

The close election generated wide interest, including a turnout of 81.8 percent of the eligible voters, the highest turnout for an election in U.S. history.<sup>93</sup> As election returns were reported throughout the country, it appeared that the Democratic candidate Samuel J. Tilden had received a plurality of about 250,000 popular votes, along with 203

---

<sup>90</sup> M. Halstead, *The War Claims of the South. The Southern Confederacy, with the Democratic Party as its Claim Agency, Demanding Indemnity for Conquest, and Threatening a Disputed Presidential Election.* (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co, 1876), 3. The address was delivered on October 25, 1876. Large excerpts were reprinted in “Mr Murat Halstead’s Speech,” *The New York Times*, October 26, 1876.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 37. Halstead’s answer was for the Republican candidate to win New York, taking away the danger of a close election. In the actual voting New York went for the Democratic candidate, Samuel L. Tilden.

<sup>93</sup> Holt, *By One Vote*, ix.

electoral votes, more than the 185 needed to be elected.<sup>94</sup> Early reports suggested that Tilden had won New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Indiana, as well as the entire South.<sup>95</sup> On election night Republican leaders, including Rutherford B. Hayes, the Republican presidential candidate, were despondent over the apparent defeat, and supporters were congratulating the Democratic nominee, Samuel J. Tilden on his victory.<sup>96</sup> However a Republican Party official, General Daniel E. Sickles, believed that Hayes still might win the election if western states voted Republican and if southern states where Republicans controlled the electoral machinery could be salvaged. Sickles telegraphed Republican leaders in South Carolina, Louisiana, Florida and Oregon, stating, “With your state sure for Hayes, he is elected. Hold your state.”<sup>97</sup>

Over the next four months the United States experienced an electoral crisis, second only to the 1860 election before the Civil War, which resulted in political

---

<sup>94</sup> This election began a string of very close Presidential elections. From 1876-1892 the party candidates were separated by less than once percentage point in the popular vote, and by about three percentage points in the other two. See Brewer and Stonecash, *Dynamics of American Political Parties*, 34.

<sup>95</sup> Hoogenboom, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 25.

<sup>96</sup> Alexander Clarence Flick, *Samuel Jones Tilden: A Study in Political Sagacity* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1939), 323, 327-328; Hayes in his diary entry stated, “The election has resulted in the defeat of the Republicans after a very close contest.” When he saw the returns that New York state had voted for Tilden Hayes wrote, “From that time, I never supposed there was a chance for Republican success.” See *Hayes: The Diary of a President, 1875-1881* ed. T. Harry Williams, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964), November 11, 1876, 47-48; *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes Volume III, 1865-1881* ed. Charles Richard Williams (Columbus, OH: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1924), November 11, 1876, 374-375.

<sup>97</sup> Hoogenboom, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 26.

uncertainty, which was to last throughout the rest of the year and into 1877.<sup>98</sup> One historian has argued that the disputed election “absorbed the attention of the country to the practical exclusion of every other subject. Each day the newspapers were filled with conjectures, rumors, and long editorials.”<sup>99</sup> *The Janesville Gazette*, a Republican newspaper, described the uncertainty as a “grave crisis” that would test the Republican institutions and the character of the American people. The *Gazette* expressed the fear that the U.S. could drift into another civil war, and looked to the negative example of Mexico to express its fears that this could mean frequent revolutions and civil wars to determine elections.<sup>100</sup> As a result of the disputed election, Americans worried that the Civil War had not solved the issues within their political system, and the onset of more political controversy might signal the beginning of the type of chronic political unrest they had long associated with Mexico.

The specific electoral dispute revolved around 20 electoral votes in South Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida.<sup>101</sup> If these votes went to Hayes, he would meet the minimum to be elected President. The electoral boards in each of these states were controlled by Republicans, and the law allowed them to throw out fraudulent votes. In

---

<sup>98</sup> “Retrospect of 1876” *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* (January 6, 1877): 3.

<sup>99</sup> Paul Leland Haworth, *The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Presidential Election of 1876* (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company, 1906), 171.

<sup>100</sup> “Grant-Tilden-Buchanan,” *The Janesville Gazette* [Wisconsin], November 20, 1876. For similar sentiments see “Perils of the Hour,” *Newport Daily News*, November 13, 1876.

<sup>101</sup> This also included one disputed elector appointed by the Democratic governor of Oregon, which should have been a Hayes delegate.



each of these states there were numerous allegations of fraud on both sides, and the Republican electoral boards rejected enough votes to allow their states to be carried by Hayes.<sup>102</sup> In the aftermath of the election an editorial in the *New York Sun*, one of the nation's largest newspapers, which favored Samuel J. Tilden for president, expressed the opinion that the nation was in danger from Republican Party actions to retain the Presidency. The *Sun* editorial lauded the history of the Republican Party in destroying slavery in the South, but expressed its opinion that the Party was in the process of being corrupted by the "long process of power." The paper declared that the installation of a President whom the people had not elected, would put the United States in a position of slavery "far baser" than the previous position of slaves in the South.<sup>103</sup> A few days later the paper expanded this analysis in another editorial describing the potential inauguration of Hayes as the "most monstrous political crime" that had ever been committed in the United States, and would result in the "murder of the republic" through the end of legitimate elections.<sup>104</sup>

On December 6 when electors from all states cast their ballots in state capitals, South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana and Oregon forwarded conflicting votes to

---

<sup>102</sup> Republican leaders justified these actions citing the widespread intimidation of black voters which had skewed the vote results. See for instance, *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes Volume III, 1865-1881*, December 5, 1876, 384-385. There were also a number of irregularities at the state level which various articles in newspapers and magazines compared to Mexico and Mexicanization. See for instance, "Is it South Carolina or Mexico?" *Elyria Constitution*, October 26, 1876; "Our Mexico," *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, December 1, 1876; "Mexico," *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, January 10, 1877; *The Independent* (January 11, 1877); *Daily Free Press*, February 28, 1877.

<sup>103</sup> "Can the Republican Party Afford it?" *New York Sun*, November 12, 1876.

<sup>104</sup> "Shall the Government be Stolen?" *New York Sun*, November 16, 1876.

Washington, and both candidates claimed the disputed 20 electoral votes. The election was to be ultimately decided by which of the conflicting sets of returns would be accepted by the Congress. Since the Senate was controlled by Republicans and the House by Democrats it was improbable that the two bodies would come to an agreement. A likely outcome was the House recognizing Tilden as the rightful President, while the Senate would recognize Hayes. In this case the country would have two individuals who could theoretically rightfully claim the title of President.

One article in a leading Republican newspaper, *The Chicago Tribune*, was entitled, “Shall We Mexicanize?” and dealt with the possibility of rival claims to the Presidency. The editorial writer advised Americans to study Mexico in order to understand what could happen in the United States if there were multiple claimants to the presidency and encouraged its readers to reject following the example of Mexico by allowing the nation to be carried away by political strife and disorder.<sup>105</sup> About the same time the Republican candidate Rutherford B. Hayes admonished calm and asserted that the United States would not accept a “Mexicanized” government.<sup>106</sup> As a way to get around this impasse the House and Senate created an Electoral Commission to be made up of five members from the House, five from the Senate, and five justices of the Supreme Court. The party affiliation of the committee was eight Republicans and seven

---

<sup>105</sup> “Shall We Mexicanize?” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 26, 1876. The *Tribune* editorial also drew contrasts between the Mexican and the American people arguing that Americans did not appreciate revolution as it stated the Mexicans did, and suggested that the American people would reject any attempts to precipitate such a revolution.

<sup>106</sup> “Speech of Gov. Hayes,” *Auburn Morning News* [NY], December 14, 1876. See also *Lowell Daily Citizen*, December 16, 1876; “Another Speech by President Elect Hayes,” *Independent Statesman*, December 21, 1876.

Democrats and the major decisions went in favor of the Republican candidate on a strictly party-line vote.<sup>107</sup> Thus concluded the second time the 1876 election was stolen—the first time by voter suppression, fraud and political violence by southern Democrats and the second time by manipulation of election laws by Republican officials in three of those states to give Hayes a lead of one in the Electoral College.<sup>108</sup>

At the same time the question remained whether the Democratic-controlled House would accept the findings of the Commission. Members of both parties foretold violence and revolution if their candidate was not certified as President. Partisans on both sides threatened to march on Washington and install their candidate by force if necessary.<sup>109</sup> An early twentieth century historian James Ford Rhodes, stated that anyone who lived through this period, or who makes a careful study of the contemporary evidence, “cannot avoid the conviction that the country was on the verge of civil war.”<sup>110</sup> While some

---

<sup>107</sup> Kenneth E. Davison, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1972), 42. The original plan had been for the party composition to be seven to seven with one independent. One of the five members from the Supreme Court was to be Justice David Davis an independent, but days before the Commission was scheduled to meet Davis was elected to the Senate by the Illinois legislature. Since all the remaining Supreme Court Justices were Republicans, the Republican Party gained an eight to seven advantage in the voting.

<sup>108</sup> Mark Wahlgren Summers, *Party Games: Getting, Keeping and Using Power in Gilded Age Politics* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 15. See also Holt, *By One Vote*, (xxii-xiii) for a similar argument.

<sup>109</sup> H. Wayne Morgan, *From Hayes to McKinley: National Party Politics, 1877-1896* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1969), 3.

<sup>110</sup> James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the Final Restoration of Home Rule at the South in 1877 Volume VII* (New York: The MacMillan Co, 1906), 243. Among the evidence to support this claim Rhodes cites the number of unemployed, and many social outcasts, who participated in railroad riots several months later. See also Haworth, *The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Presidential Election of 1876*, 168, 188-189.

contemporaries and later historians have downplayed the threat of a renewal of civil disturbances in the United States, Tilden received numerous expressions of support from Democrats willing to recruit regiments or join a fight to help him to gain the Presidency if necessary.<sup>111</sup>

The Díaz-led revolution in Mexico, which was occurring at about the same time as the disputed U.S. election, invited comparisons between the United States and Mexico during the electoral crisis in 1876.<sup>112</sup> The *Chicago Daily Tribune* speculated that while the Civil War had decided the question of whether the American nation would endure, the current issue was whether as a nation Americans were fit for self-government or whether they would follow the example of Mexico tear the country apart over an electoral dispute.<sup>113</sup> This reflected the fear that chronic political instability may become the norm in the United States as it had become in Mexico.

---

<sup>111</sup> Alexander Clarence Flick, *Samuel Jones Tilden: A Study in Political Sagacity* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1939), 331, 360-361.

<sup>112</sup> *The Nation* (December 21, 1876): 363. For another comparison of the problems in both nations see “The Two Neighbor Republics,” *Potter’s American Monthly* (February 1877).

<sup>113</sup> “One Civil War Enough,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, January 26, 1877. For similar sentiments associating a potential course of disorder and revolution with Mexico see *The Nation* (December 14, 1876): 351; “A Lesson from Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, December 23, 1876; “Why the Compromise Was Prepared,” *The Indiana Democrat*, February 1, 1877. Partisans from both sides accused each other of seeking to “Mexicanize” the country. For articles accusing the Republicans as being Mexicanizers see *The Portsmouth Times*, January 16, 1875; “Grantism in Mexico,” *Galveston Daily News*, October 25, 1876; “The Columbus Convention,” *The Elyria Constitution*, January 11, 1877; “Resolutions of Ohio Eighth of January Convention,” *Union County Journal*, January 16, 1877; “Revolutionists,” *The Portsmouth Times*, November 25, 1876. “The Peril of the Hour,” *Sedalia Daily Democrat*, January 17, 1877; *Colorado Weekly Chieftain*, January 6, 1878. For articles accusing the Democrats of being Mexicanizers see “Which is the Law-Abiding Party,” *New York Times*, November 12, 1876; “The

Because of the split between the House and Senate, it was necessary for members of one party to side with the other in order for one presidential candidate to get the approval of Congress. Republican representatives met with Southern Democrats in the hopes of gaining their support for Hayes' claim to the Presidency. They offered concessions to southern Democrats which included the withdrawal of federal troops from the South resulting in home rule for the South, aid for internal improvements, railroad subsidies, a possible cabinet seat, and a voice in the distribution of federal patronage in the South.<sup>114</sup> In return Southern Democrats agreed to refrain from participating in Democratic attempts to prevent the Congressional certification of the Hayes as President of the United States.<sup>115</sup>

After months of uncertainty, Congress declared the Republican candidate, Rutherford B. Hayes President of the United States on March 2, and his inauguration took place two days later. In his inaugural address Hayes acknowledged the unique circumstances of his election, and the fact that his opponents would view the decision of the electoral commission negatively.<sup>116</sup> Hayes stated that public sentiment made clear

---

Inauguration," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, November 24, 1876; *New York Times*, December 9, 1876; "Drifting into Revolution," *Oswego Daily Times*, November 24, 1876; *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, January 6, 1877; A Republican, "The Mexicans in Congress," *The Nation* (February 8, 1877): 86; "President Lerdo of Mexico," *Newport Daily News*, February 13, 1877; "Meeting of the Republican Executive Committee," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, September 27, 1877.

<sup>114</sup> Summers, *Party Games*, 43-44.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>116</sup> Rutherford B. Hayes, "Inaugural Address," March 5, 1877 reprinted in *Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States from Johnson to Roosevelt* ed. John Vance Cheney (Chicago: The Lakeside Press, 1905), 32.

that the conflicting claims to the Presidency must be “amicably and peaceably adjusted, and that when so adjusted the general acquiescence of the nation ought surely to follow.”<sup>117</sup> Hayes expressed gratitude that the United States could serve a model for other nations “to give to the world the first example in history of a great nation, in the midst of the struggle of opposing parties for power, hushing its party tumults to yield the issue of the contest to adjustment according to the forms of law.”<sup>118</sup>

In the aftermath of the inauguration, commentators expressed relief that the United States was free from the danger of being reduced to the level of Mexico, which one periodical linked to the working of Providence.<sup>119</sup> The prevention of civil unrest and disorder was attributed by one article in *The American Farmer* to the “intelligent self-control” of the United States, thereby implicitly referencing the persistent criticism of Latin Americans as undisciplined and lacking in self-control in much U.S. literature.<sup>120</sup> An article in *The Galaxy: A Magazine of Entertaining Reading* explained the ability of the United States to avoid disorders, while Mexico seemingly could not, in racial terms. While the editorial acknowledged that it appeared that the United States was approaching the level of Mexico during the presidential crisis the nation was really in no such danger because Americans with their strong Anglo-Saxon and German racial heritage allowed

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> “The Election of a President,” *National Repository* (May 1877).

<sup>120</sup> “Agricultural Education,” *The American Farmer* (April 1877). This theme is discussed extensively in John J. Johnson, *Latin America in Caricature* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1980), 116-156. Johnson notes that this theme often comes out in images of Latin American nations as unruly children.

them a steadfastness and common sense to prevent disorders, while implicitly the racial characteristics of the Mexicans did not allow this same restraint.<sup>121</sup>

Despite this relief, one result of the disputed election was that Hayes took office with what one analyst has described as a “cloud on his title.”<sup>122</sup> The *Cincinnati Enquirer* described Hayes’ inauguration as “the monster fraud of the century.”<sup>123</sup> Many Democrats continued to believe that Hayes had stolen the election and resented both him and his administration as well as the Republican Party. One historian reported, “In almost every issue of almost every Democratic newspaper there appeared at least one reference to the ‘Steal;’ Hayes was a ‘Usurper,’ ‘the Boss Thief;’ Liberty had been ‘stabbed by Radical Ruffians;’ the ‘Death knell of the Republic’ had sounded. Nor did the cry lessen in intensity as the months passed.”<sup>124</sup> These sentiments ensured that Hayes’ term would be tumultuous and some Democratic politicians would seek ways to expose of the wrongs they believed were committed in the electoral process.

#### The Potter Committee and Fears of the “Mexicanization” of the Government

In May of 1878 the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, adopted a resolution introduced by New York representative, Clarkson N. Potter, to investigate the alleged false and fraudulent electoral returns from Louisiana and Florida.<sup>125</sup> The

---

<sup>121</sup> *The Galaxy: A Magazine of Entertaining Reading* XXIII: 4 (April 1877). The editorial identifies Anglo-Saxons and Germans as “Teutonic.”

<sup>122</sup> James Ford Rhodes, *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1919), 1.

<sup>123</sup> *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, March 2, 1877.

<sup>124</sup> Haworth, *The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Presidential Election of 1876*, 306.

<sup>125</sup> See *Congressional Record*, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 3529.



Democrats hoped to associate the Republican administration with fraud and hoped to gain an advantage in upcoming elections. With the passage of what was termed “the Potter Resolution,” the Republican Congressional Committee responded with a statement to the American people accusing the House Democrats of using the investigation as a pretense to “lay the foundation for a revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office.”<sup>126</sup> The Republican Committee asserted that this was a new effort of the Democratic Party to “inaugurate anarchy and Mexicanize” the government by attacking the legitimacy of the title of the President linking the actions of the Democratic majority in the House to southerners who seceded in 1861.<sup>127</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Reprinted in *Appleton’s Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1878* New Series Volume III (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1885), 802-803. This statement was also reprinted or quoted by various newspapers. See for instance, *Auburn Morning News*, May 18, 1878; “Republican Dismay,” *The Evening Auburnian*, May 18, 1878; “Republican Address,” *Fort Wayne Daily Sentinel*, May 18, 1878; “The Revolutionists,” *The Oshkosh Daily Northwestern*, May 20, 1878; “Address of the Republican Congressional Committee to the Voters of the United States,” *Denver Daily Tribune*, May 21, 1878; “Address of the Republican Congressional Committee,” *Iowa State Reporter: Waterloo*, May 22, 1878; “The Crisis,” *The Indiana Progress*, May 23, 1878; “News of the Day,” *The Long Island Traveler*, May 23, 1878; *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, May 23, 1878; “The Democratic Plot,” *Gettysburg Star and Sentinel*, May 24, 1878. Several state parties made similar statements at their state conventions. See for instance, “The Republicans, What They Said and Did at Indianapolis,” *Sedalia Daily Democrat*, June 6, 1878; “Indiana Republicans Speak, Without Reserve,” *Utica Weekly Herald*, June 11, 1878; “Ohio Republicans,” *Wheeling Daily Register*, June 13, 1878; “Ohio Convention,” *The Carthage Republican and the Northern New Yorker*, June 18, 1878; “Ohio Republicans in Convention,” *The Richwood Gazette* [Ohio], June 20, 1878.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.* President Hayes viewed the proceedings as an attempt to lay the foundation for a revolution. In one entry in his diary he wrote, “It is another rebellion!” *Hayes: The Diary of a President, 1875-1881*, May 19, 1878, 142. Hayes’ Postmaster General David M. Key from Tennessee appealed to southerners in a widely quoted and cited statement. Key described the Resolution as an attempt to Mexicanize the nation, and appealed to Southerners to reject this action and to show their loyalty to the Union. See *Appleton’s Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1878*, 805-806. For coverage of Key’s statement see, “A Cabinet Officer to the People of the



Numerous Republican-leaning newspaper reporters and editorialists reiterated these charges, believing that the Potter Commissions represented a conspiracy against the government.<sup>128</sup> One Ohio small town Republican newspaper noted Mexico's history of unrest and accused the Democrats of preparing the way for a "like condition of revolution and anarchy in America."<sup>129</sup> Another editorial in a Cincinnati paper described the

---

South," *The Palladium*, May 29, 1878; "A Ringing Appeal to the Country," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, May 30, 1878; "The Investigation," *Wisconsin State Journal*, June 4, 1878; "The Investigation," *The Carthage Republican and the Northern New Yorker*, June 4, 1878; "The Revolutionists Agitation," *Utica Weekly Herald*, June 4, 1878; "The Real Design of the Plotters," *Iowa State Reporter Waterloo*, June 5, 1878; "Key's Key Note," *The Athens Messenger*, June 6, 1878; "Mr. Key's Appeal to the South," *Plattsburg Sentinel*, June 7, 1878; "The Potter Resolution Denounced," *The Indiana Progress*, June 13, 1878.

<sup>128</sup> One article stated that it appeared that the only goal of the commission was to seize the Presidency and Mexicanize the country. See "The Conspiracy to Seize the Presidency," *Decatur Weekly Republican*, May 30, 1878. Other articles critical of the feared Mexicanizing plans of the Commission include, "What the Democratic Conspirators are Doing for Their Constituents," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 15, 1878; "The Democratic Conspiracy," *Daily Kennebec Journal*, May 21, 1878; "Wisconsin Politics," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 11, 1878; "The Revolutionary Movement," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, June 17, 1878; "Passage of the Potter Resolution," *Petersburg Index-Appeal*, May 20, 1878; "The Democratic Conspiracy," *Roman Citizen* [Rome, NY], May 21, 1878; "The Democratic Conspiracy," *The Palladium*, May 23, 1878; "The Republican Party Growing in Strength," *The Janesville Gazette*, May 29, 1878; "Attitude of Southern Democrats," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 30, 1878; *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, May 30, 1878; "Interesting Interviews," *Iowa State Reporter: Waterloo*, June 5, 1878; "The Plain Duty of Patriots," *The Athens Messenger*, June 6, 1878; "Effects of the Potter Resolution," *Traveler Herald*, June 8, 1878; *Rochester Union and Advertiser*, June 18, 1878; "The 14 Democrats," *The Plattsburgh Sentinel*, June 21, 1878; *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 27, 1878; Samuel T. Spear, "The Presidential Title," *The Independent* (July 4, 1878); "Tilden Resolved on Revolution," *The Plaindealer* [St Lawrence, NY], August 15, 1878; "Zach Chandler," *Boulder County Courier*, September 27, 1878; *New Hampshire Sentinel*, July 1, 1880.

<sup>129</sup> *The Athens Messenger*, June 20, 1878. One article suggested that this attempt would not succeed. See "The Potter Resolutions," *Christian Union* (May 22, 1878). An article in *The Atlanta Daily Constitution* June 11, 1878, suggested that while the investigation had "Mexicanized" individuals, it remained to be seen whether it would

Democratic actions as “Mexican politics” which would degrade the U.S. to the position of Mexico,<sup>130</sup> while another quipped that revolutionists in Mexico might begin using Democratic tactics to overthrow their president.<sup>131</sup> An Iowa newspaper used a racial slur usually reserved for Mexicans and other “mixed race” peoples referring to Potter and his supporters as “Mexican greasers.”<sup>132</sup>

Democratic partisans answered charges that they were trying to turn the United States into “another Mexico.” An editorial in the independent *Philadelphia Times* defended Potter and the Democrats by asserting that Republicans had “Mexicanized” the government through fraud in the election of 1876, and further denied that finding the “truth” about the Republican actions represented any type of Mexicanization.<sup>133</sup> While some radicals in the Democratic Party hoped to use these revelations to affect a judicial

---

succeed in Mexicanizing the whole republic. Another just expected that the Committee would just make itself look ridiculous. See *Indiana Progress*, June 20, 1878.

<sup>130</sup> “Mexicanizing Politics,” *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, June 26, 1879.

<sup>131</sup> *Oswego Daily Times* (June 19, 1878). This was reprinted from the *Troy Times*. The *Cincinnati Commercial* described the creation of doubts on the title of the President as a “Mexican” tactic. See (May 20, 1878).

<sup>132</sup> *The Cedar Rapids Weekly Times*, June 6, 1878. Another article referred to Congress as the “present Mexicanizing and anarchy-breeding Congress. *The Athens Messenger*, June 13, 1878. See also “The Terrible Congress,” *Scribner’s Monthly* (September 1878); and discussion of this article in *The Boulder County Courier*, September 6, 1878. Several books deal with Anglo racial attitudes toward Mexican descent peoples by making the word “greaser” a part of the analysis. See Arnoldo De Leon, *They Called Them Greasers* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983) and Jerome R. Adams, *Greasers and Gringos: The Historical Roots of Anglo-Hispanic Prejudice* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2006).

<sup>133</sup> Reprinted in “Who are Mexicanizing us?” *Wheeling Daily Register*, June 4, 1878. For similar sentiments see “Judge Geddes, A Talk with the Democratic Candidate in the Boot District,” *Ohio Democrat*, August 23, 1878.

challenge of the Hayes' presidency, most did not go this far.<sup>134</sup> A little over a week after the Republican National Committee statement, Clarkson Potter responded to the Republican accusations by denying that there was a danger of revolution as a result of the investigation. He suggested that any results that came out of his committee would be using a legal remedy to correct wrongs, if there were some found to have been committed. He also answered the charge that he was seeking to Mexicanize the country, claiming that his investigation was evidence that the U.S. was not at the level of Mexico, because the Congress was using legal methods to determine the validity of the past election. This use of legal methods, in Potter's mind distinguished Americans from the disorder consistently prevalent in Mexico.<sup>135</sup>

Democratic partisans built on Potter's defense and denied the charge that the Commission was seeking to make the United States into "another Mexico."<sup>136</sup> One editorial sought to turn Republican criticism on its head by arguing that the United States was already Mexicanized as a result of the fraud that had allowed Hayes to be elected and that demexicanization would occur when the frauds are exposed and with the restoration

---

<sup>134</sup> Hoogenboom, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 71.

<sup>135</sup> *Appleton's Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1878*, 803-804.

<sup>136</sup> See for instance the *St Louis Advocate*, June 12, 1878. See also, *The Racine Argus*, June 6, 1878; "The Great Investigation," *The Ohio Democrat*, June 6, 1878; "The Republicans and the Frauds," *The Franklin Gazette*, May 24, 1878; "The Great Fraud, Curious Developments before the Potter Committee," *Hagerstown Mail* [MD], June 7, 1878.

of the “purity of republican institutions.”<sup>137</sup> These sentiments reflected Democratic views that the Republican Party had used, and might continue to use illegal means to continue in power despite the will of the U.S. electorate.

The meaning of the term Mexicanization had shifted since it had been frequently applied during the election controversy over a year earlier. The term had been associated with a general fear of revolution and associated with Mexico. In the summer of 1878 however, this term was associated with the tendency of groups in Mexico to overthrow the popularly elected government. An editorial in the *Chicago Daily Tribune* entitled “What Mexicanization Means” explained Mexicanization as the “premature and compulsory retirement of a President of Mexico” which seems certain to occur after every Mexican election.<sup>138</sup> The editorialist expanded this definition to describe Mexicanization as any project to overthrow a government using methods outside of the Constitution and accused Democrats of doing this.<sup>139</sup>

*The Nation* however had a different definition of “Mexicanization” in the context of political disputes in the United States. It suggested that “true Mexicanization” consisted of the belief among voters that the government can only be carried by one party, and if the other party gains power it ought to be resisted by force if necessary. The

---

<sup>137</sup> “The Grand Inquest,” *Petersburg Index-Appeal*, May 21, 1878. For similar sentiments see “Trying to Reduce the United States to the Condition of Mexico,” *Ohio Democrat*, December 21, 1876.

<sup>138</sup> “What ‘Mexicanization’ Means,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 25, 1878. For similar sentiments see “Mexicanizing the Government,” *Plattsburgh Sentinel*, June 7, 1878, reprinted from the *New York Herald*.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.* For similar fears see discussion in *The Brooklyn Eagle*, May 29, 1878.

editorial suggested that this was the philosophy of the Democratic Party in the secession crisis in 1860, and during the present crisis. The editorial expressed the opinion that Mexicanization was not civil war, nor any “overt act whatever; it is a state of mind, a way of looking at political affairs, which makes civil war always possible and prevents all internal reform.”<sup>140</sup> *The Nation* went on to ridicule the idea that the Democratic investigation was Mexicanization, suggesting that this was “Mexican talk” not Anglo-Saxon talk. The editorial speculated that the Republicans were trying to frighten the people, but in doing so the Republicans were Mexicanizing the people by causing them to fear the election of the Democrats.<sup>141</sup> As such, both parties were equally guilty of “Mexicanizing” the United States and in doing so both had put the nation’s political process in serious jeopardy.

Despite the fact that the eleven seats on the Potter Committee were filled by Hayes’ enemies, the results turned out different from the expectations of Potter and his allies. Beginning its work on June 1, 1878, the Commission unified the Republican Party, divided the Democratic Party and public opinion swung in support of the President. Unimpressive testimony, the firmness of Hayes, and public opposition to the work of the Committee undermined the goals of those Democrats who sought to unseat Hayes.

---

<sup>140</sup> ““Mexicanization,”” *The Nation* (June 13, 1878): 383. The newspaper of the American colony in Mexico disagreed with this assessment of Mexico instead emphasizing the progress in Mexico and the lack of disturbances in the 1880 election. See “Mexicanizing American Institutions,” *The Two Republics*, December 5, 1880.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 384. The article suggested that the Democrats should be attacked in the minds of the people, “on the assumption that the majority desire good, orderly, and progressive government and by a party which is itself united, and has a programme of its own which commends itself to the intelligence and social aims and ambitions of the industrious classes” (384).

Moderate Democrats sided with Republicans and passed resolutions expressing the opinion that neither Congress nor the Courts could reverse the certification of Hayes as President. The Potter Committee was unable to find the smoking gun to charge Hayes with fraud, and was pressured to extend the work of the Committee to investigate allegations that the Tilden campaign had engaged in bribery, which served to taint the Democratic Party and undermined the work of the Committee.<sup>142</sup>

Undaunted, Democratic members of the Committee published a final report which accused Republican officials of engaging in unprecedented fraud, which had resulted in President Hayes occupying his position based on fraudulent and false pretenses.<sup>143</sup> The conclusion of the majority opinion stated unequivocally that the Democratic candidates “Samuel J. Tilden and Thomas A. Hendricks, were and Rutherford B. Hayes and William A. Wheeler were not, the real choice of a majority of the electors duly appointed by the several States and of the persons who exercised and were entitled to the right of suffrage at the last general election in the United States.”<sup>144</sup> As such the Democratic members of the Committee implied that the Republican Party mechanisms had thwarted the will of the people and in so doing had endangered the Republic.

---

<sup>142</sup> Hoogenboom, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 73-74; Morgan, *From Hayes to McKinley: National Party Politics*, 55.

<sup>143</sup> United States Congress, House, *Investigation of Alleged Frauds in the Late Presidential Election*, House Report 140, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Session, 1879: 2, 10.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 67. In the end the Potter Committee investigation only served to reinforced what most Democrats and Republicans “already believed- that their party won the presidency in 1876.” Frank P. Vazzano, “The Louisiana Question Resurrected: The Potter Commission and the Election of 1876,” *Louisiana History* 16:1 (Winter 1975): 57.

### Conclusion

The disputed election continued to have salience as an election issue in the 1878 and to a lesser extent the 1880 campaigns as both parties used it as a campaign issue. The *Republican Campaign Textbook for 1878* included a chapter entitled “The Revolutionary Acts and Purposes of the Democratic Party,” which included many of the same themes originally published in earlier statements, detailing the danger of a Mexicanization of the country.<sup>145</sup> Some Democratic supporters responded with similar accusations.<sup>146</sup> In the years after the 1880 the use of the term Mexicanization in a political context declined, but would occasionally be used to describe fears or accusations of electoral fraud,<sup>147</sup> and would also be used to describe attempts to unseat elected officials who were rightly

---

<sup>145</sup> *Republican Campaign Textbook for 1878* (Washington D.C.: Republican Congressional Committee, 1878). See also, *The Athens Messenger*, June 6, 1878; “Republican Senatorial Convention,” *The Portsmouth Times*, August 9, 1879; “Taking the Responsibility,” *New York Times*, March 15, 1880; “Hancock’s Coup de Mexico,” *Albany Evening Journal*, July 12, 1880; “Miscellaneous Items,” *The Palladium*, July 15, 1880.

<sup>146</sup> “Our Washington Letter,” *Ohio Democrat*, June 27, 1878; *The Racine Argus*, April 22, 1880.

<sup>147</sup> See for example, “Will They Dare?” *Boston Evening Journal*, November 18, 1879; “Maine vs. Mexico,” *Boston Daily Globe*, January 25, 1880; “Are the Organs Foolish, or Do They Think the People Fools?” *Weekly Eastern Argus*, August 19, 1880; *The Oshkosh Daily Northwestern*, April 1, 1880; “Brooklyn Speech, 1880,” *Political Speeches of Robert G. Ingersoll* (New York: C.P. Farrell, 1914), 358; “Republican Confession that the Presidency Was Stolen in 1876,” *The Ogdensburg Advance*, October 19, 1882; “Revolutionary,” *The Galveston Daily News*, November 11, 1884; Ourdan Sounds the Key Note for the Hoosiers,” *The Fort Wayne Sentinel*, September 28, 1886; “Indiana Democrats,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, January 15, 1887; “The Outlook,” *Christian Union* (December 5, 1891); *The Campaign Textbook of the Democratic Party for the Presidential Election of 1892* (New York: Democratic National Committee, 1892), 190; “Trying to Mexicanize Chicago,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 5, 1893; *Worth County Index* [Northwood, Iowa], May 21, 1903; “Would Adopt the Slogan of 1876,” *The Evening Independent* [Massillon, Ohio], July 14, 1910.



elected.<sup>148</sup> This term also was sometimes used to describe a more vague lack of respect for law and order, the Constitution, or established political norms in the United States.<sup>149</sup>

While Republican candidates would still “wave the bloody shirt” in order to gain votes from former Union soldiers, and others in the North, in succeeding elections, sectional issues would lose their salience as the U.S. moved away from the Civil War, and issues between workers and capital, economic fears, as well as agrarian discontent, took center stage.<sup>150</sup> Likewise as the Díaz regime consolidated its power and welcomed

---

<sup>148</sup> *Journal of the Senate of the State of Minnesota, Sitting as a High Court of Impeachment, for the Trial of Hon. E. St. Julien Cox, Judge of the Ninth Judicial District* Volume III (St Paul: Printing House O. G. Miller, 1882), 2894-2895; Frank a. Flower, *Life of Matthew Hale Carpenter* (Madison, WI: David Atwood and Co, 1884), 421; *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, April 9, 1880; “The Outlook,” *The Christian Union* (November 29, 1888); “The New Rebellion,” *Newark Daily Advocate*, July 2, 1890; *The Daily Times* [New Brunswick, NJ], December 4, 1891; *Newark Daily Advocate*, December 8, 1891; “And So it Will Continue,” *Decatur Daily Review*, July 27, 1892. Certain histories and biographies also referred to past events such as the Civil War, the actions of the Democratic Party during the war or the impeachment of Andrew Johnson. See for instance, “Senator Conkling at Tippecanoe,” *Potsdam Courier Freeman*, October 21, 1880; John Robert Irelan, *The Republic or a History of the United States of America in the Administrations from the Monarchic Colonial Days to the Present Times Volume XVII* (Chicago: Fairbanks and Palmer Publishing Co, 1888), 551; John Witherspoon DuBose, *The Life and Times of William Loundes Yancey, A History of Political Parties in the United States, from 1834 to 1864: Especially as to the Origin of the Confederate States* (Birmingham, AL: Roberts & Son, 1892), 580; “A New England College in the West,” *The New England Magazine* New Series XVIII: 4 (June 1898): 474; Edward H. Stiles, “General Fitz Henry Warren,” *Annals of Iowa* 3<sup>rd</sup> Series VI: 7 (October 1901): 483; Henry Greenleaf Pearson, *The Life of John A. Andrew Governor of Massachusetts, 1861-1865* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co, 1904), 321; Carl Schurz, “Reminiscences of a Long Life” *McClure’s Magazine* Second Series XXVIII: 5 (March 1907): 458.

<sup>149</sup> “Who Wants the Show?” *The Rolla New Era*, March 25, 1893; Alfred Young, “The Coming Contest-Have Catholics a Political Enemy?” *The Catholic World* LVIII (February 1894): 697; *Hamilton Evening Democrat*, March 25, 1902; “Senator Overman Chairman,” *Nebraska State Journal*, July 15, 1910.

<sup>150</sup> Barney, *Battleground of the Republic*, 303.



U.S. capital into Mexico, American observers began to reassess Mexico in light of the perceived order and stability that he seemed to have brought to Mexico. The next chapter discusses the beginnings of U.S. economic expansion into Mexico and the Mexican government campaign to rehabilitate Mexico's image in the United States as a first step to promote U.S. investment into Mexico.

## CHAPTER FOUR: THE BEGINNINGS OF U.S. ECONOMIC EXPANSION INTO MEXICO, 1876-1882

By 1876 much of the discourses in the United States regarding Mexico reflected deep disillusionment with Mexico and the Mexican people. On several occasions the U.S. press and American diplomats had expressed optimism for the prospects of stability under a republican government in Mexico, economic prosperity, and increased trade between the two countries, only to be disappointed with a reoccurrence of political instability. Likewise by the mid-1870s Protestant hopes for a wide-scale conversion of Mexico to Protestantism, through the work of American missionaries had dimmed. The Díaz-led revolution in 1876 seemed to be evidence that the character of the Mexican people had not changed dramatically. The preceding chapter reflects this disillusionment as Mexico was used as a trope in the public sphere to represent anarchy, revolution, and disorder in political discourse in the United States. When Americans of all political stripes attacked their opponents by suggesting that they were acting to “Mexicanize” the United States, it was clear what they were referring to. Their opponents might deny that they were “Mexicanizers,” or make counter-“Mexicanization” claims, and very few if any Americans were prepared to defend Mexico and suggest that these terms were unfair or inaccurate portrayals of Mexico or the Mexican people. U.S. negative views of Mexico were further exacerbated by border instability, which most Americans blamed on Mexico. Unrest in the border region appeared to be dramatic evidence of the inability of the Mexican government to provide protection for life and property in that country, as well as general political stability.

The years between 1876 and 1882 served as a bridge between the antebellum discourses of U.S. mission to Mexico, which most often involved discussions of formal annexation of Mexican territory, or formal protectorates of Mexican territory, and later congratulatory discussions lauding the progress and modernization brought on by the transfer of American methods, ideas and citizens later in the nineteenth century. After the end of the U.S. Civil War, American capitalists began to invest into Mexico, though because of the need for capital for the reconstruction of the United States, the number of capital invested was small. At this point ideas about the U.S. mission to Mexico were not well-developed. By the mid-1870s, American capitalists began to look abroad for opportunities for trade and investment, and because of its geographic proximity and untapped resources Mexico seemed to be a logical choice. While sometimes vaguely discussing providence and its mission to the world in general or Mexico in particular, most U.S. discussions revolved around the abundance of Mexican resources and potential profits to be made from Mexican investments, rather than a mission to remake Mexico in the U.S. image. The recent history of unrest and revolutions left many U.S. investors, U.S. diplomats and commentators in the press unconvinced that Mexico would be a suitable place for U.S. economic expansion. Because of long-standing negative perceptions of Mexico, and the Mexican people, American investors and other analysts expected Mexico to prove it was worthy of U.S. capital and further U.S. attention.

Díaz and Mexican officials, particularly Manuel Maria de Zamacona, the Mexican Minister to the United States, worked to prove that Mexico was deserving of U.S. investment. Domestically Díaz defeated challenges to his regime, consolidated his power, transferred troops to the border region to prevent or punish cross-border raids. Díaz also

welcomed U.S. capital to Mexico in the form of concessions, tax breaks, and enhanced police protection coupled with guarantees for the safety of American and their capital in Mexico. At the same time Mexican officials discerned the importance of changing Mexico's image in the United States to remove the stigma of past disorder and instability. Díaz successfully employed diplomatic agents, particularly Manuel Maria de Zamacona, the Mexican Minister to the United States, and friendly U.S. promoters who supported the image of a stable Mexico that welcomed U.S. investment which helped to dramatically increase U.S. investment into Mexico. Díaz and Zamacona in their public dealings with the U.S. appealed to American views of its mission to the world to show that they understood, and embraced this mission whatever concerns they may have privately had about U.S. imperialism. By 1882 Mexican officials were successful in promoting an image of Mexico as a modernizing country and this image of Mexico was a powerful counter to past perceptions of instability and revolution that had been the dominate image of Mexico in the United States. This however also reveals the unequal nature of the U.S.-Mexico relations, which was an fundamental to informal imperialism. U.S. diplomats and elected officials retained for themselves the power to judge whether Mexico had lived up to the standards that they had laid out. It was only after Mexico had proven itself worthy that the U.S. government would treat Mexico as an equal in its diplomatic relations, and would U.S. capital dramatically increase its expansion into Mexico.

#### Mexican Revolts and Border Raids

In 1876 Antonio Garcia Cubas, Mexico's leading geographer and cartographer, wrote one of many booster works to promote Mexico as a place for economic investment

and foreign immigration. His work was then translated into English and distributed in the United States. In the beginning of the text, Cubas stated that his goal was to correct the “wrong impressions” of previous writers, who “with evil intent or with the desire of acquiring notoriety,” had written inaccurate and sensational accounts of Mexico.<sup>1</sup> Cubas portrayed Mexico as a place of “unrivalled geographical position” between the two great oceans with immense natural resources. Mexico, Cubas asserted, was “one of the choicest countries” in the world for immigration with much unexplored “fountains of wealth.” Cubas hoped that his book would lead the way for other works, written by Mexicans “devoted to the prosperity of the Republic,” which would lead to foreign investment and immigrants to Mexico, thus contributing to the development of the Mexican nation.<sup>2</sup>

The job of Cubas and others was made more difficult as a result of continuing issues of disorder and frequent revolutions, and Mexican officials had to confront lingering doubts from foreigners about the stability of the country in their quest to entice foreign capital and immigration.<sup>3</sup> While there had been frequent local disturbances and

---

<sup>1</sup> Antonio Garcia Cubas, *The Republic of Mexico in 1876*, trans. George F. Henderson (Mexico: “La Esparanza” Printing Office, 1876), NP, 15. For more discussion of the career and writings of Garcia Cubas see Raymond B. Craib, *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004), 27-34; María Del Carmen Collado, “Antonio García Cubas,” *Historiografía Mexicana Volumen IV: En Busca de un Discurso Integrador de la Nación, 1848-1884*, ed. Juan A. Ortega y Medina and Rosa Camelo (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico, 1996), 430-432.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, NP. For more on the Mexican colonization efforts see Moisés González Navarro, *Los Extranjeros en México y Los Mexicanos en El Extranjero, 1821-1970* Volume II (México: El Colegio de México, 1993), 51-71.

<sup>3</sup> As a way to entice foreign investment, Mexico participated in the 1876 Philadelphia Expedition. See *Philadelphia International Exhibition, 1876, Mexican Section* (Philadelphia: Dan F. Gillin, Printer, 1876).

several aborted national scale revolutions, the Restored Republic was free from revolutionary change of governments.<sup>4</sup> However in 1876 Porfirio Díaz successfully revolted against the legitimate constitutional government of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada. After Díaz gained military control of the Mexican capital and had pacified most of the country, his actions were given a measure of legitimacy by his victory in national presidential elections in 1877. In his first address to the Mexican Congress on September 19, 1877 Díaz emphasized that Mexico was entering an “epoch of regeneration and of prosperity for the Republic,” and that the previous “irregular period” associated with his revolution had now ended.<sup>5</sup>

Most American commentators were much less confident of the prospects for stability in Mexico. As discussed in the previous chapter, U.S. press analysis of the revolution reflected a general agreement that the Díaz revolution was just the latest episode in a seemingly Mexican compulsion for revolt, disorder and anarchy.<sup>6</sup> The U.S. consul in Baja California, Eugene Gillespie, noted that a review of reports from various consulates throughout Mexico over the previous few years showed the “frequency of hope” that Mexico might achieve peace and harmony,” but these hopes continued to be

---

<sup>4</sup> This included an unsuccessful Díaz revolt against Juárez in 1872.

<sup>5</sup> “Speech of the President of Mexico on the Opening of Congress,” September 19, 1877, *British and Foreign State Papers, 1876-1877* Volume LXVIII (London: William Ridgway, 1884), 1309-1310.

<sup>6</sup> See for instance, “*St Louis Globe-Democrat*, March 25, 1876; “The Mexican Revolution,” *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, April 7, 1876; “Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (May 18, 1876); “Revolution in Mexico,” *Advocate of Peace* (May 1876); *New York Evangelist* (April 6, 1876); “A Republic in Chaos,” *New York Times*, January 30, 1877; *Prairie Farmer* (August 4, 1877). For later discussions of this theme see, *The Fort Wayne Daily Gazette*, November 27, 1879; *The Oshkosh Daily Northwestern*, January 16, 1880; *The Dubuque Herald*, June 19, 1880.

disappointed.<sup>7</sup> On several occasions previously, notably after the victory of the Liberal forces in the Wars of the Reform in early 1861, and the end of the French Intervention in 1867, Americans had expressed optimism for the future of Mexico only to be disappointed by fresh outbreaks of political unrest.

The Grant administration attempted to use the issue of recognition as a way to gain diplomatic leverage in issues with the Mexican government including border raids, compensation for Indian raids on U.S. soil from tribes residing in Mexico, and the abolition of the Mexican duty-free zone.<sup>8</sup> This represented a break with past U.S. diplomatic precedents since during the nineteenth century the United States had generally recognized revolutionary regimes in Mexico and other parts of Latin America once they had established control of the nation and had indicated that they would be willing and able to meet their international obligations.<sup>9</sup> When Rutherford B. Hayes took over the U.S. presidency his administration took an even stronger line against the Díaz

---

<sup>7</sup> Eugene Gillespie, "San Jose and Cabo San Lucas," *Report Upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1877* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 744. Despite this fact Gillespie saw reasons to be optimistic and expressed hope for the future peace and stability of Mexico.

<sup>8</sup> Jürgen Buchenau, *In the Shadow of the Giant: The Making of Mexico's Central America Policy, 1876-1930* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1996), 25.

<sup>9</sup> Friedrich Katz, "Liberal Republic and the Porfiriato, 1867-1910," *Mexico since Independence*, ed. Leslie Bethell (Cambridge University Press, 1991), 68. One of the architects of the U.S. policy regarding recognition was Frederick W. Seward the Assistant Secretary of State. Seward suggested that the Díaz government would need to show that the Mexican people approved of his election, that the administration possessed the stability to endure, and would comply with international rules and obligations of treaties. See Frederick W. Seward, *Reminiscences of a War-time Statesman and Diplomat, 1830-1915* (New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916), 436-437.

government.<sup>10</sup> For his part Díaz was very clear that his government would not accept concessions that would “wound the dignity or the rights of Mexico” in order to gain recognition.<sup>11</sup> As a result the first years of the Díaz regime were characterized by tension and difficulties with the United States government.<sup>12</sup>

Of these outstanding issues, by far the most important was the issue of border unrest. In 1876 the border areas in both countries were isolated from their respective national governments and economies as well as from each other. Likewise each national government had difficulty asserting its authority in this borderlands since the establishment of the formal border after the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848.<sup>13</sup> This would be especially problematic for the Mexican government, as officials

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 25; Daniel Cosío Villegas, *The United States Versus Porfirio Díaz* trans. Nettie Lee Benson (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963), 28, 32; C. Ignacio L. Vallarta, *Memoria Que en Cumplimiento Del Precepto Constitucional Presento Al Congreso De La Unión En El Primer Periodo De Sus Sesiones* (México: Imprenta de Gonzalo A. Esteva, 1878), xi. This was also discussed in several news stories. See for instance, *The Weekly Arizona Miner*, July 20, 1877; “Recognition of Díaz,” *Washington Post*, January 7, 1878. In an interview with a *Chicago Times* correspondent Díaz discussed his hopes for recognition from the United States, but stated that the nation would not accept conditions that offended the national dignity in order to get it. See reprint in “A Talk with Díaz,” *Daily Arkansas Gazette*, January 23, 1878.

<sup>11</sup> “Speech of the President of Mexico on the Opening of Congress,” September 19, 1877, *British and Foreign State Papers, 1876-1877*, 1310.

<sup>12</sup> Paolo Riguzzi, “John W. Foster,” *En el nombre del Destino Manifesto: Guía de Ministros y Embajadores de Estados Unidos en México, 1825-1993*, ed. Ana Rosa Suárez Argüello (México: Instituto Mora, 1998), 149; Juan Mora-Torres, *The Making of the Mexican Border* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 56.

<sup>13</sup> Mora-Torres, *The Making of the Mexican Border*, 6. In Article 11 of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo the United States had agreed to assume responsibility for preventing Indian raids from Texas into Mexico. Very shortly thereafter the U.S. government found it was unprepared to honor this obligation and was released from this responsibility as part of the provisions of the Gadsden Treaty, which ceded a portion of the border area by Arizona to the United States. See Joseph E. Chance, *José María de Jesús*



were often opposed by regional elites protecting their autonomy, who also were frequently were themselves involved in trade in contraband and cattle rustling.<sup>14</sup> During much of the nineteenth century, neither the Mexican nor the U.S. government was entirely successful in extending state power in the Southwestern borderlands, and the border itself was frequently only an illusion as peoples from both nations crossed at will.<sup>15</sup>

Each government blamed the other for their respective inability to prevent Indian raids as different groups of Indians crossed the border to conduct raids from both sides of the international border.<sup>16</sup> At various times in the pre-Civil War period, border raiding had been particularly widespread, coupled with resistance from ethnic Mexicans from both sides of the border who resisted the loss of lands, and protested their treatment by Anglo-Americans, such as those revolts led by Juan Cortina.<sup>17</sup> While border disturbances abated during the Civil War, they increased during the post-war period.<sup>18</sup> Bands of Apaches continued to raid from both sides of the border and the Kickapoos in Northern

---

*Carvaja: The Life and Times of a Mexican Revolutionary* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2006), 76-81.

<sup>14</sup> Richard W. House, *Frontier on the Rio Grande: A Political Geography of Development and Social Deprivation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 33.

<sup>15</sup> Caballero, *evolución de la frontera norte*, 70.

<sup>16</sup> Shelly Bowen Hatfield, *Chasing Shadows: Indians Along the United States-Mexico Border, 1876-1911* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), 17.

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of the “Cortina War” and other similar instances sometimes referred to as “brushfire wars,” see Manuel Callahan, “Mexican Border Troubles: Social War, Settler Colonialism and the Production of Frontier Discourses, 1848-1880.” PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2003.

<sup>18</sup> Callahan, “Mexican Border Troubles,” 117.

Mexico raided into Texas and fled back to their villages.<sup>19</sup> The Apaches in particular viewed the border as an artificial construct, since their traditional lands had always encompassed territory on both sides of the border.<sup>20</sup>

In a message to Congress in December 1877 Hayes told the country that recognition was being deferred by the problems on the border.<sup>21</sup> Politicians and citizen groups from Texas were particularly vocal against the border raids and blamed both the U.S. and the Mexican governments.<sup>22</sup> In 1876 a state Constitutional Convention convened for the purpose of asking the U.S. Congress to take action on border problems, accusing the Mexican government of making no attempt to restrain its citizens. The

---

<sup>19</sup> By 1876 most of the southern Plains Indian resistance had ended with the surrender of the Comanche chief Quannah Parker in 1875 ending what was known as the Red River War. The Mexican Kickapoo tribes had migrated from Indian territory shortly after 1848 and the Mexican government allowed them to create colonies in Northern Mexico on the condition that they be prepared to defend against raids from Comanche, Apache and other tribes that raided into Mexico. The Mexican government hoped that the Kickapoo would act as a buffer for Mexican settlements. The Kickapoo also raided ranches and farms in Texas. See Felipe A. Latorre & Dolores L. Latorre, *The Mexican Kickapoo Indians* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1976), 14-22.

<sup>20</sup> Hatfield, *Chasing Shadows*, 15.

<sup>21</sup> Hayes expressed his hope that the Mexican government would have the “disposition and the power to prevent and punish such unlawful invasions and depredations.” See “Message to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Forty-Fifth Congress,” December 3, 1877 *Letters and Messages of Rutherford B. Hayes, President of the United States, Together with Letter of Acceptance and Inaugural Address* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881), 85.

<sup>22</sup> Michael Gordon Webster, “Texan Manifest Destiny and the Mexican Border Conflict, 1865-1880.” PhD diss. Indiana University, 1972. 131. For a partial list of these raids see “Memoranda of reports received in the Office of the Adjutant-General since March 30, 1875, showing raids into Texas from Mexican territory,” November 22, 1877, *Texas Testimony Taken by the Committee on Military Affairs in Relation to the Texas Border Troubles* House of Representatives No. 64, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., January 12, 1878 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 30-32.

report from the convention suggested that “a reign of terror” existed on the frontier region of Texas and suggested that continued raids threatened the “supremacy” of “American settlers” in Texas. The Texans declared that Mexican bandits were attempting a “reconquest” of the region and stated that Americans now were involved in a battle between “civilization and savagery.”<sup>23</sup> As such the Texans linked the border troubles with the larger theme of Mexicans and Latin Americans being uncivilized as opposed to the civilized Americans, using these themes to criticize ethnic Mexicans on both sides of the border.<sup>24</sup>

The U.S. government blamed Mexico for the problems in the border region and wanted Mexican officials to allow U.S. troops to cross the border in pursuit of Indians and bandits who had committed raids or other deprecations on the U.S. side of the border.<sup>25</sup> The diplomatic position of the Mexican government was that Mexico needed to

---

<sup>23</sup> *Depredations on the Texas Frontier. Resolutions and Memorial of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Texas Asking the Attention of Congress to the Condition of Texas frontiers, and praying compensation for losses sustained by the People of Texas, by reason of the incursion of Indians and Mexicans, and reimbursement for sums of money expended by that State in defending the frontier.* House Miscellaneous Document No. 37, 44<sup>th</sup> Congress 1<sup>st</sup> Sess., January 12, 1876 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876), 3. See also Appendix A, No. 9, April 24, 1875, *Texas Frontier Troubles* House of Representatives No. 343, 44<sup>th</sup> Congress 1<sup>st</sup> Sess., February 29, 1876 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876), 74. Earlier the legislature of the state of Texas had passed a resolution requesting that its representatives in Washington seek to pass laws and appropriations to secure better protection of the border. See Joint Resolution No. 14, March 13, 1875, *General Laws of the State of Texas Passed at the Second Session of the Fourteenth Legislature* (Houston: A.C. Gray State Printing, 1875), 200-201.

<sup>24</sup> For more on this theme see Frederick Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1992).

<sup>25</sup> Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State in the Grant Administration had been more understanding to the joint problems that both nations faced in policing the border. See his

be treated as an equal of the United States in its diplomatic dealings, so any agreement of this nature would have to be reciprocal by allowing Mexican troops to cross into the United States in pursuit of raiders and Indians, something the United States was unwilling to accept since they did not consider Mexico an equal in the international arena. While U.S. troops did occasionally cross the border in pursuit of bandits or Indians, such actions were not the official policy of the United States government.<sup>26</sup> This changed on June 1, 1877, when President Hayes gave the army commander in Texas, General Edward O.C. Ord, the authority to use his discretion to cross the border into Mexico in pursuit of bandits and Indians raiding in the United States.<sup>27</sup> Many U.S. newspapers speculated that such action was necessary because Mexico either was unwilling or unable to control its citizens.<sup>28</sup> The *Chicago Daily Tribune* emphatically stated, “These border raids must

---

communication to the Mexican government, Fish to Mariscal, March 18, 1875, *Notes to the Mexican Legation in the United States, 1834-1906* RG 59, Microfilm M99, Reel 77.

<sup>26</sup> For an overview of these crossings see Secretaria de Estado y Del Despacio de Relaciones Exteriores, August 18, 1877, *Correspondencia Diplomática Relativa A Las Invasiones Del Territorio Mexicano Por Fuerzas De Los Estados-Unidos De 1873 A 1877* (México: Imprenta de Ignacio Cumplido, 1878), 3-13; Gastón García Cantú, *Las invasiones norteamericanas en México Segunda Edición* (México: Ediciones Era, 1974), 217-219.

<sup>27</sup> Secretary of War to General Sherman, June 1, 1877, *Report and Accompanying Documents of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Relations of the United States with Mexico* House of Representatives No. 701, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., April 25, 1878 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 241; *Report of the Secretary of War for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1877* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1877), XIV. Earlier a Congressional Committee had suggested that U.S. forces in Texas be given this authority. See *Texas Frontier Troubles*, XIII. This order was also discussed by President Hayes in his message to Congress. See “Message to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Forty-Fifth Congress,” December 3, 1877 *Letters and Messages of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 90-91.

<sup>28</sup> *St Louis Globe Democrat*, April 6, 1876; *Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture* (July 6, 1876); “The United States and Mexico,” *Georgia*

stop. As Mexico cannot stop them, the United States will, and all other considerations must give way to this accomplishment.”<sup>29</sup> A Brooklyn newspaper disparagingly stated that few Americans would oppose chasing the “greasers” across the border until they are caught.<sup>30</sup> Epitomizing the patronizing views of many to Mexico, the *Boston Daily Globe* suggested that it was time for “Mexico to be Stood up and Talked to,” seemingly as one would speak to a misbehaving child.<sup>31</sup>

Official statements from the U.S. government expressed the belief that this action was necessary because the Mexican government was unable to control the situation on the border where its authority was only nominal.<sup>32</sup> One U.S. congressional report on the

---

*Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger*, July 9, 1876; *Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture*, July 14, 1877; *The Independent* (July 19, 1877); *The Independent* (August 23, 1877); “Dealings with Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, July 13, 1878. This idea was cited by President Hayes as well. See Charles R. Williams, *The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes* Volume II (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914), 210.

<sup>29</sup> “Our Mexican Policy,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 23, 1878.

<sup>30</sup> “Matters Mexican,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, June 9, 1877.

<sup>31</sup> “The Mexican Border Raids,” *Boston Daily Globe*, May 9, 1877.

<sup>32</sup> *Report of the Secretary of War for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1877* (Washington: Governmental Printing Office, 1877), XIV; Report, *Texas Frontier Troubles*, VII; Examination of General E.O.C. Ord, *Texas Frontier Troubles*, 33; Augur to Sheridan, Appendix A, No. 5, March 30, 1875, *Texas Frontier Troubles*, 70-71. At the same time the governors of the Northern Mexican states of Chihuahua and Coahuila protested attacks from U.S. Indians. See Hatfield, 29. In a conversation with John W. Foster, the U.S. Minister to Mexico, Ignacio Vallarta, the Mexican Foreign Minister, stated that when Mexican officials first saw the substance of the order they refused to believe that it was accurate. This was because they had trouble believing that the United States government would “manifest such a hostile and aggressive attitude toward Mexico.” See Foster to Evarts, June 20, 1877, *Foreign Relations of the United States 1877* [Hereafter cited as *FRUS*] (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), 410. For similar sentiments see also Ignacio Mariscal, “Memorandum,” June 7, 1877, *Cuestión Americana: Negocios diplomáticos con los Estados Unidos; notas y*

border situation defined the issue as one in which the Mexican government was too weak to pacify the border region while at the same time the Mexican people were too proud to allow the Mexican government to allow the United States to intervene.<sup>33</sup> U.S. diplomats interpreted conversations with Mexican officials to support their view of the inability of the Mexican government to prevent these raids.<sup>34</sup> Díaz however, in an address to the Mexican Congress disputed this assertion, citing the number of raids coming from the United States and the inability of the United States to prevent filibusters and Díaz opponents from using the border to attack Mexican territory. He also was highly critical of the Ord Order describing it as an assault on the sovereignty of Mexico.<sup>35</sup>

---

*documentos relativos* ed. Oficial (Guadalajara: Banda, 1878), 138-142. Foster in his memoirs described the strong intensity of the feelings of Vallarta in this interview. See John W. Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs* Volume I (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1909), 92. Vallarta's communication embodied Mexican concerns about protecting its sovereignty at the same time that the nation be treated as an equal. *Ibid.*, 410-411. The Mexican government also expressed similar sentiments in an order from the Mexican Minister of War. See Pedro Ogazon, "Order of the Mexican Minister of War," in *FRUS 1877*, 417-418; Pedro Ogazon, "Secretaria de Estado y del Despacho de Guerra y Marina," *Cuestión Americana: Negocios diplomáticos con los Estados Unidos: notas y documentos relativos* ed. Oficial (Guadalajara: Banda, 1878), 128-133. Vallarta expressed similar themes in an interview with a correspondent from the *New York World*. See reprint in *St Louis Globe Democrat*, February 7, 1878.

<sup>33</sup> "Relations of the United States with Mexico," *Report and Accompanying Documents of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Relations of the United States with Mexico* House of Representative No. 701, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2nd Sess., April 25, 1878 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), XI.

<sup>34</sup> Foster to Fish, June 26, 1875, *Texas Frontier Troubles*, 157-159. Also suggested in "Our Relations with Mexico," *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, December 29, 1878.

<sup>35</sup> "El General Díaz, Al Abrir el 9<sup>th</sup> Congreso El Primer Período Del Primer Año De Sesiones, En 16 De Septiembre De 1878," in *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano: Un Siglo de Relaciones Internacionales de México (A Través de los Mensajes Presidenciales)* edited by Genaro Estrada (México: Publicaciones de la Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 1935), 123.

By 1878 many U.S. observers acknowledged that the Díaz government had made a priority of pacifying the border, but once again suggested that it was not able to do so successfully.<sup>36</sup> General Ord, the U.S. commander in south Texas expressed his opinion that despite the good intentions of the Mexican government, border feuds, and the “unrestrainable character” of Mexicans in the border region, made it necessary to take uncommon measures that would not be acceptable in a “well-ordered community.”<sup>37</sup>

Soon after the order was given, U.S. forces entered Mexico in pursuit of Indians who had been raiding in the United States. These actions were denounced by the Mexican government and Mexican press as an invasion of Mexican territory and an outrage against Mexican sovereignty.<sup>38</sup> The press in both nations discussed the possibility of war, and drew parallels between the situation and the outbreak of war in 1846 with one

---

<sup>36</sup> *Testimony Taken by the Committee of Military Affairs*, 10, 111, 177.

<sup>37</sup> Annual Report of General Ord, October 1, 1877, *Testimony Taken by the Committee of Military Affairs*, 15. The Mexican government responded to U.S. criticisms in several ways. One was to emphasize that the problem on the border were mutual and that raids came from the U.S. side of the border as well. See for instance the *Report of the Committee of Investigation Sent in 1873 by the Mexican Government to the Frontier of Texas. Translated from the Official Edition Made in Mexico* (New York: Baker & Godwin, Printers, 1875), 33, 71; I.L. Vallarta, “Memorandum of the replies given by the minister of foreign affairs to the points made by his excellency the minister plenipotentiary of the United States in the conferences had between them and this department,” June 20, 1877, *Texas Testimony*, 307. Mexican authorities also reported that the Texan claims of damages from cattle stealing and other raids were highly inflated. See *Report of the Committee of Investigation*, iv.

<sup>38</sup> Foster to Evarts, January 17, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 540; Mata to Foster, July 12, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 556-557. Some in the Mexican press criticized the Mexican government for not protesting enough against these incursions. See Foster to Evarts, August 6, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 570.



national magazine asserting that Mexico gave the United States sufficient pretext for war about once a month.<sup>39</sup>

Americans viewed border raids as an affront to their national honor. One particularly vocal press critic of Mexico declared that an army should be sent to Mexico “to avenge the repeated insults” that the U.S. had been subjected to. The editorial questioned the toughness of the administration and accused the U.S. government of “cowardice.”<sup>40</sup> Another article in a major St Louis paper went further by questioning the “manliness” of the U.S. government and suggested that U.S. manhood was at stake with

---

<sup>39</sup> “Is Universal Suffrage a Failure?” *The Atlantic Monthly* (January 1879): 72. For discussion of potential war see Cosío Villegas, 91-92; Janice Lee Jaynes, “‘Strangers to Each Other’: The American Encounter with Mexico, 1877-1910.” PhD. diss., The American University, 1999. 37. Hayes also received numerous letters advocating war with Mexico. See Gary Alvin Pennanen, “The Foreign Policy of William Maxwell Evarts.” PhD diss., The University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1969. 156. For articles in U.S. papers suggesting that war was imminent, or at least possible see “The Trouble with Mexico,” *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, April 12, 1876; *Daily Rocky Mountain News*, June 2, 1877; “Mexican Matter- A Change,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, July 16, 1877; *Christian Union* (July 18, 1877); *Cedar Rapids Weekly Times*, October 11, 1877; *Saturday Evening Post* (October 13, 1877); “War with Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 26, 1877; “Our Own War Cloud,” *Inter Ocean*, December 6, 1877; “War with Mexico Inevitable,” *The Allen County Democrat*, December 6, 1877; “War with Mexico,” *The Idaho Avalanche*, December 22, 1877; *Brooklyn Eagle*, September 4, 1878; “Peace in Washington and Wrath in Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 29, 1878; “The Mexican Invasion,” *Farmer’s Cabinet*, July 2, 1878; *The Galveston Daily News*, July 30, 1878; *Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger*, August 27, 1878. Other articles sought to downplay the possibility of war. See for instance, “The Mexican Policy,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 7, 1877; *The Nation* (July 26, 1877); “Shall We Invade?” *New York Times*, October 8, 1877; “The Mexican Troubles,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, December 16, 1877; *Brooklyn Eagle*, August 7, 1878; “Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 14, 1878. In an article the Mexican Minister to the United States Manuel Zamacona rejected the possibility of war between the two nations. See, “Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 19, 1878.

<sup>40</sup> *The Idaho Avalanche*, November 17, 1877. For similar sentiments see the *St Louis Globe Democrat*, February 1, 1878.



this issue.<sup>41</sup> However most commentators counseled caution and speculated that various groups in the United States sought to provoke war for territorial gain or political reasons.<sup>42</sup>

In response Porfirio Díaz dispatched troops to the border region with orders to repel any invasion of Mexican territory, but also to stabilize the Mexican frontier in the hopes of controlling border violence, and demonstrating that Mexico did have the ability to secure the region.<sup>43</sup> Because of increased tensions, both the Mexican and U.S. commanders actively sought to prevent the outbreak of violence between the two nations.<sup>44</sup> American troops entered Mexico in pursuit only when it was clear the Mexican troops were not in the vicinity. Likewise Mexican officers made sure to avoid any

---

<sup>41</sup> *St Louis Globe Democrat*, January 15, 1878. Historian Amy Greenberg has argued for the importance of the role of masculinity in nineteenth century U.S. culture especially regarding U.S. relations with other nations and territorial expansion. Though much of her work looks at the antebellum era, many of her conclusions are relevant for the rest of the nineteenth century. See *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

<sup>42</sup> “Our Neighbor Mexico,” *Inter Ocean*, May 22, 1878; “The Mexican-Border Grievances,” *The Nation* (August 29, 1878): 125; *The Congregationalist* (October 2, 1878); *The Weekly Times*, June 5, 1879. Many critics of Hayes accused him of trying to incite a war for political gain. Discussed in Ari Hoogenboom, *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1988), 174; Ari Hoogenboom, *Rutherford B. Hayes: Warrior and President* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995), 335; Williams, *The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes*, 209.

<sup>43</sup> Fernando Orozco Linares, *Porfirio Díaz y su Tiempo* (México: Panorama Editorial, 1986), 116; Paul Garner, *Porfirio Díaz* (London: Longman, 2001), 147.

<sup>44</sup> In testimony before Congress, U.S. commanders stationed in Texas acknowledged the danger of armed conflict with Mexican forces. See Statement of Lieutenant-General Sheridan, December 12, 1877, *Texas Testimony*, 67; Examination of General Ord, December 6, 1877, *Texas Testimony*, 95; Examination of H.C. Corbin, December 14, 1877, *Texas Testimony*, 149.

meeting with American military units which might have led them to armed conflict.<sup>45</sup>  
Still tensions remained high between the two nations.

### Mexican Appeals for U.S. Capital

In the context of these strained relations Mexican officials worked to draw U.S. capital to the country. In the late 1860s, the Mexican economy had collapsed because of the decade of war encompassing the Wars of the Reform and the French Intervention. Juárez continued to face numerous localized revolts, the Mexican government was deeply indebted, European governments had broken diplomatic relations as a result of the Maximilian execution and Mexican capitalists were reluctant to invest in the Mexican economy. Because of their limited options, Mexican Liberals would look to the United States for capital investment.

In the years after the end of the French Intervention in Mexico, the Mexican Liberal governments under Juárez and Ledro sought to reconstruct the Mexican economy. Thanks to the greater pacification of the country and governmental economic initiatives, the Mexican economy began to show signs of growth. Of particular importance was the opening of Mexico's first major railway in the 1873, which connected Mexico City and the major port city of Veracruz.<sup>46</sup> During this period, often referred to as the "Restored Republic," (1867 to 1876) Mexico and the United States began to form economic links that would increase dramatically under the Díaz regime later in the nineteenth century.

Díaz and other Mexican officials viewed American capital as essential to the task of creating a modern and progressive nation, and in the words of Díaz sought to provide

---

<sup>45</sup> Katz, "From Liberal Republic to Porfiriato," 69.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 64.

U.S. capital and investors with “generous hospitality.”<sup>47</sup> In 1876 Porfirian officials saw Mexico as a hopelessly backward country which had been “scarcely been touched by the scientific, technological, and industrial revolutions or the material conquests of the nineteenth century.” Likewise the Díaz government encountered an empty treasury, poor credit rating, large foreign debts and skepticism about Mexico as a safe place for foreign investment.<sup>48</sup> Mexican officials adopted and adapted European and American liberal ideas, particularly positivism and sought to infuse the nation with foreign immigrants, capital and technology, believing this would bring economic prosperity and support the creation of a strong Mexican nation.<sup>49</sup> Economically these officials hoped to transform Mexico from a state of relative backwardness into an integrated nation characterized by steady economic growth and progressive modernization.<sup>50</sup> If this happened these officials

---

<sup>47</sup> Quoted in Don M. Coerver, *The Porfirian Interregnum: The Presidency of Manuel Gonzalez of Mexico, 1880-1884* (Fort Worth, TX: The Texas Christian University Press, 1979), 189.

<sup>48</sup> Michael C. Meyer, and William L. Sherman, *The Course of Mexican History* Fourth Edition (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 431-432. Quote is from page 431.

<sup>49</sup> Richard Weiner, *Race, Nation, and Market: Economic Culture in Porfirian Mexico* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2004), 49. See also John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 73; John Lear, *Workers, Neighbors, and Citizens: The Revolution in Mexico City* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 18. Other Latin American nations followed the same policy. See Victor Bulmer-Thomas, *The Economic History of Latin America Since Independence*, Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 46.

<sup>50</sup> Edward Beatty, *Institutions and Investment: The Political Basis of Industrialization in Mexico Before 1911* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 5.

believed other benefits would result including advanced technologies, and modern social relations.<sup>51</sup>

Because of the loss of Mexican territory as a result of the U.S.-Mexico War, as well as frequent U.S. discussions of potential annexation of Mexican territory, many Mexicans, including Liberals associated with the Díaz regime, feared the implications of U.S. economic expansion into Mexico.<sup>52</sup> Despite these concerns the Díaz government offered generous subsidies to foreign investors and at the same time Mexican agents began an active recruitment campaign to promote investment in the United States and

---

<sup>51</sup> Robert M. Buffington and William E. French, “The Culture of Modernity,” *The Oxford History of Mexico*, eds. Michael C. Meyer and William H. Beezley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 399-400. See also Mark Overmyer-Velazquez, *Visions of the Emerald City: Modernity, Tradition, and the Formation of Porfirian Oaxaca, Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 11.

<sup>52</sup> Even in the early years of U.S. expansion, many different groups of Mexicans expressed concerns about the potential for U.S. economic domination of the Mexican economy. J.M. Vigil, the editor of Mexico’s leading newspaper, *El Monitor Republicano*, expressed concerns about increased U.S. investment, and even Manuel Maria Zamacona, counseled caution in the rewarding of concessions to American firms. Despite these fears, the United States would gain a dominant position in the Mexican economy as a result of the investment policies of the Díaz regime. By the end of the nineteenth century there was a widespread discussion of fears of American economic domination expressed by a number of groups in Mexico including some individual members of the regime, liberal and conservative opponents of the regime and elites and working classes. For some examples of elite opposition including intellectuals associated with the regime including Justo Sierra see Hale, *The Transformation of Liberalism* (242-243); for opposition of conservative and liberal opponents of the regime see Weiner 51-52, 64; For working and middle class opposition see Ramón Eduardo Ruiz, *The People of Sonora and Yankee Capitalists* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988), 63-71. See also Merle E. Simmons discussion of Mexican folk songs called “corridos” regarding the United States in *The Mexican Corrido as a Source for Interpretive Study of Modern Mexico (1870-1950)* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957), 72-73, 419-460, which includes discussion of corridos after Díaz was deposed as well.

Europe.<sup>53</sup> In this campaign Porfirian officials promoted Mexico's natural resources, and stressed their acceptance of the ideals of liberal capitalism, progress and political stability.<sup>54</sup> Recently Thomas P. Passananti has argued that the Mexican insertion into the global economy was not imposed by external forces, nor did foreign actors impose such terms on Mexico. Rather these terms were negotiated and renegotiated between Mexican officials and private actors and foreign investors. In this Passananti suggests, Mexico's primary aim was to obtain foreign investment, "but not at any price."<sup>55</sup>

The Mexican quest for capital and its integration into the world economy happened at the same time that U.S. actors looked abroad for opportunities for further expansion. The years after the Civil War witnessed the beginnings of American economic

---

<sup>53</sup>Alex M. Saragoza, *The Monterrey Elite and the Mexican State, 1880-1940* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988), 26; Gene Yeager, "Porfirian Commercial Propaganda: Mexico in the World Industrial Expositions," *The Americas* 34:2 (October 1977): 230. See also Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996), 19.

<sup>54</sup> Colin M. MacLachlan and William H. Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo: A History of Greater Mexico* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999), 172. See also Thomas P. Passananti, "Dynamizing the Economy in a *facon irreguliere*: A New Look at Financial Politics in Porfirian Mexico," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 24:1 (Winter 2008): 3.

<sup>55</sup> Thomas P. Passananti, "'Nada de Papeluchos!' Managing Globalization in Early Porfirian Mexico," *Latin American Research Review* 42:3 (October 2007): 103, 112. A similar point was made by Steven C. Topik and Allen Wells for the Latin American response to liberalism and insertion into the world economy. See "Introduction: Latin America's Response to International Markets during the Export Boom," *The Second Conquest of Latin America: Coffee, Henequen, and Oil during the Export Boom, 1850-1930* eds. Steven C. Topik and Allen Wells (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998), 2.

expansionism overseas.<sup>56</sup> The United States entered the world stage as a major economic force during this period, as the nation exploited its natural resources, underwent industrial and modernizing revolutions, and sought markets for products and investment opportunities for capital.<sup>57</sup>

The effects of the Depression beginning in 1873 continued to the end of the 1870s convincing many in the business community to look to the foreign trade expansion.<sup>58</sup> One report from the Congressional Committee on Manufacturers expressed the common belief that the U.S. home markets were “greatly overstocked” and that the interest of labor and capital required the speedy development and extension of foreign trade.<sup>59</sup> Many of these trade expansionists were frustrated by economic cycles and foreign competition and saw expansionism as a cure for the fears of glut and overproduction.<sup>60</sup> By 1876 traditional

---

<sup>56</sup> Walter LaFeber, *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations Volume II: The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 1. During the period from 1870 to 1913 the United States grew at about twice the rate of the next largest competitor, Great Britain. By the 1890s the U.S. had surpassed Britain as the world’s leading industrial power. See Alfred E. Eckes, Jr., and Thomas W. Zieiler, *Globalization and the American Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 11.

<sup>57</sup> W. Dirk Raat, *Mexico and the United States: Ambivalent Vistas* Third Edition (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), 81-82.

<sup>58</sup> “How to Promote Our Trade with Mexico,” *Inter-Ocean*, July 22, 1878. See also Steven C. Topik, *Trade and Gunboats: The United States and Brazil in the Age of Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 14. For more on the 1873 Depression see Jean Edward Smith, *Grant* (New York and London: Simon and Schuster, 2001), 575.

<sup>59</sup> *Spanish American Commercial Company*, February 6, 1879, Senate Report 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., Report No.1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1879), 1.

<sup>60</sup> David M. Pletcher, “1861-1898, Economic Growth and Diplomats Adjustment,” *Economics & World Power: An Assessment of American Diplomacy since 1789*, ed. William H. Becker and Samuel F. Wells, Jr. (New York: Columbia University

U.S. trade patterns had been reversed, when U.S. merchandise exports began to exceed imports, creating the need for the cultivation of foreign markets.<sup>61</sup> Support for economic expansionism would come from a wide variety of groups including businessmen, politicians, editors, agrarian spokesmen, and others who laid the foundation for the new global role of the United States.<sup>62</sup>

It was in this context that U.S. businessmen, bankers, politicians and others looked to the Mexico as a place for trade and investment.<sup>63</sup> In the 1870s U.S. exports to Mexico remained around the \$6 million level. These rose to about \$11 million in 1881,

---

Press, 1984), 123. See also Walter LaFeber, *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963), 14; Howard B. Schonberger, *Transportation to the Seaboard: The "Communication Revolution" and American Foreign Policy, 1860-1900* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1971), 174.

<sup>61</sup> Charles S. Campbell, *The Transformation of American Foreign Relations, 1865-1900* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 85.

<sup>62</sup> Edward P. Crapol and Howard Schonberger, "The Shift to Global Expansion, 1865-1900," *From Colony to Empire: Essays in the History of American Foreign Relations*, ed. William Appleman Williams (New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972), 137. Of special importance were farm businessmen (including ranchers, etc) who were instrumental in this push for international expansionism. See also William Appleman Williams, *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* Second Edition Revised (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1972), 9; Schonberger, *Transportation to the Seaboard*, ix.

<sup>63</sup> See example, "Proceedings of the Annual Meeting," May 29, 1877, *Report of the New York Produce Exchange from June 1, 1876 to December 31, 1877* (New York: Jones Printing, Co., 1878), 15; *Treaty with Mexico* House of Representatives Report No. 108, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess. February 13, 1879 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1879), 1; "Trade with Mexico," *The Denver Daily News*, March 2, 1881; "Facts Worth Thinking About," *The Virginias* (April 1881): 51-52; "Chicago and Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 20, 1883.



\$15 million in 1882, and \$17 million in 1883.<sup>64</sup> Of even greater importance was the role of U.S. direct investment to Mexico. About this time the United States was transitioning from being a major net borrower abroad, and New York banks in particular helped to organize the major railroad, mining, agribusiness and manufacturing concerns in Mexico. U.S. merchants, manufacturers and investors, facilitated through the efforts of U.S. bankers, looked abroad for investment opportunities.<sup>65</sup> Shortly after the Civil War U.S. direct investment into Mexico was only a few million, but by the 1880s it had grown to about \$100 million, and by 1902 U.S. direct investment had grown to \$503 million.<sup>66</sup> Because of the strained relations between the U.S. and Mexico during the first years of the Díaz regime, many U.S. capitalists were concerned about the poor state of relations between the two countries and worried that the U.S. might be losing an important potential market, as well as an outlet for investment and future profits.<sup>67</sup>

Because of this interest in closer economic relations, Mexican officials worked to influence public opinion against the Mexican policy of the Hayes administration. Díaz and other Mexican officials began a process of what has been called “image-building”

---

<sup>64</sup> Campbell, *The Transformation of American Foreign Relations*, 91. While this was dramatic growth it was much smaller than the amount exported to Canada.

<sup>65</sup> Jeffrey A. Frieden, *Banking on the World: The Politics of American International Finance* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 17-18; Topik, *Trade and Gunboats*, 16.

<sup>66</sup> Pletcher, *The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment*, 77-78. This investment included \$341.2 million in railroads, \$102 million in mining, \$31 million in real estate, \$10.2 million in manufacturing, \$7.2 million in banking (78).

<sup>67</sup> Campbell, *The Transformation of American Foreign Relations*, 89.



within the United States and other countries with potential investors.<sup>68</sup> Mexican officials were especially interested in the coverage of Mexico in the U.S. press, as Mexican diplomats, consuls and agents “monitored the press, corrected errors, and supplied articles favorable to Mexico.”<sup>69</sup> Mexican officials employed a campaign to exploit political divisions in the United States regarding the policy of the Hayes administration toward Mexico, while increasing U.S. interest in economic opportunity in Mexico.<sup>70</sup> Mexican officials used several tactics to try to influence U.S. public opinion. These included the use of articles and interviews by Mexican officials, payments to American writers and others to write favorable articles and editorials about Mexico, and the encouragement of articles and editorials critical of the Hayes’ administration policy.<sup>71</sup> During this period there was a convergence of goals between Mexican officials and a diverse group of American business and financial interests along with promoters of Mexico within the United States.

---

<sup>68</sup> Cott, “Porfirian Investment Policies,” 65.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 73. The Díaz regime provided subsidies for Mexican newspapers that would be amenable to the goals and perspectives of the administration, including the *Mexican Herald* (founded in 1895), an English language published in Mexico City, by which many American diplomats and others got their news from Mexico. The Díaz government also made payments to foreign newspapers for favorable stories throughout the Porfiriato. See Phyllis Lynn Smith, “Contentious Voices Amid the Order: The Porfirian Press in Mexico City, 1876-1911.” PhD. diss., The University of Arizona Press, 1996. 93.

<sup>70</sup> William E. Gibbs, “Díaz’ Executive Agents and United States Foreign Policy,” *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 20:2 (May 1978): 171. See also Rubén Ruiz Guerra, *Más Allá de la Diplomacia. Relaciones de México con Bolivia, Ecuador y Perú, 1821-1994* ( México: Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 2007), 103.

<sup>71</sup> Gibbs, “Díaz’ Executive Agents and United States Foreign Policy,” 172-175.

The most influential Mexican executive agent during this period was Manuel Maria Zamacona.<sup>72</sup> Zamacona was an experienced diplomat who had spent three years negotiating with the Joint Claims Commission, and had served as Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations.<sup>73</sup> Zamacona came to the United States in 1877 with instructions to try to secure U.S. recognition of the Díaz government and the withdrawal of the order allowing U.S. troops to cross the border, without giving up “humiliating concessions.”<sup>74</sup> At the same time Zamacona was charged with publicizing Mexican resources and promoting Mexico as a place of political stability.<sup>75</sup> Zamacona was well aware of a number of negative articles about Mexico in the press and believed they could be combated with a media offensive of his own.<sup>76</sup> Zamacona sought to influence laboring and religious circles as well as commercial and financial media, presenting his case in working men’s clubs, religious gatherings, chambers of commerce, industrial associations

---

<sup>72</sup> For a brief biographical sketch of Zamacona see Roderic A. Camp, *Mexican Political Biographies, 1884-1935* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991), 228.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 172. For Zamacona’s introduction by the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations to officially appoint Zamacona Minister see Vallarta to Foster, April 9, 1878, *Notes from the Mexican Legation to the United States, 1821-1906* RG 59, M 54, Microfilm, Reel 17 and Díaz to Hayes, April 9, 1878, Enclosure in *Ibid.* The U.S. Secretary of State, William M. Evarts described Zamacona as a “very plausible smooth talker.” See Chester L. Barrows, *William M. Evarts: Lawyer, Diplomat and Statesman* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941), 358. John W. Foster described Zamacona as the “ablest man in the Mexican government.” Gibbs, “Spadework Diplomacy,” 122.

<sup>74</sup> David M. Pletcher, “Mexico Opens the Door to American Capital, 1877-1880,” *The Americas* 16:1 (July 1959): 3.

<sup>75</sup> Cott, “Porfirian Investment Policies,” 73.

<sup>76</sup> Janice Lee Jayes, “‘Strangers to Each Other’: The American Encounter with Mexico, 1877-1910.” PhD diss., The American University, 1999. 99-100; Gibbs, “Spadework Diplomacy,” 113-114.

and in numerous newspapers throughout the United States. As part of this campaign he visited and presented his case in commercial, industrial and transportation centers such as Chicago, Pittsburg, Milwaukee, St Louis and Cincinnati.<sup>77</sup> Zamacona's goal was to gain an advantage in the U.S. public sphere by appearing at meetings of teachers, clergymen, merchants, and bankers as well as appearing before the United States Senate.<sup>78</sup> Zamacona became a "ubiquitous figure in Washington, seeking out influential members of the administration, opposition leaders, business representatives, and 'Mexicophiles' in general."<sup>79</sup> Zamacona also sought to seduce Washington society with grand balls at least one of which was described by one reporter as the "most brilliant ever given at a private residence."<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> Cosío Villegas, *The United States Versus Porfirio Díaz*, 144; Carlos Bosch García, "El Conflicto del Siglo XIX con los Estados Unidos," *Relaciones México-Estados Unidos: Una Visión Interdisciplinaria* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1981), 35; Clementina Díaz y De Ovando, *Las Ilusiones Perdidas Del General Vicente Riva Palacio (La Exposición Internacional Mexicana, 1880) y Otras Utopías I* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2002), 86. See also, "Trade with Mexico and Brazil," *Washington Post*, September 20, 1878; "Mexico and its Resources," *The Two Republics*, June 26, 1881.

<sup>78</sup> Cosío Villegas, *The United States Versus Porfirio Díaz*, 147.

<sup>79</sup> Gibbs, "Spadework Diplomacy," 133-134.

<sup>80</sup> See "Washington Society," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, February 11, 1880. For coverage of this and other receptions see "The Mexican Minister's Ball," *Baltimore Sun*, February 10, 1880; "The Mexican Grand Fete," *Baltimore Sun*, February 25, 1879; *Trenton State Gazette* [New Jersey], February 9, 1880; "Senor Zamacona's Grand Ball," *The Two Republics*, March 28, 1880; "Hail and Farewell: The Mexican Minister Gives His Final Reception," *Washington Post*, January 10, 1882.

Zamacona entered the United States in November of 1877, first stopping in New Orleans where he held a press conference.<sup>81</sup> He would follow this pattern at various stops along the way to his eventual destination in Washington D.C.<sup>82</sup> In a series of interviews Zamacona declared that he was coming to the United States to establish commercial and friendly relations between the two countries. He informed his audience that the “influential classes” of Mexico were of the opinion that in order to develop the material resources of Mexico it was necessary to establish commercial intercourse with the United States.<sup>83</sup>

As part of his campaign, Zamacona travelled to New York City to speak before the Chamber of Commerce. In his address Zamacona used religious imagery to describe the benefits of closer relations between the United States and Mexico. He suggested that commercial intercourse would create not only an immense amount of wealth between the two republics, but would also “infuse and perpetuate a Christian spirit in the civilization

---

<sup>81</sup> See “The New Mexican Minister: Interviewed by a Picayune Reporter,” *The New Orleans Daily Picayune*, November 21, 1877. See also “Arrival of the New Mexican Minister at New Orleans,” *San Francisco Bulletin*, November 21, 1877. Business interests in New Orleans had shown a strong interest in trade with Mexico for several years, and had sent a delegation to Mexico to investigate future trade and investment prospects. See “The Merchants Mission to Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, March 3, 1875; “The New Orleans Chamber of Commerce,” *The Two Republics*, March 24, 1875.

<sup>82</sup> Gibbs, “Díaz’ Executive Agents,” 175. This included discussions with merchants and other businessmen in New York. See Byron to Díaz, Diciembre 8 de 1877, *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz, Memorias y Documentos* Tomo XXVIII edited by Alberto Maria Carreño (Mexico: Instituto de historia de la Universidad Nacional, 1960), 77; Pritchard to Díaz, Diciembre 12 de 1877, in *Ibid.*, 88. For coverage of Zamacona’s presentation of credentials see “The Presentation of the Mexican Minister’s Credentials,” *The Washington Post*, May 8, 1878.

<sup>83</sup> “Mexico’s Problem,” *Washington Post*, December 12, 1877.

of the new world.”<sup>84</sup> He also reiterated his earlier theme of the admiration that Mexico held for the United States. In conclusion he stated, “When I consider the links with which nature has connected our two countries, to make them co-workers-the promoters of Christian civilization on this continent-I can but be reminded of those words which religion uses to consecrate the union of two persons whom love has united, ‘what God has joined together, let no man put asunder.’”<sup>85</sup> What is interesting about this statement is that Zamacona seems to embrace the idea that the United States has a providential mission in the Western Hemisphere, while at the same time seeking to suggest that Mexico and the United States could cooperate in this mission as “co-workers.”

#### U.S. Responses to Mexican Promotion

Pressure from Zamacona and American business interests interested in closer economic relations with Mexico, as well as Hayes’ opponents along with those interested in economic expansion had become more critical of the President’s Mexico policy.<sup>86</sup> The U.S. Minister to Mexico, John W. Foster, appeared before Congress and expressed his

---

<sup>84</sup> Proceedings of the Chamber of Commerce, March 7, 1878, *Twentieth Annual Report of the Corporation of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York for the Year 1877-1878* (New York: Press of the Chamber of Commerce, 1878), 155.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 156. Zamacona also accepted the invitation of the Baltimore Board of Trade to speak before their organization. See Zamacona to Díaz, Septiembre 18 de 1879, *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz*, Tomo XXIX, 274. For U.S. coverage see “Local Matters,” *Baltimore Sun*, July 2, 1878; *Baltimore Sun*, October 16, 1878; “Commerce with Mexico and France,” *Baltimore Sun*, December 2, 1878; “The Mexican Minister’s Address,” *Baltimore Sun*, December 2, 1878.

<sup>86</sup> Pletcher, *The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment* 87. See also “The American Policy Toward Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, December 28, 1878. Much of this criticism revolved around the supposed goal of Hayes to provoke a war with Mexico. See Hans L. Trefousse, *President Hayes* (New York: Henry Holt and Co, 2002), 108.

opinion that nonrecognition was hurting commercial relations.<sup>87</sup> As a result of Foster's representations to the President and Secretary of State, as well as increasing public pressure linked with the Mexican public relations offensive, Foster was instructed to inform the Mexican government that the United States was officially recognizing the Díaz government.<sup>88</sup> Foster communicated this change in policy to the Mexican government on April 11, 1878.<sup>89</sup>

At about the same time the House of Representatives released a report on the relations of the United States with Mexico which linked closer trade relations with unrest

---

<sup>87</sup> Michael J. Devine, *John W. Foster: Politics and Diplomacy in the Imperial Era, 1873-1917* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1981), 21. Foster reported that Díaz was trying to suppress border raids and had achieved greater success than his predecessors.

<sup>88</sup> John W. Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 95; Evarts to Foster, March 23, 1878, *Diplomatic Instructions of the Department of State*, Record Group 59, Microfilm M77 Reel 115. While Foster had privately recommended recognition much earlier, he publically supported the official policy and was frequently criticized by the press in both Mexico and the United States for his supposed support for the non-recognition policy. Secretary of State William M. Evarts, cited Mexican policies of trying to promote border stability, and acceptance of treaty obligations, as well as citing the impediment that nonrecognition was playing in helping to come to agreements over disputed questions and authorized the recognition of the Díaz regime. Evarts to Foster, March 23, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879* 543-544. Evarts did suggest that Foster continue to try to reach agreements on outstanding issues. Despite recognition, tensions between the two countries remained high, particularly in the summer of 1878 when more border raids were reported. See William Ray Lewis, "The Hayes Administration and Mexico," *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* XXIV: 2 (October 1920), 149; "Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Mexico," *The Encyclopedia Americana* (New York and Chicago: The Encyclopedia Americana Corporation, 1919), 799; R.E.L. Saner, "When President Díaz Sought Recognition," *American Bar Association Journal* VI (December 1920), 197.

<sup>89</sup> Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 95. In his classic work on U.S.-Mexican relations J. Fred Rippy argued that the U.S. recognition of Mexico without preconditions was a defeat for the Hayes administration and a success for the Mexican government. See *The United States and Mexico* (New York: F.S. Crofts & Co., 1931), 310.

on the U.S.-Mexico border. This document reported that on the one hand the country witnessed the need for measures to create border security at the same time the nation had “become fully alive” to the necessity of foreign markets.<sup>90</sup> The report cited not only the opportunity presented by the small proportional share of U.S. commerce with Mexico, but the fact that the total commerce of Mexico itself was small and presented the opportunity for an enormous increase.<sup>91</sup> One of the conclusions from the report was that there was no reason why the United States “should not be the leading power in the markets of Mexico,” as well as Central and South America.<sup>92</sup>

The House report was emblematic of a larger interest in commercial relations with Mexico by many merchants, businessmen and bankers in the United States in the late 1870s. In 1878 a group was organized in Chicago named the Manufacturer’s Association of the Northwest.<sup>93</sup> One of the goals of this group was to promote trade with Mexico and they extended an invitation to Zamacona to visit Chicago to confer with its citizens “with the view of opening closer relations of trade with Mexico.”<sup>94</sup> Zamacona quickly accepted

---

<sup>90</sup> *Report and Accompanying Documents of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Relations of the United States with Mexico* House of Representatives Miscellaneous Document No. 701, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., April 25, 1878 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878), I.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, XXX. This mirrors one of the points that Zamacona was making at the time. See “Trade with Mexico,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, April 6, 1878.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, XXXII.

<sup>93</sup> For more discussion about the founding of this group see “Our Trade with Mexico,” *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, June 19, 1878.

<sup>94</sup> “How to Promote Our Trade with Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Inter Ocean*, July 22, 1878. The Committee appointed a separate Committee on Mexican Affairs to facilitate their efforts.

the invitation citing his hope that closer relations would act as a peace measure, particularly in light of continuing dissention based on border problems.<sup>95</sup>

In anticipation of Zamacona's visit the *Chicago Daily Tribune*, one of the largest newspapers in the Midwest, was optimistic for the expansion of trade with Mexico linking it to the future role of the United States as an international economic power in the Western Hemisphere and the world, asserting, "Mexico is on our border. She is part of Republican America, and her destiny, as the home of free and industrious people, is closely connected with our own."<sup>96</sup> While trade with Mexico was important in its own right, the paper expressed its belief that trade with Mexico would be a forerunner of similar commercial relations with the West Indies, Latin America, and eventually the English-speaking states of the South Pacific.<sup>97</sup> As such Americans saw Mexico as the first step to a larger expansion of American capital throughout Latin America.

Before Zamacona's arrival, the Manufacturers Association sent invitations to prominent citizens which were described by one reporter as resembling a wedding announcement for Chicago and Mexico.<sup>98</sup> On the day after arriving, Zamacona addressed a crowd of prominent citizens, merchants, and politicians from Chicago, the state of Illinois and some surrounding states. One report stated that when he was introduced

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> "Our Trade with Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 3, 1878. The article associated commerce with "free, liberal, and friendly relations" between the two nations.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> "Chicago-Mexico," *Chicago Inter Ocean*, September 3, 1878.



Zamacona was greeted with applause lasting several minutes.<sup>99</sup> Interestingly, Zamacona used imagery that embraced the vision of the U.S. as a nation with a providential mission to the world, and a special relationship with Mexico. Zamacona referred to the “manifest designs of Providence,” which he said, had provided the U.S. and Mexico with the elements necessary for the interchanging of products and closer relations.<sup>100</sup> In another later speech Zamacona described the United States as the future “commercial center of the world,”<sup>101</sup> and also thanked the American merchants and manufacturers for providing him with “striking and important examples for the Mexican people.”<sup>102</sup> In this way Zamacona co-opted popular U.S. symbols and beliefs in ways that could be used for his own purposes. This strategy was successful, particularly with those optimistic for the future of U.S. trade with Mexico.

While Zamacona’s speech was originally well-received by the public, the U.S. Minister to Mexico, John W. Foster, changed the contours of the discussion when he expressed negative views of closer economic relations between Mexico and the United

---

<sup>99</sup> “Senor Zamacona,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 6, 1878; “Mexico, Reception to the Minister Don Manuel de Zamacona,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 4, 1878.

<sup>100</sup> “Senor Zamacona,” *Chicago Tribune*, September 6, 1878.

<sup>101</sup> “Ready for Business-Zamacona Makes a Speech,” *Atlanta Daily Constitution*, November 14, 1878; *Wheeling Daily Register*, November 14, 1878; “Our Great Country,” *Washington Post*, November 14, 1878. The occasion was a commercial convention in Chicago. For more coverage of this event see “Trade with Mexico,” *The Syracuse Morning Standard*, November 14, 1878; “Chicago Commercial Convention,” *Wisconsin State Journal*, November 14, 1878; see also Zamacona to Díaz, Noviembre 15 de 1878, *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz*, Tomo XXIX, 307-308.

<sup>102</sup> “Minister Zamacona,” *Chicago Inter Ocean*, September 11, 1878. The Mexican press followed Zamacona’s reception in the United States. Díaz y De Ovando, *Las Ilusiones Perdidas I*, 104.

States, at least for the immediate future. Foster had been aware of Zamacona's propaganda activities in the United States and viewed them as a direct challenge to the Hayes' administration policy toward Mexico, which Foster had helped frame.<sup>103</sup> In his response to a request for information from the Manufacturers Association Foster noted that he had read the accounts of Zamacona's visit with great interest, because he, like Zamacona, had been deeply interested in closer economic relations between the two nations.<sup>104</sup> Foster acknowledged that his views would probably not be met with a "cheerful welcome," because instead of flattering expectations of enlarged trade and a prosperous commerce expressed by Zamacona he described the "difficulties, embarrassments and dangers" of attempts to expand trade with Mexico.<sup>105</sup>

While Foster admitted that Mexico provided a natural market for the United States, and believed the two countries should have closer economic relations, he reported that U.S. business interests should continue to look to other places until Mexico initiated

---

<sup>103</sup> Gibbs, "Spadework Diplomacy," 180-181. Originally Foster had been invited to attend the reception for Zamacona in Chicago, but he was unable to attend because of the distance from Chicago to Mexico City. In lieu of attending the events in Chicago, Foster was asked to provide his views as to future economic relations with Mexico. Bowen to Foster, August 23, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 637; Foster to Evarts, October 9, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 636.

<sup>104</sup> Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 108. In fact Foster recounted that he had come to Mexico with high hopes of extending American trade and had "omitted no proper opportunity" to express his hopes both in the United States and Mexico. See John W. Foster to Carlile Mason, October 9, 1878, *Trade with Mexico. Correspondence Between the Manufacturers' Association of the Northwest, Chicago and Hon. John W. Foster* (Chicago: Manufacturers Association of the Northwest, 1878), 5-6. This correspondence was printed in full in *Commercial Relations with Mexico*, House Miscellaneous Document, January 7, 1879, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Session No. 15 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1879); and in Foster to Mason, October 9, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 637-654.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*

serious reforms toward railroad investment, tariff and trade relations, and would be able to preserve a stable government by enforcing order and protecting life and property.<sup>106</sup> He described a lack of Mexican government support and protection for railroad construction, lack of short term credits, high tariffs, unfavorable exchange rates, and high taxes on mining. Most important, however were banditry and disorder, along with the ever-present fears of revolutions, which continued to result in a lack of protection to persons and property.<sup>107</sup> Foster counseled American business interests to wait until Mexico had made these reforms, and proved its worthiness for closer attention from U.S. investors.

Foster's letter got wide circulation in the United States causing controversy between those optimistic and those skeptical for the immediate prospects of the Mexican market.<sup>108</sup> Several media outlets viewed the letter as a direct challenge to Zamacona and Mexican promotion in the United States.<sup>109</sup> In interpreting Foster's letter, a correspondent for the *Chicago Daily Tribune* suggested that Foster believed American capitalists should not risk their money in what would be a "useless endeavor to extend commerce with Mexico."<sup>110</sup> While earlier the *Tribune* had been optimistic for Mexico trade, an editorial

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 41-43.

<sup>107</sup> Foster emphasizes this theme throughout. See for instance discussion on pages, 19, 28, 31-32, 33, 40.

<sup>108</sup> Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 115.

<sup>109</sup> "Minister Foster's Remarkable Dispatch," *The Daily Picayune*, November 26, 1878. This was a reprint from the *Chicago Times*. See also "A Mexican Market for Our Manufacturers," *Cincinnati Daily Gazette*, November 20, 1878.

<sup>110</sup> "Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 20, 1878. Similar, but more restrained sentiments are expressed in *The Marion Daily Star*, November 21, 1878.

stated that Foster crushed this “whole scheme of any increase of trade between the United States and Mexico to powder and scatters the powder to the wind.” The editorial criticized the romantic views of the potential of Mexico, particularly those created by Zamacona.<sup>111</sup>

Other papers however denounced Foster’s communication and agreed with Zamacona’s optimistic assessments of Mexico. In response to the *Tribune* editorial, the *Chicago Inter Ocean*, an important Midwestern paper, suggested that Foster had fallen victim to elements in the United States who opposed free trade, or possibly to English, French or German merchants in Mexico who wanted to keep Mexican trade for themselves.<sup>112</sup> Further it disputed the idea that Zamacona had deceived the American people, instead suggesting that they preferred to trust Zamacona’s statements over those

---

Foster’s letter was also summarized in other major U.S. papers including “Mexico, Mr. Foster’s Letter on the Commercial Condition of That Country,” *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, November 24, 1878; “American Trade with Mexico,” *Galveston Daily News*, November 27, 1878. Others discuss the letter but do not focus so much on the negative aspects of his letter, instead focusing on his small section outlining suggestions for future trade. See “Prospect of Trade with Mexico,” *San Francisco Daily Evening Bulletin*, November 20, 1878; “Mexico’s Exclusiveness,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, November 20, 1878; “Trade Relations with Mexico,” *Philadelphia North American*, November 20, 1878; *Sedalia Daily Democrat*, November 20, 1878; *The Dubuque Herald*, November 20, 1878.

<sup>111</sup> “Minister Fosters Letter of Trade with Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 22, 1878.

<sup>112</sup> “Our Trade with Mexico,” *Chicago Inter Ocean*, November 25, 1878. A later article also discusses the supposed role of German merchants in creating distrust of the United States in Mexico. See “A Good Work for Mexico,” *The Salt Lake City Tribune*, December 15, 1878. A different article suggested the same activities to French merchants. See “Mexico and Foster,” *The Dubuque Herald*, March 28, 1878. The competition with France, England, and Germany for Latin American trade would later become a part of the Democratic National Committee Platform. See *The Political Reformation of 1884* (New York: Democratic National Committee, 1884), 263.

of Foster.<sup>113</sup> Another periodical suggested that Foster had put himself in a position of “decided antagonism” to the development of commercial relations between the U.S. and Mexico.<sup>114</sup>

Foster’s communication had reached Mexico at a time when tensions were high over border issues and Foster’s letter offended Mexican national pride. In response the Mexican press roundly denounced the Foster who had damaged their public relations campaign.<sup>115</sup> As to be expected, Mexican officials were displeased by Foster’s communication.<sup>116</sup> Zamacona challenged Foster’s interpretations in interviews in U.S.

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid. Several articles expressed support for Foster over Zamacona. See *Decatur Review*, November 27, 1878; “Trade with Mexico,” *Atlanta Daily Constitution*, November 28, 1878.

<sup>114</sup> “Our Minister to Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, March 29, 1879. The article called for the removal of the Foster as Minister to Mexico. Other newspapers speculated that the Mexican government might ask for the removal of Foster. See “Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 2, 1879; “News Notes,” *Fort Wayne Daily Sentinel*, February 6, 1879; “Minister Foster,” *The Bismarck Tribune*, February 8, 1879; *Mesilla News*, February 22, 1879. In his memoirs Foster did acknowledge tension with the Mexican government at times in his tenure, but suggested that he never lost the esteem of the Mexican authorities and reported that when he left Mexico he left with the “hearty friendship” of Díaz and his top officials. See Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 142.

<sup>115</sup> Gibbs, “Spadework Diplomacy,” 233. Foster appears to have been surprised by the hostility that he got from Mexican officials as a result of his letter, and even at times seems to have been hurt by Romero’s public criticism of him and the Mexico policy of the Hayes administration. See Foster to Evarts, February 18, 1879, *Despatches from United States Ministers to Mexico, 1821-1906 Record Group 59, Microfilm, M97, Reel 62*; and Foster to Evarts, February 15, 1879, Ibid.

<sup>116</sup> Zamacona to Díaz, January 2, 1879, *Archivo Del General Porfirio Díaz XXX*, 10. See also “That Trip to Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, December 1, 1878. One member of the Mexican Congress, Jose Maria Martinez y Negrete, who happened to be in Chicago at the time was interviewed and attempted to refute many of the specifics of Foster’s letter suggesting that it was based on exaggerated, incorrect discussions. Martinez suggested that he was not sure whether Foster may have been laboring under the impulse of the moment, or a “fit of indigestion,” or whether it was a “premeditated act.” See “Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 23, 1878. Quote is from “A

newspapers, and privately Zamacona described Foster's letter as a "campaign of defamation."<sup>117</sup> The Mexican government employed the Secretary of Finance, Matías Romero, to write a refutation of Foster's letter, which appeared in the official government newspaper and was reprinted in a book that was later translated into English and circulated in the United States.<sup>118</sup> In the introduction of his work Romero expressed the opinion that Foster had perpetrated conceptions of Mexico that were without foundation, and worried that this would discourage commerce that Mexico was badly needed.<sup>119</sup>

---

Member of the Mexican Congress Replies to Minister Foster's Statements About His Country," *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, November 25, 1878. Reprinted from the *Chicago Journal*.

<sup>117</sup> E.B.W., "Mexico, A Long Interview with M. de Zamacona, the Mexican Minister," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, November 25, 1878; "Our Representatives in Mexico," *Boston Evening Journal*, February 3, 1879; Zamacona to Díaz, December 27, 1878, *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz, Memorias y Documentos Tomo XXX*, ed. Alberto María Carreño (Mexico: Instituto de historia de la Universidad Nacional, 1960), 10-11.

<sup>118</sup> Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 115. Matías Romero had served in the United States with the Mexican Legation in Washington and later as Minister to the United States from most of the period from 1860-1867. He would become again become Minister to the United States in 1882 and would serve almost continuously in this position until his death in 1898. See Camp, 192. Romero wrote articles not only in Mexican periodicals, but many in the United States and as well including the *North American Review*, *Review of Reviews* and numerous papers. See Josefina Mac Gregor, "Matías Romero," *Historiografía Mexicana Volumen IV: En Busca de un Discurso Integrador de la Nación, 1848-1884*, eds. Juan A. Ortega y Medina and Rosa Camelo (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico, 1996), 472.

<sup>119</sup> Matías Romero, *Report of the Secretary of Finance of the United States of Mexico of the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, on the Actual Condition of Mexico, and the Increase of Commerce with the United States. Rectifying the Report of the Hon. John W. Foster, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States in Mexico, the 9<sup>th</sup> of October, 1878* (N. Ponce De Leon, Publisher and Printer, 1880), 2. This was discussed by John W. Foster in Foster to Evarts, January 28, 1879, *Message from the President of the United States Communicating, In answer to a Senate resolution of February 20, 1879, information in relation to the construction of railroads in Mexico* Senate Executive Document No. 73, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., March 1, 1879 (Washington D.C.:

Romero expressed the opinion that the Mexican government believed that the United States would help Mexico to develop its resources and through closer economic relations would “facilitate the pacific and friendly solution of pending questions,” and of those that might in the future arise, and will provide mutual benefit to both nations.<sup>120</sup>

In his visit to Chicago, Zamacona had suggested that merchants and manufacturers from Chicago send agents to Mexico to survey the land and display their wares.<sup>121</sup> After Foster’s negative letter the excursion to Mexico gained new significance as Zamacona and other Mexican officials hoped that American visitors would contradict Foster’s negative assessment.<sup>122</sup> The Mexican government put Riva Palacio, the Minister

---

Government Printing Office, 1879), 2. The Foster, Zamacona and Romero discourse in the media was discussed in Henry S. Brooks, “Our Relations,” *Californian* I: 3 (March 1880); “Our Mexican Relations,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 14, 1880.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 325.

<sup>121</sup> “Senor Zamacona,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 6, 1878. The excursion to Mexico created a rivalry among several cities in the United States, particularly between Chicago and St Louis. Since Zamacona had originally made the suggestion of a visit to Mexico to Chicago business interests, businessmen from that city took the lead in organizing and planning the trip. This created concerns in St Louis that their city would be at a disadvantage with trading with Mexico. St Louis merchants held a series of meetings in which they discussed their concerns. Originally they discussed the possibility of sending a separate excursion to Mexico, but were worried that it could not commence one until after the expedition from Chicago and that Chicago will get the upper hand on Mexican trade. The St Louis businessmen ended up going joining the excursion from Chicago, with other merchants from Philadelphia, New York, and other cities. See “A Railroad to Mexico,” *St Louis Globe Democrat*, November 8, 1878; “Trade with Mexico,” *St Louis Globe Democrat*, November 8, 1878. The merchants were determined the St Louis not be “outdone by Chicago.” See also “On to Mexico,” *St Louis Globe Democrat*, November 12, 1878. Chicago newspapers referred to the St Louis discussions as based on jealousy. See “The Excursion to Mexico,” *Inter Ocean*, December 27, 1878.

<sup>122</sup> Zamacona to Díaz, January 10, 1879, *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz* XXX 15; Zamacona to Díaz, February 7, 1879, Ibid., 29. As such the *New York Times* suggested that the trip would be one of both business and pleasure. “The Excursion to Mexico,” *New York Times*, December 5, 1878. Foster in his letter expressed the belief



of Public Works, in charge of the reception for the excursion party and the Mexican government had spent over \$50,000 on entertainment for the party while in Mexico.<sup>123</sup> Other Mexican agents in the United States suggested that the Mexican government viewed this excursion to be one of considerable national importance. Romero stated that he hoped the excursion may bring the popular masses of Mexico into contact with the manufacturing classes of the United States, and that it would help to correct some errors in the United States about Mexico.<sup>124</sup>

After consulting with Zamacona, the “American Industrial Deputation to Mexico” left New Orleans on January 9, 1879 on a steamer bound for the port city of Vera Cruz, Mexico, with the object of opening up closer economic relations with Mexico.<sup>125</sup> The expedition included bankers, railroad officials and contractors, merchants, manufacturers, scientists and the wives and other family members of some of these excursionists from fourteen states. The group was also accompanied by correspondents from several media sources including the *New York Herald*, *New York Tribune*, *Chicago Inter Ocean*, *St*

---

that the Mexican nation would provide the American visitors with a “hearty welcome and courteous treatment.” Foster, *Trade with Mexico*, 44.

<sup>123</sup> See Mexico’s American Guests,” *New York Times*, December 5, 1878; *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, January 3, 1879.

<sup>124</sup> See Romero, *Report of the Secretary of Finance of the United States of Mexico* 24.

<sup>125</sup> “Trade with Mexico,” *New York Times*, December 4, 1878; “The Mexican Excursion,” *Logansport Daily Journal*, January 14, 1879. For a discussion of the reception in Vera Cruz, see “Gov. Fisk Talks to the Greasers,” *The Daily Commonwealth*, January 27, 1879. For a description of the steamer trip and arrival in Mexico see “From Mexico,” *Logansport Daily Journal*, January 29, 1879; “The Commercial Expedition to Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, February 15, 1879.



*Louis Globe Democrat* and *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*.<sup>126</sup> When they arrived in Mexico City, John A. Rice, a member of the expedition, described that it appeared “all Mexico” had come to see them as they were greeted with a “graceful and exuberant hospitality.”<sup>127</sup>

Upon receiving the group in the National Palace, President Díaz expressed his pleasure at the purpose of the group’s mission and his hopes for closer business and social relations between the two republics. He stated, “The alliance of two free nations for the purpose of developing their respective industries-the foundation of all greatness-is a glorious spectacle to contemplate.” Díaz expressed his hopes that the Deputation would be the foundation of a friendly union that would be of lasting benefit to the citizens of both republics. In accepting the Deputation’s gift of an American flag Díaz expressed his hope that American colors would merge with those of Mexico and would “blend with ours in our mutual march to a still grander and more comprehensive civilization.”<sup>128</sup> Several of the leading Mexican newspapers published editorials favoring friendlier

---

<sup>126</sup> John A. Rice, “Mexico: The Great West of the Near Future,” *Transactions of the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society* XVII (1878-1879): 358.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 364.

<sup>128</sup> “Speech of President Díaz,” January 15, 1879, *The Survey of the Austin-Topolovampo Pacific Route: Memorial of A.K. Owen, C.E.* House of Representative Miscellaneous Document No. 20, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., February 13, 1879 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1879), 13-14. John F. Finerty, a member of the Deputation, reported that Díaz had exclaimed that he hoped the flag of Mexico would “ever wave beside the flag of Washington for God, Liberty and Commerce!” *John Finerty Reports*, 94.

relations with the United States and increased commercial relations between Mexico in the United States, and hoping that this would result from the Deputation.<sup>129</sup>

The members of the Deputation expressed their opinion that negative reports circulating in the United States had done Mexico serious harm and released a statement stating that they had found everywhere only the most cordial feelings in Mexico and an unanimous desire for closer economic relations with the United States and had not witnessed any special insecurity to life, property or internal improvements.<sup>130</sup> The Deputation expressed its hopes that the U.S. government would do what it could to build on the positive sentiment expressed by Mexican leaders thereby uniting the two nations

---

<sup>129</sup> Cott, "Porfirian Investment Policies," 67. Cott cites editorials in the January 7, and 18 editions of *La Libertad*, as well as those in the January 15 and 17<sup>th</sup> editions of *El Siglo XIX* in Mexico City.

<sup>130</sup> Many members of the deputation were hopeful for the prospects of Mexican trade. See for instance "Mexico's Merchant Visits," *Daily Nevada State Journal*, February 16, 1879; *Brooklyn Eagle*, February 19, 1879; *Hancock Herald*, March 1, 1879. This was also the assessment of paper of the American colony. See "American Excursionists-Results-Expectations," *The Two Republics*, February 15, 1879. One member however, H.N. Rust was less optimistic and the *Chicago Daily Tribune* ran several articles and editorials based on his assessments which suggested that Foster's critical letter on Mexico was correct. Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 20, 1879; "Editorial Article 3," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 20, 1879; "The Mexican Trade Craze," *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 21, 1879. For similar views of another excursionists see "Trade with Mexico," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, May 12, 1879. Some of these themes who later discussed in Railroads and Trade with Mexico," *Daily Evening Bulletin*, March 7, 1879. During the excursion itself the correspondent of the *Logansport Daily Journal* had reported that the field in Mexico was not too promising. See January 29, 1879. Other articles and editorials poked fun at the excursion as only a "free lunch" enterprise that will have no real effect. See *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 9, 1879; *Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*, February 25, 1879; "How They Behaved in Mexico," *Daily Commonwealth*, March 22, 1879; "A Huge Joke," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 25, 1879.

in trade increasing the strength of both, and supporting the prevailing sentiment in favor of republican principles on the American continent.<sup>131</sup>

At the same time Mexican attempts to stabilize the frontier began to bear fruit as U.S. diplomats expressed happiness with the desire of the government to preserve peace and good order on the frontier by adopting measures to repress border raids.<sup>132</sup> At the end of 1878 President Hayes expressed gratification at the successes that the Mexican government had in punishing and preventing these border raids.<sup>133</sup> In his 1879 address he was even more laudatory, stating, “The past year has been one of almost unbroken peace and quiet on the Mexican frontier, and there is reason to believe that the efforts of this Government and of Mexico, to maintain order in that region, will prove permanently successful.”<sup>134</sup> As such, improvement in stability on the border region led to better perceptions of Mexico and helped in the Mexican quest for increased U.S. capital.

In the summer of 1879, the Mexican Minister, John W. Foster citing an earlier conversation with Grant in which the then-President had expressed an interest in visiting

---

<sup>131</sup> “Returning from Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, February 14, 1879. See also, “Mexico Through Gov. Fisk’s Spectacles,” *Daily Commonwealth*, April 4, 1879. The U.S. Secretary of State expressed some skepticism that there would be serious lasting results from the excursion party, and instead suggested that while Mexican declarations in favor of closer economic relations were nice, the nation needed to do a better job of securing lives and property and meeting its financial obligations. See Evarts to Foster, February 20, 1879, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 799.

<sup>132</sup> Evarts to Foster, March 23, 1878, *FRUS 1878-1879*, 543.

<sup>133</sup> “Message to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Third Session of the Forty-Fifth Congress,” December 2, 1878 *Letters and Messages of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 124-125.

<sup>134</sup> “Message to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Forty-Sixth Congress,” December 1, 1879 *Letters and Messages of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 274.

Mexico, had written to the former President inviting him to visit Mexico.<sup>135</sup> Shortly after arriving in the United States at the end of a tour to Europe, the Middle East and Asia, Grant decided to go on another voyage to Cuba and Mexico.<sup>136</sup> After spending a short time in Cuba, Grant arrived in the port of Veracruz, Mexico, on February 18, 1880.<sup>137</sup> Upon his arrival Grant expressed his happiness at arriving in Mexico, and his hopes that relations between the United States and Mexico would grow closer. He stated that the development of Mexico would be of “great advantage to the United States,” while many Americans were finding satisfaction in the progress of Mexico.<sup>138</sup> The Grant party then travelled to Mexico City, in the company of Matías Romero and other Mexican officials.<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant Volume 29: October 1, 1878-September 30, 1880*, ed. Aaron M. Lisee (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 352ftn. After his presidential term had ended in the spring of 1877, Grant had gone on an international tour beginning in Europe then to Egypt, India, China and Japan. On his tour Grant was accompanied by a correspondent from the *New York Herald*. The positive publicity created an interest in Grant being nominated for a third term. Part of the interest in going on another international tour was to continue to garner positive publicity outside of the United States, while Grant’s supporters could try to maneuver his nomination. An article in *The Two Republics* discusses Grant’s “long cherished desire” to visit Mexico that he was now able to fulfill. See “General Grant,” *The Two Republics*, January 11, 1880.

<sup>136</sup> For discussion of Grant’s trip see J.T. Headley, *Life and Travels of General Grant* (Philadelphia: Hubbard Bros., 1879).

<sup>137</sup> Albert D. Richardson, *A Personal History of Ulysses S. Grant* (Boston: D.L. Guernsey, 1885), 576-577.

<sup>138</sup> Speech, February 18, 1880, *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant Volume 29*, 363.

<sup>139</sup> For coverage of Grant’s reception see “Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, February 25, 1880; “Mexicans Welcoming Grant,” *New York Times*, February 25, 1880; *The Daily Republican*, February 25, 1880; “Grant in Mexico,” *Inter-Ocean*, February 27, 1880; “Grant in Mexico,” *Inter-Ocean*, February 28, 1880; “Mexico,” *Newport Daily News*, February 28, 1880; “Gen. Grant’s Tour in Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated*

The Mexican government and the Mexican offered the former U.S. President a warm welcome as the Mexican government made every effort to match the praise and honors that Grant had received from other foreign nations on his world tour.<sup>140</sup> Grant's trip coincided with the solution to one of the biggest problems in U.S.-Mexican relations, that of the presidential order to General Ord authorizing U.S. troops to cross the Mexican border in pursuit of Indians or thieves. The U.S. Secretary of War noted that the conditions on the border which made the Ord Order necessary were no longer valid. In doing so the U.S. government recognized the "well-proved ability" of the Mexican Government to restrain effectively violations of United States territory, and the Secretary of State declared the orders no longer in force.<sup>141</sup> Mexican government officials as well as the Mexican press viewed the repeal of the Ord Order as a significant diplomatic victory as well as a signal that relations with the United States would improve.<sup>142</sup>

---

*Newspaper*, March 13, 1880; "General Grant in Mexico," *Harper's Bazaar* (April 24, 1880); W.J. Thorton, "The Land of the Montezumas," *Potter's American Monthly* XIV:100 (April 1880).

<sup>140</sup> Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 138. For a discussion of one of the Mexican receptions see "Reception of General Grant at the Capital," *The Two Republics*, February 29, 1880.

<sup>141</sup> Ramsey to Evarts, February 25, 1880, *FRUS 1880-1881*, 736. Ord had earlier reported that the order to cross the border was no longer necessary. See also Evarts to Zamacona, March 1, 1880, *Ibid.*, 736. The withdrawal of the Ord Order was discussed by Hayes in December 1880. See "Message to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Third Session of the Forty-Sixth Congress," December 6, 1880, *Letters and Messages of Rutherford B. Hayes*, 323. One of Hayes biographers refers to the Ord Order as an "obnoxious but efficacious order." See Williams, *The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes*, 210.

<sup>142</sup> Gibbs, "Spadework Diplomacy," 260; Jayes, "Strangers to Each Other," 130.

Before he left Mexico, Grant received a letter from prominent Mexican citizens expressing their belief that the construction of railroads in Mexico would provide great benefits to Mexico, as well as the United States.<sup>143</sup> They requested that Grant represent to the American public how much both nations would gain with closer relations brought by railroad construction.<sup>144</sup> The letter gained a receptive audience with the former President who agreed that the building of railroads would bring prosperity to both nations, while strengthening the “bands of friendship” and link the progress of each nation with the other and offered to help their endeavor.<sup>145</sup> After his return to the United States, Grant promoted Mexico as a place for future trade and investment.<sup>146</sup> In a well-publicized speech in Boston, Grant described Mexico as on the eve of a “great advance and very

---

<sup>143</sup> Many U.S. railroad companies and U.S. financial interests had already shown an interest in investing in Mexican railway building. See for instance, *Proceedings of the National Railroad Convention at St Louis, Nov 23 and 24, 1875 in Regard to the Construction of a Southern Trans-Continental Railway Line from the Mississippi Valley to the Pacific Ocean* (St Louis: Woodward, Tiernan and Hale, 1875), 14, 20-21, 161-164; *Proceedings of the Convention of the American Bankers Association, August 11-13, 1880* (New York: Banker’s Publishing Association, 1880), 27-28.

<sup>144</sup> Reprinted in the *New York Daily Tribune*, April 2, 1880; “Railroads in Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, March 28, 1880.

<sup>145</sup> Grant to Riva Palacio, Gillow, Romero, Mejia and others, March 17, 1880, *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant, Volume 29*, 366-367. See also *Speech of Senor Don Matias Romero, Mexican Minister at Washington on the 65<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on the 65<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of General Ulysses S. Grant* (New York: 1887), 9-10. One of Grant’s friends who later wrote his memoirs reported that during this period Grant turned his interest almost exclusively to Mexican affairs. See Adam Badeau, *Grant in Peace From Appomattox to Mount McGregor. A Personal Memoir* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971), 350. [Reprint from the 1887 edition].

<sup>146</sup> See for instance “Mexico as Seen by Grant,” *New York Times* (May 7, 1880); “General Grant on Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, May 8, 1880; “Grant at Fort Leavenworth,” *New York Times*, July 9, 1880; “Letters from General Grant,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, September 24, 1880.

desirous to extend their foreign commerce,” and stated that Mexico could produce nearly all of the semi-tropical products the U.S. needed and in return would import U.S. manufactured goods.<sup>147</sup>

Both Grant and Matías Romero promoted closer economic relations between the United States and Mexico, and in 1882 Grant was chosen to negotiate a reciprocity treaty between the United States and Mexico.<sup>148</sup> On January 20, 1883, Grant representing the United States, and Romero, representing Mexico, signed a treaty which would have created a number of products admitted free of tariffs from Mexico to the United States and vice versa.<sup>149</sup> While the U.S.-Mexico Reciprocity Treaty fell victim to domestic

---

<sup>147</sup> Speech of Ulysses S. Grant, October 13, 1880, *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant Volume 30: October 1, 1880-December 31, 1882*, ed. Aaron M. Lisee (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 5-7. For press coverage see “General Grant’s Speech,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, October 14, 1880; *New York Times*, October 14, 1880; “Trade with Mexico,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, October 15, 1880; *Christian Union* (October 20, 1880); *Christian Advocate* (October 21, 1880); “Trade with Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, October 21, 1880; “Americans in Mexico,” *Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture* (October 23, 1880); “Development in Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, October 30, 1880.

<sup>148</sup> In Mexico, Romero had received a concession to construct a railway from the Southern state of Oaxaca to Mexico City, and came to the United States to try to get capital investment in the project. After a series of meetings between investors and Grant and Romero, the Mexican Southern Railroad Company was incorporated with Grant as the President in early March 1881, and shortly thereafter Grant and Romero visited Mexico. See “Chap.36. An Act to incorporate the Mexican Southern Railroad Company,” March 17, 1881, *Laws of the State of New York Passed at the One Hundred and Fourth Session of the Legislature Volume I* (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company Printers, 1881), 35-38; David M. Pletcher, *Rails, Mines and Progress: Seven American Promoters in Mexico* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1958), 163. For more information about the proposed company see Robert B. Gorsuch, *The Mexican Southern Railway, to be Constructed Under a Charter from the Mexican Government, Through the States of Vera Cruz and Oaxaca* (New York: Hosford & Sons, 1881).

<sup>149</sup> Pletcher, *Rails, Mines, and Progress*, 174-175. For the text of this treaty see “Commercial Convention between the United States and Mexico,” January 20, 1883,



pressures from protectionists in the U.S. Congress, Grant continued to promote the optimistic view of Mexico in the United States.<sup>150</sup> As a former U.S. President who had disavowed expansionist themes and had shown himself to be a friend of Mexico, while also promoting the development of Mexico, Grant was able to soothe many of the fears of Mexican nationalists.<sup>151</sup> Grant's prestige, as President and national hero, reaffirmed the promotion of Mexico by Romero, Zamacona and others, and accelerated the U.S. economic investment and trade with Mexico.<sup>152</sup> Grant therefore granted prestige to the Mexican promotion campaign.

---

*British and Foreign State Papers, 1883-1884 LXXV* (London William Ridgeway, 1891), 484-486.

<sup>150</sup> Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 111. For a discussion of battles between free trade and protectionists groups in the United States see Alfred E. Eckes, Jr., *Opening America's Market: U.S. Foreign Trade Policy Since 1776* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995), especially 28-84 for the period between the end of the Civil War and the Taft administration. For discussion of the political issues around the Reciprocity Treaty see "The Extent, Growth and Details of Our Trade with Mexico," *Bradstreet's* (September 16, 1882), 179; *Bradstreet's* (January 26, 1884), 291; "The Mexican Treaty," *Bradstreet's* (March 15, 1884), 162-162; *Bradstreet's* (February 14, 1885).

<sup>151</sup> MacLachlan and Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo*, 95; "Grant Loved Mexico," *The Denver Evening Post*, January 21, 1896. Grant also failed in his business ventures, including the Mexican Southern Railroad Company, which fell victim to Grant's personal financial troubles and a business downturn in 1884. For discussion of the nullification of the Mexican Southern Railroad Company Charter see *Bradstreet's* (June 13, 1885): 389. Foster also noted that Grant was viewed as a great friend of Mexico. See Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs*, 137.

<sup>152</sup> Pletcher, *Rails, Mines, and Progress*, 180. One of Grant's contemporaries also made this point. See William Henry Bishop, *Old Mexico and Her Lost Provinces: A Journey in Mexico, Southern California and Arizona by Way of Cuba* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883), 56; José C. Valadés, *El Porfirismo: historia de un régimen, el nacimiento 1876-1884* (Mexico: Antigua librería Robredo, 1941), 316-317. On the legacy of General Grant regarding promotion of Mexican resources and closer economic relations see "Grant as a Friend of Mexico," *The Washington Post*, July 24, 1885; "In Memoriam!" *The Two Republics*, August 20, 1885; Gen. Grant and Mexico," *Chicago*



### Conclusion

Many Americans at this time suggested that closer trade relations would not only benefit both countries economically, but would also lead to better diplomatic relations particularly problems on the border.<sup>153</sup> Earlier a speaker before the National Board of Trade in 1876, mirroring the sentiments of Zamacona stated that the U.S. had a tendency to “drift into” difficulties with Mexico, but that creating common interests through trade would not only uplift the Mexican people from its “semi-barbarous state,” but also establish common interests that would obviate continued border unrest.<sup>154</sup> Díaz helped to stabilize the Mexican side of the border by gaining effective control of the nation thereby allowing him to transfer troops to the border region, rather than holding them near the

---

*Daily Tribune*, March 20, 1887; “In Memory of Grant,” *The Two Republics*, May 1, 1891; Gen. Grant and Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, July 11, 1894; “Gen. Grant and Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, July 12, 1894. One historian has argued that at his death in 1885, Grant was widely considered to be the “greatest American of the nineteenth century.” See Kenneth D. Ackerman, *Dark Horse: The Surprise Election and Political Murder of President James A. Garfield* (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2003), 443.

<sup>153</sup> *The Congregationalist* (November 24, 1880); *Transportation of United States Mails between Galveston and Vera Cruz*, May 27, 1878, House of Representatives Report No. 886, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1878), 2; and Exhibit A, Marcus J. Wright to Benjamin Wilson, February 10, 1879, *Treaty with Mexico* House of Representatives Report No. 108, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess. February 13, 1879 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1879), 3.

<sup>154</sup> *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the National Board of Trade Held in New York June 1876* (Chicago: Knight & Leonard Printers, 1876), 132. See also, “Changed Feeling Toward Mexico,” *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, November 21, 1878. Other reports suggesting that closer economic relations would solve border problems include, *Transportation of United States Mails between Galveston and Vera Cruz*, May 27, 1878, House of Representatives Report No. 886, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1878), 2; and *San Antonio and Mexican Border Railway Company*, April 7, 1880, House of Representatives Report No. 756, 46<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), 3.

capital or other provinces to defeat potential insurrections, and this was also facilitated by the extension of railways into the region thereby extending the reach of the central government.<sup>155</sup> The Rio Grande region was also stabilized by the U.S. Cavalry troops on the U.S. side along with the Texas Rangers who used harsh tactics, particularly against the ethnic Mexican population to stabilize the lower Rio Grande region in Texas. As previously discussed quiet on the border influenced the decision of the Hayes administration to revoke the Ord Order.

By 1881 most of the problems on the border region had shifted from the lower Rio Grande to the land boundary in the West between El Paso and the Pacific, and were the result of raids by Apaches who had fled the reservation, many of whom were led by Geronimo.<sup>156</sup> The Mexican government once again expressed its willingness to negotiate an agreement for the reciprocal crossing of the border in pursuit of Indian raiders in order

---

<sup>155</sup> Linda B. Hall and Don M. Coerver, *Revolution on the Border: The United States and Mexico, 1910-1920* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 10; Clarence C. Clendenen, *Blood on the Border: The United States Army and the Mexican Irregulars* (London: The Macmillan Company, 1969), 85; Robert D. Gregg, *The Influence of Border Troubles on Relations Between the United States and Mexico* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937), 146. U.S. railroad companies, financiers and supporters also used the argument that railway expansion to the border region would facilitate the movement of U.S. troops to the region in case of Indian raids or other military necessities. See *Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Merchants Exchange of Saint Louis, Missouri, in Favor of Granting aid in the construction of a railroad from San Antonio, Tex., to the Rio Grande, at or near Laredo, Mexico*, January 28, 1879, Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 54, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., (Washington D.C.: Government printing Office, 1879); and *San Antonio and Mexican Border Railway Company*, April 7, 1880, House of Representatives Report No. 756 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), 2.

<sup>156</sup> Leon C. Metz, *Border: The U.S.-Mexico Line* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2008) 178.

to try to stabilize this region.<sup>157</sup> Several months later the Mexican and U.S. governments agreed to such a treaty, which was renewed several times and became an important aspect of border relations between the two nations.<sup>158</sup> In so doing Mexico achieved success in its long-standing goal in being treated as an equal by the United States on this issue.

In a letter regarding commercial relations with Mexico in 1878, the U.S. Secretary of State, William M. Evarts, suggested that trade and prosperity would not occur until an era of peace and political and social stability allowed the country to develop its resources. Evarts emphasized that American capitalists were interested in trade and investment in Mexico, but were unwilling to invest in Mexico, until the people had proven that they had abandoned revolutionary activities in favor of peaceful and industrial pursuits.<sup>159</sup> By the

---

<sup>157</sup> “Agreement between the United States and Mexico establishing the reciprocal right to pursue savage Indians across the boundary line; concluded, signed, and exchanged at Washington July 29, 1882,” *Statutes of the United States of America, Passed at the First Session of the Forty-Seventh Congress, 1881-'82 and Recent Treaties and Executive Proclamations* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1882), 120-122; Zamacona to Evarts, March 10, 1880, *Ibid.*, 782-783. For Mexican requests to begin these negotiations. See also Ruelas to Morgan, July 23, 1880, *FRUS 1880-1881*, 764-765; Morgan to Evarts, September 21, 1880, *Ibid.*, 774-776. Díaz described the revocation of the Ord Order as a victory for international law and would get rid of one of the problems that were hurting commerce between the two nations. See “El General Díaz, Al Inaugurar el 9<sup>th</sup> Congreso El Último Período De Sus Sesiones, en 1 Abril de 1880,” in *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano: Un Siglo de Relaciones Internacionales de México (A Través de los Mensajes Presidenciales)*, ed. Genaro Estrada (México: Publicaciones de la Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 1935), 128-129.

<sup>158</sup> Mexico: Reciprocal Right to Pursue to Pursue Savage Indians across the Boundary Line, July 29, 1882, *FRUS 1882-1883*, 396-397. See also *The Nation* 894 (August 17, 1882): 122. This treaty would be renewed throughout the end of the nineteenth century. See Conflict Threatening Mexico’s Sovereignty: The Continuing Crisis,” *Modernization and Revolution in Mexico: A Comparative Approach*, ed. Omar Martinez Legorreta. Tokyo: United Nations University, 1989), 50; Hall and Coerver, *Revolution on the Border*, 10.

<sup>159</sup> “Letter from the Secretary of State Transmitting the Annual Report upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1878,”

next year Evarts reported that he was convinced that the “best minds” in Mexico were trying to bring their country into harmony with the United States, which he described as the most advanced civilization of the day. The Secretary hoped that the Mexican people would soon see that the Americans were their “sincerest friends—friends ready with capital and business energy to help to develop the boundless resources of that country; must see that the best interests of Mexico suggest the closest commercial relations with the United States.”<sup>160</sup> By the close of 1882 the U.S. Consul General in Mexico, David H. Strother, emphatically stated that the Mexican Republic was enjoying the continued peace and a degree of material prosperity previously unknown in its history, as the “whole character of Mexican society” appeared to be undergoing a “rapid and favorable change.”<sup>161</sup>

---

*Report Upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1878* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1879), 59.

<sup>160</sup> “Letter from the Secretary of State Transmitting the Annual Report upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1879,” *Report Upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1879* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), 26. See also “Letter from the Secretary of State Transmitting the Annual Report upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Years 1880 and 1881,” *Report Upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1880 and 1881* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1883), 26. For similar sentiments see “Commerce of Mexico, and Our Share Therein,” *Reports (Nos. 1, 2 and 3) from the Consuls of the United States of the Commerce, Manufactures, Etc., of their Consular Districts* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881), 60. The report was from Consul Sutton of Matamoros.

<sup>161</sup> “Trade and Industries of Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States on the Commerce, Manufactures, Etc., of their Consular Districts. For the Months of January, February, March, April, and May, 1883* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1883), 519, 523. Quote is from page 523. See also “Mexican Development,” *Bradstreet's* (May 5, 1883), 284, and Strother to Hunter, September 1, 1880, *Despatches from United States Consuls in Mexico City* Microfilm, Reel 9.

In an 1882 letter to the New York *Evening Post*, the formerly critical John W. Foster, declared that his previous concerns about Mexico were no longer valid, and that Mexico had now proven that it could secure life and liberty for U.S. capital and investors.<sup>162</sup> It is important to note that through this paternalistic rhetoric U.S. officials and other observers retained for themselves the ability to evaluate whether Mexico was living up to these ideals and as such retained the power to judge whether Mexico had lived up to the standards that they had created for not only Mexico but other “developing nations.” As such even laudatory rhetoric often reveals the asymmetrical power relations between the two nations.<sup>163</sup> These trends would continue throughout the rest of the nineteenth and early twentieth century as Americans would debate the nature of Mexico and the Mexican people most frequently judging them according to how well they measured up to U.S. standards of modernity, development and other themes.

---

<sup>162</sup> John W. Foster, “Díaz and Gonzalez,” *The New York Evening Post*, September 20, 1882. Also cited in Matías Romero, *Railways in Mexico in Answer to an Article of the Hon. John Bigelow Entitled ‘The Railway Invasion of Mexico’* (Washington D.C.: Harper’s Monthly Magazine, 1882), 4. Romero’s article was originally published in the October 1882 edition of *Harper’s Magazine*. It should be noted that Foster about this same time Foster was representing the Mexican Legation in the United States as their general counsel. See, Riguzzi, “John W. Foster,” 150. Foster would later express similar views in “Mexican Prosperity,” *The Two Republics*, March 5, 1890.

<sup>163</sup> In understanding this theme I benefited from Paul Kramer’s discussion of the “politics of representation” regarding the United States and the Philippines during the U.S. colonial period. Kramer argues that U.S. officials created standards whereby the colonized, particularly Filipino elites, could achieve political participation and inclusion and theoretically a timetable for the future transfer of power. As such the United States, by retaining this power to evaluate, affirmed the unequal relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. See Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States & the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), especially 18-19.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE DÍAZ LEGEND AND U.S.  
MISSION TO MEXICO, 1883-1906

During the Gilded Age the reunited United States “lurched in fits and starts toward great power status.”<sup>1</sup> Herring notes that during this period the “ideology and instruments that provided the basis for America’s global investment in the twentieth century took form,” and the Gilded Age can be seen as a transition period between territorial expansion and the formal empire after the War of 1898.<sup>2</sup> In his recent book on liberal-internationalism in the Gilded Age, Frank Ninkovich has shown that during this period many Americans came to “picture their country as existing within a global economic, political, and cultural environment,” through which the “cultural foundation” was laid for the turn to formal empire and world power at the turn of the twentieth century.<sup>3</sup> During this transition period Americans would frequently use the same terminology and themes, such as “mission” and “destiny” that previous generations had used, though sometimes with different connotations. This sentiment would be vividly expressed by the U.S. consul in Acapulco who stated that the American people would not be true to themselves or to American history and traditions if they did not seize the opportunities that Mexico presented to them. Further he noted that Mexico and Latin America would be the “great fulcrum from which American sentiment will extend its influence upon the civilized world.” From there Americans would be able to employ “that

---

<sup>1</sup> George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 265.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 271.

<sup>3</sup> Frank A. Ninkovich, *Global Dawn: The Cultural Foundation of American Internationalism, 1865-1890* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 1.

political and social revolution which awaits the future and is replete with blessings to humanity.”<sup>4</sup>

During this period, secular discussions of U.S. mission to Mexico were related to two related themes. The first was the benefits of increased U.S. trade with Mexico whereby U.S. products would be sent to Mexico, resulting not only in increased profits for United States merchants and manufacturers, but also what one scholar has described as “civilizing through the sale of commodities,” as companies such as Singer, McCormick, Heinz, Kodak and New York Life Insurance Company, used both the “economic ‘logic’ of profit and loss and the cultural discourse of civilization.”<sup>5</sup> These first U.S. international companies stressed a narrative of progress whereby other countries, like Mexico would be transformed into modern industrial nations. In this way American businesses viewed “all peoples were potential consumers and all nations potentially modern.”<sup>6</sup> Increased trade with Mexico and other parts of the world would bring not only profits for U.S. merchants and manufacturers, but as one historian has described “wellspring of social enlightenment, moral improvement, and international peace.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> R.W. Loughery, “Condition of Trade in Acapulco, Mexico,” *Consular Reports* 103 (March 1889), 397.

<sup>5</sup> Mona Domosh, “Toward a Cultural Analysis of America’s Economic Empire in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* New Series 29:4 (December 2004): 464.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 464.

<sup>7</sup> Robert L. Beisner, *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900* Second Edition (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc, 1986), 24. See also Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1982), 37.



The second theme was related to the progress brought to Mexico from the expansion of U.S. capital with the building of railroads, investment in mining, banking and other parts of the economy. Thomas F. O'Brien has noted that US business leaders to remake the world in the "image and likeness of the United States." American companies exported technology, U.S. social relations, along with ideas about individual freedom.<sup>8</sup> In the US, promoters of capitalist development succeeded in presenting "rationalization" which was defined as "the process of constantly increasing the efficiency of economic activity, individual human beings and nature itself, as a civilizing mission that would bring perpetual progress and improvement in the human condition."<sup>9</sup> It was at the beginning of the twentieth century that American corporate culture began a "global mission." This mission consisted of a spreading of a "unique blend" of advanced technologies and work methods, along with "longstanding American values" such as individualism and competitiveness, a concern with the new and the "acquisitive values" of the new consumer society to other areas of the world, particularly Latin America.<sup>10</sup>

By focusing on the progress and modernization brought on by the transfer of American methods, ideas, products and citizens Americans accepted the theme of the United States as the "pilot society" of the world. As John Mason Hart has argued, U.S. economic and political leaders "envisioned a greater American nation," that would exercise "cultural, economic and political hegemony," over the regions of Latin-America,

---

<sup>8</sup> Thomas F. O'Brien, *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprise in Latin America, 1900-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 1.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 32.



the Caribbean, and the Pacific while “offering an example of cultural, economic and political success to the rest of the world.”<sup>11</sup>

The period discussed in this chapter 1883-1906 represents the culmination of the projects began in the early years of U.S. economic expansion as the dominant view in the U.S. discourse was of Mexico as a progressing, modernizing nation. This was formed through a partnership between Mexican elites and American capitalists and investors, made possible through by what Americans described as the progressive leadership of Porfirio Díaz. In earlier years Americans had debated the “fitness” of the Mexican people for republicanism and self-government, and by the end of the nineteenth century had concluded that the Díaz system of dictatorship under republican forms was the best system for Mexico. As such the discourses on Mexico reflected a hybrid of the two strands of thoughts on America’s exceptionalism, that of uniqueness and universality.

The American view of mission had shifted since the early nineteenth century when it was largely concerned with spreading republican values, linked with democratic norms and self-government. Americans accepted the lack of republican norms in Mexico as necessary given the racial and cultural nature of the Mexican people, suggesting that they were not ready for republicanism of the nature of U.S. institutions. This led to a “Díaz Legend” that was espoused in the United States beginning from the beginning of the second term of Díaz in 1884 and virtually uncontested until 1906, except by those who remained skeptical of the Mexican ability to progress because of cultural or racial reasons, or who focused on a comparison with the development of Mexican with the

---

<sup>11</sup> John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 2.

United States. The Díaz Legend argued that Porfirio Díaz had provided Mexicans with a “firm hand” while serving as a “benevolent despot” by providing the type of leadership that the Mexican people needed. In this discourse the birth of modern Mexico coincided with the beginning of the rule of Díaz who had provided peace and stability for Mexico, and invited U.S. capital and methods into the nation providing the basis for the transformation of Mexico.<sup>12</sup>

### U.S. Capital and Mexican Railroads

In the years after Reconstruction, major U.S. cities such as New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, Chicago and St Louis began to compete with each other for markets in the U.S. South, the Southwest and the West, which was described by one author as the “age of competition.”<sup>13</sup> This spirit of competition also coincided with the increased interest in Mexico as a place for investment and trade in the late 1870s discussed in the previous chapter. Americans had long been interested in Mexican resources frequently referring to that nation as a “treasure house,” or as one 1880 travelogue described, “the promised land” of American commerce.<sup>14</sup>

The famous booster of St Louis, Logan U. Reavis linked these themes in a letter to the *St Louis Globe-Democrat* by declaring that the United States was destined to

---

<sup>12</sup> I took the term “Díaz Legend” from an article which was published after the fall of the Díaz regime. See William Archer, “The Collapse of the Díaz Legend,” *McClure’s Magazine* XXXVII: 4 (August 1911), 395.

<sup>13</sup> John W. Leonard, *The Industries of Saint Louis* (St Louis: J.M. Elstner, 1887), 5, 14.

<sup>14</sup> M. Wineburgh, *Where to Spend the Winter Months: A Birdseye View of a Trip to Mexico Via Havana* (New York: M. Wineburgh & Co., 1880), 28. See also N.H. Darton, “Mexico-The Treasure House of the World,” *The National Geographic Magazine* XVIII: 8 (August 1907): 493-519.

control the commerce not only on the American continent, and the Western Hemisphere but the commerce of the entire world. This he referred to as its “commercial destiny.”<sup>15</sup> Reavis linked this idea of destiny to railroad linkages between the United States, particularly St Louis and Texas as the first step to linkages with Mexico and the rest of Latin America. In October 1878 he gave an address to the Texas State Fair where he linked the future destiny of the United States, to its earlier mission of Westward expansion and Manifest Destiny.<sup>16</sup> Reavis suggested that the movement of U.S. commerce would result in a “new and mightier commerce, a more shining civilization, a greater manhood than was ever known before to the world.”<sup>17</sup>

Reavis used explicitly gendered language to describe what he saw as the future relationship between the United States and Latin America. He stated that “North America is masculine by nature in its relation to South America; South America is feminine. North America is positive, its people of the Anglo-Saxon blood possess the spirit of aggression, of adventure and conquest; South America is negative, its people, offspring of the Latin races, are subjective and receptive. North America being of the male nature, its people will rule the destiny of the hemisphere.”<sup>18</sup> This statement reveals much about how U.S.

---

<sup>15</sup> L.U. Reavis, “Inter-Continental Commerce of the Western Hemisphere,” *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, February 7, 1877. Because of the commercial position of the Mississippi Valley, fueled by improvements to the Mississippi River, he predicted St Louis and the region was to become the center of this trade. Because of this, he argued, St Louis and the region should work make links particularly with Mexico, Central and South America in order for the region to fulfill this “destiny.”

<sup>16</sup> L.U. Reavis, *The North and South: An Address* (St Louis: Woodward, Tiernan & Hale, 1878), 8, 9.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

promoters, investors and merchants viewed Mexico during the late nineteenth century, as Latin America was frequently portrayed as a seductive woman “seemingly anxious to yield to superior males in return for support.”<sup>19</sup> Likewise Reavis expectation of a “receptive” Latin America corresponds to the “symbolic characterization” that they should respond by being “loving, grateful, happy, and appreciative of paternal protection,” to “patriarchal tutelage.”<sup>20</sup>

Like Americans, Porfirio Díaz and Mexican officials viewed the railroads as the “ultimate symbols” of civilization and material progress.<sup>21</sup> In their view U.S. investment in railroads was indispensable for helping Mexico solve its transportation problems, which they believed was the key to the development of the Mexican economy and for future economic growth.<sup>22</sup> The Díaz regime, Mexican elites, and middle-class supporters

---

<sup>19</sup> John J. Johnson, *Latin America in Caricature* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1980), 73. See also Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987), 59-60; Frederick Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: university of Texas Press, 1992), 160.

<sup>20</sup> Emily S. Rosenberg, “Gender,” *The Journal of American History* (June 1990): 119.

<sup>21</sup> Michael Matthews, “De Viaje: Elite Views of Modernity and the Porfirian Railway Boom” *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 26:2 (Summer 2010): 257.

<sup>22</sup> John H. Coatsworth, *Growth Against Development: The Economic Impact of Railroads in Porfirian Mexico* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois Press, 1981), 6, 119; Kenneth S. Cott, “Porfirian Investment Policies, 1876-1910.” PhD. diss., The University of New Mexico, 1979. 50, 79; Lorena M. Parlee, “Porfirio Díaz, Railroads, and Development in Northern Mexico: A Study of Government Policy toward the Central and National Railroads, 1876-1910.” PhD. diss., University of California at San Diego, 1981. 147; Matthews, “Railway Culture and the Civilizing Mission in Mexico,” 30, 38; Daniel Lewis, *Iron Horse Imperialism: The Southern Pacific of Mexico, 1880-1951* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2007), 11-12.

of the regime viewed railroads as vital to transforming Mexico along modern, progressive lines, and them as a means of attaining social order, political stability and material progress. Likewise they heralded the completion of the national railroads as evidence of a modernizing Mexico.<sup>23</sup> The railroad connection with the United States facilitated the transportation of agricultural and mineral resources, brought with it economic development, and enhanced the ability of the political centralization of the north of Mexico.<sup>24</sup>

By 1883 American and Mexican observers had begun to see results from the investment of U.S. capital investment into Mexico. In that year the Mexican Central Railway was completed which connected Mexico City with the United States through El Paso, Texas.<sup>25</sup> This was followed by the completion of the Mexican National Railroad

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 266. Matthews does suggest that elite and middle-class supporters did share apprehensions as to how this modernization might “alter familiar understandings of time and place as well as social and gender relations” (255).

<sup>24</sup> Jürgen Buchenau, *Mexican Mosaic: A Brief History of Mexico* (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2008), 69.

<sup>25</sup> By the late 1870s U.S. railroad companies had begun the process of expanding their rail lines into Mexico. This was accomplished with the moral and financial support of the Mexican government as the fulfillment of the consistent goal of several Liberal Mexican governments, particularly since 1867. In addition to the promotional efforts, discussed in the previous chapter, between 1876 and 1884 the Mexican government spent between 130,000 and 270,000 pesos per year to support railroad projects, in addition to subsidies to American railroad companies for each kilometer of track completed. In 1879 Mexico agreed to pay up 32 million pesos through five different railroad contracts which were to complete 2,500 miles of track, and by 1880 sixteen American concessioners were building lines in Mexico. John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 120. In 1873 a railway was completed between Vera Cruz and Mexico City built predominately with British capital and supported by long-term subsidies from the Mexican government to the Mexican Railway Company. After the late 1870s most of the financing was done through U.S. investors. See Frank Averill Knapp, Jr., *The Life of Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada, 1823-1889: A Study of Influence and Obscurity* (New York:

linking Mexico City and Laredo, Texas in 1888, and later the Sonora Railroad Company linked Nogales, Arizona and the port on Guaymas, Sonora in Mexico.<sup>26</sup> In addition to national railroads numerous smaller lines were built in the 1880s and 1890s, and the railroads had increased from about 400 miles in 1876 to over 15,000 miles in 1911, of which 80% of the capital came from the United States.<sup>27</sup>

U.S. observers viewed the completion of railways in Mexico through U.S. capital as part of the larger mission of the United States to Mexico and other nations which would result in not only the expansion of not only American technology, but also progress and modernity. Much of the capital for the Mexican Central Railroad came from Boston capitalists and the *Boston Daily Advertiser* described the opening of the railway as the “New Conquest of Mexico.” The conqueror in the mind of the editorialist was the railroad and U.S. capital, but in this conception “it is the conquest where the conqueror comes as the servant of the conquered, and the two forces strike hands and labor to a

---

Greenwood press, 1968), 206. See also Mihill Slaughter, *Railway Intelligence* Volume XVII (London: Mihill Slaughter, 1873), 226-228.

<sup>26</sup> Parlee, “Porfirio Díaz, Railroads, and Development in Northern Mexico,” 145. For coverage in the U.S. and Mexico about various stages of the completion of this historic railway see “Mexican Railway Plans,” *New York Times*, March 4, 1881; “The Central Completed,” *The Two Republics*, March 12, 1884; “Through to Chicago,” *The Two Republics*, March 23, 1884; *New York Times*, March 28, 1884; “From the City of Mexico,” *New York Times*, March 29, 1884; “The First Train From Mexico,” *New York Times*, March 28, 1884; “The Mexican Central,” *New York Times*, April 8, 1884; “Heavy Capitalists,” *The Two Republics*, May 9, 1884; *The Two Republics*, May 15, 1884; “City of Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, May 12, 1884; “A Banquet in Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, May 12, 1884; “Mexico,” *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, May 12, 1884.

<sup>27</sup> Michael C. Meyer, William L. Sherman and Susan M. Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History* Eighth Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 386.

common end.”<sup>28</sup> While never completely ignoring the potential for profits from economic expansion, this statement reflects a presentation of U.S. economic expansion as an almost altruistic enterprise, which glossed over the reality of domination inherent to the practice of informal imperialism.

The account of the first excursion of Americans on the Mexican Central in 1884, attended by many of the leading investors described the completion as bringing Mexico “under the influence of the progressive nineteenth-century spirit of her sister republic.”<sup>29</sup> This was expressed by Lionel Sheldon, Governor of New Mexico in his visit to Mexico that same year. He wrote that it was the “duty of the people of the United States to lend their assistance” in helping to produce change in Mexico.<sup>30</sup> In addition to hopes of profits from their investments, and increased trade between the countries the railroads also provided U.S. capitalists with access to Mexican resources, including raw materials.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> “The New Conquest of Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 10, 1884.

<sup>29</sup> Jose Margati, *A Trip to the City of Mexico* (Boston: Putnam, Messervy & Co., 1885), 7. The trip culminated in a banquet on April 29, 1884 in Mexico City with Porfirio Díaz and other Mexican officials to commemorate the completion of the railway linking the two nations.

<sup>30</sup> Letter XIII (November 19, 1884), *Letters of Governor Sheldon Written to the Santa Fe Mexican while on a Visit to Mexico City* in Special Collections, Degolyer Library, Southern Methodist University.

<sup>31</sup> William E. French, “In the Path of Progress: Railroads and Moral Reform in Porfirian Mexico,” *Railway Imperialism*, eds. Clarence B. Davis and Kenneth E. Wilburn, Jr. (New York and Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1991), 89-90. The hopes of getting access to Mexican resources is discussed in Edward Atkinson, *The Railroads of the United States: A Potent Factor in the Politics of that Country and of Great Britain* (Boston: A. Williams and Company, 1881), 42; “Mexico,” *Friend’s Intelligencer* (March 10, 1883).



Americans in Mexico and observers in the United States viewed railroad development in Mexico as evidence of the expansion of civilization, modernity and development into Mexico, since the railroad was the “expression and the instrument of modern civilization.”<sup>32</sup> Americans used several metaphors to describe the results of U.S. expansion including, “opening up Mexico,” to a new era<sup>33</sup> and in other instances as “waking up Mexico”<sup>34</sup> as if the nation had been in a slumber until the coming of the railroads and the expansion in U.S. investment. Fannie B. Ward, a journalist and one of the first women travel writers, was among in the first group of tourists to visit Mexico after the opening of the railroads and cautioned Americans that if they wanted to see Mexico “while the glamour of the past” was still upon her, they must come quickly for

---

<sup>32</sup> Howard Conkling, *Mexico and the Mexicans or, Notes of Travel in the Winter and Spring of 1883* (New York: Taintor Brothers, 1883), 256; William Henry Bishop, *Old Mexico and Her Lost Provinces: A Journey in Mexico, Southern California, and Arizona by Way of Cuba* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883), 94-95. See also French, “In the Path of Progress,” 85. For similar sentiments see “Our Mexican Neighbors,” *Boston Daily Globe*, September 13, 1886; “Pleasant Winter Quarters,” *The Phrenological Journal* 85:6 (December 1887), 308.

<sup>33</sup> “Opening Up Mexico,” *New York Times*, March 8, 1881; “Opening Up Mexico,” *New York Times*, March 6, 1883.

<sup>34</sup> See for instance *Bradstreet's* (September 22, 1883), 180; “Waking Up Mexico,” *Boston Daily Globe*, May 17, 1884; and “Out of its Lethargy,” *The Denver Daily News*, January 27, 1889. Other similar sentiments are described in “Railways in Mexico,” *The Two Republics*, September 10, 1879; “The Results of Railroads,” *Friends Review* (February 11, 1882); “An Awakened Nation,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, January 29, 1883; “Wide-Awake Mexico,” *Chicago Inter Ocean*, December 13, 1891; “Mexico Waking Up,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, May 19, 1894; “Mexico Awakening,” *Boston Daily Globe*, September 29, 1901; “Awakened Mexico,” *New York Times*, November 10, 1901; Charles F. Lummis, *The Awakening of a Nation: Mexico of To-day* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1902); B. O. Flower, “A Bit of Old Mexico,” *The Arena* XXVII: 6 (June 1902); Howard B. Grose, “The Awakening of a Nation,” *The Baptist Home Missionary Monthly* XXVI: 10 (October 1904): 365-368; “The ‘Land of Tomorrow’ Wakes Up to Modern Ideas,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 12, 1909.



the “prince” which she likens to Americans, was on the way to “awaken the Sleeping Beauty from the repose of centuries.”<sup>35</sup> As a result of this “awakening” one travelogue described Mexico as the “coming country of the capitalist and tourist; a land in which, by the invitation of its people, we have already begun an endless series of beneficent and bloodless conquests,” while a later guidebook explained that Mexico was a cornucopia and there was nothing for Americans to do but “pour out its treasures of climate, scenic beauty, antiquity, legends, and commercial wealth for our delectation and to the prosperity of its people and ours.”<sup>36</sup> The railroads also spurred an increase in U.S. tourist travel into Mexico and through this an increase in guidebooks and travel accounts in American newspapers, magazines, and books. By the mid-1890s analysts would look back on the coming of the railroads as a turning point in Mexican history, one describing it as the beginning of “modern Mexico.”<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Fannie B. Ward, “Monterey-The Metropolis of Northern Mexico,” *Frank Leslie's Popular Magazine* XVII: 3 (March 1884): 264. In the 1880s and 1890s Ward travelled to the U.S. southwest, Cuba, Central and South America in addition to Mexico. Her dispatches appeared in over forty newspapers in U.S. newspapers. See Loris Troyer, *Portage Pathways* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1998), 126-127.

<sup>36</sup> James W. Steele, *To Mexico by Palace Car: Intended as a Guide to Her Principal Cities and Capital, and Generally as a Tourists Introduction to Her Life and People* (Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Company, 1884), 8; *Tropical Tours to Toltec Towns in Mexico* (New York: Mexican National Railroad, 1893), 5. Other sources that include the theme of conquest include Sylvester Baxter, “Wheeling Among the Aztecs,” *Outing and Wheelman* 5:2 (November 1884): 101; “A Glimpse at Mexico, Her People and Her Civilization,” *The Denver Daily Post*, October 2, 1898.

<sup>37</sup> “Modern Mexico,” *The Mexican Financier* XXVIII: 16 (July 4, 1896): 351. For similar sentiments see “What Railroads Have Done for Mexico,” *Locomotive Engineering* IX: 8 (August 1896): 708-709; Bernard Moses, *The Railway Revolution in Mexico* (San Francisco: The Berkeley Press, 1895), 12; Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, “The Railways of Mexico,” *Moody's Magazine* VIII:1 (July 1909): 7.

Despite support of the railroads by Mexican elites and supporters of the Díaz regime, the Porfirian railway development project proved controversial among opponents of the regime and among popular sectors.<sup>38</sup> The regime's policy of granting railway concessions and the resulting foreign domination of the economy ignited nationalist fears of a "pacific conquest" of Mexico by Americans, and was used as a symbol for those who opposed the regime's development policies as well as the extension of the power of the central government.<sup>39</sup> Many American commentators acknowledged Mexican opposition to railroads or to U.S. capital, but frequently discussed this in the context of the transformation of Mexico into a modern nation. Americans tended to view Mexican nationalist fears as the product of irrationality and an adherence to a premodern way of viewing the world which they believed would subside once Mexican opponents of American capital progressed and understood the true benevolence of the enterprise and the benefits of the railroads and modernity in general.

This theme is exemplified in an article entitled "American Railroading in Mexico," in the *Railroad Trainmen's Journal*, which was the periodical for the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The unnamed writer, who appears to have spent time in Mexico working on the U.S.-owned railroads, stated that it was a "settled truth that, to the average Mexican, the railroad is a device of the hated Gringo, installed into the land of the peon and mesquite for the simple purpose of aiding and abetting the devil and all

---

<sup>38</sup> Michael Matthews, "Railway Culture and the Civilizing Mission in Mexico," 237.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 263-264.

his works.”<sup>40</sup> The writer attributed Mexican “hatred” toward U.S. railroads and railway men as based on ignorance and “surprising” considering the services that they were providing to the Mexican nation.<sup>41</sup> The periodical republished a fictional short story by western travel writer Bourdon Wilson entitled “The Conversion of Don Enrique” which it described as “instructive as well as entertaining.”<sup>42</sup> In the story Don Enrique, who is a wealthy hacendado in the northern state of Chihuahua, was portrayed as superstitious and irrational in his opposition to the railways going as far as to hold up his hands in horror when he heard that an American company had been granted a concession to build in

---

<sup>40</sup> “American Railroading in Mexico,” *Railroad Trainmen’s Journal* XVIII: 7 (July 1901): 521.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 522. Some articles commented on the superstitious nature of the Mexican people that resulted in their suspicion of the railroads and American capital and methods or described hostility to the railroads as hostility to progress. See “Across the Rio Grande,” *Chicago Inter Ocean*, February 18, 1882; Arthur Spring, *Beyond the Rio Grande* (Lebanon, NH: NP, 1885), NP; “Non-Progressive Mexico,” *Michigan Farmer* (January 1, 1884), reprint from the *Louisville Courier Journal*. Other articles emphasized the theme of original opposition of local landowners or peasants to the rails only to be converted after seeing their effects. See Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, *Locomotive Engineers Monthly Journal* XX:12 (December 1886): 363-364. Others emphasized the social changes that the railroads had already brought the Mexican nation. See “Mexico’s Social Transition,” *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, August 7, 1888; “Mexico’s Social Life,” *The Milwaukee Journal*, October 26, 1888. Some missionaries in Mexico hoped that the coming of the rails and American enterprise in general would be helpful in dispelling the “ignorance and fanaticism” of the Mexican people making them more susceptible to the message of the Protestant missionaries. See J. Marshall Barker, “American Enterprise in Mexico,” *Western Christian Advocate* (October 19, 1881); and James D. Eaton, “The Opening of Chihuahua, Mexico,” *The Missionary Herald* (July 1882).

<sup>42</sup> Bourdon Wilson contributed numerous short stories and travel writings to western-based magazines in the United States including the *Argonaut*, where this story first appeared, *Overland and Out West Monthly* and *Sunset Monthly* which was owned by the Southern Pacific Railroad. He visited Mexico and wrote fiction and nonfiction about his experiences and published a promotional work about Hermosillo in the state of Sonora. See Bourdon Wilson, *In the Region of Hermosillo Mexico* (San Francisco: Sunset Magazine Homeseekers’ Bureau, ND).

Mexico. Later as the line was being built near his house Don Enrique “raved and stormed like one beside himself” and crossed himself in “pious horror” at the sight of the telegraph wires along the railroad lines and described the railroad as a “device of the devil.” Don Enrique was not alone as many others in his area also expressed similar outrage at the sight of the railroad. In contrast to Don Enrique, the American railroader in the station by the hacienda had a reputation for his “coolness and nerve” but also as “utterly lacking in respect for Mexicans.”<sup>43</sup> Don Enrique’s views changed when his family was endangered by Apaches who were on the warpath. As a last resort Don Enrique and his wife went to the rail station in hopes of fleeing the marauding Apaches. There the “sobbing, praying and, hysterical,” Don Enrique and his family provided a stark contrast to the level-headed Evans who telegraphed for soldiers and prepared to defend the station if they did not arrive in time. When all seemed lost the soldiers were able to arrive quickly through the use of the locomotive conducted by the skilled American, ‘Cussin Jimmy Johnson. The sight of the train and the pursuing Mexican soldiers caused the Indians to flee. When the Apaches had fled Don Enrique reacted as one who had “seen a vision” as his lot improved from one of total despair to safety. Because of this Don Enrique realized that he had been wrong about the railroads and in his criticism of the government for permitting them to be built declaring that he was now a friend to the railroads and the Americans. The story ended with Don Enrique’s daughter getting married to Evans, who appeared to have had a change of heart towards the

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 526.

Mexicans as well.<sup>44</sup> This story reflects the hope that Mexicans would understand the benefits of the railroads, and the modernization of Mexico, and by extension, the role of Americans and U.S. capital in Mexico.

#### Mexican Promotion and U.S. Trade with Mexico

The opening of the railways linking Mexico and the United States also stimulated closer relations between the two nations by facilitating flows of newspapers, information and travelers between the two nations. The Mexican government also continued its earlier practice of image building in the United States. While utilizing its diplomats for this purpose the government also sent special visitors to the U.S. The most distinguished visitor to the United States was Porfirio Díaz, who briefly served as Secretary of Public Promotion, when he was out of office from 1880-1884. In 1883 Díaz visited the United States as part of the Mexican delegation to the World Industrial and Cotton Exposition in New Orleans.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 531-532. The story was also reprinted in Bourdon Wilson, "The Conversion of Don Enrique," *Locomotive Engineering* (January 1901): 34-37.

<sup>45</sup> The World Industrial and Cotton Exposition commemorated the centennial of the first shipment of cotton from the Americas, and was the first of several such expositions in the South as an attempt to highlight the Southern achievements, the resources of the American South as well as demonstrate that the South had recovered from the Civil War, and its new leaders were capable of guiding the region into progress. Other southern fairs included expositions in Atlanta in 1895, in Tennessee in 1897, in South Carolina in 1901-1902 and in Jamestown, Virginia in 1907. Samuel S. Cox, *Union-disunion-reunion: Three Decades of Federal Legislation, 1855 to 1885* (San Francisco: Occidental Publishing Co, 1885), 678. Robert W. Rydell, *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1984 ), 73.

American newspapers treated the Díaz visit as a major event and he toured major U.S. cities to a number of complimentary speeches and entertainments.<sup>46</sup> While he was not currently President of Mexico, most observers rightly expected that he would regain the presidency of Mexico in 1884, though Díaz tried to downplay this speculation during his visit.<sup>47</sup> Many U.S. newspapers were laudatory in their praise of Díaz, and declared him deserving of the hospitality and praise of the American people because of his support for closer relations with the United States, as well as the role that he had played in providing order and stability to Mexico.<sup>48</sup> Díaz, for instance, was described by the *Omaha Daily Bee* as Mexico's "greatest soldier, its first citizen, and its most influential

---

<sup>46</sup> "General Díaz's Visit," *The Two Republics*, May 3, 1883. Mexico used its attendance at the Exposition to highlight its progress and to present the image of a modern nation, which was part of a larger strategy begun by Mexican promoters in the earlier period discussed in Chapter 4. The Mexican government saw the New Orleans Exposition as an opportunity to attempt to change the widespread perception that Mexico was a violent and uncivilized nation. See Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: The University of California Press, 1996), 38. American observers were greatly impressed with the Mexican exhibit, as one history of the fair described it as the "largest and finest exhibit" of all the foreign nations attending the fair. See Herbert S. Fairall, *The World's Industrial and Cotton Exposition, New Orleans, 1884-1885* (Iowa City, Iowa: Republican Publishing Co, 1885), 389. In addition to the exhibit itself fair goers were impressed with the Mexican band that performed in the opening ceremony and toured various cities in the United States. The Mexican involvement in the Exposition provided American and Mexican commercial interests with the opportunity to exhibit what each country produced and manufactured, and aid in the development of trade between the two nations.

<sup>47</sup> For Díaz downplaying the certainty of his future elections See "The General has a Brief Conversation with a Reporter," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1883. For speculation of the future reelection of Díaz see, "Gen. Díaz's Visit," *The New York Times*, April 1, 1883; "A Distinguished Visitor- The Next President of Mexico," *Reno Evening Gazette*, March 13, 1883; "Díaz's Visit," *The Salt Lake Herald*, March 14, 1883.

<sup>48</sup> See for instance "The Visit of General Díaz," *The New York Sun*, April 9, 1883; "Gen. Díaz's Visit," *The New York Times*, April 1, 1883; *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 17, 1883.

leader” who would remain the “arbiter of its destiny.”<sup>49</sup> In a commonly repeated description the editorial declared that the election of Díaz in 1876 had been a turning point in Mexican history.<sup>50</sup> Of particular importance was the encouragement that Díaz gave to American investment and enterprise in Mexico.<sup>51</sup> An editorial in a San Francisco paper suggested that the Mexican party would be able to not only learn about the United States, and make friends in the U.S., but could help to allay American prejudices toward Mexico.<sup>52</sup> Díaz would be accompanied by the former U.S. Minister to Mexico, John W. Foster, and was joined by former President Grant throughout portions of his journey, and met with President Arthur while in Washington DC.<sup>53</sup> He toured many major cities in the United States including New York City, Boston, Chicago and St Louis.<sup>54</sup> In an address in

---

<sup>49</sup> “General Díaz,” *The Omaha Daily Bee*, March 2, 1883. For other expressions of admiration of Díaz see “A Warm Welcome to General Díaz and His Friends,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 8, 1883.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> “Ex-President Díaz in the United States,” *Washington National Republican*, March 3, 1883.

<sup>52</sup> “Díaz in the United States,” *Daily Evening Bulletin*, April 4, 1883.

<sup>53</sup> Foster would later become U.S. Secretary of State. Foster frequently acted as interpreter for Díaz on this trip. “Report to Accompany Proposed Amendment to H.R. 6770,” Senate, 48<sup>th</sup> Congress, Second Session, Report 566, May 22, 1884, *Reports of the Senate of the United States for the 1<sup>st</sup> Session of the Forty-Eight Congress, 1883-1884*, Volume 5 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1884).

<sup>54</sup> For coverage of his visit to New York City see *Report of the New York Produce Exchange from January 1, 1883 to July 1, 1883* (New York: Jones Printing Co., Steam Printers, 1883), 45; “Military Courtesies to Díaz,” *New York Tribune*, April 4, 1883; “The Movements of General Díaz,” *New York Tribune*, April 5, 1883; “Entertaining General Díaz,” *New York Tribune*, April 7, 1883; “General Díaz Seeing the Sights,” *New York Times*, April 6, 1883; “The Visit of General Díaz,” *The New York Sun*, April 9, 1883; “Dinner to General Díaz,” *New York Times*, April 14, 1883; “General Díaz’s Farewell,” *New York Tribune*, April 14, 1883. For coverage of his time in Boston see



St Louis Díaz declared his hopes that Mexico and the United States would work together for the “great advantage of both,” stating that Mexico had done all in its power to shorten the distance between the two countries and confidently expected the aid of the United States, so that henceforth the labors undertaken and the advantages gained will be shared by the two “sister nations.”<sup>55</sup> As such Díaz continued the rhetoric of the promotional campaign begun in the aftermath of his taking office in 1876.

Díaz’ statements would receive a receptive hearing in the United States. In response to congressional inquiries, Joseph Nimmo, Jr., on behalf of the Office of the Treasury, transmitted a report he compiled on the subject of potential trade between the United States and Mexico. Though not obvious to readers at the time, Nimmo’s positive report of Mexico reflected the success of the Mexican promotional campaign as he consulted with the Mexican Minister, Matías Romero in the writing of the report, which also strongly reflects Romero’s image building campaign.<sup>56</sup>

---

“Gen. Díaz and Party,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 8, 1883; “Arrival of General Díaz,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 9, 1883; “The City’s Guests,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 11, 1883; “Our Mexican Guests,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, April 9, 1883; “General Díaz Visit,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, April 10, 1883; For coverage of his trip to Chicago see *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1883; “Porfirio Díaz,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1883; “The General has a brief Conversation with a Reporter,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1883; “The Regular Banquet of the Congregational Club Mainly Devoted to Gen. Díaz’s Reception,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 21, 1883; “President Díaz,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 22, 1883.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid. In its annual report the Merchants’ Exchange would describe the Díaz visit as one of the most profitable incidents of the year. *Annual Statement of the Trade and Commerce of St Louis for the Year 1883 Reported to the Merchants’ Exchange* (St Louis: R.P. Studley, 1884), 10.

<sup>56</sup> Nimmo exchanged a number of letters with Romero, asking for specific information regarding Mexican population and statistics on the Mexican economy. He also appears to have sent Romero a draft of his report for criticism a little over a week before it was transmitted to the House of Representatives. See Nimmo to Romero,



Nimmo reported that within the last three years enterprises had begun which would bring about a new advent in the relations of the two countries, opening up the commercial relations which would be felt in both nations.<sup>57</sup> Nimmo described Mexico as entering a “new life” which was being manifested itself in the growth of commerce, the building of railroads, and legal reforms.<sup>58</sup> In this optimistic view expressed by Mexican officials and many U.S. observers, a new advent had been established in Mexico with the election of Díaz in 1877, which had inaugurated a new departure in the political and commercial history of Mexico.<sup>59</sup> Nimmo cited evidence such as the granting of liberal concessions to U.S. corporations for railroads which in Nimmo’s view was “unmistakable evidence” of Mexico government’s faith in its own power and

---

January 29, 1884, Matías Romero Papers, 1837-1899, Benson Latin American Collection, General Libraries, The University of Texas at Austin, Reel 42.

<sup>57</sup> *Trade Between Mexico and the United States, Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury*, February 8, 1884, House of Representatives Executive Document No. 86, 48<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Sess., (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1884), 7. See also discussion of the Nimmo report in “Intimate Relations with Mexico,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, February 16, 1884; “Mexico and the United States,” *Bradstreet’s* (March 1, 1884), 131.

<sup>58</sup> For similar sentiments see Lester, 4; “The Political Outlook in Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News*, April 9, 1880; William Butler, “Mexico and Her New Life,” *Zion’s Herald* (December 16, 1880); “On to Mexico,” *Rocky Mountain News*, November 20, 1880; “Progress in Mexico,” *Bradstreet’s* (February 24, 1883), 124; “Mexico,” *The Literary World* (July 14, 1883); *The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, Volume XIV: History of Mexico Volume VI*, 448, 456. Another article in *Bradstreet’s* did warn against unrealistic optimism. See (May 19, 1883).

<sup>59</sup> *Trade Between Mexico and the United States*, 35. See also, “The Proper Policy Towards Mexico,” *The Galveston Daily News* (August 12, 1880); John W. Butler, “The Opening Up of Mexico,” *Zion’s Herald* (November 4, 1880); “The United States and Mexico,” *The Youth’s Companion* (July 7, 1881); “General Díaz,” *The Omaha Daily Bee*, March 2, 1883; “Mexico,” *Friend’s Intelligencer* (March 10, 1883); “Our Mexican Guests,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, April 9, 1883; *Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture* (April 14, 1883).

permanency and desire to cultivate closer relations with the United States. Despite some nationalist concerns in Mexico regarding U.S. investment, Nimmo suggested that pro-U.S. sentiment appeared to be dominant in Mexico regarding future commercial intercourse with the United States.<sup>60</sup>

Nimmo acknowledged that it was impossible to fully forecast accurately the commercial results which would be realized in Mexico though it was clear that a great change was at hand.<sup>61</sup> This was evident from the fact that within a space of two or three years Mexico had changed beyond the old system of commerce to embrace the type of commerce in the more advanced nations at the present day.<sup>62</sup> Nimmo emphasized, “The transformation will probably be one of the most marked within the records of history.”<sup>63</sup> This would further result in Mexico placing itself with the more advanced nations which would rapidly draw them into unity of purpose with the people of the United States.<sup>64</sup> In this sense the Americans perceived that the U.S. controlled the economic destiny of

---

<sup>60</sup> *Trade Between Mexico and the United States*, 34.

<sup>61</sup> Other sources would discuss Mexico as entering a “new era” or being on the verge of great changes. See *Daily Evening Bulletin*, October 15, 1880; “Opening up Mexico,” *New York Times*, March 8, 1881; “Mexican Railways,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, October 8, 1881.

<sup>62</sup> See also, “The New Conquest of Mexico,” *The Youth’s Companion* (November 2, 1882).

<sup>63</sup> *Trade Between Mexico and the United States*, 44. See also “Capital and Enterprises in Mexico,” *Bradstreet’s* (September 23, 1882), 195.

<sup>64</sup> *Trade Between Mexico and the United States*, 44. An article in *Bradstreet’s* suggested that it was the decisive period in which the trade of Mexico must “be lost or won by the United States.” See “Capturing the Trade of Mexico,” *Bradstreet’s* (December 16, 1882), 390.

Mexico with one leading business periodical suggesting that “Mexico enters the world through the United States.”<sup>65</sup> This reflects U.S. views of Mexico as unequal dependent on the United States for its future progress.<sup>66</sup>

As discussed previously, the Díaz regime made the inducement of foreign investment a priority throughout the Porfiriato, hoping that this would be the catalyst for the transformation of the Mexican economy and the creation of a modern, prosperous state on the model of Europe or the United States.<sup>67</sup> Americans were the largest investors into Mexico, and became one its largest trading partners. The result of the railway and increased investments was the integration of Mexico into the U.S. market, causing some historians to describe Mexico as an “economic colony” of the United States during the Díaz years.<sup>68</sup> The historian Steven C. Topik has argued that Mexico by the beginning of the twentieth century was at the center of “international struggle” between capitalists from Europe and the United States. Mexico became one of the most hotly contested sites

---

<sup>65</sup> “Trade Currents Between Mexico and the United States,” *Bradstreet’s* (March 21, 1885). Another article suggested that there was no limit to the potential trade between Mexico and the United States. W.W. Nevin, “The Mexican Reciprocity Question,” *Bradstreet’s* (February 2, 1884), 69.

<sup>66</sup> Janice Lee Jayes, *The Illusion of Ignorance: The American Encounter with Mexico, 1877-1920* (Lanhan, MD: The University Press of America, 2011), xvi.

<sup>67</sup> Friedrich Katz, “The Liberal Republic and the Porfiriato, 1867-1910,” *Mexico Since Independence*, ed. Leslie Bethell (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1991), 81; Edward Beatty, *Institutions and Investment: The Political Basis of Industrialization in Mexico Before 1911* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 5.

<sup>68</sup> Gilbert G. González, *Culture of Empire: American Writers, Mexico and Mexican Immigrants, 1880-1930* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004), 12. For the theme of the integration of Mexico into the U.S. market see Paolo Riguzzi, “From Globalization to Revolution? The Porfirian Political Economy: An Essay on Issues and Interpretations,” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 41:2 (May 2009): 347.

during this period, and received more foreign capital than any other developing economy with the exception of Argentina, more than countries such as China and India.<sup>69</sup>

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the Chief of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the U.S. State Department, Frederick Emory, stated that the commercial expansion of the United States was “no longer problematical, but a fact of constantly enlarging proportion which opens up new vistas in the struggle for ascending among the industrial powers.”<sup>70</sup> While much of the historical discussion of the economic relations between the United States and Mexico has centered on U.S. investment in railways, mining and other industries, the discourses on trade and the Mexican market are equally important. Discussions of the Mexican market were just as widespread in the U.S. public sphere, and captured the interest of many smaller merchants, and manufacturers, that were focused on expanding trade on a much smaller level than the larger U.S. capital enterprises and investments that would become associated with investment in Mexico.

However despite these views American promoters of closer trade relations remained frustrated at the slow rate with which their merchants were gaining control of this trade.<sup>71</sup> European, particularly English and German merchants, retained a substantial

---

<sup>69</sup> Steven C. Topik, “The Emergence of Finance Capital in Mexico,” *Five Centuries of Mexican History: Papers of the VIII Conference of Mexican and North American Historians*, eds. Virginia Guedea and Jaime E. Rodriguez O. (Mexico: Instituto Mora, 1992), 227, 230.

<sup>70</sup> Frederick Emory, “A General Survey of Foreign Trade,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 247 (April 1901), 424-425.

<sup>71</sup> See for instance R.W. Loghery, “Acapulco,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries during the Years 1886 and 1887* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888), 585-586; R.W. Loghery, “Condition of Trade in Acapulco, Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 103 (March 1889), (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), 397; Eugene O. Fechet, “Mexican

portion of this trade and U.S. merchants and American consuls in Mexico and the rest of Latin America continued to lament the slow rate of U.S. commercial expansion in Mexico. Through much of the 1880s the United States had a trade deficit due largely to its failure to increase exports to Latin America. For instance, in 1889 the United States had a surplus of \$128 million with the rest of the world, but a deficit of \$142 million with Latin America. While the United States imported raw materials, such as coffee and sugar from Latin American countries, the U.S. exported a small percentage of manufactured articles to these nations, who got the vast majority of these goods from European merchants.<sup>72</sup> American discussions of European trade with Mexico, and Latin American countries reflected a jealousy for this trade, but a confident expectation that they would soon wrest it away from Europeans.

U.S. promoters used older ideas of Latin America in making their case for U.S. commercial expansion in Mexico at the expense of European merchants. This was especially prevalent in the statements by U.S. consuls that were published by the federal government, and sent to commercial interests throughout the nation and frequently reproduced in U.S. newspapers and magazines.<sup>73</sup> In 1891 the U.S. consul in Piedras

---

Trade and How to Secure it," *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 146 (November 1892), Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892), 394.

<sup>72</sup> Steven C. Topik, *Trade and Gunboats: The United States and Brazil in the Age of Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 35. See also William Eleroy Curtis, *Trade and Transportation between the United States and Latin America* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889), 2. During 1888 the U.S. bought 35 percent of Latin American exports, but sold only 15 percent of the goods imported into Latin American, see Curtis, *Trade and Transportation*, 10.

<sup>73</sup> In 1893 the mailing list for the *Consular Reports* included 1,200 newspapers and journals, 600 libraries, 150 boards of trade and 3,000 individuals. See "Distribution

Niegras, Mexico declared that U.S. businesses had a great trade at their “very doors,” but that U.S. manufacturers and merchants were not putting forth the effort to secure it.<sup>74</sup>

R.W. Loughery the U.S. consul in Acapulco declared that the U.S. should “re-assert the Monroe Doctrine” through prompt and vigorous commercial action, and later suggested that Americans would not be true to American “history and traditions” if they failed to seize the opportunities that had been presented to them, and instead allowed Europe to be the leading voice in Mexico. He stated, “This continent is the great fulcrum from which American sentiment will extend its influence upon the civilized world.”<sup>75</sup> This was described by the St Louis Spanish Club, an organization devoted to expanding trade with Mexico and Latin America, as the “patriotic duty” of American merchants and manufacturers.<sup>76</sup> Several years later the consul at Durango, built on this theme, stating that he did not believe the United States should split trade with Europe in Mexico, rather that the United States should control it all, while another consul in the same year declared that U.S. merchants were “justly entitled” to this trade.<sup>77</sup> The consul in Tampico, Mexico

---

of Consular Reports,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 156 (September 1893), V.

<sup>74</sup> Eugene O. Fechet, “American vs. European Trade in Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 131 (August 1891), 583.

<sup>75</sup> R.W. Loughery, “The District of Acapulco,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 108 (September 1889), 91; R.W. Loughery, “Condition of Trade in Acapulco, Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 103 (March 1889), 397.

<sup>76</sup> St Louis Spanish Club, “Spanish American Trade,” *Annual Statement of the Trade and Commerce of St Louis for the Year 1894 Reported to the Merchants’ Exchange of St Louis* (St Louis: Press of R. P. Studley & Co., 1895), 136.

<sup>77</sup> Walter H. Faulkner, “Durango,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries during the Years 1898* (Washington: Government Printing

suggested that Mexico should be understood as a “new West” and therefore linked this issue with earlier discussions of territorial expansion from the time period, while another described Mexico as “virgin country, with its arms extended to receive our capitalist.”<sup>78</sup>

### The “Firm Hand” of Porfirio Díaz

Americans frequently complimented Porfirio Díaz and his regime and the progress that they saw as instituted by his rule in Mexico. One of the strongest statements came from Ethel Tweedie, a popular writer who wrote several books about Mexico and Díaz, declared him to be “the greatest man of the nineteenth century.”<sup>79</sup> Because of this Díaz was frequently compared with great figures in American history, especially George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.<sup>80</sup> The former Ambassador to Mexico, David E. Thompson, went as far to describe Díaz as a “noble man of God.”<sup>81</sup>

---

Office, 1899), 572; Louis Kaiser, Supplementary Report,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries during the Years 1898* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), 580.

<sup>78</sup> Samuel Magill, “Tampico,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries during the Years 1900* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901), 580; Arthur Di Cima, “America: Mexico,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries during the Years 1896 & 1897* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898), 498. See also Edward M. Conley, “American Investments in Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 146 (June 1904) 999-1000. Conley was the vice-consul for Mexico City.

<sup>79</sup> Mrs Alec Tweedie, *Mexico as I Saw It* (London and Kingston: Kelly’s Directors LTD., 1901), 116. Other sources that are complimentary of Díaz include, “Díaz and Mexico,” *The Washington Post*, March 27, 1896; Marie Robinson Wright, *Picturesque Mexico* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1897), 92; “Mexico’s Great Ruler,” *Congregationalist* (December 8, 1900); “Old Mexico,” *Railroad Trainmen’s Journal* XXII:4 (April 1905): 241.

<sup>80</sup> “The Mexican Wizard,” *The Land of Sunshine: The Magazine of California and the West* IX (September 1899): 310. See also “President Díaz,” *Los Angeles Times* (February 13, 1901); Joseph Wharton, *Mexico* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company,



Yet the progress and development of Mexico came with a price. Despite the frequent statements that Díaz had brought peace and stability to Mexico, recent historians of Mexico have noted that the Porfiriato was a “violent and contentious period in Mexico,” and the rule of Díaz was never as absolute as the regime tried to portray in Mexico and abroad.<sup>82</sup> While the degree of political stability during the Díaz years was unprecedented in Mexico’s independent history, until the outbreak of the Revolution in 1910, the regime faced a number of challenges to his rule from regional caudillos who challenged its authority, from dissidents who rejected his reelections, and from communities which resisted the encroachments of centralized authority, the loss of autonomy and Mexicans who suffered from the nature of the economic modernization programs.<sup>83</sup> American observers frequently noted challenges to the rule of Díaz, whether in the form of the anti-reelectionist revolt of Catarino Garza in 1891, Indian rebellions, throughout the period, or those of regional strongmen, but instead of hurting the image of Díaz in the United States, these challenges actually enhanced it. Americans tended to view revolts against Díaz unsympathetically, and the success of Díaz in defeating them, seemed to support the need of a leader like Díaz to reign in the revolutionary and

---

1902), NP; John R. Dos Passos, “Díaz Like Washington,” *The Washington Post*, March 10, 1911.

<sup>81</sup> “Díaz Called ‘Man of God’” *The Washington Post*, December 9, 1909.

<sup>82</sup> Elliott Young, *Catarino Garza’s Revolution on the Texas-Mexico Border* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 58; Paul Vanderwood, *Disorder and Progress: Bandits, Police and Mexican Development* (Lincoln and London: The University of Nebraska Press, 1981), 89; Garner, *Porfirio Díaz: Profiles in Power* (London: Longman, 2001), 99.

<sup>83</sup> Garner, *Porfirio Díaz*, 127-131.



anarchistic nature of the Mexican people.<sup>84</sup> This was expressed by one American visitor who expressed admiration for Díaz, who was able to keep in check “a people so excitable and so turbulent.”<sup>85</sup> Even laudatory articles and books about Mexico and Díaz frequently commented on the darker side of Mexican development such as the suppression of labor, peonage, the treatment of indigenous Mexicans, social and economic inequality in Mexico as well as a lack of true democracy and republicanism in Mexico.

In 1884 for the second time the Presidency of the Mexican Republic changed hands without any incident disturbing the peace of the Republic. In his address to Congress in 1885 Díaz declared that this showed that “democratic institutions are being deeply rooted in the habits of our people.”<sup>86</sup> While Díaz would not relinquish power until he was deposed by the Mexican Revolution in 1911, and his regime would be characterized by political repression and a lack of democratic norms, in 1885 it appeared to many observers that Mexico was creating a vibrant healthy republic. U.S. Senator John T. Morgan, in an article in the *North American Review*, which also reflected Romero’s consultation, suggested that Mexico was showing the world that they could create a free,

---

<sup>84</sup> Commentators about the revolutionary nature of the Mexican people, or the potential danger of new outbreaks of revolution include, “Perturbed Republics,” *The Illustrated American* (February 27, 1892): 51; S. Glen Andrus, “The Regeneration of the Army and Navy,” *The National Magazine* XVII: 5 (February 1903): 618; Juan De Alberto, “The Next President of Mexico,” *Success* VI: 110 (July 1903): 418.

<sup>85</sup> Harriott Wight Sherratt, *Mexican Vistas Seen from Highways and Byways of Travel* (Chicago and New York: Rand, McNally & Co., Publishers, 1899), 108. For similar views see Mary E. Muncey, “The City of Mexico,” *The New Bohemian* II:6 (June 1896): 250.

<sup>86</sup> “Message of the President of Mexico, on the Opening of Congress,” April 1, 1885, *British and Foreign State Papers, 1884-1885* (London: William Ridgway, 1891), 851-852. John W. Foster made a similar point in his article to the *NY Evening Post*. See Romero, *Railway’s in Mexico*, 4.

democratic, constitutional government, and would be an example to other nations qualified for self-government.<sup>87</sup>

However soon after regaining power in 1884 Díaz and other Mexican officials undermined representative government in Mexico leading to the seemingly perpetual reelection of Díaz as well as other offices in Congress, the military and judiciary that would be filled throughout the nation by Díaz supporters. Díaz also commenced a repression of the opposition press through fines, imprisonment and possibly assassination of hostile editors and journalists.<sup>88</sup> Díaz and the Liberal elites associated with the regime shifted focus from support for individual liberties and democracy which was the focus of classical liberalism into positivism, which was concerned with economic development and the building of a strong central state.<sup>89</sup> Mexican elites believed that Mexicans lacked the self-restraint necessary for democratic government, and hoped that political stability in the form of the Díaz regime would allow them to create conditions for economic

---

<sup>87</sup> Morgan, "Mexico," 409-410, 416. Morgan asked Romero for advice as to where to find information about Mexico history and other information in order to gain background for his article. See Morgan to Romero, March 14, 1883, Matías Romero Papers, Reel 41; Morgan to Romer, March 24, 1883, Ibid. Like Nimmo's report Morgan's article clearly mirrors the Mexican image building campaign.

<sup>88</sup> See Thomas Benjamin, "Introduction: Approaching the Porfiriato," *Other Mexicos: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876-1911*, eds. Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), 10-11; Brian R. Hamnett, *A Concise History of Mexico* Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 186-189; Peter Standish, *A Companion to Mexican Studies* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Tamesis, 2006), 64.

<sup>89</sup> Buchenau, *Mexican Mosaic*, 63. For a discussion of this theme see Charles A. Hale, *The Transformation of Liberalism in Late Nineteenth-Century Mexico* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989).

development.<sup>90</sup> In the years shortly after Mexican independence Americans had hoped that Mexico would emulate the example of the United States and form a republican government.

Occasionally commentators glossed over the nature of the Díaz regime and described it as they might a representative republican government. For instance a 1903 article in *Current Literature* stated that Díaz had given the Mexican nation the “free ballot, free press and an honest government.”<sup>91</sup> This was especially prevalent in speeches by U.S. politicians and government officials on diplomatic occasions which frequently emphasized the theme of the United States and Mexico as “sister republics.” Perhaps the most glaring example of this is U.S. Secretary of State Elihu Root’s visit to Mexico in 1907 where he emphasized this theme on several occasions.<sup>92</sup>

However, American commentators usually acknowledged that Mexico under Díaz was not a true republican government and accepted that Díaz ruled Mexico as a dictator.<sup>93</sup> For instance A.A. Graham, an attorney from Topeka, Kansas who had just

---

<sup>90</sup> Robert M. Buffington and William E. French, “The Culture of Modernity,” *The Oxford History of Mexico*, eds. Michael C. Meyer and William H. Beezley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 399, 402.

<sup>91</sup> “Porfirio Díaz,” *Current Literature* XXXV: 2 (August 1903): 156. For a similar description see Charles Johnston, “Porfirio Díaz,” *The North American Review* DLIV (January 1903): 124.

<sup>92</sup> “Mr Root’s Reply,” *Latin America and the United States: Addresses by Elihu Root*, eds. Robert Bacon and James Brown Scott (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917), 165.

<sup>93</sup> For a sample of U.S. commentators referring to Díaz as a dictator see, “The Mexican Dictator,” *Boston Daily Globe*, March 11, 1888; “Trembling Mexico,” *The Denver Daily News*, September 1, 1891; “Mexico’s Despotism,” *The Milwaukee Daily Journal*, December 31, 1891; “The President of Mexico,” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, February 7, 1892; “Peace and Suffering,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, June 27, 1892; “Díaz

returned from a two- month business trip to Mexico, wrote a book about that nation in which he depicted Mexico as “absolutely, immediately and irrevocably handled by President Díaz... no parallel of like absolutism has ever existed.”<sup>94</sup> While noting that Mexico was governed the name of a republic, an article in the New York *Metropolitan Magazine* stated that it was just an “idle name.”<sup>95</sup> Even when noting sometimes repressive measures in Mexico, Americans often justified them, because of the nature of the Mexican people. For instance an editorial in the *New York Observer and Chronicle* stated that though the rule of Díaz had at times been arbitrary, and he had ignored constitutional forms, “the work of reclaiming a great state from anarchy is not to be done with gloves,” and the progress of Mexico justified his methods.<sup>96</sup> As such these

---

as a Dictator,” *The San Francisco Morning Call*, December 3, 1893; “Díaz for a Fifth Term,” *The Washington Post*, September 28, 1895; S. Glen Andrus, “The Passing of Mexico’s Man on Horseback,” *The National Magazine* XVII: 2 (November 1902): 170; James B. Morrow, “Díaz’s Rule of Iron,” *The Washington Post*, July 17, 1904; “Díaz Will Rule,” *Daily Capital Journal* [Salem, OR], September 12, 1906; *The Columbus Enquirer-Sun*, September 12, 1906; William English Carson, *Mexico: The Wonderland of the South* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1909), 198; Tweedie, *Mexico as I Saw It* 143.

<sup>94</sup> A.A. Graham, *Mexico with Comparisons and Conclusions* (Topeka, KS: Crane and Co, 1907), 147. See also, “All Report to Díaz,” *Boston Daily Globe*, June 28, 1896; “No Scruples About a Third Term,” *Louisiana Democrat*, December 9, 1896; “President Porfirio Díaz,” *Denver Evening Post*, April 17, 1897; “Díaz and Mexico,” *The St Paul Globe*, June 30, 1901.

<sup>95</sup> “William Eugene Lewis, “Díaz: Mexico’s Man on Horseback,” *Metropolitan Magazine* IX: 5 (May 1899): 469. For a similar description see “A Fifth Term for Díaz,” *The Minneapolis Journal*, June 26, 1896; Julian Hawthorne, *History of Spanish America from the Earliest Period to the Present Time* (New York: Peter Fenelon, 1899), 461; Sidney Low, “Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century,” *The Living Age* (April 13, 1901): 82; “The Rules of Mexico,” *The Baltimore Sun*, August 29, 1909.

<sup>96</sup> “The Mexico of To-Day,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (March 24, 1898), 382. See also, “Díaz and Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, August 30, 1895; “W.E. Curtis, “A Great Ruler,” *The Hartford Courant*, May 15, 1906.

commentators had a similar analysis of the nature of the Mexican masses as Mexican elite supporters of the regime.

Many observers expressed the caveat, that although he was a dictator, which usually was associated with negative connotations, Díaz was a “benevolent despot” who ruled wisely in the interests of the Mexican people. Though a dictator, Díaz was described as a leader who used his power wisely in the interests of the Mexican people.<sup>97</sup> An article in *The Methodist Review* proclaimed that it was hard to find another leader who had such “despotic power” and used it so “wisely and benevolently” for the good of his country.<sup>98</sup> This was expressed strongly in an editorial in the *El Paso Herald* which

---

<sup>97</sup> Other commentators that use the “benevolent” or “beneficent” despot theme include, “What Díaz Has Done for Mexico,” *The Hartford Courant*, October 6, 1898; “William Eugene Lewis, “Díaz: Mexico’s Man on Horseback,” *Metropolitan Magazine* IX: 5 (May 1899): 469; Alfred Bishop Mason, “An Audience with Díaz,” *The Century Magazine* LXIV: 2 (June 1902): 188; John Vavasour Noel, *History of the Second Pan-American Congress* (Baltimore: Guggenheimer Weil, & Co., 1902), 285, 291; S. Glen Andrus, “The Regeneration of the Army and Navy,” *The National Magazine* XVII: 5 (February 1903): 619; “Toward the Golden Gate,” *The National Tribune*, September 3, 1903; “Porfirio Díaz: The Liberal Minded Despot Who Rules Mexico,” *New York Sun*, December 20, 1903; “Who Shall Follow Díaz- Limantour or Reyes?” *St Louis Republic*, December 20, 1903; Frank H. Taylor, “President Porfirio Díaz: The Benevolent Despot of Mexico,” *The Booklovers Magazine* III: 6 (June 1904): 763-773; “Mexico Enjoys Autocratic Rule of Díaz as Benevolent Dictator,” *The San Francisco Call*, February 22, 1909; “Engineering Opportunities in Mexico,” *The Iowa Engineer* XI: I (October 1910): 17. For the theme of Díaz acting wisely in the interests of the Mexican people see Edgar Sanderson, J. P. Lamberton and John McGovern, *The World’s History and its Makers, Volume III* (Chicago: Universal History Publishing, Co., 1900), 402. See also “The Presidential Election in Mexico,” *Congregationalist* (July 19, 1900); James Creelman, *Díaz, Master of Mexico* (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1911), 418.

<sup>98</sup> Archer Brown, “Mexico in 1904,” *The Methodist Review* 20: 6 (November 1904): 882. See also “Our Near Neighbor,” *The Hartford Courant*, November 10, 1898; Edgar Sanderson, J. P. Lamberton and John McGovern, *The World’s History and its Makers, Volume III* (Chicago: universal History Publishing, Co., 1900), 402; “The Presidential Election in Mexico,” *Congregationalist* (July 19, 1900); “The Mexican

stated that if Díaz was “an oppressor, it is to keep down the powers of evil. If he is a tyrant, it is to keep in chains those whose ways would be worse than tyranny.”<sup>99</sup> While often noting that a despotism of the Díaz type would not be acceptable in the United States, commentators suggested it was good for the people of Mexico, with one writer declaring that “no national presiding officer in the world, whatever the title may be, has better adaptation to his work, nor has been more successful as the benefactor of his people than Porfirio Díaz, president of the Republic of Mexico.”<sup>100</sup> This theme of Díaz as a benevolent dictator was widespread enough for the New York State Education Department to include a section on the theme of Díaz as a benevolent dictator in its *Syllabus for Secondary Schools* in 1910.<sup>101</sup>

U.S. commentators frequently viewed the relationship between Díaz and the Mexican people as paternalistic with Díaz providing the Mexican people with the type of

---

Outlook,” *Mining and Scientific Press* XCVIII: 16 (April 17, 1909): 533; “President Díaz,” *Goodwin’s Weekly* (September 18, 1909).

<sup>99</sup> “Díaz and the Reign of Peace,” reprinted in *The Editorial Review* I (November 1909): 431. For similar sentiments that Díaz needed to use arbitrary power or strong measures because of the nature of the Mexican people see “Mexico’s Strong Man,” *The Illustrated American* IX: 94 (December 5, 1891): 109; Arthur Inkersley, “The Republic of Mexico,” *The Chautauquan* XXII: 2 (November 1895): 132.

<sup>100</sup> W.F. Cloud, *The Heart of Mexico: Politics! Religion! War! Pain and Her Methods Overthrown* (Kansas City, MO: Hailman & Company Printers, 1898), 34. For articles noting that Díaz methods would not be good for the United States, but were successful in Mexico see “President Díaz,” *The Washington Post*, July 14, 1888; “The Mexican Presidency,” *The Washington Post*, June 29, 1890; “Will Díaz Succeed Himself?” *The San Francisco Morning Call*, January 6, 1895.

<sup>101</sup> New York State Education Department, *Advance Sheets of Syllabus for Secondary Schools 1910: History and Social Science* (Albany: New York State Education Department, 1910), 98.



leadership they needed.<sup>102</sup> This is reflected in a *Los Angeles Times* editorial which declared that Díaz knew “how much liberty may safely be allowed to a people who are in the formative stage of development as citizens of a free country.”<sup>103</sup> This shows both the success of the Porfirian regime in what one historian has described as the creation of deference to the patriarchal figure of Porfirian Díaz in the political culture in Mexico and the success of Mexican officials in building the nation’s image around this theme abroad.<sup>104</sup> In describing the rule of Porfirio Díaz, Americans frequently utilized a variation on the theme of the “firm hand,” that the Mexican people needed and Díaz had provided.<sup>105</sup> Americans usually acknowledged the lack of democracy and civil liberties

---

<sup>102</sup> Arthur Howard Noll, “Porfirio Díaz,” *The Sewanee Review* XIV: 3 (July 1906): 447; Arthur Howard Noll, *From Empire to Republic: The Story of the Struggle for Constitutional Government in Mexico* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1903), 302-303. For similar sentiments suggesting that Díaz provided the kind of rule Mexico needed see “President Díaz,” *The Washington Post*, July 14, 1888; “Progress in Mexico,” *The Washington Post*, September 27, 1895; “Spanish American Dictators,” *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, February 17, 1896; Frederick Stone Daniel, “Mexico As It Is,” *Frank Leslie’s Popular Monthly* XLV: 1 (January 1898): 10; Juan Otalora, “Díaz, The Autocrat of Mexico,” *Baltimore Sun*, December 20, 1903; “The Visits of Porfirio Díaz,” *America* II: 2 (October 23, 1909): 43.

<sup>103</sup> “An Enlightened Ruler,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 7, 1900.

<sup>104</sup> Garner, *Porfirio Díaz*, 127.

<sup>105</sup> “Díaz for President,” *The Washington Post*, February 18, 1892; F.L. Oswald, “Republicanism in Spanish America,” *The Republican Magazine* I:6 (November 1892): 509-510; “Díaz-A Nation Builder,” *St Paul Globe*, March 23, 1901; S. Glen Andrus, “The Passing of Mexico’s Man on Horseback,” *The National Magazine* XVII: 2 (November 1902): 169; “The Mexican Succession,” *Houston Daily Post*, December 26, 1902; “President Porfirio Díaz: The Benevolent Despot of Mexico,” *The Booklovers Magazine* III: 6 (June 1904): 763; Tweedie, *Mexico as I Saw It*, 117; “Inauguration of Díaz,” *The Washington Post*, December 16, 1900; “Impending Political Changes in Mexico,” *The Independent* LIII: 2732 (April 11, 1901): 843; *The History of Nations: Mexico, Central America and the West Indies*, ed. Henry Cabot Lodge from the work of Brantz Meyer and Frederick Albion Ober (Philadelphia: John D. Morris and Co., 1906), 410-412; Díaz, President for Life,” *The Duluth New Tribune*, April 17, 1909; *Grand*

but accepted it as necessary given the nature of the Mexican people. As discussed in previous chapters, Americans had often debated the future of republicanism in Mexico, frequently concluding that the Mexican people were unfit for self-government. This sentiment was reiterated in an 1910 article that stated that the mass of people from Latin American countries are “illiterate and ignorant” and have “no idea of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship,” while because of “their temperament and training” they are easily excited and led.<sup>106</sup>

While later historians have emphasized the importance of the American categorization of Mexicans as “mixed-race” in understanding how Mexicans were racialized, American commentators also frequently addressed the fact that at least a third of the Mexican population was “Indian,” though this category tended to be elastic and sometimes meant different things for different commentators. The most common statistics of the ethnic composition of Mexico came from the 1900 census which listed 19% of the population as white, “or nearly white,” 43% as “mixed race” and 38% as Indians. Of the Indian population in 1895 there were almost two million who did not

---

*Forks Daily Herald*, September 14, 1909; “President Díaz,” *Outlook* 95: 11 (July 16, 1910): 549.

<sup>106</sup> NS Mayo, “Mexico,” *Outlook* (June 18, 1910): 373; See also “President Díaz,” *Outlook* (July 16, 1910): 548. For other similar analysis see W. Barrows, “Both Sides of the Rio Grande,” *Magazine of Western History* I: 5 (March 1885): 387-388. An editorial in the *Santa Fe New Mexican* suggested that republicanism was an Anglo-Saxon idea and would always prove a failure in Mexico. See September 27, 1900. For a strong statement of the inability of Latin Americans for self-government or even progress based on racial characteristics see Alfred P. Schultz, *Race or Mongrel* (Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1908), 147-163.



speak Spanish, out of a population of about twelve million.<sup>107</sup> Still American visitors to Mexico produced widely diverging assessments of the number of Mexico's Indian population, with some listing the census numbers (or those from a previous census), and others suggesting the Indian population to be one-half, two-thirds, three-fourths, or almost all. One writer in the *St Louis Globe-Democrat* stated that "ethnology in Mexico is very complicated," and that to the "inexperienced eye" most of the mixed races look like Indians.<sup>108</sup> Some writers described Mexico as an Indian nation, though noting the differences in civilization between the mixed races and those of purer Indian blood.<sup>109</sup>

In the minds of U.S. commentators, the Indian population of Mexico provided special challenges and opportunities for the potential progress of Mexico, since for Mexico to be fit for self-government and to progress, Díaz and the government would have to incorporate them into the polity and civilize them generally. Much of this discussion was in context of attempts in late nineteenth century to "civilize" Native Americans in the United States through the breaking up of reservations as a result of the Dawes Act of 1887 in order to turn Indians into property owners and "propel them into industrious pursuits," and the use of Indian boarding schools to educate young Native

---

<sup>107</sup> International Bureau of American Republics, *Mexico: Geographical Sketch, Natural Resources, Laws, Economic Conditions, Actual Development, Prospects of Future Growth* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), 6.

<sup>108</sup> W.B.S., "Mexico's Indian Problem," *St Louis Globe-Democrat*, May 12, 1887.

<sup>109</sup> Frederick Stone Daniel, "Mexico as It Is," *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly* XLV: 1 (January 1898): 3.

Americans to civilize Indians.<sup>110</sup> The larger goal of these programs in the United States was to assimilate and Americanize Native American groups.<sup>111</sup>

American commentators used several different strategies in seeking to understand and predict the future of the Mexico with its large Indian population. Susan Hale, who visited Mexico in 1885, and wrote several books about that nation, stated that the peace and prosperity brought by the rule of Díaz, whom she identifies as an Indian, was allowing Mexico's Indians a "chance to show whether they are capable of taking a leading place among the races of the earth." She wrote that their true character would have a chance to assert itself and the world would see if Mexico had the "capacity of self-government." In order for this to happen Hale stated, Mexicans would have to "root out of their nature the savage instincts" of not only their Aztec ancestors, but those inherited from the Spanish. If the Mexican people could do this then Mexico had the opportunity to take an "honorable place among the peoples of the western continent."<sup>112</sup>

Building on earlier themes of Mexican history from the period of the Mexican Wars of the Reform, and French Intervention, Alabama Senator John T. Morgan, described the majority of Mexicans as Indians and stated that it was the Indians who had restored liberty to Mexico giving it a "free constitutional government" while opposed by the European Intervention and the Catholic Church party. He stated that those who disparaged the capacity of Mexicans "to perform the highest functions of free

---

<sup>110</sup> Ninkovich, *Global Dawn*, 195; David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995), 17-18.

<sup>111</sup> Ninkovich, *Global Dawn*, 192-193.

<sup>112</sup> Susan Hale, *Mexico* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1888), 400-401.

government, forget their history and ignore their success in founding and defending a great republic,” while countries like France and Spain still struggled between self-government and monarchy.<sup>113</sup>

American writers sometimes sought to draw distinctions between Indians in the United States and those in Mexico. An article in *Modern Mexico* which consistently sought to increase trade and investment in Mexico, suggested that when Americans think of the Mexican Indians they think of the “sullen and revengeful redman known there” not the “meek and respectful laborer of Mexico.”<sup>114</sup> The chief of The Bureau of Statistics, Joseph Nimmo, also asserted that the Indians of the United States, and the “so-called Indians of Mexico” were actually of two different races. He stated that Mexican Indians were “docile and industrious, engaging in agriculture, and were enfranchised citizens in the political system.”<sup>115</sup> Nimmo noted that numerous “men of mark,” had risen from the ranks of its Indian population, including some in science, the arts, letters, education, as well as the church, military and government and explained that the Mexico’s future prosperity was related to their “capacity as producers.”<sup>116</sup> Another writer, Nevin O. Winter also drew a distinction between Mexican and American Indians, describing it as a difference in nature which he attributes to the fact that the “American Indian was never

---

<sup>113</sup> John T. Morgan, “Mexico,” *The North American Review* CCCXVIII (May 1883): 415-416.

<sup>114</sup> “Mexico’s High and Low Classes,” *Modern Mexico* XIV: 5 (February 1903): 26. Other commentators emphasizing the theme of difference between Mexican and U.S. Indians include “Lectures on Mexico,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, January 3, 1898.

<sup>115</sup> *Trade Between Mexico and the United States*, 10-11.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*

fully subdued,” while Mexico’s were crushed by the Spanish conquest.<sup>117</sup> Winter viewed the Mexican Indian as similar to the “southern negroes- a race without ambition,” who were therefore “content to be the servants of another race” neither courting nor welcoming change.<sup>118</sup> Winter went on to describe them as being always willing to follow a leader who could appeal to their “prejudices or fanaticism,” making them a “serious obstacle to a progressive government.”<sup>119</sup> Maturin Ballou writing years before had expressed similar views and had believed that it would take generations of “close contact with a more cultured and democratic people,” before such “servile” ideas could be transformed.<sup>120</sup>

One detractor of this view was M.J. Bentley, who had served for many years as an Indian agent in present-day Oklahoma. After a visit to Mexico he stated that the Indians in Mexico were not essentially different than those in the United States. What was different was governmental policy toward them, Bentley declared. While in the United States they are made wards of the state, and U.S. policy had degraded the Indian, in Mexico they have been given the chance to be a “self-respecting” citizens. Bentley described Mexico as “practically a great Indian republic,” and suggested that Mexico had

---

<sup>117</sup> Nevin O. Winter, *Mexico and Her People of To-Day* (Boston: L.C. Page and Company, 1907), 183,193. Another article described the Indians of Mexico as having faces that had the “melancholy cast of people borne down by oppression.” See “The People of Mexico,” *Saturday Evening Post* (October 27, 1883): 14.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 185.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 186. For similar views as to the nature of the Mexican peon see C.B. Harris, “The Peon of Modern Mexico,” *The Harvard Monthly* LI: 4 (January 1911): 142-143,148.

<sup>120</sup> Maturin M. Ballou, *Aztec Land* (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890), 35.

shown the “possibilities of the Indian.”<sup>121</sup> Bentley’s view of the Mexican Indians as citizens was however a minority one as many writers described a general lack of interest on the part of the Indians, or the Mexican people generally as to politics, which made the creation of true republican government at that time an impossibility.<sup>122</sup> Given these views, they concluded that the Mexican people needed a leader such as Díaz, who would provide a firm hand to reign in these instincts, but also help to civilize the Indians and in a larger sense the Mexican people to create the conditions for true republicanism sometime in the future.<sup>123</sup>

While many times U.S. commentators made statements about the ability or lack thereof of Mexicans and Latin Americans for self-government or the need for an education for self-government without elaboration, others analyzed this theme with some sophistication. One such commentator was Solomon Bulkley Griffin, who visited Mexico in 1885, while serving as the editor of the *Springfield Republican*, an influential Boston-area newspaper. Griffin explained that Mexico by virtue of its Spanish colonial past

---

<sup>121</sup> “Indian Territory Redman’s Grave,” *The Washington Times*, March 20, 1906. Others commentators that described the treatment of Mexico towards its Indians as superior to that of the United States include, W.F. Mallalieu, “An Indian Village in Mexico,” *Christian Advocate* (March 13, 1890); Walter S. Logan, “The Nation Maker,” *A Mexican Night: The Toasts and Responses at a complimentary dinner given by Walter S. Logan at the Democratic Clun, New York City* (New York: A.B. King, 1892), 4. Logan, though not apparently Catholic himself, built on a theme that was sometimes espoused in Catholic literature to counteract the “Black Legend,” which was that the Spanish colonial process had civilized and Christianized the Indians, while the English colonists had killed them.

<sup>122</sup> Stanton Davis Kirkham, *Mexican Trails: A Record of Travel in Mexico, 1904-1907, and a Glimpse at the Life of the Mexican Indian* (New York and London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1909), 11; Creelman, *Díaz, Master of Mexico*, 397-398.

<sup>123</sup> Creelman, *Díaz, Master of Mexico*, 397-400.

entered nationhood with “customs, methods, beliefs and prejudices that belonged to the Middle Ages, and were not easily shaken off.”<sup>124</sup> Speaking on the same theme, another analyst contrasted Mexico with the United States which at the time of its independence had had an education in self-government, going back to the Magna Carta, and was prepared for true republicanism upon its independence.<sup>125</sup> Griffin explained that the task before Mexico was great and difficult- “nothing less than the education of many millions of Indians in books, in the habit of thinking, and in independent citizenship.” Griffin believed this was a task that would take time and nothing, “beyond a certain point could hasten it.”<sup>126</sup> Griffin believed that in addition to the expansion of popular and political education, the stability of liberal institutions would be dependent on economic prosperity,

---

<sup>124</sup> Solomon Bulkley Griffin, *Mexico of To-Day* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1886), 249. For similar views see Henry Brooks, “Our Relations with Mexico,” *Californian* I:3 (March 1880): 210; Thomas A. Janvier, “The Mexican Army,” *The North American Review* LXXIX: CCCCLXXIV (November 1889): 813; Walter S. Logan, *A Mexican Law Suit. An Address Delivered before the Department of Jurisprudence of the American Social Science Association, at Saratoga, September 5, 1895* (Brooklyn: Eagle Book and Job Printing Department, 1895), 11; John Birkinbine, “Our Neighbor, Mexico,” *National Geographic Magazine* XXII: 5 (May 1911): 486-487.

<sup>125</sup> William H. Burges, “A Comparative Study of the Constitutions of the United States of Mexico and the United States of America,” *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Session of the Texas Bar Association* (Austin Texas Bar Association, 1905), 204. For similar sentiments see, Henry Brooks, “Our Relations with Mexico,” *Californian* I:3 (March 1880): 211; John W. Foster, “The Latin-American Constitutions and Revolutions,” *The National Geographic Magazine* XII: 5 (May 1901): 174.

<sup>126</sup> Griffin, *Mexico of To-Day*, 249; Logan, *A Mexican Law Suit* 25-26. For similar sentiments see Charles F. Scott, *Letters* (Iola, KS: Iola Register Print, 1892), 216-217. Scott’s observations are based on an excursion to Mexico as part of the a group of Kansas and Missouri journalists in 1888. For his original columns see “Newspaper Clippings: Kansans in Mexico,” Clifford C. Baker Collection, Kansas Collection, RH MS C74, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, University of Kansas. For a discussion of the lack of interest and experience of the majority of the Mexican people in political matters see Mary Elizabeth Blake and Margaret F. Sullivan, *Mexico: Picturesque, Political, Progressive* (Boston: Lee and Shepard Publishers, 1888), 195-196.

and hence the United States could help in the process through investment aiding its economic development, which would be in the larger interest of both nations.<sup>127</sup> The consul in Acapulco admonished Americans to not only take the lead commercially but to infuse Mexicans with “the spirit of American enterprise and progress.” He explained that emigrants from every country brought with values peculiar to their former civilization, and therefore Americans would be able to bring with them values that would lead to the establishment and strengthening of republican institutions in Mexico.<sup>128</sup> While later historians would describe the Porfirian regime’s policies towards the Indians as harsh and repressive and note that Mexico’s Indians were worse off by the end of the Porfiriato because of the loss of land instituted as part of the modernization process, Americans at the time often saw Díaz as a fatherly figure bringing them up in the ways of civilization.<sup>129</sup>

As such those who believed Mexicans could progress and someday be ready for true republican institutions lauded Díaz’s role in providing a guiding hand, and acting as a schoolmaster for true republicanism with accompanying free elections in Mexico.<sup>130</sup> George B. Winton, who had served as a missionary and educator in Mexico for over

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 256.

<sup>128</sup> R.W. Loughey, “The Pacific States of Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 114 (March 1890), 443. Loughey was specifically speaking of the prospects of the Pacific coast states of Mexico.

<sup>129</sup> This study deals with the issue of peonage, as well as the treatment of Native American groups that resisted the loss of lands, including the Mayan revolts in the Yucatan, and the Yaquis in Sonora in the next chapter.

<sup>130</sup> “Mexico and the United States,” *The Washington Post*, June 27, 1897; “President Díaz of Mexico,” *Public Ledger Almanac* (Philadelphia: Public Ledger, 1898), 11.



twenty years before becoming professor at Vanderbilt University, accepted the view that the Spanish colonial past had reduced the Indians of Mexico to a level of “individual and national incompetency” which made previous attempts at popular government disastrous during the previous years. He argued that Díaz was attempting to create in the Mexican people elements that would make them capable of an independent popular government.<sup>131</sup>

Felix L. Oswald, who had visited Mexico in 1879 and frequently contributed articles to American magazines about Mexico, suggested that the benevolent despotism might “serve as a stepping-stone of the progress to rational freedom.”<sup>132</sup> Likewise Julian Hawthorne, in a history of Latin America, stated that Porfirio Díaz had shown “what intelligent and benevolent dictatorship may accomplish,” and hoped that upon the passing of Díaz, Mexicans would be prepared to inaugurate a real republic in Mexico, which would be the first true republic in Latin America.<sup>133</sup> At a time when Americans were embarking on their own “civilizing mission” to uplift the former Spanish colonies in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, one of the most popular writers on Mexico, Charles F. Lummis would emphatically state that no other man had “taken a comparable dead-

---

<sup>131</sup> G.B. Winton, “The Real Situation in Mexico,” *The Methodist Quarterly Review* LVIII: 1 (January 1909): 88-89.

<sup>132</sup> Felix L. Oswald, “King Díaz,” *The Chautauquan* XXVII: 2 (May 1898):161. For similar analysis see, J.D. Whelpley, “The Political Outlook in Mexico,” *Harpers Weekly* (May 4, 1901): 457; Cloud, *The Heart of Mexico*, 36.

<sup>133</sup> Julian Hawthorne, *History of Spanish America from the Earlier Period to the Present Time* (New York: Peter Fenelon Collier, 1899), 294. See also Arthur Howard Noll, *From Empire to Republic: The Story of Constitutional Government in Mexico* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1903), 304; “The Government of Díaz,” *Banker’s Magazine* 82:2 (February 1911): 246.

weight of population and so uplifted and transformed it.”<sup>134</sup> Those that cited the education for republicanism theme applauded not only the order and progress brought by the Díaz regime, and but also the material advancement and the increases in popular education as bringing the Mexican people closer to republicanism.<sup>135</sup>

Some argued that Mexican success was a marker that there was hope for the uplift of other races that had been perceived in a backward condition. On the occasion of the meeting between President Taft and President Díaz on the U.S.-Mexico border in 1909, the influential periodical, *The Independent* argued that Mexico was proof that there was no place for Anglo-Saxon claims of superiority. The article declared, “What Anglo-Saxon’s can do the Spanish race can also do, whether in government or in business.” The article suggested that education and training was vital for the continued uplift of nonwhite races.<sup>136</sup> This article, like at least several others would see in Díaz a symbol of the possible success by either Indians, or those “mixed races” with Indian blood.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> Lummis, *Awakening of a Nation*, 11.

<sup>135</sup> Winton, “The Real Situation in Mexico,” 92; Lummis, *Awakening of a Nation* 4; Henry Ware Allen, “President Díaz and the Mexico of To-Day,” *The Review of Reviews* VI: 36 (January 1893): 677; Creelman, *Díaz, Master of Mexico*, 399-400.

<sup>136</sup> “Díaz and Taft,” *The Independent* (October 21, 1909): 937. This argument corresponded with general argument as to the potential and future of the American Indian. See David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1995) for more on the goals of assimilating and “civilizing” the Native Americans.

<sup>137</sup> See for instance “Mexico’s Great Ruler,” *Congregationalist* (December 8, 1900): 836; Martyn, “The Half Castes,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (November 17, 1898): 629; H.M. Robinson, “The Half-Breed Indians,” *Forest and Stream* (January 31, 1903): 83; “Díaz, The Foremost Indian of Modern Times,” *The Minneapolis Journal*, December 19, 1903. The race attributed to Díaz in the press varied from Spanish to mestizo (mixed Spanish and Indian) to Indian. Historians have found that he came from a mestizo family in Oaxaca.

U.S. Assessments of Mexican Progress

By the end of the nineteenth century, the American press, politicians and many others frequently commented on the progress of Mexico, and the success of U.S. capital, methods, trade and leadership in transforming Mexico, in partnership with the wise leadership and stability brought on by the rule of Porfirio Díaz who had welcomed Americans and American capital into Mexico.<sup>138</sup> One journalist stated that Díaz was a “friend to the United States because that is the best way to be a friend to Mexico.”<sup>139</sup>

The Porfirian regime sought to replace traditional Mexican society based on “local loyalties and forms of knowledge” with a modern society based on a “universal abstract notion of time and space shared by all its members along with a loyalty to the nation-state.”<sup>140</sup> The regime operated under the political ideology symbolized by its motto “Order and Progress.”<sup>141</sup> The historians Colin M. MacLachlan and William H. Beezley suggest that “the genius of Porfirio Díaz lay in the realm of the psychological. While an effective politician, a valiant soldier, a clever manipulator of the greed and ambition of others, a loyal friend, an accomplished propagandist, and a sincere patriot, he excelled at

<sup>138</sup> Charles De Kay, “Mexico’s Future,” *New York Times*, January 4, 1903. For commentators recognizing Díaz as the source of Mexican progress see also “Progressive Mexico,” *Dun’s Review* III: 2 (April 1904): 13; Alcee Fortier and John Rose Ficklen, *The History of North American, Volume Nine: Central America and Mexico* (Philadelphia: George Barrie & Sons, 1907), 366.

<sup>139</sup> Frederick Palmer, *Central America and its Problems: An Account of a Journey from the Rio Grande To Panama, with Introductory Chapters on Mexico and Her Relations to Her Neighbors* (New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1910), 10.

<sup>140</sup> Buffington and French, “The Culture of Modernity,” 401, 432.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 432; Buchenau, *Mexican Mosaic*, 67.

illusion.”<sup>142</sup> Indeed Mexico’s transformation seemed “to have been conjured into glorious existence through the strength of Díaz’s persuasive personality.”<sup>143</sup>

The Díaz regime, as well as U.S. observers, had could point to dramatic evidence of a progressing, modernizing Mexico including the completion of railroads, domestic improvements, and the development of resources in mining and agriculture. After the second term of Díaz, Mexico entered into a period of sustained economic growth unprecedented in its history.<sup>144</sup> From 1884 to 1900 the gross national product rose at an annual rate of 8%, which was most pronounced in the export-oriented sectors of the economy.<sup>145</sup> Although a majority of Mexicans did not benefit from this economic growth, between 1893 and 1907 the Mexican economy grew at a faster rate than the U.S. economy.<sup>146</sup> While in the earlier in the nineteenth century Mexico had been in debt, and close to bankrupt, and struggling to make its international debt payments, when Díaz left office in 1911 the treasury had about 70 million pesos in cash reserves.<sup>147</sup> One textbook on Mexican history states that “Beyond all expectations” Díaz had “succeeded in

---

<sup>142</sup> MacLachlan and Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo*, 184.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> Meyer, Sherman and Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History*, 382.

<sup>145</sup> Katz, “The Liberal Republic and Porfiriato, 1867-1910,” 74-75.

<sup>146</sup> Coatsworth, *Growth Against Development*, 4; Mark Wasserman, *Everyday Life and Politics in Nineteenth Century Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000), 186-187.

<sup>147</sup> Meyer, Sherman and Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History*, 384.

reassuring the outside world that Mexico had not only turned the corner but also deserved international dignity and respect.”<sup>148</sup>

Internationally Mexican officials had largely succeeded in presenting their country in terms of nineteenth century ideal of universal progress, while at the same time projecting their future as identical to, and closely linked with that of the United States and Western Europe.<sup>149</sup> In doing so the Mexican government was successful in presenting their country in an acceptable form in order to be accorded legitimacy and respect among U.S. government leaders and in the U.S. public sphere by embracing not only this vision of progress, but also U.S. leadership in their quest for it.<sup>150</sup>

Díaz successfully portrayed Mexico as a receptive student of the United States. Díaz frequently met with American visitors to Mexico City and extolled the virtues of the United States and the role that the United States was playing the progress and development of Mexico.<sup>151</sup> For example, in late 1888 a group of newspaper editors from

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.

<sup>149</sup> MacLachlan and Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo*, 172.

<sup>150</sup> In conceptualizing this point my thinking was influenced by Harold Mah, “Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians,” *The Journal of Modern History* 72 (March 2000): 164-168.

<sup>151</sup> This was the Mexican government’s strategy for promoting foreign investment into Mexico. See Colin M. Maclachlan & William H. Beezley, *Mexico’s Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 202. For some accounts of meetings between Díaz and American visitors see, “Reception at the Palace by President Díaz,” *The Two Republics*, March 7, 1890; Howard Paul, “A Mexican Visit,” *Frank Leslie’s Popular Monthly* XXXVIII: 3 (September 1894): 324; “Called on Díaz,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, January 26, 1900; General Roeliff Brinkerhoff, *Recollections of a Lifetime* (Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1900), 405; Marrion Wilcox, “A Question of Efficiency,” *Tropical and Subtropical America I*: 5 (June 1908): 195.

the United States visited Mexico as part of the National Editorial Association, and attended a reception at the Presidential Palace. During this reception Díaz addressed the editors explaining that he was striving to model Mexico after the United States which was “his ideal of a prosperous Republic.” Reports suggested that the editors “noisily” appreciated his statement and cheered his statements.<sup>152</sup> In an interview with the correspondent of the New Orleans *Daily Picayune* Díaz expressed thanks for the “pluck, enterprise and generosity” of the citizens and capitalists of the United States for the creation of Mexican railways and noted that Mexico had sought to give them every encouragement and assistance possible. Díaz stated that it was his goal for Mexico to be the “second greatest republic” on the American continent.<sup>153</sup> Díaz was also quoted in U.S. newspapers as describing the United States as Mexico’s “big brother,” thereby seemingly accepting the power differential between the two nations.<sup>154</sup> This was part of what one historian has described as “official Porfirian discourse” consisting of republican empathy and cooperation. While this discourse masked deeper concerns as to U.S.

---

<sup>152</sup> Addie McGrath, “The Colonel’s Eggs-The Cathedral-Legend of the City-The Reception,” in the Baton Rouge *Weekly Truth*, December 21, 1888, reprinted in *Journalists’ Letters Descriptive of Texas and Mexico* edited by Robert H. Thomas (Mechanicsburg, PA: Farmer’s Friend Print, 1888), 92; “The Mexican Opinion,” *The Two Republics*, November 28, 1888, reprinted in *Ibid.*, 117-118. For similar expressions from Díaz see “President Díaz’s Expression of Friendship,” *Modern Mexico* (April 1897), 16. For expressions of Mexicans accepting U.S. leadership see “Mexicans Make Speeches,” *Atlanta Journal Constitution*, November 16, 1901; Speech of Porfirio Díaz,” in *Latin America and the United States*, 163.

<sup>153</sup> “Díaz on the Situation,” *The Daily Picayune*, October 14, 1893. For similar expressions from Díaz see “President Díaz of Mexico,” *The Milwaukee Journal*, September 26, 1896.

<sup>154</sup> “Cause for Thanksgiving in Mexico,” *Christian Science Monitor* (November 25, 1908); Edward C. Butler, “Mexico, Its Resources, Its Industries and Its Relations to the United States,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 19, 1902.

hegemony in Mexico, it was successful in promoting a positive image of Mexico in the United States.<sup>155</sup>

Former Secretary of State John W. Foster, who as U.S. Minister to Mexico, had been pessimistic about the immediate potential for Mexican trade in the late 1870s, visited Mexico after an absence of over twenty years in 1901, sending a series of letters of his impression of Mexico to the *New York Tribune*, and later addressing the National Geographic Society upon his return. Foster would describe the changes brought on by the peace and order because of the leadership of Porfirio Díaz as the “new” Mexico which had resulted in the “complete transformation” of the nation.<sup>156</sup> Foster described Mexico as a place where life and property as safe as in the United States, and which had been making steady progress over the previous twenty years.<sup>157</sup> Foster further described

---

<sup>155</sup> Paul Garner, *Porfirio Díaz*, 144-145. Garner states that this official rhetoric hid private concerns by Díaz and the Mexican elites as to U.S. economic domination of Mexico and U.S. threats to Mexico’s sovereignty.

<sup>156</sup> John W. Foster, “Mexico Revisited,” *New York Tribune*, February 3, 1901; John W. Foster, “Montezuma’s Capital,” *New York Tribune*, February 10, 1901; John W. Foster, “The Financiers of Mexico,” *New York Tribune*, February 24, 1901; John W. Foster, “The New Mexico,” *The National Geographic Magazine* XIII: 1 (January 1902): 2, 5. For similar descriptions of a “new” Mexico see “President Díaz and Mexico,” *The Youth’s Companion* (January 3, 1889); Charles F. Lummis, “Mexico,” *The 19<sup>th</sup> Century: A Review of Progress* (London and New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1901), 98; “Transformation of Mexico,” *The Mexican Investor* (September 3, 1904): 10; “The Passing of Old Mexico,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 20, 1905. For a discussion of the lecture see, “Mexico’s Development,” *The Washington Post*, January 4, 1902.

<sup>157</sup> This theme of Mexican progress would be widely described in the U.S. public discourses about Mexico throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. See for instance, “Progressive Mexico,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 29, 1887; “Evidences of Mexican Progress,” *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* XLVIII (June 8, 1889): 744; Felix L. Oswald, *The Open Court* (July 31, 1890); W. F. Mallalieu, “The Future Progress of Mexico,” *Southwestern Christian Advocate* (June 12, 1890); “Brooklyn Boys in Mexico,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, March 6, 1897; “Mexico’s Rapid Development,” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 24, 1898; “Progress in the Mexican Republic,”



Mexico as a place where Americans, U.S. capital, and enterprise are welcomed by the government and people, and where there was a “wide field” for the exercise of U.S. “surplus capital and energy.”<sup>158</sup> Foster predicted that both the United States and Mexico would continue to enjoy “the blessings of peace, prosperity, and independence.”<sup>159</sup> On a later occasion Foster stated that no statesman during the past fifty years had accomplished so much for the good of his country and race as Porfirio Díaz had done.<sup>160</sup> Throughout this period numerous publications emphasized similar themes viewing Díaz as the creator of modern Mexico, and the biggest reason that the country had been receptive to American capital, ideas and methods and therefore was advancing and developing.<sup>161</sup> A 1903 editorial in the *New York Tribune* noted that before the ascension

---

*Bradstreet's XVII*: 1085 (April 15, 1899); Paul S. Reinsch, “A New Era in Mexico,” *Forum XXXII*: 5 (January 1902): 528-538; John James Davies, “Mexico’s Progress and Prosperity,” *Banker’s Magazine* 67:1 (July 1903): 77-79; “The Advancement of Mexico,” *The Washington Post*, July 1, 1904.

<sup>158</sup> Foster, “The New Mexico,” 24. For more on Foster’s trip to Mexico see John W. Foster, “Montezuma’s Capital,” *New York Tribune*, February 10, 1901; “Gen. Foster on Mexico,” *The National Geographic Magazine XII*: 4 (April 1901): 159-160.

<sup>159</sup> Foster, “The New Mexico,” 24.

<sup>160</sup> John W. Foster, “Porfirio Díaz: Soldier and Statesman,” *The International Quarterly VIII* (December-March 1903): 342.

<sup>161</sup> For a sample of this sentiment see Fenton R. McCreery, “Thanksgiving Speech,” McCreery-Fenton Family Papers Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Box 3 Folder 97; “They Owe Everything to Díaz,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 26, 1890; “Díaz Administration,” *The Morning Oregonian*, December 9, 1891; Walter S. Logan, “The Nation-Maker,” *A Mexican Night: The Toasts and Responses at a complimentary dinner given by Walter S. Logan at the Democratic Clun, New York City* (New York: A.B. King, 1892), 12-13; Jose Gonzales, “The Rise of Díaz,” *California Illustrated Magazine* 2:5 (October 1892): 669-702; “Inauguration of Díaz,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, December 3, 1892; “Gen. Díaz’s Fourth Term,” *The Daily Picayune*, December 21, 1892; “Through Mexico,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, March 11, 1893; Walter Meade O’Dwyer, “The Prospectus of Mexico,” *The North American Review*



of Porfirio Díaz, Mexican history was a history of revolutions, resulting in the widespread use of the word “Mexicanization” which had “gained a recognized place in the world’s vocabulary,” and meant to plunge into political chaos, but since his rule this was no longer accurate as Mexico had been as stable as any other nation in the world.<sup>162</sup>

Because of the role of U.S. capital in Mexico’s transformation, and frequent Mexican acceptance of U.S. leadership, Americans took pride in Mexican progress as a fulfillment of their modernizing mission.<sup>163</sup> As early as 1879, the U.S. Consul-General in Mexico anticipated the future development of Mexico through the “incentive” of the U.S.

---

CLIX: CCCCLII (July 1894): 120-124; “Short Trip Through Mexico,” *The Memphis Commercial Appeal*, August 4, 1895; “A Tribute to President Díaz,” *The San Francisco Call*, October 11, 1895; “Speaking of Díaz,” *The Atchison Daily Globe*, March 19, 1896; “The Elections in Mexico,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* (July 23, 1896); “A Many-Termed President,” *The Minneapolis Journal*, December 1, 1896; “Election, Fifth of Díaz,” *The Daily Picayune*, December 4, 1896; “The Master of Mexico,” *New York Daily Tribune*, February 6, 1898; “The Master of Mexico,” *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, July 30, 1899; “Progress in Mexico,” *Bradstreet’s* XXIII:900 (September 28, 1899); “President Porfirio Díaz of Mexico, The Maker of a Nation,” *Omaha World Herald*, October 15, 1899; J.D. Whelpley, “Mexico, Our Sister Republic,” *Congregationalist* (May 4, 1901); “Mexican Progress,” *Zion’s Herald* (October 22, 1903); “Porfirio Díaz,” *Current Literature* XXXV: 2 (August 1903): 155-156; “Mexico As It Is To-Day,” *The Washington Post*, May 8, 1904; “Mexico’s Progress Under Just and Wise Statesmanship,” *The Arena* XXXII: 180 (November 1904): 540-541; “How Mexico Impressed Gen. Joseph Wheeler,” *New York Times*, January 15, 1905; Mrs Alec Tweedie, *The Maker of Modern Mexico: Porfirio Díaz* (New York: John Lane Company, 1906); E.H. Talbot, “Mexican Letter,” *Moody’s Magazine* I: 5 (April 1906): 589-590; “Mexico and Díaz,” *The Washington Post*, September 16, 1908.

<sup>162</sup> “Porfirio Díaz,” *New York Daily Tribune*, June 24, 1903. See also *The Vermont Watchman*, September 27, 1899; John D. Richardson, “The State of Tamaulipas,” *Report of the Consuls of the United States* 127 (April 1891), 602.

<sup>163</sup> For some examples of U.S. pride in Mexican progress see “Mexico,” *Boston Daily Advertiser*, November 22, 1893; *Zion’s Herald* (January 14, 1903).

example and the help of U.S. energy and capital.<sup>164</sup> In 1903, *Modern Mexico* a magazine devoted to the expansion of U.S. commerce with Mexico, explained that the bulk of the progress of Mexico had been accomplished through foreign capital and ingenuity, because of traditional Mexican conservatism and fears because of the traditional problems with instability.<sup>165</sup> By the end of the nineteenth century Americans were able to see tangible results from what Elisha Talbot, who had long promoted U.S. investment in Mexico, described U.S. investors in Mexico in the previous decades as the “greatest army of commercial and industrial invasion that ever marched across an international boundary.”<sup>166</sup>

By the end of the nineteenth century, Americans believed that they should actively guide other nations down the same path to modernity. The historian Michael Adas has analyzed the widely held American belief that their society should serve as a “model of modernity for all humankind.”<sup>167</sup> Since Americans linked the United States

---

<sup>164</sup> David Hunter Strother, “Condition of American Trade in the Several Consulates,” *Report Upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year 1879* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 26. For similar sentiments see “Americans in Mexico,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, February 8, 1883.

<sup>165</sup> “Mexicans and Mexican Business,” *Modern Mexico* (August 1903): 21.

<sup>166</sup> Elisha Talbot, “Mexico as a Great Field of Opportunity,” *The Mining World* XXXI: 1 (July 3, 1909): 36. For similar language about an American invasion of Mexico see “The Great American Invasion of Old Mexico,” *The Washington Times*, May 17, 1903; Wallace Gillpatrick, “Mexico’s Pacific Conquest,” *Outlook* (August 26, 1905); “Americans in Mexico,” *The Minneapolis Journal*, March 11, 1906 and an article written after the Revolution, E. Alexander Powell, “Is There Any Hope for Mexico?” *Sunset, the Pacific Monthly* 31:2 (August 1913): 301.

<sup>167</sup> Michael Adas, *Dominance by Design: Technological Imperatives and America’s Civilizing Mission* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2006), 73, 125.

with progress, U.S. commentators often described positive changes in Mexico as “Americanization” suggesting that Mexicans were adopting values, ideas, and methods from the United States and profiting from the example of the United States.<sup>168</sup> A 1905 article in the *Boston Daily Globe* noted the importance of Díaz in employing American “energy and ingenuity,” along with U.S. capital in promoting Mexican progress. The paper declared that through the initiative of Díaz, Mexico had “adopted the American spirit of living and working in so remarkable a degree that the complete Americanization of the people in many features of life is predicted for no remote future.”<sup>169</sup> While sometimes American commentators were referring to the expansion of U.S. capital, or a vague sense of progress when using the term Americanization, the American Vice-Consul in Mexico, Edward Conley provided perhaps the most vivid description of what Americanization meant. He declared that, “Modernization and Americanization are

---

<sup>168</sup> “American Influence in Mexico,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, September 8, 1882. See also “Capital and Enterprises in Mexico,” *Bradstreet’s* (September 23, 1882), 195; “Progressive Mexico,” *St Louis Daily Globe-Democrat*, December 4, 1887; Ballou, *Aztec Land*, 32.

<sup>169</sup> “Making Mexico American,” *Boston Daily Globe*, December 20, 1905. Others who commented on the Americanism of Mexico include “Mexico Americanized,” *St Louis Globe Democrat*, February 5, 1883; “Our Influence in Mexico,” *Emporia Daily Gazette*, September 28, 1893; “Mexico Taking a Hand in its Development,” *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, July 19, 1899; “Americanization of Mexico,” *The Baltimore Sun*, September 16, 1903; B.M. Sherman, “Mexico’s Great President and His Probable Successor,” *New York Times*, November 27, 1904. American based magazines that sought to promote trade and commerce in Mexico were uncomfortable with the discussions of “Americanization” believing that this increased Mexican nationalist fears and were used by Mexican newspapers to suggest that the U.S. sought annexation of Mexico. See “The ‘Americanization’ of Mexico,” *Modern Mexico* XX: 4 (January 1906): 15-16.

almost synonymous in Mexico.”<sup>170</sup> He explained that Americans had invested in banking, and “have taught the Mexicans banking and the use of banks.” He stated, “We are paving city streets with asphalt, putting in sewer and waterworks systems, electric lighting plants and street car systems, replacing cumbrous old buildings with modern, steel-frame structures, changing the external appearance of things generally.” Speaking of Mexico City, Conley declared that Americans had invested in real estate, and “are teaching the Mexicans how to build a city.”<sup>171</sup> Conley also asserted that by their example and commercial products, Americans had taught the Mexican peon to wear shoes and a hat. While Mexico City had seen the biggest effects of Americanization Conley stated that its effects could be seen throughout Mexico since, “there is hardly a spot in Mexico which does not show some impress of the American.”<sup>172</sup> Previously American commentators tended to see the traditional character of Mexico as lethargic and lazy, as evidence by the description of Mexico as the land of “mañana,” by embracing the American spirit energy and thrift, sometimes described as “Yankee-like” values, Mexico was now on its way to a new and progressive future.<sup>173</sup> Marie Robinson Wright, an American tourist, suggested

---

<sup>170</sup> Edward M. Conley, “The Americanization of Mexico,” *The American Monthly Review of Reviews* XXXII: 6 (December 1905): 724.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 725.

<sup>173</sup> “Mexican Prosperity,” *The Youth’s Companion* (October 9, 1890). Articles that continue to use the “mañana” trope for Mexico include Elizabeth Visere Mc Gary, *An American Girl in Mexico* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1904), 30; Broughton Brandenburg, “The Land of the Half-Shut Eye,” *Leslie’s Monthly Magazine* LX: 3 (July 1905): 311; “Sunny Days in Manana Land,” *Town and Country* (January 11, 1908): 22.

that the Mexicans were moving away from their old customs due to the “civilizing influence” of the American people.<sup>174</sup>

An article in the magazine, *Current Literature* by Eugene P. Lyle suggested that it was up to Americans to show the Mexican people what kind of resources they had. This was done through U.S. expertise in railroads, mining and industrial methods, which Lyle described as the “industrial American naturalization of an entire people.”<sup>175</sup> In addition to the influence of American citizens in Mexico this also included delegations of Mexicans to the United States for the purpose of studying U.S. institutions, and gain new ideas to adopt.<sup>176</sup> The discussion of the Americanization of Mexico was so prevalent that Michigan Superintendent for Public Instruction included the question, “What do you understand by the phrase ‘the Americanization of Mexico?’” in the United States History portion of the examinations for Normal School Training classes for teachers in Michigan.<sup>177</sup>

---

<sup>174</sup> Wright, *Picturesque Mexico*, 443.

<sup>175</sup> Eugene P. Lyle Jr., “The American Influence in Mexico,” *Current Literature* XXXV: 4 (October 1903). Articles that commented on the Mexican adaptation of U.S. ideas and methods include “Rapid Progress of Our Nearest Southern Neighbor,” *Brooklyn Eagle*, August 12, 1890; “Yankee Ideas in Mexico,” *New York Times*, February 5, 1893; “Mexico Being Americanized,” *The Washington*, February 9, 1902; “Americanism in Mexico,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 22, 1902; “Mexico’s National Necessity,” *The Washington Post*, November 30, 1903; “Mexico Adopts Our Methods,” *Los Angeles Times*, July 10, 1907.

<sup>176</sup> “Progressive Mexicans,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, April 3, 1887; “Teachers Come From Mexico,” *Boston Daily Globe*, February 5, 1905; “Come From Mexico to Study American Educational Methods,” *Boston Daily Globe*, February 28, 1905.

<sup>177</sup> *Sixty-Eighth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan* (Lansing, MI: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford, State Printers, 1905), 104.

Americans also moved to Mexico in larger numbers by the early twentieth century. This included a number of Americans who bought estates in Mexico, as well as a number of other Americans in the cities and throughout the country. The historian John Mason Hart notes that Americans came from every state in the Union, “eager to join in the Mexican experience.”<sup>178</sup> The Consul in Tampico, Samuel Magill noted that many Americans were looking toward Mexico as a place for investment in lands similar to Americans two generations before viewed the West in the United States.<sup>179</sup> At about the same time the U.S. Consul-General in Mexico, Andrew Barlow reported that his office received hundreds of letters from young men, usually college graduates who wanted to come to Mexico to make their fortune and inquired about employment opportunities in Mexico.<sup>180</sup> Though Barlow advised caution for young Americans who did not have ample funds in coming to Mexico, Edward Conley, the Vice-Consul-General a few years later encouraged them to come. He explained that Americans had reached a stage in its national life where they had begun to think about expanding. He noted that a number of young Americans were seeking their fortunes in foreign lands based on the “spirit of adventure” which was a national characteristic.<sup>181</sup> Between 1900 and 1910 about 3,000

---

<sup>178</sup> Hart, *Empire and Revolution*, 201.

<sup>179</sup> Saml. E. Magill, “Tampico,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries During the Year 1900*, Volume I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901), 580.

<sup>180</sup> Andrew D. Barlow, “Mexico,” *Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries During the Year 1901*, Volume I (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), 445.

<sup>181</sup> Edward M. Conley, “Opportunities for Employment in Mexico,” *Reports from the Consuls of the United States* 286 (July 1904), 63.

Americans entered Mexico each year, eventually reaching 40,000 at the beginning of the Mexican Revolution.<sup>182</sup>

The “Americanization of Mexico” along with increasing numbers of Americans in that country prompted discussions of the annexation of Mexico territory to the United States. In an article in *Munsey’s Magazine*, Walter Flavius McCaleb, a writer and historian, suggested that as Mexico advanced in civilization and wealth and population pressures influenced more Americans to immigrate to Mexico, the question of the future destiny of Mexico would be more and more important. McCaleb stated that it was very likely that Mexico would become part of the United States at some point in the future.<sup>183</sup> Statements such as these in the U.S. press often provoked outrage in Mexico and contributed to deep-seated fears in that nation as to the nature and results of the “pacific conquest” of Mexico. Throughout the Porfiriato Mexican newspapers would express concerns about potential U.S. designs on Mexican territory, and Mexican officials, including Porfirio Díaz would express misgivings about the U.S. role in Mexico.<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> Ibid.

<sup>183</sup> Walter Flavius McCaleb, “The Absorption of Mexico,” *Munsey’s Magazine* XXX: 4 (January 1904): 489-490. See also John Heard Jr., “Letters from Sonora,” *Lippincott’s Magazine of Popular Literature and Science* IX (March 1885): 240; James Howard Bridge, “A Fresh View of ‘Manifest Destiny,’” *Overland Monthly* XXXI: 182 (February 1898):118; “Quaint Customs that Catch American Eyes in Mexico,” *The Fort Worth Telegram*, February 20, 1906; “Mexico Soon to Be Ours?” *Every Where* (September 1906): 35; Carson, *Mexico*, 176.

<sup>184</sup> For a detailed discussion of Mexican misgivings see Robert John Deger, “Porfirian Foreign Policy and Mexican Nationalism: A Study of Cooperation and Conflict in Mexican-American Relations, 1884-1904.” PhD. diss., Indiana University, 1979., 175-210. Others that discuss Mexican nationalist fears include Richard Weiner, *Race, Nation and Market: Economic Culture in Porfirian Mexico* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2004), 48-69; Garner, *Porfirio Díaz* 141,146-149.



In response to periodic discussions in the U.S. press about the annexation of Mexican territory and the resulting Mexican nationalist outrage, Díaz instructed the Mexican Minister in the United States, Matias Romero, to meet with U.S. officials and write articles stressing Mexican nationalism in the U.S. press.<sup>185</sup> In 1889 Romero wrote “The Annexation of Mexico,” published in *The North American Review*, one of the leading U.S. periodicals. Romero, who was in the United States in the 1860s when annexation had been discussed at length, revived and revised arguments against the potential U.S. annexation of Mexico. For instance, many of the earlier and at times current opponents of U.S. annexation of Mexico had cited the racial and cultural inferiority of the Mexican people. While not accepting Mexican inferiority, Romero emphasized the difficulty of a potential assimilation of twelve million Mexicans, who were of a “different race, speaking a different language and possessing very different habits and ideas, two-thirds of whom are pure blooded Indians” into the United States. Romero suggested that even though Mexican Indians were peaceful and “law-abiding” they would present the American republic with the “same social and political problems” that the nation faced with blacks in the South.<sup>186</sup> Romero, who was writing shortly after the Exclusion Acts on Chinese immigration, also appealed to U.S. racial and economic

---

<sup>185</sup> Deger, “Porfirian Foreign Policy and Mexican Nationalism,” 194.

<sup>186</sup> Matias Romero, “The Annexation of Mexico,” *The North American Review* CXLVIII: CCCXC (May 1889): 530. On several other occasions Romero addressed letters to the editor refuting claims that the Mexican government was willing to sell territory to the United States or was in favor of annexation to the United States. See M. Romero, “Letter II,” *The North American Review* CXLI: CCCXLVIII (November 1885): 509; Matias Romero, “Not One Republic,” *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, April 29, 1888. Articles that brought up the theme of the difficulty of successfully incorporate Mexicans into the United States as a reason to oppose annexation include “American Interests in Mexico,” *New York Times*, August 26, 1882.

fears, by explaining that annexation of Mexico would lead to possibly up to three million Mexican workers, who would be American citizens, migrating into the United States in search of higher wages.<sup>187</sup> Romero also explained that most Mexicans would oppose annexation, and instead suggested that Mexico and the United States continue to enlarge the political, social, and commercial relations between the two nations, without “diminishing the autonomy” or “destroying the nationality of either.” This, Romero argued, would give both countries “all the advantages of annexation without any of its drawbacks.”<sup>188</sup> Romero’s sentiments were echoed in an editorial in *The Washington Post* which accepted the difficulties of annexation and favored closer trade and economic relations instead.<sup>189</sup>

Despite these views, many of the U.S. financial elite, who had interests in Mexico, sought the annexation of at least portions of Mexican territory to the United States, though U.S. political leaders generally rejected this possibility.<sup>190</sup> U.S. capitalists and American political leaders followed a “strategy of developing Mexico’s infrastructure while taking a wait-and-see approach to the ‘Mexican Question’ of territorial acquisition.”<sup>191</sup> Discussions of the possibility of annexation of Mexico, which were less frequent than in the years before the Civil War, but generally followed the same

---

<sup>187</sup> Romero, “The Annexation of Mexico,” 532.

<sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, 535.

<sup>189</sup> “Mexico and the States,” *The Washington Post*, April 29, 1889. See also Henry S. Brooks, “The Annexation of Mexico,” *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine* XIV: 79 (July 1889): 87-92.

<sup>190</sup> Hart, *Empire and Revolution*, 233.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 233, 235.

models as earlier debates with those opposed to annexation citing the difficulty of incorporating Mexicans into the U.S. republic or the general unprofitability of such an enterprise.<sup>192</sup> By the late nineteenth century most commentators rejected the idea of annexation by force and acknowledged that Mexicans as a whole opposed incorporation into the United States.<sup>193</sup> Those who did suggest the possibility of future annexation considered that it might occur after Mexico had been modernized through U.S. informal imperialism, and was ready to be accepted in the Union. *The Independent*, a national magazine, wistfully suggested that while Mexico, as well as Canada would be better off as part of the United States as a part of one “beneficent single nation,” Americans should rejoice in the progress of its fellow republics, “but at the same time wishing that in their own time and way they might desire to join forces under equal conditions with their sister republic.”<sup>194</sup> Until this might occur Americans believed Mexico would continue to be Americanized by U.S. capital and influence in Mexico, and was to be a part of the American Union commercially, though not necessarily politically.<sup>195</sup>

---

<sup>192</sup> For sentiments opposing the annexation of Mexico see “About Mexico” *Hartford Daily Courant*, May 7, 1884; “Don’t Want Mexico,” *The Glendive Times* [MT], May 24, 1884; “Mexico as it is,” *The Denver Daily News*, January 5, 1886; D.J. Powers, “A Winter Run Through Mexico,” *Chicago Inter Ocean*, February 3, 1889; “Mexico is Safe,” *The Philadelphia North American*, October 24, 1899; Emanuel Caplin, “Should We Annex Mexico and South America?” *The Baltimore Sun*, August 21, 1906.

<sup>193</sup> For example see Henry Ware Allen, “Would the Annexation of Mexico be Desirable?” *The Arena* 9:4 (March 1894): 480. Sources that discuss the opposition of the Mexican people to annexation include W.H.B., “From Mexico to Acapulco,” *The Nation* (October 19, 1882), 327-328; William Henry Bishop, *Old Mexico and Her Lost Provinces: A Journey in Mexico, Southern California and Arizona by Way of Cuba* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1883), 275-278.

<sup>194</sup> “Annexation,” *The Independent* (January 26, 1905): 220.

<sup>195</sup> “The Invasion of Mexico,” *The Washington Post*, October 25, 1903.

Discussions such of annexation exacerbated Mexican concerns about U.S. intentions toward Mexico. Anti-Americanism in Mexico had deep popular roots in Mexico, which was exacerbated by foreign domination of the Mexican economy, informal imperialism as well as the actions of Americans who visited or lived in Mexico.<sup>196</sup> One opposition newspaper in Mexico City, *El Tiempo*, asserted that the Mexican middle-class was “solidly anti-American.”<sup>197</sup> Despite the congratulatory tone of much of the American discussion of its influence in Mexico, commentators frequently acknowledged that Americans and American capital were not universally loved by the Mexican people.<sup>198</sup> Roy Marshall, an American newspaperman who had lived in Mexico wrote an article for *The Business Man’s Magazine* in which he suggested that while life and property is safe there, Americans were not popular in Mexico. He suggested that many Americans in Mexico, particularly in the Northern Mexican states tended to be types not to be proud of such as army deserters, ex-convicts or those seeking to get rich quick schemes, who gave all Americans a bad name.<sup>199</sup> Other things that led to the Mexican dislike of Americans

---

<sup>196</sup> Ramón Eduardo Ruíz, *The Great Rebellion: Mexico, 1905-1924* (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1980), 107.

<sup>197</sup> Quoted in *Ibid.*, 107.

<sup>198</sup> A sample of some of the articles include, “New Views of Mexico,” *The New Orleans Daily Picayune*, July 4, 1883; “Anti-American Agitation in Mexico,” *The Galveston News*, August 21, 1883; “Mexican Views of the Yankee,” *The Washington Post*, May 14, 1899; “Tirade Against Americans,” *New York Times*, July 20, 1908; “Ill-Feeling in Mexico,” *New York Times*, September 13, 1908; “Why Mexicans Hate Us,” *The Washington Post*, April 15, 1911.

<sup>199</sup> Roy Marshall, “The Alleged Recent American Commercial Conquest of Mexico,” *The Business Man’s Magazine* XIX: VI (December 1906): 33-35. Other articles that discuss some American visitors in Mexico giving all Americans a bad name include, John Heard Jr., “Letters from Sonora,” *Lippincott’s Magazine of Popular Literature and*

were the behavior of American tourists in Mexico, which was sometimes insensitive, insulting or boorish.<sup>200</sup> In 1909, Andrés Molina Enríquez, a Mexican intellectual, stated that the foreigner was the guest that Mexicans “implore to come and receive with outreached arms but who, for his part, treats us shabbily.”<sup>201</sup> This was commented upon by, A.W. Sefton, an American who worked as a guide in Mexico, and addressed a letter to *The Washington Post* in which he related that he had been called upon to interpret some “severe rebukes to Americans, brought about by their meddlesome and even predatory habits; and as vandals, they are par excellent.”<sup>202</sup>

---

*Science IX* (March 1885): 240. “Ill-Feeling in Mexico,” *New York Times*, September 13, 1908; “Why Mexicans Hate Us,” *The Washington Post*, April 15, 1911.

<sup>200</sup> For discussions of U.S. tourism to Mexico during the Porfiriato see Douglas A. Murphy, “Mexican Tourism, 1876-1940: The Socio-Economic, Political, and Infrastructural Effects of a Developing Leisure Industry.” MA Thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1988. 1-39; Aida Mostkoff, “Foreign Visions and Images of Mexico: One Hundred Years of International Tourism, 1821-1921.” PhD., diss., University of California at Los Angeles. 1999. 68-114; Janice Lee Jaynes, “‘Strangers to Each Other’: The American Encounter with Mexico.” PhD., diss., The American University, 1999. 271-328; Andrea Boardman, *Destination México: “A Foreign Land a Step Away” U.S. Tourism to Mexico, 1880s-1950s* (Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University, 2001), 13-56; Jason Ruiz, “Americans in the Treasure House: Travel to Mexico in the U.S. Popular Imagination, 1876-1920.” PhD., diss., University of Minnesota, 2008.

<sup>201</sup> Andrés Molina Enríquez, *Los Grandes Problemas Nacionales* (Mexico: Ediciones Era, 1978; orig. 1909), 215 quoted in Ruíz, *The Great Rebellion: Mexico*, 108.

<sup>202</sup> A.W. Sefton, Jr., “Defense of Mexico,” *The Washington Post*, June 16, 1902. Numerous articles in U.S. newspapers, often reprinted or based on articles in periodicals from English-language newspapers in Mexico such as the *Mexican Herald* discussed the behavior of U.S. tourists in Mexico and negative Mexican views toward them. See “The Gringo in Mexico,” *Boston Daily Globe*, February 11, 1883; “Down in Mexico,” *Bismarck Daily Tribune*, June 9, 1885; “Americans in Mexico,” *New York Times*, July 19, 1885; “American Tourists in Mexico,” *The Sunday Inter Ocean*, October 27, 1895; “Tourists in Mexico,” *The New Orleans Daily Picayune*, December 30, 1895; “Philistines Abroad,” *New York Tribune*, January 12, 1902; “American Vandals in Mexico,” *The Hartford Courant*, January 27, 1902; “Doesn’t Like Yankee Tourists,” *The Hartford*

It was not uncommon for Mexicans, particularly critics of the Díaz regime to describe Americans as “rude and insolent” who were in the process of stealing the country’s wealth.<sup>203</sup> For instance sometimes U.S. tourists would speak disparagingly of Mexico, with statements such as that a couple of hundred Americans could conquer the whole country, or refer to Mexicans with racial epithets, or having a general air of superiority.<sup>204</sup> This was described in an article from the *New York Post* as “Yankeeismo.” The correspondent described Yankeeismo as “a feeling of infinite superiority” at every turn which manifested itself in its milder form by a “supercilious, arrogant air, impatience with the native’s slowness and lack of familiarity with our business methods, and general contempt for everything that is not up to our ideas of progress.” In its more virulent form, this could mean the feeling that Mexico belongs to the United States, and that in a short time Americans would possess it, and that in the “meantime it is in the temporary possession of a set of barbarians who are entitled to no consideration from the real owners.”<sup>205</sup>

Offensive U.S. tourist behavior could involve entering the houses of ordinary Mexicans uninvited to see how they lived, interrupting church services, cutting up

---

*Courant*, March 15, 1902; “Shocking the Mexicans,” *New York Times*, June 1, 1902; “Shock the Mexicans,” *The Washington Post*, June 8, 1902; “Rowdy Americans in Mexico,” *The Hartford Courant*, October 6, 1909.

<sup>203</sup> Matthews, “Railway Culture and the Civilizing Mission in Mexico,” 268.

<sup>204</sup> Marshall, “The Alleged Recent American Commercial Conquest of Mexico,” 35; Carson, Mexico, 174. The behavior of American tourists is also discussed in Walter Clark, “The Land of the Noonday Sun-Mexico in Midwinter,” *The Arena* LXXVIII (May 1896): 912.

<sup>205</sup> Reprinted in the *Bismarck Daily Tribune*, June 13, 1885.

furniture or curtains in houses or even in the presidential palace for souvenirs or generally treating Mexicans insensitively, leading one American observer to suggest that there should be a school for tourists in every city in America, and no American should be allowed to leave the United States who had not graduated.<sup>206</sup> Roy Marshall, in his article, acknowledged that despite the progress that the U.S. had brought Mexico, the ordinary Mexican sees “his fellow countrymen worked like slaves by American corporations, he sees his country’s institutions sneered at, by aliens, his church insulted, his women made fun of.”<sup>207</sup> Marshall went on to criticize the bombast, and self-adulation of American capitalists, which made it seem as though Americans were engaged in a philanthropic enterprise for the good of the Mexican people. While admitting that some good had come from American investments, he noted that it was incidental to the goals of making profits for U.S. capitalists and investors.<sup>208</sup> Perhaps the strongest statement as to the views of Mexicans and other Latin Americans toward the United States came from U.S. economist David A. Wells, who travelled to Mexico to explore its resources and trade potential and wrote a series of articles for *Popular Science* that were incorporated into a book shortly thereafter. Wells stated that the United States was regarded as a “great, overgrown, immensely powerful ‘bully,’ from whom no favor and scant justice are to be expected under any circumstances; and who would never hesitate, if selfish indifference prompted,

---

<sup>206</sup> Peter MacQueen, “In Mexico Today,” *Boston Daily Globe*, April 9, 1911. For discussions of offensive American tourist behavior see Charles Macomb Flandrau, *Viva Mexico!* (New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1908), 224-228; Sherratt, *Mexican Vistas*, 112-113.

<sup>207</sup> Marshall, “The Alleged Recent American Commercial Conquest of Mexico,” 36.

<sup>208</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.



to remorselessly trample down” any “weaker or inferior people.” In addition to the Mexicans, Wells stated that there was not a nation or people “on the face of the globe” with whom the U.S. had intimate contact that did not fear and hate the U.S.<sup>209</sup>

English-language newspapers from Mexico, such as the *Mexican Herald*, and *The Two Republics*, which were published for the American colony in Mexico City, as well as magazines such as *Modern Mexico*, the *Mexican Investor* and the *Mexican Financier*, which were devoted to increasing American trade and investments in Mexico as well as members of the American colony in Mexico City sought to induce American tourists to treat Mexicans with more respect when visiting the nation and to try promote better cultural relations between the two countries. Perhaps the best of these attempts was a book written in 1887 by Fanny Chambers Gooch, who had lived in Mexico for seven years. Like other writers, Gooch noted offensive American behavior in Mexico, which excited nationalist sentiments in the Mexican people, especially inferences of future annexation.<sup>210</sup> While accepting that Mexico was rapidly progressing under Porfirio Díaz, Gooch cautioned Americans that some of these changes would take time and the American manner of proceeding with his “accustomed force and energy” would not be

---

<sup>209</sup> David A. Wells, *A Study of Mexico* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1890), 211-212. Wells suggested it was necessary for the United States to take steps to induce a different state of feeling but did not elaborate.

<sup>210</sup> The American community in Mexico frequently collaborated with the Díaz regime in welcoming potential investors, advising U.S. diplomats and consuls in Mexico, downplaying negative stories of anti-Americanism in Mexico, and presenting a positive image of Mexico in the United States. See Maclachlan and Beezley, *Mexico's Crucial Century*, 207; William Schell Jr., *Integral Outsiders: The American Colony in Mexico City, 1876-1911* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Imprint, 2001), x-xii.

successful particularly in business in Mexico.<sup>211</sup> Instead she implored Americans to become acquainted with and respectful of Mexican language, customs, habits, and sentiments and patient with aspects of Mexican life, explaining that Americans should offer the “right hand of fellowship” to the Mexico as it progressed in material and republic institutions.<sup>212</sup>

Because of Mexican nationalist fears, American business interests generally publically avoided connotations of annexation or other political control over Mexico, which was especially important given lingering Mexican fears of U.S. imperialism. In a statement the St Louis Spanish Club, an organization whose goal was to create closer trade and cultural relations with Mexico and Latin America, declared that trade would expand through peace, liberty and reciprocity without control.<sup>213</sup> An editorial in the *St Louis Republic* explained that while commerce brought the two nations closer together, it also made U.S. challenge to Mexico’s independence unlikely. In the event of a war U.S. investors would lose their capital, and Mexican resentment against American goods would severely damage U.S. trade relations with that country. The editorial suggested that every dollar invested in Mexico works for the peace and friendship of that nation,

---

<sup>211</sup> Fanny Chambers Gooch, *Face to Face with the Mexicans: The Domestic Life, Educational, Social and Business Ways, Statesmanship and Literature, Legendary and General History of the Mexican People, As Seen and Studied by an American Woman During Seven years of Intercourse with Them* (New York: Fords, Howard & Hubert, 1887), 539-540.

<sup>212</sup> *Ibid.*, 542; 581.

<sup>213</sup> “The St Louis Spanish Club and Mexican Trade,” *Modern Mexico* II: 16 (January 1897): 9.

and for the “maintenance of Mexico’s greatness as an independent Power.”<sup>214</sup> Statements often emphasized feelings of friendship with Latin-American nations, such as “Perpetually united are the free and the free.”<sup>215</sup>

#### Díaz and U.S. Intervention in Latin America and the Philippines

During the war with Spain in 1898, and shortly thereafter Americans debated the future of their nation regarding the former Spanish colonies in Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines. These discussions often took place in the context of debates about the fitness of former Spanish subjects for self-government. These discussions would mirror many of the earlier discussions of expansion at Mexico’s expense, while Mexico would be used in complex ways as a frame of reference during this period. During the debates over the annexation of the Philippines and other Spanish colonies anti-imperialists would utilize images of Mexico to argue against the annexation of colonies while often providing arguments in favor of client states and informal imperialism.

One of the most outspoken and widely cited anti-imperialists was former U.S. Senator Carl Schurz.<sup>216</sup> Schurz had been a consistent opponent of U.S. expansionism into Latin-America since the end of the Civil War, frequently utilizing similar arguments throughout various debates. These have been described as “Schurz Law” which consisted

---

<sup>214</sup> “Mexico and the United States,” *St Louis Republic*, April 6, 1902. The editorial was in response to a report in an Argentine newspaper warning of potential U.S. designs on Mexico. The editorial did leave open the possibility of future annexation, if Mexico requested it of the United States. In such an instance the editorial suggested Mexico would be the one who would gain more than the United States.

<sup>215</sup> “The St Louis Spanish Club and Mexican Trade,” 9.

<sup>216</sup> For more on Schurz see Robert L. Beisner, *Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), 18-34.

of a circular argument that the United States could never rule people undemocratically, hence annexed territory would need to be made into a state on equal footing with the others in the republic; that incorporation of Latin-American peoples would destroy the framework of American government; and that therefore annexation should be avoided because it would either violate the Constitution or corrupt the “homogeneity of the nation that was essential to orderly constitutional operation.”<sup>217</sup> In making the case that Latin-Americans were not fit to be admitted into the U.S. republic, Schurz stated that no country in the “tropics” had been able to have a democratic government “in a manner fitting it for statehood” in the Union. He noted that Mexico under Porfirio Díaz was the best governed of these countries, and probably the best government that they could get but was not a true republic.<sup>218</sup> In an earlier article Schurz had described Mexico under Díaz as a “tolerably stable government” but a military dictatorship. He declared that “under a government less vigorous in the employment of drastic measures,” Mexico would have “relapsed into the old revolutionary disorder; and it is the chronic character of this revolutionary disorder, the tendency to effect changes by force instead of the peaceable and patient process of discussion, that is characteristic of the tropics.”<sup>219</sup> Rather than annexation, Schurz argued, the United States should allow the Philippines to work out their own issues by learning self-government, by engaging in it, whether this was a republic like the United States, or a dictatorship like that of Porfirio Díaz, or

---

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., 22-23.

<sup>218</sup> *Our Future Foreign Policy, an Address by Hon. Carl Schurz at the National Conference at Saratoga, N.Y.* (NP: 1898), 5.

<sup>219</sup> Carl Schurz, “Manifest Destiny,” *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine* LXXXVII: DXXI (October 1893): 740.

another form of government. Though this might mean a period of disorder, such as Mexico had gone through, he hoped that like Mexico, it might result in an orderly government of their own making at some point in the future.<sup>220</sup>

William Jennings Bryan, the Democratic nominee for President in 1896, 1900, and 1908 also utilized the example of Mexico as a way to make his case against the formal annexation of the Philippines. Instead of formal colonies, Bryan argued in favor of continued U.S. economic and cultural expansion as a way to fulfill U.S. mission to the world. In a speech on the Philippine question Bryan declared that the forcible annexation of the Philippines was not necessary to make the United States a world power- that it had been one since its existence by virtue of the American example as to self-government. He argued that in “its brief existence it has exerted upon the human race an influence more potent for good than all the other nations of the earth combined, and it has exerted that influence without the sword or Gatling gun.”<sup>221</sup> On the occasion of his second visit to Mexico in 1900, Bryan declared that Mexico “furnishes a complete answer to the arguments of the imperialists.” He noted that the U.S. flag, which had flown in the capital during the U.S.-Mexico War, was taken down and that Mexico had been better off having its own flag, rather than having the character of the U.S. changed as a result of having the U.S. flag fly over a subject race.<sup>222</sup> Bryan was complimentary of Díaz and the progress

---

<sup>220</sup> Carl Schurz, *The Policy of Imperialism* (Chicago: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1899), 19.

<sup>221</sup> “Mr Bryan’s Speeches on Imperialism,” *Republic or Empire: The Philippine Question* (Chicago: The Independence Company, 1899), 37.

<sup>222</sup> William Jennings Bryan, *Under Other Flags: Travels, Lectures, Speeches* (Lincoln, NE: The Woodruff-Collins Printing, Co., 1904), 210. See also William J.

made by Mexico under his rule stating that “no people have made greater relative progress than the Mexican people have made under the administration of Porfirio Díaz.”<sup>223</sup> He continued that Mexico had made more progress in the past thirty years than India had made under English rule in the previous hundred and fifty years.<sup>224</sup> Another prominent anti-imperialist, David Starr Jordan, the president of Stanford University, stated that the “Force of brains is greater than force of arms, more worthy and more lasting.” He stated that the “most important and most honorable” phase of U.S. expansion had been the “peaceful conquest of Mexico.” This had resulted in the present stability of Mexico due to the influence of U.S. capital and intelligence. In contrast to formal expansion, the development of Mexico, “the awakening of a nation,” was a legitimate form of expansion through the ‘widening of American influence and an extension of republican ideas.’<sup>225</sup>

While most American commentators would have accepted the premise of the benefits of U.S. influence in Mexico, the arguments of the expansionists won out in the end and the United States annexed the Philippines, Puerto Rico and established a protectorate in Cuba. American expansionists argued that the peoples in these areas were not fit for self-government, and because of this the United States needed to take

---

Bryan, “Our Sister Republic,” *The Mexican Herald*, February 15, 1900. Bryan’s observations were original published in *The New York World*.

<sup>223</sup> Bryan, *Under Other Flags*, 202.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, 211.

<sup>225</sup> David Starr G Jordan, *The Question of the Philippines* (Palo Alto, CA: John J. Valentine, 1899), 29-30.

responsibility for the uplift and civilization of the former Spanish colonies.<sup>226</sup> One historian has described the goal of the U.S. as after an unspecified period of tutelage the inhabitants “would unlearn archaic or decadent Latin ways and substitute in their stead the way of life of their American mentors.”<sup>227</sup>

The War of 1898 signaled the arrival of the United States as a world power, and commenced a more interventionist policy in the Western Hemisphere.<sup>228</sup> The U.S. expanded its role especially under the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt who viewed many of the governments of the Western Hemisphere as weak and chaotic, thereby believing that it was the right and duty of the United States to intervene in their affairs “in the interest of order and civilization.”<sup>229</sup> This was the theme of what became known as the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. In this statement the U.S. President disavowed any interest in territorial expansion in the Western Hemisphere, and only sought to “see the neighboring countries stable, orderly and prosperous.” He stated that any country that “conducted itself well” could count on the “hearty friendship” of the United States, and need not fear any interference from the United States. However a situation of chronic “wrong-doing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening

---

<sup>226</sup> Philip W. Kennedy, “Race and American Expansion in Cuba and Puerto Rico, 1895-1905,” *Journal of Black Studies* 1:3 (March 1971): 309; Christopher Lasch, “The Anti-Imperialists, the Philippines and the Inequity of Man,” *Journal of Southern History* 24: 3 (August 1958): 323.

<sup>227</sup> Kennedy, “Race and American Expansion,” 306.

<sup>228</sup> Don M. Coerver and Linda B. Hall, *Tangled Destinies: Latin America and the United States* (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 45.

<sup>229</sup> Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy toward Latin America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 183.



of the ties of civilized society,” in the Western Hemisphere “may force” the United States to “exercise an international police power.”<sup>230</sup> Throughout his term, which ended in 1908, the United States would use this international police power to intervene militarily in various countries throughout the Latin America, taking a paternalistic view of the need for the United States to intervene in Latin America.<sup>231</sup>

Shortly after the announcement of the Roosevelt Corollary, Porfirio Díaz, who had become increasingly concerned with U.S. actions in Central America and the Caribbean, instructed the Mexican Ambassador, Manuel Azpiroz, to meet with Roosevelt to find out the implications for Mexico. In this meeting Roosevelt explained that if all Latin American nations acted like Mexico, then the Monroe Doctrine would be superfluous, and that it was disorder in small Latin American nations that might precipitate the need for U.S. intervention. Instead Roosevelt proposed that Mexico, with U.S. support, expand its border to Panama annexing Central America, apparently hoping that Mexico would act as the United States’ agent in the region.<sup>232</sup> The Mexican government respectfully declined this offer, though Roosevelt repeated his request several times.<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>230</sup> Theodore Roosevelt, “The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine,” *Latin America and the United States: A Documentary History*, eds. Robert H. Holden and Eric Zolov (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 88.

<sup>231</sup> Mark T. Gilderhus, *The Second Century: U.S.-Latin American Relations Since 1889* (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 2000), 30-32.

<sup>232</sup> Jurgen Buchenau, *In the Shadow of the Giant: The Making of Mexico’s Central America Policy, 1876-1930* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1996), 59-60.

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, 60.

As evidenced by Roosevelt's offer, the United States viewed Mexico under Díaz as a potential ally to stabilize other parts of Latin America. It was also not uncommon for American commentators to describe Díaz as the best leader in Latin America and Mexico as the premier nation among of all the former Spanish republics.<sup>234</sup> Similar to discussions of Mexico, American observers believed Latin America was not fit for self-government and needed a firm hand to guide them.<sup>235</sup> In 1908 an American businessman who had lived in Venezuela, George Crichfield, published a two-volume work entitled *American Supremacy: The Rise and Progress of the Latin American Republics and their Relations to the United States Under the Monroe Doctrine* which dealt with the nations of Latin America and their hopes for potential stability. While Crichfield's work has often been rightly cited as a strong statement of U.S. negative perceptions of Latin Americans because of racial reasons and as a proponent of U.S. intervention in those republics, Crichfield viewed Mexico under Díaz as one of the few exceptions to the perceived anarchy and disorder in Latin America.<sup>236</sup> Despite the lack of true republicanism in

---

<sup>234</sup> "Mexico's Place Among Latin-American Countries," *Modern Mexico* XI: 1 (April 1901): 15; "The Mexican Constitution," *The Mexican Investor* III: 9 (February 27, 1904): 1; "Mexico Shines by Contrast," *Modern Mexico* XVII: 4 (July 1904): 17; John Clark Ridpath, *Ridpath's History of the World* Volume VIII (Cincinnati: The Jones Brothers Publishing Company, 1910), 779.

<sup>235</sup> "South American Republics," *Munsey's Magazine* VI: 6 (March 1892): 756; Bannister Merwin, *A Continuous History of the Twentieth Century, Volume I* (New York: J.A. Hill & Co., 1904), 229-230; "President Díaz Inaugurated," *The Great Round World* XVI: 214 (December 13, 1900): 348-349; "The Wisdom of Díaz," *The Atlanta Daily Constitution*, July 20, 1904.

<sup>236</sup> For excerpts of Crichfield's work in general Latin American surveys see *Latin America: A Historical Reader*, ed. Lewis Hanke, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), 491-499; *People and Issues in Latin American History*, eds. Lewis Hanke and Jane M. Rausch (New York and Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishing, Inc., 1990), 224-232.

Mexico, Crichfield, like others, ranked Díaz as the greatest statesman that Latin America had ever produced, who had been the “salvation of the Mexican people.”<sup>237</sup> While Crichfield advocated U.S. intervention in much of Latin America to “place them under a civilized government” he singled out Mexico for praise, suggesting that if Mexico continued to progress as it had under Díaz, it “could count on the loyal friendship and moral aid” of the United States.<sup>238</sup> In confronting what they viewed as chronic instability in Latin America, U.S. observers perceived the Díaz system as a model for Latin-American republics suffering from seemingly chronic problems with political instability. An editorial in the *San Francisco Chronicle* declared that if Latin American governments were going to succeed under a republican government they needed a man like Porfirio Díaz at its head, and another commentator stated that Porfirio Díaz was the only ruler that had had success in governing Latin Americans in the Western Hemisphere.<sup>239</sup> In the words of former Secretary of State John W. Foster, Porfirio Díaz was providing an

---

<sup>237</sup> George W. Crichfield, *American Supremacy: The Rise and Progress of the Latin American Republics and their Relations to the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, Volume 1* (New York: Brentano’s, 1908), 221. Quote is from page 269. See also “Mexico’s Napoleon,” *The State* [Columbia, SC], June 27, 1896; *Christian Work* 63: 1598 (September 30, 1897): 530.

<sup>238</sup> Crichfield, *American Supremacy*, Volume 1, 225. Crichfield advocated intervention in Latin American republics in *American Supremacy: The Rise and Progress of the Latin American Republics and their Relations to the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, Volume 2* (New York: Brentano’s, 1908), 638. He singled out Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, Santo Domingo and the rest of Central America as needing U.S. intervention.

<sup>239</sup> “President Díaz,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, November 18, 1893; J.D. Whelpley, “The Last Spanish Budget in Porto Rico,” *The Independent* LII: 2702 (September 13, 1900): 2208. See also *Idaho Daily Statesman*, July 15, 1900; “Spanish American Dictators,” *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*, February 17, 1896; *Bradstreet’s* XXXII: 1370 (October 1, 1904): 625.

example to other Spanish-American republics in the way of “orderly government and prosperity.”<sup>240</sup> The problem was that the man that Americans likened to Washington and Lincoln was an exceptional leader in the minds of U.S. officials and many U.S. commentators. In contrast to Díaz, Americans saw most Latin American leaders as either tyrannical or so weak they were incapable of maintaining order and progress.

### Conclusion

The Díaz Legend, of a benevolent despot who was bringing modernization, development and progress to Mexico, and controlling the revolutionary urges of the Mexican people would be virtually uncontested in the U.S. public sphere throughout most of the Porfiriato. However the Porfiriato relied upon “the appearance of strength rather than its reality.”<sup>241</sup> By 1906 the consequences of the Mexican modernization program and the political repression not only created cracks in the regime in Mexico, but in the Díaz Legend in the United States.

While many American commentators agreed that the Mexican people were well on their way to true self-government, others expressed serious misgivings for Mexico’s future once the strong hand of Díaz passed from the scene.<sup>242</sup> A 1910 editorial in *The*

---

<sup>240</sup> John W. Foster, “Porfirio Díaz: Soldier and Statesman,” *The International Quarterly* VIII (December-March 1903): 342.

<sup>241</sup> MacLachlan and Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo*, 184.

<sup>242</sup> For sources optimistic about Mexico’s future after Díaz see “What He Stands For,” *The Mexican Herald*, September 21, 1897; “Impressions of Mexico,” *The Hartford Courant*, December 24, 1897; “Mexico Under Díaz,” *Los Angeles Times*, April 28, 1901; Theodore Woolsey, “Foreign Bonds as American Investments,” *The Forum* XXXI (May 1901): 279; “Letter from John Howland,” *Congregationalist and Christian World* (April 5, 1902); “The New Liberal Party,” *The American Review of Reviews* XXVIII: 4 (October 1903): 393; “Mexico and the Future of Investments Placed There,” *Bankers* 78: 5 (May 1909); “After Díaz- What?” *The Baltimore Sun*, December 24, 1909. For sources

*Commercial and Financial Chronicle* stated that the question Mexico faced was how far “races traditionally unfitted for self-government can be educated to such capacity by the practice of the task itself.”<sup>243</sup> Part of the consternation on the part of American commentators in the later years of the Porfiriato was related to concerns that even though Díaz had in their view brought peace and prosperity to Mexico, he had not actually educated the people for republican government, other than a general “acquisition of a better self-control.”<sup>244</sup> In 1900 Fenton R. McCreery, an American diplomat in Mexico stated that the Mexican people were “little better prepared to exercise the duties in the

---

pessimistic about Mexico’s future after Díaz see *Congregationalist and Christian World* (December 10, 1904): 861; Clark Bell, “Longevity and the Relation of Age to useful Work,” *The Bar* XIV: 11 (January 1908): 23; “Díaz, A Czar with No Line of Succession,” *The San Francisco Call* (February 25, 1909); *Current Literature* XLVII: 2 (August 1909): 25; B. H. Canfield, “After Díaz What? Only One Thing- That is Blood,” *The Tacoma Times*, December 21, 1909; N.S. Mayo, “Mexico,” *Outlook* (June 18, 1910): 373; “President,” *Outlook* (July 16, 1910): 548; Palmer, *Central America and Its Problems*, 11. For commentators who took a wait and see approach see, “After Díaz, Whom?” *The Kansas City Star*, February 20, 1898; “After President Díaz, What?” *The Florida Star*, April 12, 1901; “The Problem After Díaz,” *The Kansas City Star*, December 20, 1903; “When Díaz Dies,” *Goodwin’s Weekly* (March 28, 1903); “Díaz and Mexico,” *The San Jose Evening News*, December 3, 1902; “Mexico’s President,” *New York Times*, July 21, 1906; “Mexico’s Tomorrow,” *The New York Sun*, November 11, 1906; “An Emperor in Fact,” *The Washington Post*, April 7, 1909; “When Díaz Dies” *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 13, 1909.

<sup>243</sup> “Mexico’s Centenary,” *The Commercial and Financial Chronicle* 91:2360 (September 17, 1910): 681. For similar themes see “Men, Measures, and Motives,” *Success* VI: 107 (April 1903): 250; George B. Winton, “Porfirio Díaz and the Mexican Republic,” *The Methodist Quarterly Review* LIII: 3 (July 1904): 489.

<sup>244</sup> J.D. Whelpley, “President Díaz and His Successor,” *World’s Work* II:1 (May 1901): 700. Other criticisms of Díaz for not educating the Mexican people for self-government include, Parker H. Sercombe, “The Mexican Plutocracy,” *Twentieth Century Magazine* I: 6 (March 1910): 532-533; “Impending Political Changes in Mexico,” *The Independent* LIII: 2732 (April 11, 1901): 844; *The Nation* 91: 2360 (September 22, 1910): 255.

political life of the Republic” than their ancestors were under Cortez.<sup>245</sup> This was also expressed by John W. Foster, who though, he was complimentary of the peace and material progress of Mexico during the Díaz years, noted that Díaz had not educated the masses of “their duties under a republican government,” and Foster stated that Díaz should have left office after his second term leaving the no-reelection clause of the Mexican Constitution intact.<sup>246</sup> One common theme discussed towards the end of the Porfiriato was that the Mexicans were still not ready for self-government with some suggesting that Díaz’s successor would need to follow his methods to be successful in ruling the Mexican people reflecting continuing skepticism about the prospects for true self-government in Mexico.<sup>247</sup> Given the expanded role of Americans in Mexico and U.S. investments there, commentators suggested that if Mexico was again confronted with disorder as it had experienced in the decades before Porfirio Díaz became President, then it might be necessary for the United States to intervene in Mexican affairs.<sup>248</sup>

---

<sup>245</sup> “Mexico: Notes on Political Conditions,” McCreery-Fenton Family Papers Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Box 3 Folder 95.

<sup>246</sup> John W. Foster, *Diplomatic Memoirs, Volume I* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1910), 106-107.

<sup>247</sup> “Díaz’s Success as Ruler of the Mexicans,” *The Charlotte Daily Observer*, December 4, 1902.

<sup>248</sup> *Success VI*: 106 (March 1903): 169; James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth Volume II* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910), 574.

CHAPTER SIX: THE LEFTIST AND LABOR CHALLENGE TO U.S.  
ECONOMIC EXPANSION INTO MEXICO, 1906-1911

While most mainstream publications described U.S. economic expansion in self-congratulatory terms, labor and socialist critics would critique the effects of the expansion of U.S. capital as well as U.S. policy towards Mexico and other Latin American countries. Instead of viewing the results of the expansion of U.S. capitalism into Mexico as a benevolent mission, working-class critics of the U.S. capitalist and industrial order viewed it as an expansion of the exploitation by many of the same trusts and capitalists with whom American workers had clashed for years. Rather than solely a critique of U.S. economic expansion and U.S. mission to Mexico, socialists and some in the labor movement articulated a new mission for Mexico. This would come from their support of the Mexican Liberal Party (PLM), and after the outbreak of the Revolution from a mobilization to prevent the U.S. government from intervening to prevent the fall of the Díaz regime. This, they hoped, would allow for a transformation of Mexico, not necessarily in the image of the United States, but in the image of what they hoped the United States would also someday become.

Strongly influenced by the critiques of Mexican exiles living in the United States, labor and socialist critics would critique U.S. economic expansion, U.S. support for the repressive Díaz regime and would tenaciously attack the “Díaz Legend” which had been carefully created by Mexican officials and U.S. supporters in the mainstream press for decades. This critique entered the mainstream press in the Fall of 1909, gaining the attention of Progressives and members of Congress over the next few months. In response, U.S. and Mexican promoters, supporters of the Díaz regime, and members of



the Díaz government responded with a calculated campaign to blunt the charges of socialist and labor writers and had limited success in undermining many of the charges against the regime. However the critiques begun largely from socialists, the labor press and Mexican liberal exiles in the United States tarnished the Díaz regime in the public sphere. Likewise the campaign of labor, union, and socialists in defense of members of the Mexican Liberal Party served as a precursor to larger scale mobilization to prevent U.S. Intervention in the Mexican Revolution in support of Porfirio Díaz.

### Responses to Mexican Capitalist Development

As discussed in the previous two chapters, the Díaz regime sought to welcome foreign investment into Mexico as a means of developing the nation. The Díaz regime developed institutional safeguards in the form of banking, mining and commercial codes, while giving foreign investors special concessions, tax breaks, and enhanced police protection to create an attractive investment climate to encourage economic development in Mexico.<sup>1</sup> At the same time local, state and national elites, cooperated with managers of large industrial establishments to transform the workers into a “disciplined and subordinated workforce.”<sup>2</sup> The end result was the transformation of the nation into a

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael J. Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1940* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 24, 65; Juan Carlos Moreno-Brid and Jaime Ros, *Development and Growth in the Mexican Economy: A Historical Perspective* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 46-47.

<sup>2</sup> William E. French, “Progreso Forzado: Workers and the Inculcation of the Capitalist Work Ethic in the Parral Mining District,” *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico*, eds. William H. Beezley, Cheryl English Martin and William E. French (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1994), 192. See also Jonathan C. Brown, “Foreign and Native-Born Workers in Porfirian Mexico,” *The American Historical Review* 98:3 (June 1993): 798.



capitalist economy.<sup>3</sup> American commentators, including investors, promoters and many in the press viewed Mexican capitalist development as a positive trend, and took credit for many of the changes in Mexico because of the level of U.S. investment in the Mexican economy.

By contrast the working-class press was critical of the expansion of U.S. capital into Mexico, by many of the same capitalists with whom the U.S. workers had clashed with in the United States.<sup>4</sup> America's economic expansion began during a period of intense class conflict in the United States, beginning with the Great Railroad Strike of 1877, and included a number of strikes in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era, the most famous of which were the "Great Upheaval" in 1886 and the Homestead, and Pullman strikes of the 1890s.<sup>5</sup> This trend continued into the early twentieth century as one labor history describes the "friction between labor and capital" as at times "approaching a full-scale war." In response to labor conflict corporations frequently utilized the combined resources of private militias, and the state and federal governments to repress strikes, often with brutal violence.<sup>6</sup> *The New York Call*, a leading socialist newspaper, attributed

---

<sup>3</sup> Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1940*, 24, 65; Moreno-Brid and Ros, *Development and Growth in the Mexican Economy*, 46-47.

<sup>4</sup> Gregg Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder?: The American Federation of Labor, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-1924* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991), 3.

<sup>5</sup> Joshua Freeman, Nelson Lichtenstein, Stephen Brier, David Bensman, Susan Porter Benson, David Brundage, Bret Eynon, Bruce Levine, Bryan Palmer, *Who Built America? Working People and the Nation's Economy, Politics, Culture, and Society: Volume Two: From Gilded Age to Present* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1992), 109-100.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 160; Philip Yale Nicholson, *Labor's Story in the United States* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004), 163-164.

U.S. economic expansion to excess profits accumulated by U.S. capitalists through the exploitation of the American worker, which were then used to exploit the workers of other countries.<sup>7</sup> This perspective influenced the socialist press to challenge U.S. and Mexican promotional claims regarding U.S. economic expansion to Mexico as well as the actions of U.S. business interests in Mexico.

Mexican laborers, in general, worked long hours and received poor wages, as employers were subject to little or no legislative or practical oversight by the government.<sup>8</sup> Because of the expansion of the haciendas in rural areas, many rural Mexicans lost their lands and migrated to the cities creating a surplus labor market, and an abundance of labor.<sup>9</sup> These low labor costs were one of the biggest inducements that Mexico provided for the investor and were described by Mexican promotional works and by numerous U.S. commentators as abundant “cheap labor.”<sup>10</sup> In speaking of the

---

<sup>7</sup> “American Capital Expands,” *The New York Evening Call*, July 28, 1909; “The Growth of Internationalism,” *The New York Evening Call*, August 23, 1909.

<sup>8</sup> Alicia Hernández Chávez, *Mexico: A Brief History*, trans., Andy Klatt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), 211. Wages and conditions did vary across industries and regions, and even among different employers in the same industry (211).

<sup>9</sup> Ramón Eduardo Ruíz, *The Great Rebellion: Mexico, 1905-1924* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1980), 59; Gilbert G. Gonzalez, “Mexican Labor Migration, 1876-1924,” *Beyond La Frontera: The History of Mexico-U.S. Migration*, ed. Mark Overmyer-Velázquez (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 33.

<sup>10</sup> Juan Mora-Torres, “‘Los de casa se van, los de fuera no vienen’: The First Mexican Immigrants, 1848-1900,” *Beyond La Frontera: The History of Mexico-U.S. Migration*, ed. Mark Overmyer-Velázquez (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 16-18. For Mexican promotional statements on the cheapness of labor in Mexico see *Facts and Figures about Mexico and Her Great Railroad, the Mexican Central* Third Edition (Mexico City: The Mexican Central Railway Company Limited, 1900), 9; Bernardo Mallen, *Mexico: Yesterday and To-Day, 1876-1904* (Mexico: NP, 1904), 41; *Boletín de la Asociación Financiera Internacional* III: 9 (April 1908): 15. U.S.

potential for coffee and sugar cultivation in southern Mexico for instance, the United States Commission to the Central and South American States, described Mexican workers as the “best cheap labor in the world.”<sup>11</sup> An article in the socialist *St Louis Labor* responded to this theme noting that capitalists were “everlastingly looking” for cheap labor, and Mexico was the “El Dorado” of their dreams because of its unorganized workforce which was forced to work on near starvation wages.<sup>12</sup> Likewise the *Appeal to Reason* noted that promoters and the mainstream press tended to treat cheap labor as

---

discussions of cheap labor in Mexico include Nevin O. Winter, *Mexico and Her People of To-Day: An Account of the Customs, Characteristics, Amusements, History and Advancements of the Mexicans, and the Development and Resources of their Country* (Boston: L.C. Page and Company, 1907), 193; John Binkinbine, “Industrial Conditions in Mexico,” *The Engineering Magazine* VI: 5 (February 1894): 634; Consul John B. Richardson, “Resources of the Lower Rio Grande,” *Consular Reports* 151 (April 1893): 572.

<sup>11</sup> Report #2, Mexico, January 1, 1885, *Report of the Commissioners to the Central and South American States* 48<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, Executive Document No. 226 (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1885), 412. For similar sentiments regarding the cheapness and docility of Mexican labor see “The Peon and His Hire,” *Modern Mexico* XIX: 9 (November 1905): 16; “The Future of Mexico,” *The Mining World* XXXI: 1 (July 3, 1909): 1. Similar statements extolled the theme of “cheap labor” in Mexico in areas such as the Orizaba textile plant in Veracruz, in agriculture, and mining which would result in “enormous profits” for Mexican and foreign investors. See W.W. Byam, *A Sketch of the State of Chiapas* (Los Angeles: Geo. Rice & Sons, 1897), 69; Percy F. Martin, *Mexico’s Treasure-House- (Guanajuato)* (New York: Cheltenham Press, 1906), 61; Ida Dorman Morris and James Edwin Morris, *A Tour in Mexico* (London and New York: The Abbey Press, 1902), 284; James Joseph Fitzgerald, *Fitzgerald’s Guide to Tropical Mexico: The Health and Wealth of the Tropics* (St Louis: Perrier & Smith, 1905), 56; George W. Johnson, “Mexico’s Need for Cheap Fuel,” *Dun’s Review* III: 4 (June 1904): 20; “The Labor Situation in Mexico,” *The Mining World* XXXI: 1 (July 3, 1909): 40; Pan American Union, *Mexico: A General Sketch* (Washington DC: Pan American Union, 1911), 103, 158.

<sup>12</sup> “Observations,” *St Louis Labor*, May 1, 1909. See also “Developing Mexico by Peonage,” *Appeal to Reason*, July 11, 1908; John Larson, “Declares Mexican Workers Hopelessly Impoverished,” *The People’s Paper*, January 18, 1908; “To the Working Class of America,” *Appeal to Reason*, March 27, 1909.

though it were an inherent quality of the Mexican workforce, but ignored the role and the interest that foreign capitalists had in “cheapening labor” and maintaining it in that condition.<sup>13</sup>

Socialist writers viewed U.S. economic expansion and more direct engagement with other countries with concern. They were particularly vexed by the expansion of U.S. diplomatic service, army and navy, which they believed provided tools for coercion and the use of force in protecting the international economic interests of U.S. capitalists.<sup>14</sup> These changes had brought about the internationalization of capitalism as investors looked for new markets to exploit and sought to protect their interests which were often at the expense of the workers in the United States and abroad.<sup>15</sup> In the view of the socialist press a united capitalist class necessitated unity in the working class as well, since this internationalization of capital linked the fates of workers worldwide.<sup>16</sup> *The Chicago Daily Socialist* explained, “If the owners of stock in Mexican enterprises have a common interest in maintaining exploitation, however bloody the means to that end, the

---

<sup>13</sup> “Suppressing Free Speech,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 13, 1909. See also, “Mexico Has a Capitalist Czar,” *St Louis Labor*, August 10, 1907; John Murray, “The Men Díaz Dreads,” *Chicago Daily Socialist*, January 12, 1909; “Conquest of Mexico,” *Solidarity II*: 14 (March 18, 1910).

<sup>14</sup> “The Growth of Internationalism,” *The New York Evening Call*, August 23, 1909.

<sup>15</sup> “About Mexico,” *The International Socialist Review IX*:11 (May 1909): 918.

<sup>16</sup> “The Growth of Internationalism,” *The New York Evening Call*, August 23, 1909. See also “Internationalism,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 1, 1907; “Internationalism,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 1, 1908; A.E. Briggs, “Comrade A.E. Briggs Writes a Strong Letter on Right of Asylum for Political Refugees,” *The Oakland World*, January 22, 1909; “The Internationalism of Labor,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 15, 1909; “Who is the Foreigner,” *Industrial Worker I*: 43 (January 15, 1910).

workers of the United States and of Mexico have a common reason for hating that exploitation and the bloody methods by which it is maintained.”<sup>17</sup>

Because of the importance which Díaz and his advisors placed on providing a favorable business climate, the Mexican government was allied with domestic and foreign capitalists frequently to the detriment of the Mexican working class.<sup>18</sup> One historian of the Porfiriato has described Díaz as the “top administrator” of an order based on international capitalism, which helped him to manage Mexico for over three decades.<sup>19</sup> At the same Díaz frequently was confronted by a determined Mexican working class. While the Mexican government often responded with violence toward labor unrest, at times it tried to find a balance between workers and capitalists. One example of this was the response to a strike among the employees of the Mexican Central Railroad in 1906. In a meeting with union representatives, Díaz agreed to support the striking workers efforts to receive equal wages with foreign workers, but refused their other demands such as union recognition. Díaz also insisted that the workers return to work, and stated that the government would use “whatever means necessary” to maintain order if they refused.<sup>20</sup> Díaz explained that, “Capital must be protected, as every

---

<sup>17</sup> “Taft and Díaz,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, August 7, 1909. See also “About Mexico,” *The International Socialist Review* IX:11 (May 1909): 918; Mother Jones, “Oh! Ye Lovers of Liberty!” *Appeal to Reason*, January 23, 1909.

<sup>18</sup> Philip S. Foner, *The U.S. Labor Movement and Latin America: A History of Workers’ Response to Intervention, Volume 1, 1846-1919* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1988), 97.

<sup>19</sup> Paul J. Vanderwood, *Disorder and Progress: Bandits, Police and Mexican Development* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), 76.

<sup>20</sup> Lorena M. Parlee, “The Impact of United States Railroad Unions on Organized Labor and Government Policy in Mexico (1880-1911),” *Hispanic American Historical*

imposition placed upon it retards the forward movement of the country and its industrial development.”<sup>21</sup> Several editorials appeared in U.S. periodicals supportive of U.S. capital expansion in Mexico shortly thereafter which reproduced portions of Díaz’ statement and applauded this policy usually not noting that Díaz had gotten the railway to increase wages.<sup>22</sup> When labor unions appeared, the Mexican authorities frequently enforced laws which made it a crime to use “moral or physical force to alter wages or to impede the free exercise of industry or labor,” effectively prohibiting strikes and other similar actions which the government saw as a challenge to the political and economic order.<sup>23</sup> By 1905 hard economic conditions brought on by the declining price of silver, caused Mexican workers to suffer from higher food prices, falling real wages, and layoffs, and helped to bring about several well-publicized strikes over the next several years.<sup>24</sup> These strikes and the response by the Díaz regime would capture the attention of the labor and socialist press in the United States.

---

*Review* 64:3 (August 1984): 465. The strike involved over 3,000 railroad workers, and shut down Mexico’s largest rail network (462).

<sup>21</sup> Anderson, *Outcasts in Their Own Land*, 118-119; “Labor and Capital in Mexico,” *Mining Reporter* LV: 13 (March 28, 1907): 290. For a discussion of the role of “free labor” in the U.S. context see Theresa A. Case, *The Great Southwest Railroad Strike and Free Labor* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2010), 8-12.

<sup>22</sup> See “Labor and Capital in Mexico,” *Mining Reporter* LV: 13 (March 28, 1907): 290; “President Díaz and Strikes,” *The Mexican Investor* VII: 34 (August 25, 1906); Edward C. Butler, “Gen. Díaz’s Plain Talk,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 26, 1906.

<sup>23</sup> Ruiz, *The Great Rebellion*, 63; Foner, *The U.S. Labor Movement and Latin America*, 97.

<sup>24</sup> Ruiz, *The Great Rebellion*, 68; Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution*, 62-63.

The PLM, and Strikes at Cananea and Rio Blanco

During this same period Mexican liberals formed clubs in cities throughout Mexico which criticized the lack of democratic norms, the violation of rights guaranteed by the constitution and corruption in the judicial system, forming more than fifty clubs by 1901.<sup>25</sup> In August of 1900 Ricardo Flores Magón and other critics of the regime founded *Regeneración* in Mexico City, a newspaper which attacked the Díaz regime.<sup>26</sup> After being arrested three times, Flores Magón, along with his brother Enrique and several other liberal exiles fled Mexico, arriving in the United States in January 1904. The Mexican exiles relocated in St Louis and formed the Junta Organizadora Partido Liberal Mexicano (PLM) with Ricardo Flores Magón as its leader, intended as a first step to creating a nationwide party in Mexico to overthrow the Díaz dictatorship.<sup>27</sup> In February 1905 the group reestablished *Regeneración* which soon reached 30,000 subscribers. The newspaper drew the attention of the Díaz government, which prohibited its circulation into Mexico in September of the same year. Despite the attempt to suppress the periodical, copies were distributed by independent merchants along the border and were sent to various areas in Mexico along the rail lines.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Suzanne B. Pasztor, *The Spirit of Hidalgo: The Mexican Revolution in Coahuila* (Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Press, 2002), 45.

<sup>26</sup> Colin M. MacLachlan and William H. Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo: A History of Greater Mexico* Third Edition (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2004), 202.

<sup>27</sup> Ward S. Albro, *Always a Rebel: Ricardo Flores Magón and the Mexican Revolution* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1992), 30-31.

<sup>28</sup> Kenneth Dale Underwood, "Mining Wars: Corporate Expansion and Labor Violence in the Western Desert, 1876-1920." PhD diss., University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 2009. 166.



*Regeneración* went to various regions of Mexico, including the copper mining region of Cananea in Northern Sonora near the Arizona border. In 1905 one of the PLM supporters, Antonio de P. Araujo, had distributed copies of the newspaper to the workers at Cananea, aided by the members of the U.S.- based Western Federation of Miners (WFM), who were organizing miners on the U.S. side of the border.<sup>29</sup> In November of the same year the St Louis Junta appealed to workers at Cananea to support the PLM and by late December a branch of the group was created there.<sup>30</sup> In May 1906 there were several altercations between Mexican workers and American supervisors. This already tense situation was made worse when the Greene Consolidated Copper Company announced changes that would result in reduced wages, longer hours and a reduction in the workforce to take effect on June 1.<sup>31</sup> In response 3,000 Mexican miners went on strike, demanding pay increases, equal pay with American workers, the hiring of Mexican foreman and supervisors along with an eight-hour workday.<sup>32</sup>

The refusal by the mine owner, William C. Greene, to negotiate with the striking miners led to violent clashes between armed Americans and the Mexican strikers, when Greene's men fired into the crowd of strikers killing at least fifty Mexicans. In response

---

<sup>29</sup> W. Dirk Raat, *Revoltosos: Mexico's Rebels in the United States, 1903-1923* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 1981), 78.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 81.

<sup>32</sup> Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution*, 67; Raat, *Revoltosos*, 81. For more on the beginnings and operations of William C. Greene at Cananea see Samuel Truett, *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006), 84-103; and David M. Pletcher, *Rails, Mines, and Progress: Seven American Promoters in Mexico, 1867-1911* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1958), 219-259.



to the deteriorating situation Greene wired for assistance, and Mexican *rurales*, or rural police, and federal troops were sent to the scene. The American Consular agent in Cananea, William J. Galbraith, sent dramatic messages to the State Department asking for military aid.<sup>33</sup> Greene also requested assistance from the Arizona Rangers, who because of their proximity to the mine, arrived first and were deputized by the Governor of Sonora. The *rurales* and federal Mexican forces, along with the Americans confronted the striking miners with violence and broke the strike, forcing the miners back to work.<sup>34</sup> The commander of the *rurales*, Colonel Emilio Kosterlitzky, rounded up workers he considered ringleaders, and hung them from trees outside of town, while eighty-seven other Mexican miners were imprisoned and American miners suspected of WFM affiliation were expelled.<sup>35</sup>

The events in Cananea created divergent responses in the mainstream newspaper press in Mexico and the United States, from promoters of Mexico investment, and from the socialist and labor press. The Mexican press expressed outrage at the violation of Mexican sovereignty because of the presence of the Arizona Rangers in Mexican territory, and the fact that the Mexican government seemed more interested in securing

---

<sup>33</sup> Galbraith to State Department, June 1, 1906, *Despatches from U.S. Consuls in Nogales*, RG 59, M283, Reel 4.

<sup>34</sup> Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution*, 68.

<sup>35</sup> Michael C. Meyer, William L. Sherman, and Susan M. Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History* Eighth Edition Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 425; Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution*, 68. For more on Kosterlitzky and the Sonora-Arizona Borderlands see Samuel Truett, "Transnational Warrior" Emilio Kosterlitzky and the Transformation of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands, 1873-1928," *Continental Crossroads: Remapping U.S.-Mexico Borderlands History* eds. Samuel Truett and Elliott Young (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004), 241-272.

foreign property than protecting Mexican sovereignty.<sup>36</sup> The U.S. press was filled with sensational stories of the events at Cananea. Company officials, U.S. diplomats, and the American press interpreted Mexican economic nationalism, as well as the clashes between Mexican strikers and American employees as the beginning of a “race war,” or a riot where Mexican workers were supposedly poised for violence against Americans and their property in the area and expressed satisfaction that order was restored.<sup>37</sup> In response to the actions of the Mexican authorities, *The Copper Handbook: A Manual of the Copper Industry of the World* suggested that the cause of the disturbances was “professional agitators and would-be revolutionists,” and without much sympathy stated that the Mexican government had a way of “promptly shooting rioters and revolutionists first, and trying them later on, when time hangs heavy.”<sup>38</sup>

The labor and socialist papers in the United States granted a legitimacy to the striking miners that was absent in most mainstream press accounts. An article in the largest socialist paper, the *Appeal to Reason*, declared that there was nothing revolutionary, nor any truth to the portrayal of events in Cananea as a “race war,” rather

---

<sup>36</sup> James A. Sandos, *Rebellion in the Borderlands: Anarchism and the Plan of San Diego, 1904-1923* (Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992), 11. The PLM also emphasized this theme.

<sup>37</sup> For descriptions of the events as a “race war,” or “race riot” see Thompson to Root, June 5, 1906, *Despatches from U.S. Ministers in Mexico* RG 59, M97 Reel 79; “Yankee Massacre Starts in Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 2, 1906; “Americans Killed in Race War,” *Los Angeles Times*, June 2, 1906; “Race War Rages on Mexican Line,” *The Minneapolis Journal*, June 2, 1906; “American Force Ends Race War,” *The Washington Post*, June 3, 1906; “13 Killed in Race Riot,” *The Baltimore Sun* (June 3, 1906); “Mexicans in Control,” *The Washington Post*, June 4, 1906; “Atlanta Boy Writes of Riot at Cananea,” *Atlanta Constitution*, June 18, 1906.

<sup>38</sup> *The Copper Handbook: A Manual of the Copper Industry of the World VI* (Houghton, MI: Horace J. Stevens, 1906), 545.

that the strike was a fight for better wages and working conditions.<sup>39</sup> *The Miner's Magazine*, the organ for the Western Federation of Miners, emphasized the miners' working conditions and described the strikes as a rebellion against a "bondage that was infamous and brutal," to which capitalism secured the repressive power of both governments to crush the strikes.<sup>40</sup> The editorial likened the striking Mexicans to American patriots of the Revolutionary War era, stating that they exhibited the same "spirit of independence" that had earlier been in the hearts of American patriots when they, though "ragged and shoeless, drove from the soil of the thirteen colonies the despotism of regal imperialism."<sup>41</sup>

*The Demonstrator*, an anarchist-socialist utopian periodical, believed that it was the duty of the American "justice-loving press to give a helping hand to the struggling Mexicans and to expose the methods of the gold-thirsty capitalists" in Mexico.<sup>42</sup> However the *Appeal to Reason* expressed pessimism for the immediate prospects for the workers of Mexico, stating that because of the power of the Díaz regime and U.S. capitalists in Mexico, further strikes and organizing would be futile, and workers would continue to be killed if they tried to organize. While the mission of the socialists in the

---

<sup>39</sup> "The Czar Outdone," *Appeal to Reason*, June 30, 1906.

<sup>40</sup> *Miner's Magazine* VII: 155 (June 14, 1906): 4; "The Czar Outdone," *Appeal to Reason*, June 30, 1906; "The Organized Movement," *The Cleveland Citizen*, June 9, 1906.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> "Mexico," *The Demonstrator* (July 4, 1906). *The Demonstrator* was the paper of the anarchist utopian Home Colony at Lakebay, Washington published in the "interest of revolutionary propaganda methods." The article references that they were able to get a picture of events in Mexico through the efforts of PLM junta member Antonio I. Villareal and *Regeneración*.

United States- to overthrow the U.S. capitalist system- remained unchanged, it had gained an expanded transnational meaning in this analysis; a defeat of the U.S. capitalist system would also free the working classes of Mexico from U.S. capitalists as well.<sup>43</sup> This expanded mission of the socialist cause in the United States would be revised after socialist and labor activists became familiar with the cause of the PLM, which became a “symbol of resistance” to the regime, and U.S. leftists hoped that Mexican dissidents would be able to effect a regime change in Mexico.<sup>44</sup> The labor activist, Mother Jones, who was the most prominent figure in the PLM refugees fight, described them as “the people’s champions’ who had “risked their lives over and over again to serve the masses who look to them to lead their almost forlorn hope.”<sup>45</sup> Working-class activists hoped that the PLM would be able to overthrow Díaz, thereby providing better conditions for Mexican workers, and some hoped, an overthrow of the capitalist system in Mexico.

Since the Mexican government, and Mexican and foreign capitalists depended on a “docile” and “cheap” workforce, the Díaz government sought to downplay stories of potential labor strife, while at the same time assuring investors that the government would take harsh measures against those disrupting the industrial order in Mexico. The regime utilized its close relationship with Mexico promoters who wrote favorable responses in the U.S. press. One article in *Modern Mexico* acknowledged that there was

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> John Mason Hart, notes that between 1900-1910 Flores Magón and the PLM would pose the most serious challenge to Díaz and become a symbol of resistance to the regime. See *Anarchism & the Mexican Working Class, 1860-1931* (Austin & London: University of Texas Press, 1978), 88.

<sup>45</sup> Mother Jones, “Save Our Heroic Mexican Comrades,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 20, 1909.

tension between Americans, particularly supervisors and skilled workers and Mexican workers, but declared that the danger of unrest was small because the Mexican laborer was “docile,” and “long-suffering,” even when unjustly treated, and “easily handled when intelligently managed.” The article predicted that striking laborers would be most “promptly and effectively quieted” by the government which could take whatever action might be necessary without waiting for injunctions or other legal measures which were necessary in the United States.<sup>46</sup>

Porfirio Díaz and the Mexican government successfully portrayed the revolutionary movement of the PLM as part of an anti-American movement which would endanger the lives and property of American citizens in its communications with the U.S. government, though at the same time Mexican officials sought to downplay the importance of potential revolutionary movements in Mexico.<sup>47</sup> In the aftermath of the Cananea strikes the U.S. government and the American business community had become concerned about further “anti-American uprisings” in Mexico, which might seek to overthrow the Díaz regime and expel foreigners from Mexico. Many U.S. newspapers

---

<sup>46</sup> “Unwarranted Alarm,” *Modern Mexico* XXI:5 (August 1906): 13-14. Other articles which sought to allay fears include “Mexico’s ‘Revolution’ Over,” *Modern Mexico* XXI:6 (September 1906): 13; “Malicious Lies,” *The Mexican Investor* VII: 36 (September 1, 1906): 6; “Lies About Mexico,” *The Mexican Investor* VII: 42 (October 20, 1906): 6; “Mexico’s Answer” *Modern Mexico* XXI: 7 (October 1906): 16-20; Edward M. Conley, “The Anti-Foreign Uprising in Mexico,” *The World To-Day* XI: 4 (October 1906): 1059-1062; “The Reaction Has Begun,” *Modern Mexico* XXI: 7 (October 1906): 13-14.

<sup>47</sup> See for instance conversation related by the U.S. Ambassador in Mexico in Thompson to Bacon, July 25, 1906, *Despatches from U.S. Ministers to Mexico* RG 59, M97 Reel 179. See also discussion by the American Consulate-General in Gottaschalk to Bacon, September 10, 1906, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59 Case 100, M862, Reel 22.

circulated reports by the Associated Press which featured stories of anti-American plots in Mexico, which were supposed to commence on Mexican Independence Day on September 16, 1906. During this period the State Department fielded numerous inquiries from American investors and potential investors as to the veracity of these reports.<sup>48</sup> In response to these concerns the U.S. Ambassador in Mexico instructed U.S. consuls to watch Mexican labor organizations, particularly those which might be affiliated with the PLM, and which utilized antigovernment and anti-American rhetoric.<sup>49</sup>

Despite the confusion in the U.S. press as to potential unrest, the PLM was planning a revolutionary uprising against the Díaz regime to begin on September 24, 1906. In anticipation for the hoped-for mass uprising, the PLM released its Program and Manifesto, sending over 15,000 copies to dissident clubs in Mexico and the United States. The PLM announced political reforms including a four-year presidential term with no reelection, judicial reforms, and respect for civil liberties in the form of freedom of speech and the press. The PLM also announced reforms for the Mexican working class in the form of an eight hour workday, minimum wage laws, legalization of labor unions, and improved conditions for Mexican workers, as well as the restoration of lands illegally taken from indigenous and other peasant communities.<sup>50</sup>

The PLM attempted to balance its strong nationalist views with fears of potential U.S. intervention. The PLM Manifesto has been described as a “deeply nationalist document,” which called upon Mexicans to look at Mexico “oppressed, miserable, held

---

<sup>48</sup> Raat, *Revoltosos*, 96-97, 99.

<sup>49</sup> Parlee, “United States Railroad Unions in Mexico,” 462-463.

<sup>50</sup> Verter, “Biographical Sketch,” 44-45.

in contempt, a prisoner of foreigners whose insolence grows larger with the cowardice of our tyrants.” The PLM junta referenced the crossing of the Arizona Rangers at Cananea into Mexico by referring to this as a trampling of “the national dignity.”<sup>51</sup> At the same time the PLM leadership sent a 15 page letter to President Roosevelt hoping to assuage U.S. concerns of anti-foreign actions. The PLM letter stated that the revolution was to be directed solely against the Díaz regime and would not threaten foreigners in general or Americans in particular.<sup>52</sup> The PLM did acknowledge that the preferential treatment that the Díaz regime had given foreigners had led to his “good reputation abroad in order to sustain his tyranny,” and listed preferential treatment of foreign workers in pay for the same jobs in their case against the regime. However they reiterated the fact that the Mexican people did not “hate foreigners nor wish to injure them,” because the fault with this treatment lay solely with Porfirio Díaz, and the anger of the people would only fall upon him.<sup>53</sup> Despite this attempt, the U.S. government, especially its diplomatic and consular services in Mexico, would accept the negative portrayals of the PLM by the Mexican government and U.S. business interests in Mexico.

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 46; “Manifiesto to the Nation: The Plan of the Partido Liberal Mexicano,” reprinted in *Dreams of Freedom: A Ricardo Flores Magón Reader* edited by Chaz Bufe and Mitchell Cowen Verter (Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2005), 127.

<sup>52</sup> Villareal to Roosevelt, September 12, 1906, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59, M862, Case 100 Reel 22. Less than a week earlier the editors of *Regeneración* sent a telegram to the White House protesting being characterized as anarchists and as the instigators of anti-American sentiments in Mexico. See *Regeneration’s* Editors to Roosevelt, September 7, 1906, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59 Case 100, M862, Reel 22.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

In the uprising, PLM cells on the U.S. border and throughout Mexico attempted a coordinated revolt against the regime. Unfortunately for the Mexican Liberals, the uprising was “ill-planned, ill-directed and a tremendous failure.”<sup>54</sup> The Mexican government had infiltrated cells in Douglas, Arizona and El Paso, Texas, which led to the arrest of PLM members and the confiscation of papers, letters, maps, arms and ammunition, while uprisings failed in the states of Veracruz and Coahuila.<sup>55</sup> Several members of the PLM leadership, including Ricardo Flores Magón, Juan Sarabia, and Antonio Villareal, had come to El Paso to direct the attack on Juarez, and Magón and Villareal barely escaped arrest when U.S. agents raided their headquarters.<sup>56</sup>

The failed PLM uprising came in the context of increased industrial strife, as well as actions against the regime. In the aftermath of the Cananea strike, Mexico continued to experience industrial unrest, with sixty-five strikes taking place between 1907 and 1910.<sup>57</sup> One historian has stated that “Abusive behavior by foreign foremen, particularly North Americans employed by mills, railroads and mines, ignited many of these disputes.”<sup>58</sup> Increased conflict between workers and capitalists led the Díaz regime to intervene, often using repressive measures against labor organizations.<sup>59</sup> Despite this

---

<sup>54</sup> Albro, *Always a Rebel*, 58.

<sup>55</sup> Verter, “Biographical Sketch,” 52.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid*, 54.

<sup>57</sup> Hart, *Anarchism & the Mexican Working Class*, 99-100.

<sup>58</sup> Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution*, 65.

<sup>59</sup> John Lear, *Workers, Neighbors and Citizens: The Revolution in Mexico City* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001), 118.



violence Mexican workers continued to use collective action to better their conditions and to seek redress for grievances.<sup>60</sup> One of these strikes occurred at the French-owned textile mill at Rio Blanco in the state of Veracruz during 1907.<sup>61</sup> The workers appealed to Porfirio Díaz for arbitration who ruled for the mill owners in his final decision. In response the workers in Rio Blanco voted to go out on strike on January 6. After a confrontation the strikers burned down the company store after company guards opened fire and killed at least one worker. In response, local officials ordered the *rurales* and federal troops to intervene. Upon arrival, the Mexican troops fired into the crowd killing possibly more than 100 people including several women and children as well as workers. Government officials executed six union leaders and sent dozens more to work camps in the Yucatan, which was often the equivalent of a death sentence.<sup>62</sup>

As was the case with Cananea the year before, the strike at Rio Blanco provoked divergent responses from the U.S. government officials in Mexico and the labor and socialist press. An article in the English section of the *Boletin de la Asociacion Finaanciera Internacional*, a journal devoted to the development of Mexico and to the “interests of foreign investors in the republic,” lauded the ability of the government to “interpose the strong arm of its authority whenever would-be strikers threaten property or

---

<sup>60</sup> Jonathan C. Brown, “Foreign and Native-Born Workers in Porfirian Mexico,” 810.

<sup>61</sup> In 1905 textile workers had organized the Gran Círculo de Obres Libres, which sought to organize workers in the textile mills of the region. Late in 1906 workers in Puebla went on strike demanding an end to the 12 hour workday and higher wages, and in response mill owners declared a national lockout of major textile mills, which affected over 30,000 workers.

<sup>62</sup> Gonzales, *The Mexican Revolution*, 64-65; Meyer, Sherman and Deeds *The Course of Mexican History*, 427.

disturb the peace and order of society.”<sup>63</sup> The U.S. government response to the strikes in Mexico reflected the tendency to view strikes in the United States as disruptions to the order of society. The historian Nell Irvin Painter has noted that beginning in the Gilded Age large number of Americans associated the strike with “violence, burning and bloodshed” and often viewed organizations and actions taken by workers as “subversive by definition.”<sup>64</sup> Likewise the labor historian Sarah Lyons Watts has explained that in response to strikes business leaders, manufacturers, and the press “castigated labor for having disrupted social order and praised business for promoting efficiency, progress, social order, and American patriotism.”<sup>65</sup>

In the case of Mexico U.S. officials viewed the strike as a challenge to the existing order and supported the Mexican government’s actions. The American Consul at Veracruz, William W. Canada, described the workers as an out-of-control mob on a campaign of destruction that plundered, burned and killed. Canada acknowledged the government’s measures were harsh, but stated that they were the only means for subduing the “unruly natives” who were inflamed by liquors and the incendiary talk of labor

---

<sup>63</sup> “Mexico to the Fore,” *Boletin de la Asociación Financiera Internacional* III: 1 (August 1907): 16.

<sup>64</sup> See also Nell Irvin Painter, *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919* (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1987), 18, 23-24. Painter argues that Americans associated the strike with the Paris Commune of 1871.

<sup>65</sup> Sarah Lyons Watts, *Order Against Chaos: Business Culture and Labor Ideology in America, 1890-1915* (Westport, CN and New York: Greenwood Press, 1991), 10-11. See also Troy Rondinone, *The Great Industrial War: Framing Class Conflict in the Media, 1865-1950* (New Brunswick, NJ and London: Rutgers University Press, 2010), 3-4.

leaders, who were more like “savages” than quiet citizens.<sup>66</sup> The American Consul-General in Mexico City, Alfred ML Gottschalk sent a dispatch to the State Department in which he expressed his view that the recent strikes were just the beginning of labor difficulties in Mexico. Gottschalk suggested that labor unions, which were the result of increasing foreign contact, had changed the paternalistic relationship between labor and management where the worker had previously worked under the “direct and usually benevolent patronage of his employer.”<sup>67</sup> Gottschalk worried that the spread of public education and increases in individual rights would be used by “unscrupulous” politicians to influence the working classes to become a “tumultuous element” and a “force of evil against law and order.”<sup>68</sup>

The violence toward workers in Cananea and Rio Blanco, however, vividly illustrated to the labor and socialist press the nature of the Díaz regime and the realities of capitalist development for the workers in Mexico. These incidents would be repeatedly brought up as evidence and linked to the critique of U.S. economic expansion into Mexico. *The Chicago Daily Socialist* stated that capital is always as “brutal as it dare be,”

---

<sup>66</sup> Canada to Assistant Secretary of State, February 13, 1907, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59, M862, Case 3916, Reel 356.

<sup>67</sup> Gottschalk to Bacon, January 8, 1907, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59, M862, Case 3916, Reel 356. For more on the role of paternalism in the Mexican labor context see Tony Morgan, “Proletarians, Politicos, and Patriarchs: The Use and Abuse of Cultural Customs in the Early Industrialization of Mexico City, 1880-1910,” *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico* eds. William H. Beezley, Cheryl English Martin and William E. French (Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1994), 151-171; Michael Snodgrass, *Deference and Defiance in Monterrey, 1890-1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 55-61.

<sup>68</sup> Gottschalk to Bacon, January 8, 1907, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59, M862, Case 3916, Reel 356.

and since there was little restraint in Mexico, the brutality was “almost inconceivable.” What made the situation worse was the fact that American capitalists were at least partially responsible for many of the inhuman conditions. The editorial accused U.S. capitalists of condoning and maintaining the brutalities in Mexico.<sup>69</sup> As such, the working-class press viewed American capitalists and the U.S. government as complicit in the repression of Mexican workers and the misdeeds of the Díaz regime.<sup>70</sup>

Although the socialist and labor press would differ amongst themselves regarding goals, tactics, and ideology and there would often be serious disagreements between socialists and labor organizations, both groups were influenced by skepticism of the mainstream press in the United States. For instance in 1908 *The Journal of the Knights of Labor* published a series of articles entitled “Autocracy VS. A Republic,” which emphasized the subservience of the daily press to the “money power” in the United States.<sup>71</sup> The socialist activist Agnes H. Downing maintained that the capitalist papers

---

<sup>69</sup> “Díaz the Tool of American Capital,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, June 11, 1910. Also reprinted in “Díaz the Tool of American Capital,” *St Louis Labor*, June 25, 1910. See also “Helping Díaz in His Work of Murder,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 6, 1909; Mother Jones, “Mexico and Murder,” *Appeal to Reason*, October 23, 1909.

<sup>70</sup> “Mexico and the United States,” *The Demonstrator* (August 21, 1907): 1; “Díaz Rules with a Hand of Iron,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 8, 1909; “Díaz Still Reigns,” *The Miners Magazine* XI: 367 (July 7, 1910); John N. Landberg, “Russia and Mexico,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, August 23, 1910.

<sup>71</sup> Archie C. Fisk, “Autocracy VS. A Republic,” *The Journal of the Knights of Labor* 28:1 (July 1908): 5; Archie C. Fisk, “Autocracy VS. A Republic,” *The Journal of the Knights of Labor* 28:2 (August 1908): 5; Archie C. Fisk, “Autocracy VS. A Republic,” *The Journal of the Knights of Labor* 28:3 (September 1908): 5-6. For similar criticisms see “Plutocratic Criticism,” *Portland Labor Press*, August 10, 1906; “The Plutocratic Press,” *Portland Labor Press*, January 28, 1909; *Nashville Labor Advocate*, May 12, 1911.

misrepresented the news, and suppressed facts when it was in their interest to do so.<sup>72</sup> An editorial in the *Chicago Daily Socialist* explained, “The capitalist papers are for the capitalist class and against the working class. The Socialist papers are for the working class and against the capitalist class.”<sup>73</sup> This view of the mainstream press would influence the labor and socialist press to view mainstream descriptions of the Díaz regime and U.S. capitalism in Mexico with skepticism, influencing them to be receptive to the views of Mexican exiles in the United States.<sup>74</sup> Criticism of collusion between Porfirio Díaz, Wall Street investors, and the American press to cover up the true nature of the regime and the role of U.S. capital in Mexico would form a major part of the critique of John Kenneth Turner in the “Barbarous Mexico” articles as well as numerous critiques from the labor and socialist press.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Agnes H. Downing, “We Need a Labor Press,” *The People’s Paper*, October 28, 1910.

<sup>73</sup> “The Newspapers of the Masters Work for the Masters,” *Chicago Daily Socialist*, August 17, 1907. See also Agnes H. Downing, “We Need a Labor Press,” *The People’s Paper*, October 28, 1910. For exposes of what they perceived as the bias of the mainstream press towards the socialist movement and the working-class in general see H.G. Creel, “Tricks of the Press,” *The Coming Nation* 17 (January 7, 1911): 5; H.G. Creel, “Tricks of the Press,” *The Coming Nation* 18 (January 18, 1911): 6; H.G. Creel, “Tricks of the Press,” *The Coming Nation* 19 (January 21, 1911): 5-6.

<sup>74</sup> The labor press, which included local and regional labor newspapers, often affiliated with a central labor union for the region, to the journals of the national labor unions such as those making up the American Federation of Labor (AFL), included 364 publications in the United States in 1907, with an estimated readership of over 5 million. The socialist press featured more than 300 socialist newspapers and magazines with a combined circulation of two million in 1912. See William Restelle, “The Labor Press,” *The World To-Day* XII: 2 (February 1907): 211-212. Streitmatter, *Voices of Revolution*, 98.

<sup>75</sup> See for instance, John Kenneth Turner, “Díaz, Wall Street and the American Press,” *Appeal to Reason*, June 4, 1910; “Díaz as Press Agent,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, May 28, 1909.

Several months after a massacre of workers at Rio Blanco in the Mexican state of Veracruz, *The Los Angeles Citizen*, the newspaper for the Central Labor Union, published an article by N.F. Loya on conditions in Mexico. Loya stated that the world was unaware of the true nature of the political and economic situation in Mexico, because Americans got their information from the “capitalist press” which continually praised Díaz. Loya described Mexico as a place where the people were the “most unfortunate on earth,” where labor organizers were sent to prison or to the army, and where strikes were lost because of the intervention of the soldiers who suppressed them “with bloodshed.” Loya declared that without free speech or a free press, the only option for change open to the Mexican people was that of revolution.<sup>76</sup>

Closely related to this theme was a harsh analysis of the relationship between the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz and American capitalists which had allowed for the exploitation of the Mexican people and repressive measures in the interests of profits for U.S. investors.<sup>77</sup> An article in *The Carpenter*, the official journal of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, explained that the positive eulogies to Díaz were understandable since, from the capitalist point of view he had made Mexico a

---

<sup>76</sup> N.F. Loya, “The Czar of Mexcio,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, May 31, 1907. Loya’s article was reprinted in “The Czar of Mexico,” *The Blacksmiths Journal* VIII: 7 (July 1907): 5; “The Czar of Mexico,” *The International Woodworker* 17: 6 (June 1907): 25. Loya was introduced as one who “has had a long and terrible experience” under the conditions he describes, and it is likely he was from Mexico. For similar sentiments as to the treatment of Mexican labor by Díaz see “Mexico Has a Capitalist Czar,” *St Louis Labor*, August 10, 1907.

<sup>77</sup> Gregg Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder?*, 3.

“paradise,” by allowing the American and Mexican corporations to “exploit its people to their heart’s content.”<sup>78</sup>

In contrast to mainstream press descriptions of him as a “benevolent despot,” Díaz was depicted by the working-class press as a “ruthless agent” of international capitalism in converting the “sweat and blood of the Mexican people into interests and dividends.”<sup>79</sup> The working-class press frequently denounced Díaz and his dictatorship in stark terms as it was common for editorials and articles to refer to him as a “monstrous ruler” or a “bloody butcher” and to describe him as the worst, or one of the worst rulers on earth.<sup>80</sup> This view of Díaz would influence socialist and labor support of the PLM leadership, as they sought to prevent their extradition to Mexico, and to advocate for their freedom from U.S. jails.

#### Mexican Refugees in the United States

The suppression of the PLM and other opponents of the Díaz regime in the United States would be one of the leading diplomatic goals of the Mexican government from

---

<sup>78</sup> “Mexican Outrages,” *The Carpenter* XXIX: 9 (September 1909): 16. For similar sentiments see “The Menace to America,” *Appeal to Reason*, January 23, 1909; “Suppressing Free Speech,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 13, 1909; Alfred G. Sanftleben, “Mexico of Sorrows,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, January 15, 1909; George E. Bowen, “The Testimony of Mexico,” *Chicago Daily Socialist*, April 20, 1911; “The Mexican Revolution,” *The Young Socialists’ Magazine* IV:6 (June 1911): 5.

<sup>79</sup> “A Pyrrhic Victory,” *The New York Evening Call*, May 19, 1909.

<sup>80</sup> For some examples see W.E. Godsey, “Mexico As I Saw It,” *Los Angeles Citizen*, April 9, 1909; “Industrial News,” *The Cleveland Citizen*, February 27, 1909; “A Díaz Puppet,” *Appeal to Reason*, December 25, 1909; “The Land of the Perpetual President,” *The People’s Paper*, September 18, 1909.

1906 to the fall of Díaz in May of 1911.<sup>81</sup> The Mexican government used a variety of tactics in dealing with opponents of the Díaz regime operating in the United States. Shortly after their arrival in the United States the Mexican government used its consulates to harass members of the PLM. The tactics of the Mexican government included constant surveillance, infiltration of PLM cells by undercover agents, and the combined police forces of Mexico and the United States to conduct raids on both sides of the border.<sup>82</sup>

Since the summer, the Díaz regime had worked with the U.S. ambassador in Mexico, David E. Thompson, to suppress *Regeneración* and have the PLM leadership arrested.<sup>83</sup> Because of his close relations with the Díaz government, Thompson accepted the regime's portrayals of the PLM and his reports to the State Department reflected this. Thompson portrayed the PLM as anarchists who were seeking to awaken a "dormant spirit of revolution" in the Mexican people, and whose writings sought to foster a "feeling of hatred" against Americans.<sup>84</sup> Thompson explained that the constant

---

<sup>81</sup> Paul Garner, *Porfirio Díaz* (Harlow, England: Longman, 2001), 153; Jürgen Buchenau, *In the Shadow of the Giant: The Making of Central American Policy, 1876-1930* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1996), 187.

<sup>82</sup> Juan Gómez-Quiñones, "Piedras Contra la Luna, México en Aztlán y Aztlán en México: Chicano-Mexican Relations and the Mexican Consulates, 1900-1920," *Contemporary Mexico: Papers of the IV International Congress of Mexican History*, eds. James W. Wilkie, Michael C. Meyer, and Edna Monzón de Wilkie (Berkeley and Mexico City: University of California Press and El Colegio de Mexico, 1976), 507.

<sup>83</sup> Raat, *Revoltosos*, 111; Verter, "Biographical Sketch," 50. Thompson to Bacon, September 11, 1906, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59 Case 100, M862, Reel 22.

<sup>84</sup> Thompson to Root, June 19, 1906, *Despatches from U.S. Ministers to Mexico* RG 59 Case 100, M97, Reel 178.



publication of articles such as those in *Regeneración* incited the Mexican people against the government and acted to the detriment of the Mexican worker, helped to bring about the violence in Cananea.<sup>85</sup>

Agreeing to the request of the Mexican government, in July 1906 the U.S. State Department began an investigation into the PLM and its leaders. After analyzing several copies of *Regeneración* the U.S. Attorney for eastern Missouri, David P. Dyer, determined that the PLM leadership could be tried under criminal and civil laws and be deported under the Immigration Act of 1903. However, before the Justice Department could act, William C. Greene, the owner of the mines in Cananea, travelled to St Louis and filed a libel suit against the paper in September 1906.<sup>86</sup> The authorities effectively silenced the paper by seizing its presses and other equipment and arresting several remaining PLM members, an act which historian W. Dirk Raat describes as “of dubious legality, but not ineffective.”<sup>87</sup> The paper would be suppressed and the top PLM leadership of Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magón and Antonio Villareal would remain in hiding until they resurfaced in Los Angeles in June 1907.<sup>88</sup>

Ricardo Flores Magón and other members of the PLM leadership narrowly avoided capture in the aftermath of the failed revolutionary uprising in the fall of 1906, and remained in hiding for the next several months, though they continued to encourage

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Underwood, “Mining Wars,” 176.

<sup>87</sup> Raat, *Revoltosos*, 111; Ward S. Albro, *To Die on Your Feet; The Life, Times and Writings of Praxedis Guerrero* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1996), 25-26.

<sup>88</sup> Raat, *Revoltosos*, 116.

Mexican liberals throughout the United States and Mexico to oppose the regime and prepare for the next uprising.<sup>89</sup> The Mexican Ambassador to the United States, Enrique Creel, offered a \$20,000 reward for the capture of Flores Magón and hired the St Louis-based Furlong Detective agency to locate and apprehend the PLM leadership as well as conduct surveillance on other PLM cells in the United States.<sup>90</sup>

By June of 1907 Flores Magón, and other PLM leaders had relocated to Los Angeles and had begun publishing *Revolución* which was distributed throughout the U.S. southwest and smuggled into Mexico. The newspaper's revolutionary rhetoric caught the attention of the Mexican government, which believed Flores Magón and other liberals were now in Los Angeles and directed Thomas Furlong to try to locate and apprehend them.<sup>91</sup> Furlong, along with officers from the Los Angeles Police Department, arrested the PLM leadership, including the Flores Magón brothers, Librado Rivera, and Antonio I. Villareal on August 23, 1907.<sup>92</sup> The Mexican government originally hoped to extradite the men to Mexico, but because of the political nature of the charges, the Mexican government dropped the extradition request and the U.S. government determined to

---

<sup>89</sup> Verter, "Historical Background," 59.

<sup>90</sup> Colin M. MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: The Political Trials of Ricardo Flores Magón* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 20; Verter, "Historical Background," 59; Gómez-Quíñones, "Piedras Contra la Luna," 508.

<sup>91</sup> Verter, "Historical Background," 60.

<sup>92</sup> For Furlong's account of the events see Thomas Furlong, *Fifty Years a Detective* (St Louis: C.E. Barnett, 1912), 137-148.

transfer the PLM leaders to Arizona where they could be tried for conspiracy to violate the neutrality laws of the United States.<sup>93</sup>

The PLM newspaper *Revolución* was suppressed on September 27, 1907 when authorities arrested the printers and editor Lázaro Gutiérrez de Lara for the crime of libel. Though the PLM tried to resume publication of the paper, the editors were again arrested for libel and its presses were seized, effectively silencing the PLM publication ability until the release of Flores Magón, Rivera and Villareal in 1910. This was part of a pattern of cooperation by the U.S. and Mexican governments, as at least ten publications by opponents of the Díaz regime were seized by U.S. officials, and the editors were arrested.<sup>94</sup> The historian W. Dirk Raat has noted that the violation of the rights of Mexican dissidents was the norm in the United States from 1907-1910. These included violations of the freedom of speech and the press and privacy.<sup>95</sup> *The Chicago Daily Socialist* described these infringements as the “Mexicanization” of the United States, reviving this term that used frequently in 1870s, but with a different meaning. In this context it was used to describe violations of civil liberties in the U.S. similar to those which Díaz committed in Mexico.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Letter from the Attorney-General,” Responding to the Inquiry of the House as to the Trial, Imprisonment, Etc., of Antonio I. Villareal and Others, House of Representatives Document No. 876, 61<sup>st</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session, 2-3; Albro, *Always a Rebel*, 85-87; Verter, “Historical Background,” 62.

<sup>94</sup> Raat, *Revoltosos*, 117.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 167-169.

<sup>96</sup> “More Mexicanization of America,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, October 23, 1909. The editorial referred specifically to the arrest of De Lara in October 1909. For similar themes of U.S. actions violating U.S. traditions see Eugene V. Debs, “Rescue the Refugees,” *Appeal to Reason*, January 2, 1909.

Because of legal delays, including an appeal by the PLM's lawyers to the U.S. Supreme Court, the PLM leaders did not go to trial until May 1909, after a delay of over twenty months. These delays, along with a number of other incidents concerning Mexican exiles in the United States, would ensure that the status of the "Mexican Refugees" would remain an issue in the working-class press for several years.

The defense of the PLM leaders would unite the labor and socialist activists in California, Arizona, Texas, and other places throughout the United States.<sup>97</sup> Labor and socialist leaders correctly noted the cooperation between the U.S. and Mexican governments, which they interpreted as the result of pressure from American capitalists. In early 1908, the California branch of the Socialist Labor Party (SLP) described the arrest of the PLM leadership as an attempt by the American capitalists who had been exploiting Mexican resources to hand over opposition leaders to the Mexican government so that "their voices may be stifled forever" and declared that they found themselves in "thorough touch with the aims, hopes, and aspirations these our Mexican brothers."<sup>98</sup>

The socialist *People's Paper* described the prosecution of the PLM leadership as in actuality a trial of the "whole working class" in the United States and Mexico.<sup>99</sup> The

<sup>97</sup> MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution*, 22-23.

<sup>98</sup> California State Executive Committee of the SLP to National Executive Committee of the SLP, January 10, 1908, Socialist Labor Party of America Records, 1877-1967, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, MSS 399 Box 30, Folder 7; NEC Subcommittee Meeting, January 25, 1908, *Socialist Labor Party Records* microfilm edition (Madison: Wisconsin: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1979), Reel 3. For similar themes see "U.S. Officials Do Díaz's Dirty Work," *The New York Call*, October 1, 1909; "The U.S. Does Díaz's Dirty Work," *The New York Call*, November 4, 1909; Mother Jones, "A Sacred Call to Action," *St Louis Labor*, April 16, 1910.

<sup>99</sup> *The People's Paper*, February 27, 1909.

working-class press believed that the real crime that the PLM had committed, at least in the eyes of the Díaz government and U.S. capitalists, was to try to advocate for political and economic reforms and to try to organize Mexican workers.<sup>100</sup> They portrayed U.S. capitalist interests as instigating the arrests of the PLM leaders in order that they might continue to “grind out profits” from the Mexican workers.<sup>101</sup> Because of this, American socialists in particular, advocated action in the form of mass meetings, protests, and fundraising for the legal defense of the imprisoned PLM leaders and their mission became to “save” the PLM refugees from both Díaz and the U.S. government.<sup>102</sup> In a speech at the Convention of the United Mine Workers of America, Mother Jones stated that her goal was to get the PLM leaders out of jail, and to let them live in the United States and to fight Díaz from U.S. soil.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup> “Victims of Mexican Despotism,” *The Oakland World*, March 13, 1909; Luella Twining, “Sent to Prison by Packed Jury,” *New York Evening Call*, May 22, 1909; “Ambassador Creel Joins War on Labor Organizers,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, September 23, 1907; *The Los Angeles Citizen*, July 19, 1907.

<sup>101</sup> Luella Twining, “Sent to Prison by Packed Jury,” *New York Evening Call*, May 22, 1909; “The Despot Díaz Upheld in American Court,” *The Miners Magazine* (June 3, 1909); “Score Another Victory,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, April 1, 1909; “Magon’s Tragic Story,” *Appeal to Reason*, March 13, 1909.

<sup>102</sup> “The Mexican Case,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 6, 1909; “What Defeat Means,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 20, 1909. Numerous stories in the labor press used the trope of “saving” the PLM leaders. See for instance, “Socialists Protest,” *New York Evening Call*, November 12, 1908; “Protest Mexican Workman,” *Industrial Union Bulletin* I: 29 (September 14, 1907); “We Can Save the Mexican Patriots,” *The People’s Paper*, January 30, 1909; *Miners’ Magazine*, August 11, 1910; “De Lara Will Not Go Back,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 11, 1909.

<sup>103</sup> Mother Jones, “Speech at the Convention of the United Mine Workers of America,” January 27, 1909, *The Speeches and Writings of Mother Jones* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988), 28.

The working-class press consistently argued that the interest of the workers in Mexico, and the PLM leaders directly influenced the lot of labor in the United States, and asserted that this fact should spur American workers to the defense of the PLM and support for opponents of Díaz in what the *Appeal to Reason* described as “enlightened self-interest.”<sup>104</sup> American labor unions and socialists were influenced not only by themes of working class internationalism, but by fears of competition with Mexican workers. This competition was associated with the issues of trade protectionism and Mexican immigration to the United States, themes that were frequently linked in U.S. labor discourse.<sup>105</sup> T.A. Hickley writing in the *Appeal to Reason* explained that American labor was vitally interested in the Mexican Liberal Party and their attempt to create a true republic in Mexico because their defeat would mean the lowering of the standard of living for American workers. Hickley explained that with the expansion of capitalism in Mexico, American workers would either sink to the level of the “peon” worker in Mexico, or else “desperately struggle to lift the cross” from the Mexican worker’s backs.<sup>106</sup>

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries labor unions generally opposed increased immigration to the United States.<sup>107</sup> Labor leaders worried that poor

---

<sup>104</sup> “What Defeat Means,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 20, 1909.

<sup>105</sup> Dana Frank, *Buy American: The Untold Story of Economic Nationalism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999), 52

<sup>106</sup> T.A. Hickley, “The Yellow Peril Outdone,” *Appeal to Reason* (March 13, 1909). Also reprinted in *The Miners Magazine* X: 299 (March 18, 1909). For similar themes see “What Defeat Means,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 20, 1909.

<sup>107</sup> For recent research on the views of labor unions toward immigration see Janice Fine, and Daniel J. Tichenor, “A Movement Wrestling: American Labor’s

working conditions in Mexico influenced Mexican workers to come to the United States and compete with American workers, thereby driving down the wages of U.S. workers and providing capitalists with potential strike-breakers.<sup>108</sup> Research on Mexican immigration to the United States at the beginning of the twentieth century has noted that the large employers of Mexican labor in the United States, particularly railroads, mining and agriculture in the Southwest viewed Mexico as a large “reservoir” of “cheap labor.”<sup>109</sup> Many of the corporations which invested in Mexico also recruited and employed Mexican labor in the United States.<sup>110</sup> In the words of historian Gilbert G. Gonzalez, Mexico provided not only a “rich supply of natural resources for U.S. industrial expansion, but also, above all else had become a rich resource of surplus labor utilized when the need arose within the United States.”<sup>111</sup> These fears were in the context

---

Enduring Struggle with Immigration, 1866-2007,” *Studies in American Political Development* 23 (April 2009): 84-113; Brian Burgoon, Janice Fine, Wade Jacoby, and Daniel Tichener, “Immigration and the Transformation of American Unionism,” *International Migration Review* 44:4 (Winter 2010): 933-973.

<sup>108</sup> Chicano historians have emphasized the role of Mexican and Mexican-American labor actions and strikes during the early twentieth century. See Juan Gómez-Quíñones, *Mexican American Labor, 1790-1990* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 65-96; Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* Fifth Edition (New York: Pearson Longman, 2004), 157-158.

<sup>109</sup> Mora-Torres, ““Los de casa se van, los de fuera no vienen,”” 27. For a discussion of arguments made by employers favoring increased Mexican immigration see David G. Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants and the Politics of Ethnicity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995), 46-51.

<sup>110</sup> Gilbert G. González, *Guest Workers or Colonized Labor? Mexican Labor Migration to the United States* (Boulder, CO and London: Paradigm Publishers, 2006), 19.

<sup>111</sup> González, “Mexican Labor Migration, 1876-1924,” 37-38.

of increased immigration from Mexico to the United States, as the reported number of Mexican immigrants more than doubled from 103,393 in 1900 to 221,915 in 1910, though the actual number could have been much higher.<sup>112</sup> The labor activist, and fundraiser for the Mexican refugees, Mother Jones, suggested that if conditions were improved in Mexico it would be impossible for U.S. capitalists to have a ready supply of Mexican immigrant labor in the Southwest, and if the Mexican workers were able to better their condition, they would be less likely to come to the United States. Jones explained that “If the labor movement of America does not lend a hand to the Mexican peon and help him raise conditions in his own country, he will drag us down with him.”<sup>113</sup>

Working-class writers also feared closer economic integration between the United States and Mexico, which could emanate from the initial linkages between U.S. capital and Mexico. The working-class press believed this phenomenon was already occurring as competition of Mexican labor was taking its toll on the wages of the laborers in the

---

<sup>112</sup> Gutiérrez, *Walls and Mirrors*, 45; Martha Menchaca, *Naturalizing Mexican Immigrants: A Texas History* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 176, 216. For more on the factors in Mexico which influenced immigrants to come to the United States see George Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 20-22.

<sup>113</sup> “Mexican Peon is Menace to Labor Unions,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, December 2, 1909. See also T. A. Hickley, “The Yellow Peril Outdone,” *Appeal to Reason*, March 13, 1909. Also reprinted in *The Miners Magazine* X: 299 (March 18, 1909). In 1913 Mother Jones went across the border in El Paso into Mexico to try to halt the importation of Mexican miners who were working as scabs during the Colorado Coalfield Strikes of 1913-1914. While there she met and discussed the issue with Pancho Villa, who set up a meeting for her to address a group of Mexican miners through an interpreter. See *Mother Jones Speaks: Collected Writings and Speeches* edited by Philip S. Foner (New York: Monard Press. 1983), 239.



United States.<sup>114</sup> *The Chicago Daily Socialist* explained that workers in Mexico would soon become the most effective strikebreakers against American unions, because if industries were moved to Mexico with a lower cost of labor, then the trade union movement in the U.S. would be doomed.<sup>115</sup> These fears were discussed in the spring and summer of 1910, when the Pan-American Press, a press syndicate which supplied stories to numerous labor and socialist newspapers, provided several stories discussing a “plot” to eliminate the tariffs between the United States and Mexico, thereby allowing U.S. capitalists to move factories to that country utilizing lower wages, and the finished products would then be sent to the United States free of duties.<sup>116</sup> U.S. workers worried that direct competition with the Mexican labor would lead to the degradation of the U.S.

---

<sup>114</sup> “To the Working Class of America:” *Appeal to Reason*, May 27, 1909; “America’s Mexican Prisoners,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, April 2, 1909.

<sup>115</sup> “Mexico and Russia,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, December 30, 1908. See also Eugene V. Debs, “With Araujo in Prison,” *Appeal to Reason*, March 13, 1909; “The Menace of Peonage,” *Appeal to Reason*, February 27, 1909; and a statement by the editor of the *Appeal to Reason*, Fed D. Warren in *Appeal to Reason*, March 13, 1909; Mother Jones, *Speech at the Convention of the United Mine Workers of America*, January 26, 1910, reprinted in *The Speeches and Writings of Mother Jones*, ed., Edward M. Steel (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988), 36.

<sup>116</sup> See “Capitalists Conspire with Díaz to Crush all American Labor,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 15, 1910; “Conspire to Crush American Workers,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, March 18, 1910; “Peonage Threatens American Workers,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, July 1, 1910; “Money Kings Seek to Reduce American Labor to Mexican Peonage,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, June 25, 1910; “Conspire to Crush American Workers,” *The Blacksmiths Journal* XI: 4 (April 1910): 38-39; “Millionaires Plan Free Trade with Mexico and Use of Peon Labor to Destroy Trade Unions,” *International Stereotypers’ and Electrotypers’ Union Journal* V: 4 (April 1910): 4-5. While the U.S. did not conclude such a trade agreement with Mexico during this period, the Taft administration did negotiate a reciprocity pact with Canada in 1911, which dramatically lowered tariffs for Canadian imports. The agreement however failed in the Canadian legislature. See Alfred E. Eckes, Jr., *Opening America’s Market: U.S. Foreign Trade Policy Since 1776* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 83-84.

worker to the level of workers in Mexico.<sup>117</sup> Ultimately these two themes would coalesce in the mobilization of labor and socialist organizations to support Ricardo Flores Magón and other Mexican critics of the Díaz regime who would be arrested and many of them tried in U.S. courts for libel, or the violation of the neutrality laws of the United States.

The top labor union leadership in the United States also took an interest in the Mexican refugee issue. The American Federation of Labor passed resolutions at its annual convention in 1908 expressing sympathy for the PLM leaders, and recommended that affiliated organizations consider aiding in their defense.<sup>118</sup> At the request of the membership, AFL President Samuel Gompers met with President Theodore Roosevelt and asked for the protection of refugees from both Mexico and Russia.<sup>119</sup> In a letter

---

<sup>117</sup> Labor leaders opposed the annexation of colonies in the aftermath of the war with Spain partly because of fears that U.S. capitalists would be able to undercut wages in the United States through cheaper labor in the potential colonies. See David Montgomery, "Workers' Movements in the United States Confront Imperialism: The Progressive Era Experience," *Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 7: 1 (January 2008): 12. Dana Frank notes that some in U.S. labor, notably the AFL during this period, tended to support high tariffs because they provided higher wages for workers, others opposed them because they caused workers to pay higher prices for many goods. Frank, *Buy American*, 52. For discussion of tariffs in the Gilded Age and Progressive Era see Susan Ariel Aaronson, *Taking Trade to the Streets: The Lost History of Public Efforts to Shape Globalization* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2001), 40-47; David A. Lake, *Power, Protection and Free Trade: International Sources of U.S. Commercial Strategy, 1887-1939* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988), 119-147.

<sup>118</sup> *Report and Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor* (Washington DC: The National Tribune Company, 1908), 259-260. For more on the AFL and the defense of the PLM see Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder*, 14-22.

<sup>119</sup> Samuel Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labour: An Autobiography* Volume II (New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1925, 1967 Reprint), 308; *Report and Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor* (Washington DC: The National Tribune Company, 1909): 105; Philip Taft, *The A.F.L. in the Time of Gompers* (New York: Octagon Books, 1970), 321.

presented to Roosevelt, which was subsequently released to the public, Gompers described the PLM as seeking to obtain the rights embodied in the Mexican Constitution, and for the uplift of the Mexican people through education, and labor reforms. Gompers recounted that when Mexican reformers had tried to use peaceful means to effect change, they had been ruthlessly repressed, and that it was only after peaceful means had failed that they had attempted a revolution.<sup>120</sup>

Many liberals and progressives, as well as the labor and socialist press took an interest in the issue of asylum for foreign refugees which they viewed as an important principle in the U.S. political tradition. Several groups took up the case of the defense of the PLM leaders including the Political Refugee Defense League, made up of progressives, socialists and labor activists, which was based out of Chicago, with 312 affiliated branches in twenty-eight states<sup>121</sup> An article in the *International Socialist*

---

<sup>120</sup> Gompers to Roosevelt, January 14, 1909, Reprinted in *Hearings on H.J. Res. 201, Providing for a Joint Committee to Investigate Alleged Persecutions of Mexican Citizens by the Government of Mexico*, Hearings Held Before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, United States, June 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 1910 (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1910), 13. Hereafter cited as *Hearings on H.J. Res. 201*. See also "Letter to Roosevelt Submitted to the President of the United States by Samuel Gompers at the Time of the Interview," *Social-Democratic Herald*, February 20, 1909.

<sup>121</sup> "The Pouren Defense Committee," *The Reform Advocate* (February 27, 1909), 55; Diana K. Christopoulos, "American Radicals and the Mexican Revolution, 1900-1925." PhD diss., State University of New York, Binghamton, 1980. 99-100. The Defense League, was started in response to the threat of the extradition of Russian exiles from the 1905 Revolution, before taking up the Mexican cases shortly after its formation. The progressive reformer Jane Addams served as treasurer and John Murray, a journalist, was the secretary for the organization. Statement of Mr. John Murray, *Hearings on H.J. Res. 201* 49-50; "Luella Twining, "In the Mexican Refugee Movement," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, February 16, 1909. For a discussion of the defense of the Russian refugees see Reynolds to Addams, December 22, 1908, *The Jane Addams Papers*, microfilm (Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago, 1984) reel 5; and Neil Salzman,

*Review* noted that Americans had traditionally been proud to believe that their country had been the refuge for the “oppressed of the world,” but this tradition was threatened by capitalists, who sought to defeat revolutionary movements throughout the world. The article suggested that the interests of the working class were international as well, and it was necessary for the working class to guard the interests of revolutionaries by preventing their extradition to certain death or imprisonment, or punishment within the United States.<sup>122</sup>

The labor activist Mary Harris “Mother” Jones was the most prominent fundraiser for the Mexican refugees imprisoned in the United States.<sup>123</sup> For several years Mother

---

*Reform & Revolution: The Life and Times of Raymond Robins* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1991), 136-137.

<sup>122</sup> “The Political Refuge Defense League,” *The International Socialist Review* IX: 9 (March 1909): 706-707. In addition to raising funds and providing legal defense for the Mexican PLM leaders, the Defense League sought to publicize the issue throughout the United States. John Murray and other members of the League wrote a number of articles which were published throughout the labor and socialist press during this period, which often provided stinging indictments of the U.S. and Mexican governments as well as positive portrayals of the Mexican refugees. See for instance, “Mexican Relief Fund,” *Appeal to Reason*, March 6, 1909; “Defense of Mexican Prisoners,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, April 23, 1909; John Murray, “Mexican Refugees Must be Rescued,” *The New York Evening Call*, April 24, 1909; John Murray, “Defend Mexican Patriots,” *The Christian Socialist* VI: (May 1, 1909): 7; John Murray, “Appeal for American Refugees,” *The Oakland World*, May 22, 1909; John Murray, “Extradition Cases,” *The Socialist* [Seattle, WA] (June 26, 1909); John Murray, “Appeal from the Political Refuge Defense League,” *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen’s Magazine* 46: 6 (June 1909): 860-861; John Murray, “Political Refugee Defense Fund,” *The Painter and Decorator* [The Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America] XXIII: 6 (June 1909): 372; John Murray, “Extradition of Guerra Demanded by Mexico,” *The Brotherhood Journal* [The International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America] XXI:7 (July 1, 1909): 389-390; John Murray, “Extradition of Guerra Demanded by Mexico,” *Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers’ Journal* XIV: 8 (August 15, 1909): 308-309.

<sup>123</sup> Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder*, 16.

Jones tirelessly travelled throughout the United States appealing for funds for the defense of the Mexican prisoners seeking “rouse unions” to support the Mexican prisoners.<sup>124</sup> Mother Jones received a \$1000 contribution from the United Mine Workers of America at their convention and over \$3000 from other miners unions.<sup>125</sup> Most of the donations that Jones solicited went to the Mexican Revolutionists Defense League, based in Los Angeles. While the fragmentary nature of the reporting in labor newspapers makes a complete accounting difficult, published contribution lists show that local labor unions and individuals from at least twenty-seven U.S. states contributed for the defense of the PLM prisoners. In addition to local socialist parties, the Mexican Revolutionists Defense League received contributions from a variety of local unions including numerous locals affiliated with the Industrial Workers of the World, numerous miners’ locals, several branches of the United Brewery Workmen, the Carpenters’ Unions, Cigarmakers’ Union, the Teamsters Unions, and the Pressmen’s Union among many others.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> “Mother Jones to Help Mexicans,” *The New York Evening Call*, December 2, 1908; Elliott J. Gorn, *Mother Jones: The Most Dangerous Woman in America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), 156-157; “Mother Jones in the Mexican Fight,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, January 29, 1909.

<sup>125</sup> Dale Fetherling, *Mother Jones the Miners’ Angel: A Portrait* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1974), 81; MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution*, 23.

<sup>126</sup> Compiled from the following sources: “Mexican Defense Fund,” *The Miners Magazine* X:295 (February 18, 1909); “Mexican Defense Fund,” *Industrial Union Bulletin* II:6 (April 4, 1908); “Contributions to Mexican Fund,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, April 17, 1908; “Mexican Defense Fund,” *The Miners Magazine* X: 304 (April 22, 1909): 10; “Mexican Defense Fund,” *The Miners Magazine* X: 305 (April 29, 1909): 9. For some appeals for aid to the fund see “Letter from the Mexican Revolutionists Defense Committee,” *Socialist Party Official Bulletin* IV: 5 (January 1908); “For the Mexican Defense Committee,” *Industrial Union Bulletin* I: 49 (February 1, 1908); “Letter from the Mexican Revolutionists Defense Committee,” *St Louis Labor*, February 1, 1908; “Letter

In addition to Mother Jones, other women activists were active in the defense of the Mexican political prisoners. This included Andrea Villareal, the sister of Antonio I. Villareal, one of those imprisoned, who frequently travelled in support of the cause of the PLM leadership and was frequently prominently featured in numerous news stories as a sympathetic figure. An article in the socialist magazine *The Progressive Woman* explained that women were taking their place in both the socialist movement and in the Mexican struggle for freedom and described Villareal as the “Heroine of the Mexican Revolution.”<sup>127</sup> Villareal travelled throughout the U.S. publicizing the cause of her brother and the other prisoners, and wrote articles and poems critical of the Díaz regime at a time when many of the male members of the PLM were in jail or in hiding.<sup>128</sup>

Mother Jones made specific appeals for American women to be active in the fight for the PLM and against the Díaz regime.<sup>129</sup> In Chicago, Socialist Party’s Woman’s Organizing Committee, organized 125 women “newsies” to sell the “Liberty editions,” which featured prominently the stories of the Mexican political prisoners, of the *Appeal*

---

from the Mexican Revolutionists Defense Committee,” *The Miners Magazine* IX: 241 (February 6, 1908): 12; “To Organized Labor,” *The People’s Paper*, April 4, 1908.

<sup>127</sup> Luella Twining, “The Heroine of the Mexican Revolution,” *The Progressive Woman* II: XXIV (May 1909).

<sup>128</sup> Ibid; L. Guiterrez de Lara, “Andrea Villareal,” *The Progressive Woman* IV: XXXIX (August 1910), 13; “Senorita Villareal Takes Up Agitation for Mexican Labor,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, September 9, 1907; Ellen Dalrymple Megow, “Mexican Revolutionist Andrea Villareal,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, June 21, 1910; “Andrea Villareal,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, August 12, 1910. At other times newspaper stories tended to emphasize the helpless nature of the wives and relatives of the PLM prisoners to garner sympathy. See for instance “Mrs. Rivera in Great Need,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, April 2, 1909.

<sup>129</sup> “The Tyranny of Mexico,” *New York Call*, December 13, 1909.



to *Reason* and *The Chicago Daily Socialist* on street corners, after which the proceeds would be donated to the Political Refugee Defense League.<sup>130</sup> The success of the first campaign encouraged women socialists in Chicago to hold another event a few weeks later, and socialist women in other states such as Kansas, California, and Arizona also used similar means to publicize the fate of the Mexican political prisoners and raise funds for their defense.<sup>131</sup>

Unfortunately for the PLM leadership, the U.S. authorities had seized numerous incriminating letters and detailed battle plans, during the raid on the Douglas, Arizona PLM club. These letters linked the Flores Magóns, Rivera and Villareal to the revolutionary activity in Arizona. At the trial the jury found them guilty and the judge sentenced them to 18 months in the territorial prison.<sup>132</sup> In the ensuing months working-class advocates lobbied unsuccessfully for a presidential pardon for Magón, Rivera and Villareal and several other revolutionaries, including the well-publicized apprehension of Lazaro Guitierrez De Lara, were arrested keeping this issue in the public eye.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> "Mexican Wives to Sell Papers," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 3, 1909.

<sup>131</sup> "Women to Sell Papers Again," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 27, 1909; "Women and the Mexican Prisoners," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 20, 1909; Luella Twining, "Socialist Woman in Mexican Struggle," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, February 10, 1909.

<sup>132</sup> MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution*, 28-29; Verter, "Historical Background," 62. The incriminating nature of the letters was acknowledged in "Letters Look Bad for Magon," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 10, 1909; "Mexican Rebels Found Guilty," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 21, 1909.

<sup>133</sup> De Lara, was arrested for being an alien anarchist, and was finally released after the Mexican government was unable to make a case for his extradition. Various groups including socialists led by Eugene Debs mobilized to prevent De Lara's extradition, believing he would be killed by Mexican authorities. After his release De Lara lectured in various locales throughout the United States. For coverage of the De

### Working Class Criticisms Enter the Mainstream Discourse

The issue of Mexico in U.S. discourse would be shaped by trends in U.S. journalism in the early twentieth century, notably, that of investigative journalism by popular mainstream magazines which featured stories by “muckrakers.”<sup>134</sup> This trend was also evident in the socialist press. In 1904 the new editor of the *Appeal to Reason*, Fred D. Warren, would push the paper into investigative reporting of the capitalist system, though unlike the mainstream muckrakers, they sought to use this as a means to help bring about the collapse of the capitalist system.<sup>135</sup> Other socialist newspapers and

---

Lara case see “De Lara a Victim,” *Weekly People*, November 4, 1909; “Martyrs of Our Times,” *Social-Democratic Herald*, October 30, 1909; “De Lara Will Not go Back,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 11, 1909; “Díaz Demands New Victim from U.S.,” *The New York Call*, October 19, 1909; “Deb’s Going to Aid of De Lara,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 3, 1909; “De Lara Mass Meeting in Pasadena,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, November 12, 1909; “Thousands Throng Auditorium Demanding Release of L. Gutierrez De Lara,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, October 29, 1909; “Union Labor to Help De Lara,” *Portland Labor Press*, October 21, 1909.

<sup>134</sup> The term muckraker was given to this brand of investigative journalism by President Roosevelt who meant it as a pejorative term. While Roosevelt had been supportive of the investigative journalists at the beginning of his term, he became concerned that these journalists were creating a “revolutionary feeling” among the public. For an excerpt of his speech see “Theodore Roosevelt Finds a Name for the Muckrakers,” in *The Progressive Movement*, ed. Richard Hofstadter (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963), 18-19. These stories featured “compilations of documented fact that lead to an indictment of individuals or institutions,” as a way to expose society’s problems and often led to calls for reform highlighting issues for an increasingly disturbed middle class. Robert Miraldi, *Muckraking and Objectivity: Journalism’s Colliding Traditions* (New York and Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1990), 18, 30; Cecelia Tichi, *Civic Passions: Seven Who Launched Progressive America (And What They Teach Us)* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 24.

<sup>135</sup> Shore, *Talkin’ Socialism*, 167; Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the United States, Volume V*, 33. Before Warren’s tenure the editor and owner of the *Appeal to Reason*, J.A. Wayland based his editorials criticizing the capitalist system on articles culled from mainstream magazines and newspapers (After hiring Warren, Wayland still remained the proprietor of the paper). While the paper still did this to some extent, it also



periodicals, such as the *International Socialist Review*, the *Chicago Daily Socialist*, and the *New York Call* followed suit, and these exposes received wider exposure through summaries and reprints in the working-class press. This trend was evident in the socialist critique of Mexico, particularly in the investigative articles of socialist journalist John Murray who had travelled to Mexico and interviewed PLM members as well as gleaned information from exiles in the United States.<sup>136</sup> Murray's exposes of the Díaz regime, the persecutions of the PLM members in the United States and the relationship between U.S. capitalists, and the Mexican governments were featured in the socialist press throughout 1909.<sup>137</sup>

In addition to U.S. federal and state support for silencing anti-Díaz newspapers operated by Mexican exiles in the United States, the Mexican government was able to use U.S. libel laws to punish critics of the regime. In April 1909, shortly before the trial of the PLM leaders, another critic of the Díaz regime, Carlo De Fornaro, was arrested in New York City for the crime of malicious libel. Unlike Flores Magón and others, Fornaro was not a member of the revolutionary junta, nor was he involved in any revolutionary actions against the Mexican government. Fornaro had been born in what was then

---

featured stories gathered from its own reporters and from those appearing elsewhere in the working-class press.

<sup>136</sup> Murray was a member of the International Typographical Union which was affiliated with the AFL. Murray was an advocate of the strategy of "boring from within" the AFL to advance socialism in the American Federation of Labor. See Andrews, *Shoulder to Shoulder*, 16-17.

<sup>137</sup> For a sampling of these articles see John Murray, "The Private Prison of Díaz," *The International Socialist Review* IX: 10 (April 1910): 737-752; John Murray, "Editor Railroaded to pen for Publishing Paper in U.S.," *The International Socialist Review* IX: 11 (May 1910): 863-865; and the "The Men Whom Díaz Dreads," series which appeared in *The New York Call* from January 29-February 4, 1909.

British India to Swiss-Italian parents before moving to the U.S. in the early twentieth century. As a talented caricaturist he worked for several U.S. newspapers including *The New York Herald*, the *World* and the *Evening Sun* and his work was well-known to New York newspaper readers.<sup>138</sup> Fornaro spent three years in Mexico, and started a newspaper critical of the Díaz government.<sup>139</sup> In 1909 he moved back to the United States and published a stinging indictment of the regime, entitled *Díaz Czar of Mexico: An Arraignment* in which he reiterated many of the same charges common in the writings of the PLM and in the socialist press, albeit in a frequently more sensationalist fashion.<sup>140</sup> Fornaro included an open letter to President Roosevelt and mailed copies to members of the U.S. and Mexican governments.<sup>141</sup> Shortly after its publication, Rafael Reyes Espindola, a Mexican congressman and editor of the Mexican government-subsidized newspaper *El Imparcial* travelled to New York City to file suit against Fornaro for malicious libel, for his portrayal in Fornaro's book.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> "The Progress of the World," *The American Review of Reviews* XL:6 (December 1909): 661.

<sup>139</sup> Carlo De Fornaro, *A Modern Purgatory* (New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1917), vii-ix.

<sup>140</sup> Carlo De Fornaro, *Díaz, Czar of Mexico: An Arraignment* (New York: Carlo De Fornaro, 1909).

<sup>141</sup> "De Fornaro Must Serve His Sentence," *New York Times*, November 28, 1909.

<sup>142</sup> De Fornaro described Espindola as "a libertine, a picaroon, a procurer, a man who has done more harm to Mexico than a brood of rattlesnakes..." and accused him of having "broken up more homes and spoiled more reputations, attacked and vilified more respectable people than Espindola has hairs on his head." See "De Fornaro Must Serve His Sentence," *New York Times*, November 28, 1909. Later editions of the book redacted this section.

The case gained the attention of the *New York Times* because it was “without precedent” in the New York legal system, with a non-U.S. citizen in another country making a criminal complaint in New York for libel.<sup>143</sup> Fornaro’s defense tried to get depositions from a number of potential witnesses in Mexico, but many refused to testify, and other witness statements from opponents of the Díaz government were disallowed.<sup>144</sup> Fornaro’s defense portrayed Fornaro as a victim of the Mexican government, a view that was echoed in the socialist and labor press.<sup>145</sup> The judge in his charge to the jury explained that a writer has a right to comment on the actions of public figures, but this comment must be fair and honest, and not used as a vehicle of defamation, and the jury found Fornaro guilty of malicious libel in October 1909.<sup>146</sup>

Since Fornaro was an active member of the New York literary arts scene and a member of the National Arts Club, a number of “prominent men” signed a petition declaring Fornaro to be a man of “high ideals and morals,” and asked the judge for

---

<sup>143</sup> “Fornaro Conviction Lacks Precedent,” *New York Times*, November 18, 1909; “The Progress of the World,” *The American Review of Reviews* XL:6 (December 1909): 661.

<sup>144</sup> Carlo De Fornaro, *A Modern Purgatory*, xi-xiii.

<sup>145</sup> “Mexican Liberal Case,” *Springfield Republican*, October 30, 1909. For these sentiments in the working class press see “Fornaro Convicted of Criminal Libel,” *The New York Evening Call*, October 30, 1909; “Dictator Díaz Hounds Critics,” *The New York Evening Call*, April 30, 1909.

<sup>146</sup> “Guilty of Defaming Editor,” *The Washington Post*, October 30, 1909; “New York Artist Convicted of Libel,” *Montgomery Advertiser*, October 30, 1909; “Guilty of Defaming Editor,” *Bellingham Herald*, November 1, 1909. De Fornaro’s lawyers appealed to the state Supreme Court, but their petition was denied. For a discussion of the legal reasoning of the appellate judge see, *People, ETC v. Fornaro*, Supreme Court, New York County, Special Term, November, 1909, *New York Current Court Decisions Volume II*, ed. Frederick W. Noble (New York: Francis C. Hill, 1909), 426-430.

leniency.<sup>147</sup> The judge, however, handed down a harsh sentence of one year hard labor for Fornaro stating that he had reached the conclusion that “a man who willfully maligns the character of another commits a crime so serious that it outweighs the petition.”<sup>148</sup> The judge in the case thanked Espindola for having confidence in American courts, and stated that the community must uphold him for the confidence he placed in American courts and in the “American sense of honor and justice” by bringing the case before them. To Fornaro the judge expressed his hope that the sentence would “impress all and be a lesson to others.”<sup>149</sup> In response, socialists in New York City set up a defense fund for Fornaro, spearheaded by the socialist publisher, Gaylord Wilshire, and held a series of public meetings protesting his conviction.<sup>150</sup> A mass meeting of socialists and progressives, including Mother Jones, described Fornaro’s conviction as an “unprecedented and unconstitutional attack on free speech and the free press.”<sup>151</sup> *The New York Evening Call*

---

<sup>147</sup> Several newspapers stories reference these “prominent men” but do not identify them. See “One Year for Di Fornaro,” *Springfield Republican*, November 9, 1909; “Critic of Díaz Sent to Prison for Libel,” *The Hartford Courant*, November 9, 1909; “Jail for Radical Editor,” *New York Times*, November 9, 1909. A number of progressive and leftists also sent letter to the judge asking for leniency. See “Fornaro Sentence Again Postponed,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 5, 1909.

<sup>148</sup> “One Year for Di Fornaro,” *Springfield Republican*, November 9, 1909; “Critic of Díaz Sent to Prison for Libel,” *The Hartford Courant*, November 9, 1909; “Jail for Radical Editor,” *New York Times*, November 9, 1909. De Fornaro served ten months of the sentence, receiving two months off for good behavior.

<sup>149</sup> “De Fornaro Gets One Year Sentence,” *The New York Evening Call*, November 9, 1909.

<sup>150</sup> “Fornaro Case to be Appealed,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 11, 1909; Gaylord Wilshire, “Taft and Mexico,” *Wilshire’s Magazine* XV: 6 (June 1911): 4.

<sup>151</sup> “Mother Jones Hits Out at the Courts in Case of Mexican Artist,” *New York Times*, November 29, 1909; “Demand Pardon for De Fornaro,” *The New York Evening Call*, November 29, 1909. For discussion on the involvement of Mother Jones see

was concerned about the implications of Fornaro case since previous indictments had been against exiles who were involved in revolutionary movements, but now it appeared that the United States would not be safe for any Mexican to criticize or oppose Díaz. It would be comparatively easy for Mexican supporter of Díaz to bring libel suits against critics, and would be difficult or impossible for the Mexican critic to produce proof from Mexico, making a conviction for libel easy to secure, effectively silencing opposition to the regime.<sup>152</sup>

The Fornaro case gained the attention of Edward J. Wheeler, editor of the popular magazine *Current Literature*, a New York- based periodical, with a national circulation of over 100,000, which viewed his arrest and conviction as a violation of the right to free speech.<sup>153</sup> The periodical featured an article on Díaz and the Fornaro case entitled “A Diabolistic Interpretation of the Master of Mexico,” which discussed in detail the charges emanating from the socialist press and recounted many of their charges as well as charges

---

“Mother Jones Coming,” *The New York Evening Call*, November 18, 1909 and “Mother Jones Will Fight for Fornaro,” *The New York Evening Call*, November 27, 1909.

<sup>152</sup> “The Fornaro Case,” *The New York Evening Call*, November 10, 1909. Similar sentiments can be found with regards to foreign critics in general in the Socialist Labor Party organ, see “Tyrant’s Tools,” *Weekly People*, January 8, 1910; and in the anarchist organ, Leonard D. Abbott, “Fornaro and His Book,” *Mother Earth* IV: 10 (December 1909): 321-323.

<sup>153</sup> “Fornaro Free; Tells a Story,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, October 1910. Wheeler and other members of the magazine’s staff greeted De Fornaro upon his release from prison. *Current Literature* featured comments on the news as well as fiction, and reprints from newspapers and periodicals. Circulation figures from Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines 1885-1905 Volume IV* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957), 509-510.

made by Fornaro.<sup>154</sup> The publicity from the Fornaro case also prompted responses from defenders of the Díaz regime in sympathetic outlets such as the *Modern Mexico*, the *Los Angeles Times* and Wall Street-based *Moody's Magazine*, as well as a letter to the editor in the *New York Times*.<sup>155</sup>

Still criticism of Mexico did not reach deeply into the public sphere until the publication of the “Barbarous Mexico” articles written by John Kenneth Turner, in the *American Magazine*, a popular muckraking magazine with a circulation of over 300,000, beginning in October 1909.<sup>156</sup> In the September 1909 issue the magazine announced that it was going to begin a new series of articles entitled “Barbarous Mexico,” which would expose conditions in Mexico, including “human slavery” which existed in the “hundreds of thousands.” The editors noted that many Americans would be surprised by the expose

---

<sup>154</sup> “A Diabolistic Interpretation of the Master of Mexico,” *Current Literature* XLVI: 6 (June 1909): 617-620.

<sup>155</sup> See “A Master of Men,” *Modern Mexico* XXXIX: 18 (May 4, 1909); Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, “President Díaz,” *New York Times*, July 29, 1909; “President Díaz and His Libelers,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 18, 1909 [Reprint from the *Mexican Daily Record*]; W.O. Temple, “A Defense of President Díaz,” *Moody's Magazine* VIII: 2 (August 1909): 133-136, also reprinted in “Fair Play for President Díaz,” *Los Angeles Times*, August 22, 1909; “The Mexican Outlook,” *Mining and Scientific Press* XCVIII: 16 (April 17, 1909): 533. *Life* magazine also published a satirical letter to the editor criticizing U.S. actions in support for Díaz as well as other repressive regimes. See Ellis O. Jones, “A Principle Involved,” *Life* (December 23, 1909): 921.

<sup>156</sup> The *American Magazine* was created when top muckraking journalists, including well-known names such as Ray Stannard Baker, Lincoln Steffens and Ida B. Wells, left *McClure's Magazine* and created a new periodical. One analyst has stated that by 1909 the *American Magazine* was a “recognized force behind the developing reform movement,” and was “read and admired” by many influential political reformers. See John E. Semonche, “The *American Magazine* of 1906-1915: Principle vs. Profit,” *Journalism Quarterly* 40 (Winter 1963): 39. For more on the founding of the *American Magazine* see Ray Stannard Baker, *American Chronicle: The Autobiography of Ray Stannard Baker* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945), 220; Miraldi, *Muckraking and Objectivity*, 59.

since very little news came out of Mexico that was not “doctored,” and that critics such as Fornaro were silenced in the United States or Mexico respectively.<sup>157</sup> The magazine also promoted the new series before and during its run in 1909 and 1910 in newspapers throughout the country.<sup>158</sup>

In the editorial introduction to the “Barbarous Mexico” series, the editors discussed the series in a manner which was common in muckraking exposes. The editors stated that they were at first not inclined to accept the conclusions forced upon them through the “mass of facts.” They briefly mentioned much of the information that Turner would cover in more detail, of human slavery, and described the rule of Díaz as a more “absolute and autocratic than Russia.” They went on to declare that there was a “spreading notion” that something was wrong in Mexico, and that Americans had not been informed before because of a “great Díaz-Mexico myth” that had been built through “skillfully applied influence upon journalism.”<sup>159</sup> The *American Magazine* also bought advertisements in other magazines which reproduced its introduction in order to publicize the series.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> “‘Barbarous Mexico’ A New Series of Articles to Begin Next Month,” *American Magazine* LXVIII: 5 (September 1909): 501.

<sup>158</sup> Semonche, “The *American Magazine*,” 39. For examples of these ads see *Colorado Springs Gazette*, September 28, 1909; *The Des Moines Capital*, November 24, 1909.

<sup>159</sup> Editorial Introduction, “Barbarous Mexico,” *The American Magazine* LXVIII: 6 (October 1909): 523-524.

<sup>160</sup> “Editor’s Introduction,” Advertisement *McClure’s Magazine* XXXIII: 6 (October 1909): 14-15; *Collier’s: The National Weekly* XLIV: 1 (September 25, 1909): NP, Advertising Bulletin Insert.



In his first article the socialist journalist, John Kenneth Turner, recounted the information gathered during two trips to Mexico, during which he interviewed American and Mexican businessmen in Mexico, as well as Mexican officials while he posed as a potential American investor.<sup>161</sup> Turner described Mexico as a place without political freedom, without freedom of speech, without free elections, and without any of the “cherished guarantees of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”<sup>162</sup> Turner went on to describe labor conditions resulting from peonage in Yucatan in southern Mexico as “chattel slavery,” where Mexicans were bought and sold on henequen plantations. He described the plantation owners as having the ability to sell, abuse, and even kill “peons” under their control, and who put rewards on their heads if they tried to flee.<sup>163</sup> Turner would expand on the slavery theme in his second article, regarding Mexico’s treatment of the Yaqui Indians, and his third article came back to the issue of slavery this time in the Valle Nacional in Oaxaca which he described as the “worst slave hole” in Mexico, where all but a few slaves die within seven or eight months.<sup>164</sup> Turner’s articles and the charge

---

<sup>161</sup> John Kenneth Turner, *Barbarous Mexico* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1910), 11. Turner on his first trip was accompanied by PLM member Lazaro Gutiérrez De Lara, who posed as his interpreter, and on his second trip went to Mexico City with his wife, posing as a tennis pro and mingling in the American colony. See Christopoulos, “American Radicals and the Mexican Revolution,” 99.

<sup>162</sup> John Kenneth Turner, “The Slaves of Yucatan,” *The American Magazine* LXVIII: 6 (October 1909): 525.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 533. For a similar critique by British travelers in the Yucatan see Channing Arnold and Frederick J. Tabor Frost, *The American Egypt: A Record of Travel in Yucatan* (New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1909), 321-360.

<sup>164</sup> John Kenneth Turner, “Barbarous Mexico: With the Contract Slaves of the Valle Nacional,” *The American Magazine* LXIX: 2 (December 1909): 250. For excerpts and summaries of Turner’s second article in the mainstream press, see “Is Mexico a Land of Despotism and Slavery?” *The American Review of Reviews* XL: 5 (November 1909):

of slavery in Mexico was excerpted and summarized in numerous newspapers and magazines, as well as the working-class press throughout the United States, sometimes receiving front page coverage.<sup>165</sup>

Several newspapers published editorials about Turner's allegations expressing shock and indignation at conditions in Mexico.<sup>166</sup> For instance an editorial in *The*

---

623-624; "The Slave Trade in Mexico," *Literary Digest* XXXIX: 24 (December 11, 1909): 1053-1054; *Oregon Teacher's Monthly* 14:2 (October 1909): 101; "The American Magazine," *Ellingwood's Therapeutist* IV: 2 (February 1910): 79; "After Mexico," *The Fort Wayne Daily News*, December 21, 1909; "Tyranny, Slavery, Official Murder; That is Barbarous Mexico, Today," *Logansport Daily Reporter*, December 22, 1909; "Flays Díaz for Mexican Evils," *Trenton Evening Times*, December 22, 1909; "Magazine Again Arraigns Mexico," *The Standard* [Ogden, UT], December 24, 1909; "Magazine Notes," *Gazette-Telegraph* [Colorado Springs, CO], December 31, 1909; "The American Arraigns Mexico," *Weekly State Spirit and Dakota Huronite* [SD], January 6, 1910.

<sup>165</sup> See for instance "Slavery in Mexico," *The Evening Observer* [Dunkirk, NY], September 20, 1909; "Wholesale Slavery Horrors are Laid Bare by Expose on Mexico, Where Revolt Brews," *Trenton Evening Times*, September 20, 1909; "Barbarous Mexico," *The Tipton Daily Tribune* [Iowa], September 21, 1909; "Mexican Slavery Worse Than Negro," *The La Crosse Tribune*, September 21, 1909; "Is Mexico the Land of Slaves?" *The Fort Worth Journal Gazette*, September 23, 1909; "Slavery Exists in Old Mexico," *Logansport Daily Reporter*, September 23, 1909; "Conditions in Mexico," *Aberdeen American* [South Dakota], September 23, 1909; "Barbarism in Mexico," *The Washington Post*, September 23, 1909; "Atrocities in Yucatan," *Springfield Republican*, September 26, 1909; "Barbarous Mexico," *Trenton Evening Times*, September 26, 1909; "Mexico a Land of Despotism," *The Coconino Sun* [AZ], October 1, 1909; "Barbarous Mexico," *The Record and Chronicle* [Denton, TX], October 1, 1909; "Barbarism in Mexico," *Duluth News-Tribune*, October 17, 1909. For articles in the working-class press see "Magazine Springs a Sensation; Tells of Slavery in Mexico," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, September 23, 1909; "Barbarous Mexico," *The New York Call*, October 9, 1909; "Chattel Slavery," *Weekly People*, October 16, 1909; "Barbarous Mexico," *St Louis Labor*, November 6, 1909; "Planters Kill Mexico Slaves by Thousands," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, December 1, 1909; "Industrial News," *The Cleveland Citizen*, December 4, 1909; "Mexico Shown as Land of Barbarity and Slavery," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, December 24, 1909.

<sup>166</sup> "Magazine Notes," *Colorado Springs Gazette Telegraph*, December 31, 1909; "January Magazines," *Duluth News-Tribune*, January 2, 1909. Recent historians have discussed the possibility that Turner may have exaggerated but have generally accepted his claims as to the nature of the labor system in the Yucatan and the Valle Nacional

*Emporia Daily Gazette* stated that the “Barbarous Mexico” series of articles “have set the whole country talking, and if they are not overdrawn they reveal the worst condition of tyranny and cruelty ever heard of in this country.”<sup>167</sup> A small-town newspaper from Elyria, Illinois stated that Turner had “awakened the American public to the horrors of despotic rule in a so-called republic,”<sup>168</sup> while the *Cedar Rapids Tribune* declared that the articles had the ring of truth, and if true then Mexico was guilty of “barbarism” equaled only in the dark ages.<sup>169</sup> Articles and editorials noted that the *American Magazine* editors were considered “reputable and honest men” which gave Turner’s critique credibility,

---

frequently describing it as a de facto slave system, or a system close to slavery, or something “akin to slavery.” Gilbert M. Joseph, *Rediscovering the Past at Mexico’s Periphery: Essays on the History of Modern Yucatán* (Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1986), 70; Francie R. Chassen-Lopez, *From Liberal to Revolutionary Oaxaca: The View from the South, Mexico, 1867-1911* (University Park, PA: The Penn State University Press, 2004), 135; Meyer, Sherman and Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History*, 403; Wells, “Yucatán: Violence and Social Control,” 227; Enrique Krauze, *Mexico: Biography of Power, A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996*, trans. Hank Heifetz (New York: Harper Collins, 1997), 219; Friedrich Katz, “The Liberal Republic and Porfiriato, 1867-1910,” *Mexico Since Independence*, ed. Leslie Bethell (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 100.

<sup>167</sup> *The Emporia Daily Gazette*, November 4, 1909. Likewise numerous American visitors to Mexico had commented on the conditions of “peons” in Mexico, a term which generally was used to describe rural workers, usually Indians on Mexico’s haciendas and had compared it to slavery. See for instance Fannie B. Ward, “In the Heart of Mexico,” *Cleveland Herald*, February 8, 1884; “The Peons of Mexico,” *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper*, November 13, 1886; “Peonage in Mexico,” *The Atchison Globe*, April 23, 1887; Rollo Ogden, “Slavery in Mexico,” *The Independent* (May 31, 1888); Edgar Vance, “Worse than Slaves,” *Atchison Daily Globe*, April 19, 1889; “Slavery in Mexico,” *The San Francisco Evening Bulletin*, November 15, 1890; “Slavery in Mexico,” *The Denver Daily News*, December 14, 1890; J. Milton Greene, “Slavery for Debt in Mexico,” *New York Evangelist* (February 12, 1891); “Peasants of Mexico,” *The Sunday Oregonian*, August 15, 1891.

<sup>168</sup> “Trouble Ahead with Mexico,” *Elyria Republic*, January 6, 1910.

<sup>169</sup> *Cedar Rapids Tribune*, December 10, 1909. For similar sentiments see “Barbarous Mexico,” *Idaho Statesman*, October 6, 1909.

while comment in the socialist press suggested the articles were confirmation of the exposés in their periodicals.<sup>170</sup>

Turner's second article dealt with the issue of the Yaqui Indians from the state of Sonora in Northern Mexico. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the Mexican government viewed the Yaqui Indians as the "most serious obstacle" to the development of the state of Sonora, as they refused to accept the loss of their lands and the colonization of the Yaqui Valley, which Mexican *hacendados* and American investors coveted.<sup>171</sup> The Yaquis staged a number of uprisings against attempts to confiscate their lands, eventually adopting guerilla warfare tactics, during a protracted military resistance. The Mexican government launched a full-scale military campaign against the Yaqui from 1903-1907 eventually engaging one-fourth of Mexico's troops.<sup>172</sup> Believing that only a complete deportation against all Yaquis could dry up the social base which allowed the resistance to continue, the Mexican government began a campaign

---

<sup>170</sup> "Barbarous Mexico," *The Daily Northwestern*, December 10, 1909; "Mexican Atrocities," *Dallas Morning News*, December 10, 1909. Both articles are based on an article originally appearing in *Harper's Weekly*. For socialist press reaction see "Díaz to be Shelved," *Appeal to Reason*, September 4, 1909; "Mexico Menace's Liberty," *Wilshire's Magazine* XIII: 12 (December 1909): 7; C.M. Brooks, "Mexico Replies to the *Appeal to Reason*," *International Socialist Review* XI: 4 (October 1910): 211-212.

<sup>171</sup> Evelyn Hu-De Hart, "Sonora: Indians and Immigrants on a Developing Frontier," *Other Mexicos: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876-1911*, eds. Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), 180; Ramón Eduardo Ruíz, *The People of Sonora and Yankee Capitalists* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988), 162.

<sup>172</sup> Shelly Bowen Hatfield, *Chasing Shadows: Indians Along the United States-Mexico Border, 1876-1911* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998), 126.

which would have amounted to the extermination of the Yaqui people.<sup>173</sup> Because of labor shortages the Yaquis were sent to the Yucatan, where they were forced to work on henequen plantations in slave-like conditions, and many died within the first year. During the deportation campaign which began in 1904 and peaked in 1908, an estimated 5 to 15,000 Yaquis were sent to the Yucatan, between one quarter and one half of the Yaqui population.<sup>174</sup>

Turner explored the fate of the Yaquis once they arrived on henequen plantations in the south of Mexico. Turner explained that he had originally went to the Yucatan to witness “the final act in the life of the Yaqui nation.”<sup>175</sup> Turner reported that the Yaqui exiles to the Yucatan became slaves who were bought and sold and received no wages,

---

<sup>173</sup> Evelyn Hu-De Hart, *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: The Struggle for Land and Autonomy* (Madison, WI: The university of Wisconsin Press, 1984), 155; Katz, “The Liberal Republic and Porfiriato,” 91-92. While some of the Yaqui resisted, others provided valuable workers for the region which was suffering labor shortages. For this reason Mexican economic interests had resisted deportations, and it was through the complaints of the hacendados that the Mexican government, along with a decrease in demand for labor in the Yucatan, which finally halted the deportations in 1908.

<sup>174</sup> Hu-De Hart, *Yaqui Resistance and Survival*, 155, 188; Brian R. Hamnett, *A Concise History of Mexico* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 185. John Kenneth Turner reported the number at 15,700, while the historian Evelyn Hu-De Hart puts the number conservatively at 8,000.

<sup>175</sup> John Kenneth Turner, “Barbarous Mexico: The Tragic Story of the Yaqui Indians,” *The American Magazine* LXIX: 1 (November 1909): 33. For summaries and excerpts of Turner’s second article see “Mexicans Sold Indians as Slaves,” *Olympia Record*, October 22, 1909; “Slavery that Brings an Enormous Revenue to the Mexican Government,” *The Fort Wayne Evening Sentinel*, October 27, 1909; “Slavery that Brings an Enormous Revenue to the Mexican Government,” *The Marshfield Times* [WI], October 27, 1909; “Writer Tells More of the Murder of Mexican Indians,” *The Lexington Herald*, November 2, 1909; “Human Slavery in Mexico,” *The Agitator* [Wellsboro, PA], November 10, 1909.

many of whom died very soon after their exile.<sup>176</sup> Turner told of Yaqui women, separated from their husbands, who were forced to take new husbands and who were beaten if they refused.<sup>177</sup> In doing so Turner humanized the struggle of the Yaquis while at the same time providing evidence for his indictment of the Díaz regime in Mexico.<sup>178</sup>

Shortly after the announcement of the “Barbarous Mexico” series, the U.S. Ambassador, David E. Thompson met with Porfirio Díaz, who presented him with a copy of the *American Magazine* announcement protesting against what he described as libelous statements. Thompson, who stated the charges were without foundation, asked the State Department to look into the possibility of suppressing the articles “in fairness to Mexico and our people not acquainted with Mexico,” a request that other Americans with interests in Mexico would also make to the U.S. government.<sup>179</sup> The State Department representative responded that the U.S. government was unable to legally suppress the articles or prevent the *American Magazine* from being sent through the U.S. mails. The

---

<sup>176</sup> Turner, “Barbarous Mexico: The Tragic Story of the Yaqui Indians,” 43-46.

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>178</sup> For previous socialist critiques of the treatment of the Yaquis see “Burn and Drown Yaqui Indians,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 20, 1908; Luella Twining, “The New York Evening Call, May 6, 1909; “Yaquis Deported in Torture Trains,” *People’s Paper*, July 18, 1908.

<sup>179</sup> Thompson to State Department, September 2, 1909, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59 Case21327 Reel 1109. For other requests to suppress the articles or prevent their entrance into Mexico see Michie to Taft, September 5, 1909, in *Ibid.* Some Americans in Mexico City considered suing the *American Magazine* in New York before the publication of the articles, forcing the magazine to prove the truth of the articles before they were published. See “Libeling Mexico,” *Los Angeles Times*, September 4, 1909.



State Department did express the opinion that the articles did constitute libel, and suggested the use of the courts to suppress the articles.<sup>180</sup>

Turner's articles provoked widespread denunciations by the American colony in Mexico, U.S. investors and others with interests in Mexico. Representatives from the American colony in Mexico City sent a protest to the *American Magazine* denouncing the series.<sup>181</sup> Paul Hudson, the publisher of *Modern Mexico* and the *Mexican Herald*, in conjunction with Mexican public and private interests, created a "Bureau of Information" to combat the negative publicity created by the "Barbarous Mexico" articles and to continue to promote U.S. investment into Mexico.<sup>182</sup> The Bureau of Information worked with the *Mexican Herald* and with the representatives of the Associated Press to plant favorable stories of Mexico in U.S. newspapers, and provide information that numerous popular magazines and newspapers would use to write positive portrayals of Mexico and Porfirio Díaz.<sup>183</sup>

Through this press campaign and private initiative, stories appeared in U.S. newspapers from Americans in Mexico, or who had visited Mexico, claiming that

---

<sup>180</sup> State Department to Adey, December 16, 1909, *State Department Numerical File, 1906-1910* RG 59 Case21327 Reel 1109. At about the same time the *Mexican Herald* featured an interview with W.O. Temple, an American judge and visitor to Mexico who suggested that he would not be surprised if "libelers" of Mexico such as Turner, met the same fate as Fornaro. See "Attitude Toward Mexico is of Best," *The Mexican Herald*, March 12, 1910.

<sup>181</sup> W.L. Vail, K.M. Van Zandt, and W.W. Blake to the Editor of the *American Magazine*, September 8, 1909, in *The American Magazine* LXIX: 2 (December 1909): 282-283. See also "Resents Slur on Republic," *Los Angeles Times*, September 26, 1909.

<sup>182</sup> Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 176.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, 176-177.



Turner's claims had been fabricated. For instance the archaeologist Edgar L. Hewitt stated in a lecture that he had spent several years in the Yucatan, and saw no signs of the type of slavery that Turner described, while Dr. Eugene F. McCampbell, a bacteriologist who had studied disease in Mexico, in another lecture declared that Turner had exaggerated.<sup>184</sup> Other sources featured similar interviews from former missionaries, tourists and investors.<sup>185</sup> The number of these type of stories prompted the *Chicago Daily Socialist* to note a "strange similarity" in these articles from Americans who had lived or travelled all around in Mexico, but had not seen anything that Turner had described, and believed it to be confirmation of manipulation of the U.S. mainstream press by the Mexican government and its agents.<sup>186</sup>

In response to widespread press comment, the editors of the *American Magazine* reaffirmed that Mexico "as a civilized government is a farce and failure; as a republic it is a mockery," and even though Mexico had some of the "glitter of civilization," it had very little of the real thing.<sup>187</sup> The *American Magazine* then presented evidence to support

---

<sup>184</sup> See "Barbarous Mexico All Fake Says Mr. Hewitt," *Albuquerque Journal*, October 23, 1910; "Lecture," *The Maysville Republican*, March 10, 1910.

<sup>185</sup> For missionary refutations see "Not So Barbarous Says Minister of This City," *Albuquerque Journal*, May 14, 1910, and a later speech by J.W. Butler, in *Bostonia XII*: 3 (October 1911): 143. For other refutations see "Wall Street Blamed for Weird Stories," *Daily Oklahoman*, January 23, 1910; "He Defends Mexico," *New York Times*, January 14, 1910; Sam W. Teagarden, "Mexico a Land Not as Black as it's Painted," *Anaconda Standard*, February 16, 1910 ; "Galveston Can Be Made a Second Atlantic City," *The Galveston Daily News*, February 27, 1910. For a contrasting view from a former employee at a copper mine in Durango and on the Mexican Central Railway see "Park Findley Says Mexican Horrors True," *The Des Moines News*, November 27, 1909.

<sup>186</sup> "It Proves Too Much," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, October 5, 1909.

<sup>187</sup> "Barbarous Mexico," *The American Magazine* LXIX: 3 (January 1910): 291.

Turner's claims including quotes from Mexican officials and excerpts from Mexican newspapers describing similar conditions, along with pictures of the labor contracts from the Valle Nacional, and even previous articles from Díaz supporters such as the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *Mexican Herald* which had described distasteful aspects of peonage in the Yucatan, and the treatment of the Yaqui.<sup>188</sup>

Even though the *American Magazine* made the controversial decision not to run any more articles from John Kenneth Turner, they continued the series with other authors.<sup>189</sup> One of these articles was by Herman Whitaker, who had spent six months in Mexico studying the rubber industry. Whitaker had published a novel entitled *The Planter* in 1909 based on his research whose main character was an American youth who

---

<sup>188</sup> "Moving Pictures of Mexico in Ferment," *The American Magazine* LXIX: 3 (January 1910): 292-304.

<sup>189</sup> When none of his articles appeared for several months Turner claimed that his articles were suppressed by the editors at *American Magazine*, while the editors stated that they intended to run them in the future. Turner ended up withdrawing them, and running them in the *Appeal to Reason* in the summer of 1910 and later publishing them in his book *Barbarous Mexico*. Turner would continue with his claim of suppression that the *American* denied, stating that they could not confirm some of the information in them. Turner's later articles contained direct indictments of Díaz and U.S. interests in Mexico, so that could have led to the uneasiness of the editors at the *American Magazine*. The theme of "suppression" of the articles would be repeated in the working-class press though the journalism scholar John E. Semonche found no direct evidence to support this claim. See "Writer on Mexico Angry," *New York Times*, May 3, 1910, for disagreement between Turner and the *American*; for Turner's accusation see John Kenneth Turner, "How the American Press is Throttled," *Appeal to Reason*, May 28, 1910; and the denial from the magazine "Barbarous Mexico" *American Magazine* LXIX: 4 (August 1910): 538; see also Semonche, "The *American Magazine* of 1906-1915," 40, for a discussion of the controversy. For articles expressing the view of the suppression of the Turner's articles see "Díaz Reached Big Magazine, Says J. K. Turner, Writer," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 27, 1910; "Freedom (?) of Press," *Appeal to Reason*, June 11, 1910; "The Turner Articles," *Appeal to Reason*, July 2, 1910; "American's Explanation," *Appeal to Reason*, July 2, 1910; "Was the True Story of Barbarous Mexico Suppressed," *The Los Angeles Citizen*, June 10, 1910.

moved to Mexico to work on an American-owned rubber plantation and witnessed slavery of the Mexican peons and Yaqui Indians, as well as violence towards the Mexican workers.<sup>190</sup> In both the introduction to the novel, and in the article in *American Magazine* Whitaker described conditions on American-owned rubber plantations as “undoubtedly the worst form of slavery this world has ever seen, where American planters “worked their labor into the crop,” with labor conditions resulting in the deaths of workers from exhaustion and disease because of unsanitary conditions.<sup>191</sup> Whitaker stated that the tragedy of the Yaqui was “without parallel in American history” and expressed the hope that an “indignant American opinion” would make the Mexican government end labor abuses.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>190</sup> Herman Whitaker, *The Planter: A Novel* (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1909). Publisher’s ads described the novel as the “Uncle Tom’s Cabin” of Indian servitude. See *Harper’s Weekly*, May 29, 1909. The book was described by an article in *The San Francisco Call*, as “one of the sensations of the year.” See “Whitaker and Wilson After More Material,” *The San Francisco Call*, July 18, 1910. The book was widely advertised and reviewed in numerous magazines. For reviews see “The Latest Books,” *Life* LIII: 1388 (June 3, 1909): 778; J. B. Kerfoot, “A Review of Books,” *Everybody’s Magazine* XXI: 1 (July 1909): 140; “Books and Authors,” *The Living Age* XLIII: 3387 (June 5, 1909): 640; *The Outlook* XCI (April 10, 1909): 814.

<sup>191</sup> Herman Whitaker, “Barbarous Mexico: The Rubber Slavery of the Mexican Tropics,” *The American Magazine* LXIX: 4 (February 1910): 550; Whitaker, *The Planter* viii. See also Herman Whitaker, “A Reply to Critics of ‘*The Planter*’” *Harper’s Weekly*, May 22, 1909. The 1911 edition of *Encyclopedia Britannica* featured a short discussion of peonage and slavery and the Yaqui deportations citing *The Planter* as a source. See “Mexico,” *The Encyclopedia Britannica* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 322. Likewise the union periodical *The Carpenter* cited the novel as evidence of labor conditions in Mexico under Porfiro Díaz. See “Mexican Outrages,” *The Carpenter* XXIX: 9 (September 1909): 17.

<sup>192</sup> Whitaker, “Barbarous Mexico: The Rubber Slavery of the Mexican Tropics,” 555. Other articles in the “Barbarous Mexico” series include “Barbarous Mexico: Three Months in Peonage,” *The American Magazine* LXIX: 5 (March 1910): 633-636; “Barbarous Mexico: Personal Observations of Two Englishmen Upon Slavery in Yucatan,” *The American Magazine* LXIX: 6 (April 1910): 829-830; Dorothy Johns,

In 1910 John Kenneth Turner published the book *Barbarous Mexico*, based on his research, which went further in indicting U.S. capitalists in enslavement of Mexicans. He described Porfirio Díaz as the “central prop” of the slavery, but indicated that it was American commercial interests which formed the “determining force” in the continuation of American slavery.<sup>193</sup> Speaking of the U.S. government and “the interests that control” the government, Turner declared that U.S. corporations had extended slavery in Mexico, and had “virtually transformed Mexico into a slave colony of the United States” profiting from it, and actively working to maintain it.<sup>194</sup> Speaking of planters he stated that Americans worked the slaves, bought them, drove them, locked them up at night, beat them, and killed them, and acted with Díaz to suppress opponents of the regime, such as Flores Magón and the PLM.<sup>195</sup> In doing so, Turner directly challenged the sense of U.S. mission, that is the idea that the United States was helping to modernize and develop the nation, and that American influence was beneficial to Mexico.

By the spring of 1910 U.S. interests in Mexico, under the leadership of the Bureau of Information began a counteroffensive against the negative publicity from the “Barbarous Mexico” articles and the scrutiny as to the nature of the labor system in Mexico and the Díaz regime. The Bureau of Information as well as Mexican officials

---

“Barbarous Mexico: ‘The Little Eagle’ and Other Memories,” *The American Magazine* LXX: 5 (September 1910): 538-544; E. Alexander Powell, “Barbarous Mexico: The Betrayal of a Nation,” *The American Magazine* LXX:6 (October 1910): 716-728; “Barbarous Mexico: I Also Accuse,” *The American Magazine* LXXI: 2 (December 1910): 158-160.

<sup>193</sup> Turner, *Barbarous Mexico*, 121.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 254.

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*, 260, 254.

were most concerned that the negative publicity would dissuade foreign investors from investing into Mexico and much of the campaign on periodicals geared towards them.<sup>196</sup> Sympathetic writers featured articles in the *Bankers Magazine*, *Moody's Magazine*, *The Mining World*, and the *American Exporter*.<sup>197</sup> Other newspapers and magazines which were owned by corporations or individuals with extensive investments in Mexico such as the *Sunset Magazine*, owned by the Southern Pacific Railway, which had extensive railway interests in Mexico, the *Los Angeles Times*, owned by Harrison Gray Otis, who had extensive landholdings in Mexico, and *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, which was owned by William Randolph Hearst who had several large ranches in Mexico, published articles refuting Turner's claims.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>196</sup> Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 176.

<sup>197</sup> *Bankers' Magazine* 79:4 (October 1909): 498-500; E.S. Smith, "The Truth About Mexico," *Bankers' Magazine* 79: 5 (November 1909): 687-96; Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, "The Truth About Mexico," *Moody's Magazine* VIII: 6 (December 1909): 427-434; Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, "The Truth About Mexico," *Moody's Magazine* IX: 1 (January 1910): 17-30; Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, "The Truth About Mexico," *Moody's Magazine* IX: 2 (February 1910): 105-117; Elisha Hollingsworth Talbot, "The Truth About Mexico," *Moody's Magazine* IX: 3 (March 1910): 181-189; Dwight E. Woodbridge, "Mexico's Physical, Moral and Financial Condition," *The Mining World* XXXII: 4 (January 22, 1910): 149-150. The *American Exporter* article is discussed in "Amusing Ways of a Literary Bureau," *The San Francisco Call*, December 17, 1909.

<sup>198</sup> For a short discussion of *Sunset Magazine* see Mott, *A History of American Magazines 1885-1905 Volume IV*, 105. For the articles in defense of the Díaz regime see Gaspar Estrada Gonzales, "Mexico As It Is," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 1 (January 1910): 73-79; Gaspar Estrada Gonzales, "Mexico As It Is," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 3 (March 1910): 291-295; Gaspar Estrada Gonzales, "Mexico As It Is," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 4 (April 1910): 426-431; Herman Whitaker, "Díaz, Maker of Mexico," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 5 (May 1910): 481-494; Robert Hammond Murray, "Mexico and the Yaquis," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 6 (June 1910): 619-628; Gaspar Estrada Gonzales, "Mexico As It Is," *Sunset Magazine* XXV: 1 (July 1910): 83-98; Robert H. Murray, "Growling at Mexico," *Sunset Magazine* XXV: 2 (August 1910): 205-212. For more on the Mexican landholdings of the Otis family see Dennis McDougal, *Privileged Son: Otis Chandler*

These articles sought to reaffirm the Díaz Legend, featuring the theme of Díaz as the man who has brought progress, peace and stability to Mexico thus reaffirming the Díaz Legend discussed in the previous chapter.<sup>199</sup> Herman Whitaker, who had earlier contributed to the *American Magazine*'s Barbarous Mexico series, reaffirmed his statements about peonage in Mexico in a *Sunset Magazine* article, but suggested that it was wrong to blame Díaz for this vestige of Mexico's colonial heritage and stated that Díaz was a benevolent despot who had provided the kind of government that Mexico needed.<sup>200</sup> A later article by Whitaker featured the caption that to certain critics Díaz was "a barbarous dictator of an abused people," while he considered Díaz to be "an abused savior of barbarous people."<sup>201</sup> Pierre N. Beringer, sent by *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine* to study conditions in Mexico, stated that Díaz had brought the

---

*and the Rise and Fall of the L.A. Times Dynasty* (Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing, 2001), 73-74. Articles in the *Los Angeles Times* include "Newspapers and Magazines," June 6, 1910; "The Muckrakers and the Reds," *Los Angeles Times*, October 22, 1909; J. Torrey Connor, "Muck-raked Mexico- A Protest," *Los Angeles Times*, November 14, 1909; "Barbarous United States," *Los Angeles Times*, February 4, 1910; "Refutes Lies About Mexico," *Los Angeles Times*, February 17, 1910; "Newspapers and Magazines," *Los Angeles Times*, June 6, 1910. Hearst's landholdings included a 1,192,000 acre hacienda in Chihuahua and 389,120 acres on the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. See John Mason Hart, *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 179-180.

<sup>199</sup> Gaspar Estrada Gonzales, "Mexico As It Is," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 1 (January 1910): 74; Gaspar Estrada Gonzales, "Mexico As It Is," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 3 (March 1910): 293.

<sup>200</sup> Herman Whitaker, "Díaz, Maker of Mexico," *Sunset Magazine* XXIV: 5 (May 1910): 493-494.

<sup>201</sup> Herman Whitaker, "Mexico and Her Common Man," *Sunset Magazine* XXVI: 2 (February 1911): 217.

“Awakening of Mexico,” and suggested that the criticisms of Turner were “libelous” and not worthy of refutation.<sup>202</sup>

The numbering of flattering articles about Díaz and Mexico caught the attention of several commentators in the U.S. public sphere. An editorial in *Town and Country* observed the number of positive articles about Mexico inferred that Díaz had paid for the services of “brilliant writers” to praise him. The editorial suggested that, “If you see now any very flattering article about Mexico you may guess how it came to be printed.”<sup>203</sup>

Some months later, during the Mexican Revolution, *The American Review of Reviews* stated that Americans knew very little of what was going on in Mexico, but had learned to discount both the “rosy reports” of the situation in Mexico, as well as the “gruesome tales” of opponents.<sup>204</sup> The joint U.S.-Mexican promotion campaign served to blunt many of the criticisms of Díaz, and at least muddy the issue, but were not able to prevent the damage to Díaz’ reputation in the United States.<sup>205</sup>

The controversy over the treatment of Mexican exiles in the United States would soon gain the attention of members of Congress. In March 1909 socialist leader Eugene Debs sent a letter to leading progressive Wisconsin Senator Robert M. La Follette

---

<sup>202</sup> Pierre N. Beringer, “The Awakening of a Nation,” *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine* LVI: 1 (July 1910): 4; Pierre N. Beringer, “Marvelous Mexico and the Muckraker,” *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine* LV: 5 (May 1910): 490-493.

<sup>203</sup> *Town and Country* (July 2, 1910): 10. Another article critical of the counteroffensive by Díaz supporters was from the socialist writer W.J. Ghent in the mainstream periodical *The Independent* See “Mexico Judged by Its Friends,” *The Independent* 68: 3190 (January 20, 1910): 132-136.

<sup>204</sup> “The Progress of the World,” *The American Reviews of Reviews* XLIII: 4 (April 1911): 401-402.

<sup>205</sup> “Díaz and Despotism,” *Current Literature* XLIX: 1 (July 1910): 29.



recounting the crimes of the Díaz regime, the repressive labor system in Mexico, and detailed the treatment of the Mexican prisoners by U.S. and state authorities. Debs also asked for La Follette's aid in publicizing the cases, and helping to launch a Congressional investigation.<sup>206</sup> La Follette responded with an article in his weekly magazine stating that while U.S. capitalists were pleased that Díaz was to continue in power, the positive press portrayals of the regime had always concealed something "sinister" in Mexico. Taking a non-interventionist view, he declared that the internal political situation in Mexico was not of the U.S. concern; however he was disturbed by the fact that Mexico appeared to be using the U.S. legal system to try to punish those who were only guilty of political crimes. La Follette stated that the views of the Mexican Liberals rang true, as they seemed to be filled with a "sense of the wrongs" that had been endured by the Mexican people. La Follette stated that because of this and the actions of the U.S. officials, many Americans were convinced that a "great crime against liberty" was being committed against the Mexican prisoners.<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup> Eugene V. Debs to Robert M. La Follette, March 7, 1909, *Letters of Eugene Debs Volume 1*, ed. J. Robert Constantine (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990), 299-302. For more on La Follette's time in the Senate during this period see Nancy C. Unger, *Fighting Bob La Follette: The Righteous Reformer* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 139-152; 180-199.

<sup>207</sup> "Mexican Revolutionists or Mexican Criminals?" *La Follette's Weekly Magazine* I: 17 (May 1, 1909): 3-4. Another progressive magazine, *The Public* also took up the theme of political asylum, the nature of the Díaz regime and the treatment of Mexican opponents of Díaz in the United States. See "Mexican Patriots in American Prisons," *The Public* (February 5, 1909): 122-123; "Autocracy in Mexico," *The Public* (February 26, 1909): 194; "The Mexican Neutrality Cases," *The Public* (April 30, 1909): 411-412. See also the muckraking editor B.O. Flower's article on another arrest of a Mexican opponent of Díaz, "The De Lara Case: Another Exhibition of the March of Despotism in the United States," *Twentieth Century Magazine* I: 3 (December 1909): 263-266.

By early 1910 labor leaders such as Mother Jones and Samuel Gompers and John Murray from the Political Refugee Defense League, approached labor-friendly members of Congress about the issue of the U.S. government's treatment of Mexican opponents of the Díaz regime.<sup>208</sup> By April, Congressman Thomas D. Nicholls, a former miner and local union president with the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) presented a resolution the House of Representatives asking the Attorney General for information regarding the cases of Magón, Rivera and Villareal, stating that he had reason to believe that U.S. neutrality laws were being used as a means to persecute "Mexican patriots" who were agitating against the "operation of actual slavery" in the "so-called" Mexican republic.<sup>209</sup> Shortly after the passage of the Nicholls resolution, another former officer in the UMWA, Congressman William B. Wilson, also from Pennsylvania, introduced a joint resolution for the creation of a joint committee to investigate the Mexican cases.<sup>210</sup> During the hearings on the bill Wilson accused the Mexican government of maintaining a system of espionage in the United States in order to persecute political refugees living in

---

<sup>208</sup> Gompers, *Seventy Years of Life and Labor*, 309; Gorn, *Mother Jones*, 159-160. Both Thomas D. Nicholls and William B. Wilson had been in attendance at the 1909 UMWA Convention when Mother Jones had laid out her case for the support of the PLM leadership.

<sup>209</sup> Representative Nicholls (PA), "House Resolution 542," (April 21, 1910) *Congressional Record*, Volume 45, 61st Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1910), 5135-5136. For coverage of the resolution see "Labor's Politics," *Cleveland Citizen*, April 16, 1910; "Seeks to Stop Díaz Scandal," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, April 27, 1910. The resolution passed and the Attorney General complied with a short discussion of the facts of the case. Letter from the Attorney-General," Responding to the Inquiry of the House as to the Trial, Imprisonment, Etc., of Antonio I. Villareal and Others, House of Representatives Document No. 876, 61<sup>st</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session.

<sup>210</sup> "Industrial News," *The Cleveland Citizen*, May 7, 1910.

the United States, and declared that U.S. officials cooperated with Mexican agents to arrest and persecute them.<sup>211</sup> Most of the legislative representatives from organized labor attended the hearings, including officials from the AFL, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the International Association of Machinists, and the International Seaman's Union, to show their support for the principle of asylum and opposition to U.S. policy toward Mexican refugees.<sup>212</sup>

Newspapers throughout the nation covered the hearings and recounted the charges against the Díaz regime.<sup>213</sup> Shortly thereafter the *New York Times* featured a nearly full-page article on the issue of the Mexican refugees entitled "How We Pull Díaz's Chestnuts Out of the Fire."<sup>214</sup> The article predicted that the U.S. Congress would eventually be forced to examine the treatment of Mexican exiles and cooperation between Mexican and U.S. governments. The article acknowledged the anger expressed by the working class, and suggested that it was soon to have an effect on public opinion that would be

---

<sup>211</sup> Statement of Hon. William B. Wilson, "Alleged Persecutions of Mexican Citizens," June 10, 1910, *Hearings on H.J. Res. 201*, 4, 8. The hearings also featured testimony by Lazaro Gutierrez de Lara, John Kenneth Turner, Mother Jones, and John Murray who recounted many of the changes that had been made in the working-class press for several years.

<sup>212</sup> "Labor Helps Mexican Probe," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, June 17, 1910; "Labor Interested in Mexican Cases," *Los Angeles Citizen*, June 24, 1910.

<sup>213</sup> See for instance "Declare Federal Officers Aid Díaz," *Trenton Evening Times*, June 9, 1910; "Says U.S. Officers are Tools of Díaz," *Lincoln Evening News*, June 9, 1910; "Charges are Made Against Mexicans," *The Portsmouth Daily Times*, June 9, 1910; "Another Sensation," *Laredo Times*, June 12, 1910; "Mexico Accused of Kidnapping Here," *New York Times*, June 12, 1910; "Hounded by Díaz, He Says," *The Baltimore Sun*, June 11, 1910; "De Lara Assails Díaz," *New York Times*, June 11, 1910; "Denounces Díaz as 'Dirty Despot,'" *Boston Journal*, June 11, 1910.

<sup>214</sup> "How We Pull Díaz's Chestnuts Out of the Fire," *New York Times*, August 7, 1910.

impossible to ignore, making an investigation unavoidable. The article provided a detailed examination of the facts of the Mexican cases, as well as charges against the Díaz regime, and predicted that the expected investigation would embarrass those Americans who had been prospering under Díaz.<sup>215</sup> Calls for a wide-reaching Congressional investigation were however mitigated by an early release of the PLM prisoners as well as rapidly moving events in Mexico that would culminate into the Mexican Revolution.<sup>216</sup>

Despite the negative publicity in the United States, the protectors of Díaz proved to be quite successful in shaping U.S. discourse on Mexico in the months before the Mexican Revolution showing the continuing power of the Díaz promotional program. This was especially evident in the coverage of the Mexican Centennial, a month-long celebration of the one-hundred year anniversary of Father Miguel Hidalgo's cry for political independence from Spain on September 16, 1910. In a larger sense the Díaz regime sought to portray an "image of peace, order and progress, and Mexico's acceptance by Western Europe and the United States as a modern nation."<sup>217</sup> Paul Hudson from the Bureau of information travelled to the United States to organize an excursion of journalists from the leading periodicals to visit Mexico during the

---

<sup>215</sup> Ibid.

<sup>216</sup> Diana K. Christopoulos, "American Radicals and the Mexican Revolution," 96.

<sup>217</sup> Michael J. Gonzales, "Imagining Mexico in 1910: Visions of the *Patria* in the Centennial Celebration in Mexico City," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 39: 3 (August 2007): 497.

celebrations.<sup>218</sup> Hudson and Mexican officials used the presence of the international press to orchestrate what they hoped would be a “final rebuttal” of the Díaz government’s critics.<sup>219</sup> In coverage of the events, U.S. journalists published numerous positive stories about the peace, stability and progress in Mexico, and heralded Díaz.<sup>220</sup> One representative article in the *Bankers’ Magazine* stated that whatever criticism there was of Díaz, he had “given his country for over thirty years a peaceful orderly form of government,” something which had not existed before he took power, and described Díaz as the “builder of modern Mexico.”<sup>221</sup> However an article in the *Syracuse Post-Standard* noted that the peace and stability brought by Díaz was one side of the Mexican story, but also stated that the articles in the *American Magazine*, which outlined the position of the peons in Mexico, was the other side of the story.<sup>222</sup> While Díaz and the Mexican government still had numerous defenders in the U.S. public sphere, the criticisms of the

---

<sup>218</sup> Albert Hale, “An Editorial Excursion to Mexico,” *Bulletin of the Pan-American Union* XXXI: 5 (November 1910): 780.

<sup>219</sup> Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 179.

<sup>220</sup> See for instance, “Mexico’s Progress Shown at Centennial in Exposition,” *The Baltimore Sun*, September 2, 1910; “At the Mexican Capital,” *The Hartford Courant*, September 15, 1910; *Bradstreet’s* XXXVIII: 1681 (September 17, 1910); “Mexico Celebrates Its Centenary,” *Zion’s Herald* 88: 38 (September 21, 1910): 1188; “Díaz Overshadows Mexico Centennial,” *New York Times*, September 24, 1910; “A Hundred Years of Mexican Independence,” *New York Observer and Chronicle* 89: 15 (October 13, 1910): 457; Pierre N. Beringer, “The Mexican Centennial,” *Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine* LV: 4 (April 1910): 428; “Old Mexico, The Land of Color,” *Springfield Republican*, October 11, 1910, “A Stirring Event in the History of Mexico,” *Christian Science Monitor*, November 23, 1910.

<sup>221</sup> “The Centennial of Our Neighboring Republic,” *Bankers’ Magazine* 81:2 (August 1910): 139.

<sup>222</sup> “Two Sides of a Shield,” *The Post-Standard*, September 24, 1910.

working class press, the Barbarous Mexico articles and book, and the Congressional Hearings helped to tarnish Mexico's image in the United States and provided a backdrop for U.S. views of the early Mexican Revolution.

### The Coming of the Mexican Revolution

In his important book on the role of ideology in U.S. foreign policy, historian Michael H. Hunt has noted the ambiguity with which Americans have tended to view revolutions. On the one hand they saw the United States Revolution as a model for other nations to emulate, but were frequently disappointed in the results of revolutions, and attempted revolutions by foreign peoples.<sup>223</sup> By the early twentieth century Americans tended to view revolutions with anxiety and focus on the dangers of revolutions.<sup>224</sup> During the early twentieth century socialist writers discussed the need for a world-wide revolution. The Milwaukee-based Social-Democratic periodical *The Vanguard* featured an article by the English socialist William Morris, entitled "Why a Revolution?" Morris admitted that the word "revolution" had a "terrible sound" to most people, even when it does not necessarily mean a change accompanied by disorder and violence. Morris suggested that socialists used the term revolution in the "etymological sense" meaning a "change in the fundamental structure of society."<sup>225</sup> U.S. socialists frequently described

---

<sup>223</sup> Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987), 102.

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, 97. Hunt argues that Americans viewed a successful revolution as tied to the U.S. experience. For them "Revolution was a solemn affair, to be conducted with a minimum of disorder, led by respectable citizens, harnessed to moderate political goals, and happily concluded only after a balanced constitution, essential to safeguarding human and property rights, was securely in place" (116).

<sup>225</sup> William Morris, "Why a Revolution?" *The Vanguard* 5:8 (June 1907): 231. See also William Morris, "Revolution," *Appeal to Reason*, July 21, 1900. For a similar

revolution as their goal for the United States, but most did not believe that it would be an armed revolt through violence, but was to come through “popular victory at the polls.”<sup>226</sup> While believing that revolutionary change in the United States would come through non-violent means, socialists and others in the working-class press accepted that in places such as Mexico, where there was no freedom of the press, speech or free elections, it might be necessary for workers and others in society to commence an armed revolt against a tyrannical government.

By the spring of 1909 Mexican opposition to Díaz would be led by Francisco Madero, who came from an upper-class family in the state of Coahuila in Northern Mexico, and based his movement around the themes of “effective suffrage” and “no reelection.”<sup>227</sup> Madero and other wealthy Mexicans had at one time supported the PLM, but turned from them because of concerns with the increasing radicalism of Ricardo Flores Magón, who expressed support for a wide-scale social revolution and eventually

---

theme see “Revolution,” *Cleveland Citizen*, November 20, 1909, reprint from the *Christian Socialist*. Eugene V. Debs also used the theme of “revolution in his speeches. See for instance “Revolutionary Unionism,” Speech at Chicago, November 25, 1905, in *Debs: His Life, Writings and Speeches* (Girard, KS: The Appeal to Reason, 1908), 427-443.

<sup>226</sup>“*Yours for the Revolution:*” *The Appeal to Reason, 1895-1922*, ed. John Graham (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), 173. Socialists believed that victory at the polls would allow them to incrementally transform the structure of capitalism in the United States to a socialist society. See also Allen Ruff, “*We Called Each Other Comrade: Charles H. Kerr & Company, Radical Publishers* (Urbana and Chicago: The University of Illinois Press, 1997), 98-99.

<sup>227</sup> David G. LaFrance, *The Mexican Revolution in Puebla, 1908-1913: The Maderista Movement and the Failure of Liberal Reform* (Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Imprint, 1989), 2.



openly espoused anarchism.<sup>228</sup> Madero became the leader of the Anti-Reelectionist Party, and with the PLM leadership still in prison in the United States most of Mexican opposition embraced Madero's movement. For the next year Madero travels throughout Mexico recruiting followers, forming local political clubs, and playing on widespread discontent with Díaz. Díaz became increasingly concerned with Madero, and had him arrested before the Mexican election in July of 1910.

Upon his release Madero fled to San Antonio, Texas where he planned a revolution against Díaz. In October Madero announced the Plan of San Luis Potosi, which declared the recent election to be null and void, and proclaimed himself provisional president, calling for an armed uprising against Díaz on November 20, 1910.<sup>229</sup> While many Americans had consistently doubted the fitness of the Mexican people for self-government, Madero declared that the Mexican people had showed that they were fit for democracy by participating in the political process and attempting to vote. Instead, Madero asserted, it was Díaz who was keeping them from achieving true self-government.<sup>230</sup> Madero attracted a wide range of groups disaffected from the Díaz regime including middle-class intellectuals who wanted democratic reforms, workers

---

<sup>228</sup> MacLachlan and Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo*, 215; Pasztor, *The Spirit of Hidalgo*, 45-46; Albro, *Always a Rebel*, 27.

<sup>229</sup> Jürgen Buchenau, *Mexican Mosaic: A Brief History of Mexico* (Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2008), 79.

<sup>230</sup> Francisco Madero, "The Plan of San Luis Potosi," *Competing Voices from the Mexican Revolution*, ed. Chris Frazer (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press, 2010), 31.

demanding union rights and better wages and conditions, peasant communities who wanted to regain lost lands, villagers who wanted to regain local autonomy.<sup>231</sup>

While the Revolution began slowly, several large Mexican cities including Mexico City, and Guadalajara, were rocked by anti-American riots brought on by the lynching of a Mexican citizen, named Antonio Rodriguez in Rock Springs, Texas, who was burned at the stake by an American mob.<sup>232</sup> Upon hearing of the lynching, Mexican newspapers published angry editorials, denouncing the crime and Americans in general.<sup>233</sup> In Mexico City mobs marched in the streets using slogans such as “Death to Americans,” pulled down and trampled American flags that flew at American businesses and threatened U.S. businesses and residences. In Guadalajara several hundred university and medical students organized a demonstration, which vandalized American businesses and property.<sup>234</sup> The labor and socialist press coverage tended to describe the riots as the

---

<sup>231</sup> Chris Frazer, *Competing Voices from the Mexican Revolution*, ed. Chris Frazer (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press, 2010), 27.

<sup>232</sup> Frederick C. Turner, “Anti-Americanism in Mexico, 1910-1913,” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 47: 4 (November 1967): 505; Schell, *Integral Outsiders*, 184. Rodriguez was accused of murdering an Anglo woman, and was arrested. While in a Rock Springs jail, a mob of ranchers and other townspeople attacked the jail and took him where he was killed and his body burned.

<sup>233</sup> Turner, “Anti-Americanism in Mexico,” 505. The Mexican American community was also concerned about the lynching of Rodriguez and other similar incidents in Texas, as well as various forms of discrimination. In response various mutual benefit societies met in a state-wide convention called the *Congreso Mexicanista* in 1911 which formed the *Gran Liga Mexicanista de Beneficiencia y Protección*. See Congreso Mexicanista, 1911, “Por la raza y pata la raza,” in *Foreigners in Their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans, 30<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Edition*. Ed. David J. Weber (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 248-251.

<sup>234</sup> Turner, “Anti-Americanism in Mexico,” 505-506. For U.S. diplomatic coverage of the events see Shanklin to Secretary of State, November 9, 1910; *State Department Decimal File*, RG 59 812.00/378, M274, Reel 10; Wilson to Secretary of

result of exploitation by American interests of the Mexican working class and support for the Díaz regime.<sup>235</sup> While the United States government threatened interventions in situations where U.S. citizens' lives and property were endangered, it had difficulty protecting the lives of foreign nationals within its own territory. Researchers have documented 597 lynchings of ethnic Mexicans in the United States from 1848-1928 and the treatment of Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans in the United States frequently caused friction between the United States and Mexico.<sup>236</sup> One story about the

---

State, November 9, 1910, *State Department Decimal File*, RG 59 812.00/557, M274, Reel 10; Wilson to Secretary of State, November 10, 1910, *State Department Decimal File*, RG 59 812.00/389, M274, Reel 10. For discussions of the often related themes of Mexican nationalism and ant-Americanism in Mexican history see George W. Grayson, "Anti-Americanism in Mexico," *Anti-Americanism in the Third World: Implications for U.S. Foreign Policy* eds. Alvin Z. Rubinstein and Donald Smith (New York: Praeger, Publishing, 1985), 31-48; Alan Knight, "Peasants into Patriots: Thoughts on the Making of the Mexican Nation," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 10:1 (Winter 1994), 135-161; Stephen D. Morris, "Reforming the Nation: Mexican Nationalism in Context," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 31: 2 (May 1999): 363-397; Ruiz, *The Great Rebellion*, 100-119.

<sup>235</sup> See "American Interests in Mexico," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, November 12, 1910; "U.S. Gold Breeds Mexican Rioters," *Seattle Union Record*, November 17, 1910; "U.S. Gold Breeds Mexican Riots in Land of Peons," *The Labor Leader*, November 19, 1910 [San Diego]; "U.S. Gold Breeds Mexican Riots," *The Fort Worth Union Banner*, November 19, 1910; "U.S. Gold Makes Mexico Riotous," *The Oklahoma Labor Unit*, November 1910. Many of these articles are based on reporting from the labor/socialist news service, the Pan-American Press. Socialist and labor press stories were likely influenced by an article by Ricardo Flores Magón which makes the same point. See "The Repercussions of a Lynching," *Regeneración*, November 12, 1910, reprinted in *Dream of Freedom*, 198-201.

<sup>236</sup> Mario T. García, "Porfirian Diplomacy and the Administration of Justice in Texas, 1877-1900," *Aztlan* 16: 1-2 (1987): 20-21. Figures are from William D. Carrigan and Clive Webb, "The Lynching of Persons of Mexican Origin or Descent in the United States, 1848 to 1928," *Journal of Social History* 37:2 (Winter 2003), 413; William D. Carrigan and Clive Webb, "Muerto por Unos Desconocidos (Killed by Persons Unknown): Mob Violence against Blacks and Mexicans in Texas," *Beyond Black & White: Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in the U.S. South and Southwest* eds Stephanie Cole & Alison M. Parker (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2004), 36. For a

lynching stated that the citizens of Rock Springs who committed the crime did not make any effort to disguise themselves, and matter-of-factly stated that when it was over “the participants and spectators returned quietly to town and business was resumed.”<sup>237</sup> The anti-American riots in Mexico received wide coverage in the U.S. mainstream press, editorials frequently responded with anger and embarrassment because of the lynching, viewing it as a blot on the United States and expressing anger over the fact that the federal government could not guarantee that the perpetrators would be punished.<sup>238</sup>

In response to the outbreak of the Revolution, the socialist and labor press hoped that the revolution would be successful in toppling the Díaz regime. An article in the *El Paso Labor-Advocate* stated that the Mexican people had been oppressed by “long years of tyranny that a favored few might pile up untold wealth at the expense of the many, the struggling masses have at last risen in their might and dared to throw off the tyrant’s yoke.”<sup>239</sup> Several writers again likened the Mexican revolutionaries to American

---

discussion of violence towards Mexican immigrants during the first decades of the twentieth century see F. Arturo Rosales, *¡Pobre Raza! Violence, Justice and Mobilization Among México Lindo Immigrants, 1900-1936* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999).

<sup>237</sup> “Texas Town that Burned Mexican is not Worried,” *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, November 11, 1910.

<sup>238</sup> See “The Mexican Riots,” *The Washington Post*, November 11, 1910; “The Mexican Riots,” *New York Times*, November 11, 1910; *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* LXXXI: (November 12, 1910): 1291; “A Defect in Our National Organization,” *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, November 15, 1910; “A Mexican Boycott,” *The Independent* 69: 3233 (November 17, 1910): 1111. Many of the editorials advocated for a law that would allow those who engaged in violence against foreigners to be punished by federal authorities rather than the unpredictability of state and local authorities.

<sup>239</sup> “More on the Mexican Revolution,” *El Paso Labor-Advocate*, February 24, 1911. For other expressions of support for the Mexican revolutionaries see “The United States and Mexico,” *San Francisco Labor Clarion*, March 17, 1911; Joseph Moore,

colonists who were fighting for freedom during the American Revolution and called up American workers to support the efforts of Mexican revolutionaries fighting for the overthrow of Díaz.<sup>240</sup>

By the time of Díaz's inauguration in early December, the regime had quelled anti-American actions, and the Madero-lead revolution appeared to be dying.<sup>241</sup> In a telegram to the *St Louis Post-Dispatch* Díaz confidently stated that he had the situation under control and no Revolution would be able to prevail "against the firm guarantees of peace" that Mexico possessed.<sup>242</sup> The mainstream U.S. press speculated that another revolt against Díaz had failed.<sup>243</sup> The *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, a leading business magazine, had first reacted with shock at the revolts, but soon concluded that the Mexican government had the whole situation well under control and that the "Madero

---

"Barbarous Mexico-An Inferno," *San Francisco Labor Clarion*, March 31, 1911; "Would You Have Slavery No Thought of Revolution," *The People's Paper*, December 1, 1910; "Extermination in Mexico," *Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 14, 1911; "The Mexican Revolution," *The Agitator* 1:14 (June 1, 1911).

<sup>240</sup> San Francisco labor Council to Taft, February 21, 1911, reprinted in *Documents on the Mexican Revolution Volume I:1*, ed. Gene Z. Hanrahan (Salisbury NC: Documentary Publication, 1976), 169-170; Joseph Moore, "Barbarous Mexico-An Inferno," *San Francisco Labor Clarion*, March 31, 1911; "More on the Mexican Revolution," *El Paso Labor-Advocate*, February 24, 1911; "Rebellion in Mexico," *The Laborer* [Dallas, TX], December 3, 1910; "Mexican Revolution," *The Los Angeles Citizen*, February 3, 1911; Ethel D. Turner, "Would You Have Slavery No Thought of Revolution," *The Los Angeles Citizen*, December 1, 1910.

<sup>241</sup> LaFrance, *The Mexican Revolution in Puebla*, 59.

<sup>242</sup> Porfirio Díaz to Editor, *Post-Dispatch* reprinted in "Díaz Tells *Post-Dispatch* of His Firm Faith in Mexico," *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, December 2, 1910.

<sup>243</sup> "The Revolt Against Díaz," *The Literary Digest* XLI: 23 (December 3, 1910): 1019; *Bradstreet's* XXXVIII: 1691 (November 26, 1910): 764.

marauders will shortly be brought under complete subjection.”<sup>244</sup> However the socialist and labor press remained optimistic about the ultimate outcome of the Revolution and remained skeptical as to the reporting of the mainstream press on the successes of Díaz’ forces.<sup>245</sup> An editorial in the *Cleveland Citizen*, for instance, predicted that the Díaz and his American allies would not be able to crush the Revolution regardless of the methods they attempted to use.<sup>246</sup> By early 1911, the revolutionaries in western Chihuahua under the leadership of Pascual Orozco and Pancho Villa won clashes with federal troops and soon controlled a large portion of the state with their force of about 2,000 guerrillas.<sup>247</sup> By February and March there were local revolts all over Mexico, including peasant revolts led by Emiliano Zapata in the southern Mexican state of Morelos and the Laguna region in Coahuila.<sup>248</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* 91: 2371 (November 26, 1910); *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* LXXXI: 2371 (December 3, 1910): 1477; *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* 91:2373 (December 17, 1910): 1597; Other sources that comment on the calm of Mexico despite the rumored revolt include “Oath Taken by Díaz,” *The Washington Post*, December 2, 1910; “Díaz Inaugurated Eighth Time, Issues Message to All Nations,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 2, 1910.

<sup>245</sup> See for instance Joseph Moore, “Barbarous Mexico-An Inferno,” *San Francisco Labor Clarion*, March 31, 1911; *Cleveland Citizen*, December 17, 1910; *Cleveland Citizen*, December 24, 1910; “The Mexican Revolution,” *The Peoples Paper*, January 13, 1911; *Cleveland Citizen*, January 28, 1911; *Wheeling Majority*, February 16, 1911.

<sup>246</sup> *Cleveland Citizen*, January 28, 1911. For similar sentiments see “More on the Mexican Revolution,” *El Paso Labor Advocate*, February 24, 1911.

<sup>247</sup> Katz, “The Liberal Republic and the Porfiriato,” 123; John Womack Jr., “The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1920,” *Mexico Since Independence*, ed. Leslie Bethell (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 131.

<sup>248</sup> *Ibid.*

From the beginning of the Revolution, the labor and socialist press had feared that the U.S. government would intervene in Mexico in order to prevent the collapse of the Díaz regime.<sup>249</sup> The successes of the rebels exacerbated these fears and they seemed about to be realized when President Taft ordered mobilization of 20,000 U.S. troops to the border, which was one-fourth of the U.S. army, and sent warships to Mexican ports in March of 1911.<sup>250</sup> Taft, influenced by concerns expressed by the U.S. ambassador in Mexico, sought to stabilize the border region and to be prepared to protect American citizens and their property.<sup>251</sup> The *Wheeling Majority*, a labor paper, speculated that U.S. intervention in Mexican affairs was likely. The editorial argued that while Díaz had previously provided U.S. capitalist interests with protection, but as the power of Díaz waned, the military strength of the United States would be used to repress the revolt in the interests of the “money power” of the United States.<sup>252</sup> The working-class press

---

<sup>249</sup> See for instance “Díaz, Tyrant, Trembling,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, November 24, 1910; H.T.J., “Mexico, Wall Street and the White House,” *Social Democratic Herald*, November 26, 1910; *Miners’ Magazine* XI:390 (December 15, 1910): 1; *Cleveland Citizen*, January 7, 1911; “Aid Díaz and Then Issue Lame Excuse,” *Chicago Daily Socialist*, February 16, 1911; “Hands Off,” *The People’s Paper*, February 10, 1911.

<sup>250</sup> Don M. Coerver, and Linda B Hall, *Texas and the Mexican Revolution: A Study in State and National Border Policy, 1910-1920* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1984), 23.

<sup>251</sup> P. Edward Haley, *Revolution and Intervention: The Diplomacy of Taft and Wilson with Mexico, 1910-1917* (Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1970), 26; “Díaz’s weakness, Not Japan Sent Army to Border,” *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, April 7, 1911; “U.S. Forced to Aid Mexico,” *Boston Daily Globe*, February 6, 1911. For coverage of the U.S. army in Texas see “Pitching Camp for Twenty Thousand,” *Harpers Weekly*, April 1, 1911.

<sup>252</sup> *Wheeling Majority*, March 9, 1911. For similar sentiments see “To Help Díaz,” *Los Angeles Citizen*, March 10, 1911; J.R.W., “Political Club,” *Los Angeles Citizen*, March 17, 1911; “Wall Street in Plot to Crush Insurrection,” *Chicago Daily Socialist*,



expressed outrage of potential U.S. involvement to support Díaz, with the IWW union periodical, *The Agitator* describing the troop movements as a “dastardly crime against a people struggling for freedom.”<sup>253</sup> In the context of these fears, socialist and labor groups considered it their mission to prevent the United States from intervening in the Mexican Revolution.

In response the Socialist Party of American (SPA) mobilized in order to agitate against the expected U.S. intervention.<sup>254</sup> The Socialist Party saw itself as agitating in order to prevent a war that would save the Díaz regime and prevent the transformation

---

March 17, 1911; Henry T. Jones, “War, Taft, Wall Street and Monster Díaz,” *Social Democratic Herald*, March 25, 1911; “Getting Busy with Mexico,” *Plumbers’, Gas and Steam Fitters’ Journal* XVI: 5 (May 1911): 35; *The Miners’ Magazine* XI: 412 (May 18, 1911): 5; “The Mexican Revolution,” *The Agitator* I: 5 (January 15, 1911); “Wall Street in Plot to Crush Insurrection,” *Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 17, 1911; “Stray Straws,” *Cleveland Citizen*, March 18, 1911, *Mother Earth*, VI:3 (May 1911): 72-73; “Exit Díaz--- Enter Morgan,” *Appeal to Reason*, March 18, 1911; “Intervention,” *Revolt* I:2 (May 6, 1911): 3; A.M. Simons, “Why the Troops Were Sent,” *The Coming Nation* (March 18, 1911); “Mexican Plutocracy,” *San Francisco Organized Labor*, March 18, 1911; “‘Interests’ in Mexican revolution,” *El Paso Labor Advocate*, March 17, 1911; “Taft Sends Army to Aid Díaz,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 7, 1911; Clarence Meily, “The Shame of America,” *The People’s Paper*, March 17, 1911.

<sup>253</sup> “Shall America Throttle Mexican Freedom?” *The Agitator* 1:9 (March 15, 1911).

<sup>254</sup> National Executive Committee to Berger, March 11, 1911, *Victor L. Berger Papers* (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1994), Reel 37. This was also the suggestion of Algie Martin Simmons the editor of the socialist periodical *The Coming Nation* which Berger and the other NEC members embraced. See Simmons to Berger, March 13, 1911, *Victor L. Berger Papers*, Reel 37; Berger to Simmons, March 21, 1911, *Victor L. Berger Papers*, Reel 37; A.M. Simons, “Call Off Díaz’ Watch Dogs,” *The Coming Nation*, March 25, 1911. The SPA leadership also sought to link the issue of the movement of troops to the border to anti-militarism. See Barnes to Hillquit, March 15, 1911, *Morris Hillquit Papers*, (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1969), Reel 2.

of Mexico.<sup>255</sup> The National Executive Committee (NEC) approved an emergency resolution, entitled “Withdraw the Troops!” which claimed that the troops were sent to the border in order to save the Díaz regime and to “quell the rising of the Mexican people,” and lodged “its public and emphatic protests,” to the troop movements. The NEC called upon Socialist Party locals, labor unions, and other bodies of Progressive citizens to protest.<sup>256</sup> The resolution was reprinted throughout the working-class press, and numerous labor unions and socialist locals passed resolutions denouncing potential U.S. intervention.<sup>257</sup>

---

<sup>255</sup> Sally M. Miller, *Victor Berger and the Promise of Constructive Socialism* (Westport, CN and London: Greenwood Press Inc., 1973), 77.

<sup>256</sup> See Victor L. Berger, James F. Carey, George H. Goebel, Robert Hunter, Lena Morrow Lewis, John Spargo, and J. Mahlon Barnes, “Proclamation Withdraw the Troops!” *The Socialist Party Official Bulletin* VII:7 (March 1911): 4. The Progressive U.S. Senator Robert La Follette expressed similar views in editorials and comments on the news in his magazine. See “News Worth Remembering,” *La Follette’s Weekly Magazine* III: 11 (May 18, 1911), 9; “Why War?” *La Follette’s Weekly Magazine* III: 11 (May 18, 1911), 1. For an overview of differing views about the nature of the troop movements and concerns about the possibility of war see “Possibilities on the Mexican Border,” *The Literary Digest* XLII: 12 (March 25, 1911); 555-556.

<sup>257</sup> For reprints see “Withdraw the Troops,” *The International Socialist Review* XI:10 (April 1911): 585-588; “Proclamation- Withdraw the Troops,” *The Christian Socialist* VIII:12 (March 23, 1911): 1; Proclamation Withdraw the Troops!” *Cleveland Citizen*, March 25, 1911; “Withdraw the Troops,” *Social-Democratic Herald*, March 25, 1911; “American Socialists Condemn Money War,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 15, 1911; “Withdraw the Troops,” *The Laborer* [Dallas, TX], April 8, 1911. For other similar resolutions from socialist groups and labor unions see “We Protest!” *The Progressive Woman* IV: 47 (April 1911), 3; “Resolutions for Liberty,” *Miners’ Magazine* XI: 410 (May 4, 1911): 8; “East Nashville Socialist Local,” *Nashville Labor Advocate*, April 14, 1911; “Díaz and Taft Denounced,” *The People’s Paper*, May 6, 1911; “Petition from Garden City, KS,” *The Prolocutor*, April 20, 1911; “Resolutions Protesting Against Mobilization of American Army on Mexican Frontier,” *St Louis Labor*, March 18, 1911; “Socialist and Labor Protest,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, March 9, 1911; “League of Mexican Liberty,” *The People’s Paper*, March 17, 1911; “Labor Council Resolutions,” *The Los Angeles Citizen*, March 24, 1911.

The first socialist U.S. congressman, Victor L. Berger, from Wisconsin, who was also a member of the NEC, described himself as the “‘congressman at large’ at the disposal of the working class of America” and introduced a congressional resolution asking President Taft to withdraw the troops.<sup>258</sup> In late April he presented petitions from throughout the United States, from labor and socialist organizations, totaling over 87,500 signatures on the floor of the House of Representatives, which was one of the largest petitions ever presented to Congress, up to that point.<sup>259</sup> The petition stated, that the massing of U.S. troops on the Mexican border was intended to “intimidate, impede and harass” the people of Mexico in their revolution against the “despotic rule of a cruel dictator,” and was undertaken for the sole purpose of protecting the interests of a American capitalists and speculators, which would aid Díaz in the Mexican people. Because of this the petitioners requested that Congress order the immediate recall of the American army from the Mexican border.<sup>260</sup>

Contrary to the fears of the socialist and labor press, the United States Army did not intervene to support the Díaz dictatorship. Meanwhile by April most of the Mexican countryside was under the control of revolutionaries opposed to the Díaz government.

---

<sup>258</sup> Berger to Smith, April 7, 1911, *Victor L. Berger Papers*, Reel 37; “Report Of Representative Victor L. Berger, Of The Fifth District Of Wisconsin, As To His Activity In Congress,” *Victor L. Berger Papers*, Reel 25; “Berger Demands Taft Show Army Maneuvers’ Cause,” *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, April 6, 1911. For coverage of Berger’s election from a leading U.S. periodical see “The Socialist Congressman,” *Outlook* 96:17 (December 24, 1910), 918-1919.

<sup>259</sup> “Congress Awes by Monster Petition,” April 23, 1911, Clipping, *Victor L. Berger Papers*, Reel 11.

<sup>260</sup> “Petition Withdraw the Troops,” *The Socialist Party Official Bulletin* VII:7 (March 1911): 4. For more on Berger’s views see his interview in “America Aiding a Despot,” *The Kansas City Star*, March 12, 1911.

The Díaz government conducted formal and informal negotiations with Madero's emissaries for several months, but were unable to come to an agreement because of the rebel insistence that Díaz resign the office of presidency, and many Mexican political elites viewed U.S. troop movements as a sign that the United States had lost faith in Díaz, which hastened his resignation.<sup>261</sup>

By the time of Díaz's resignation and exile from Mexico in late May 1911, the U.S. government, and many U.S. commentators, had lost faith in Díaz and saw him as an obstacle to peace in Mexico.<sup>262</sup> Still many of eulogies of Díaz and his time as leader of Mexico were positive and recounted many of the same themes common in earlier discussions of him. The *New York Times* incorrectly predicted that within a few years' time Mexico would erect a "splendid monument" in honor of Díaz, and stated that Mexico, in search of its freedom, had deposed its "greatest ruler" and probably the "greatest man" the country had ever produced.<sup>263</sup> The working-class press however

---

<sup>261</sup> Womack, "The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1920," 131; Paul Garner, *Porfirio Díaz*, 219; Friedrich Katz, *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, The United States and the Mexican Revolution* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), 39.

<sup>262</sup> For instance discussion of this trend in the U.S. Press in "The Impotent Díaz," *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, April 17, 1911; "War Again," *St Louis Post-Dispatch*, May 10, 1911; "Mexico's Dilemma," *The Commercial and Financial Chronicle* 92:2395 (May 20, 1911), 1342; "IN Mexico," *Harper's Weekly*, May 20, 1911; "The Fall of Díaz," *Outlook* 98:5 (June 3, 1911): 227; "Reform in Mexico," *Christian Science Monitor*, March 28, 1911; "Díaz and Mexico," *The American Journal of International Law* 5:31 (July 1911): 714; John A. Avirette, "Díaz and His Peons," *Everybody's Magazine* XXIV:6 (June 1911): 758-760; *The Forum* XLVI (July 1911): 109-110. This "desertion" of Díaz was noted by the socialist press. See "Destiny of Díaz," *Appeal to Reason*, April 29, 1911; *Wilshire's Magazine* XV:5 (May 1911), 2.

<sup>263</sup> "Memorials of Díaz," *New York Times*, May 28, 1911. For similar complimentary sentiments regarding Díaz see "The Future of Díaz," *Los Angeles Times*, May 19, 1911; "Results in Mexico," *Wall Street Journal*, May 30, 1911.

continued to condemn him and express pleasure in his resignation. A headline in the story of Díaz's resignation in *The Chicago Daily Socialist* stated, "Díaz, Tyrant, Gone from the Backs of Mexican People."<sup>264</sup> The *El Paso Labor Advocate* described the Revolution as a "heroic struggle," which had returned political power into the hands of the Mexican people.<sup>265</sup> Although various groups of labor and socialists were split about the immediate prospects for a social revolution in Mexico, most were optimistic that the fall of the Díaz regime would lead to reforms and an improvement in the condition of the Mexican working class something that they had played a role in bringing about.<sup>266</sup>

### Conclusion

While Díaz and the Mexican government still had numerous defenders in the U.S. public sphere, the criticisms of labor and socialists, the Barbarous Mexico articles and book, and the Congressional hearings helped to tarnish Mexico's image in the United States and provided a backdrop for U.S. views of the early Mexican Revolution. Likewise working class and progressive mobilization in opposition to intervention would influence

---

<sup>264</sup> "Díaz, Tyrant, Gone From the Backs of Mexican People," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 26, 1911.

<sup>265</sup> "The Metamorphosis of Mexico," *El Paso Labor Advocate*, May 26, 1911.

<sup>266</sup> Several editorials suggests that since Díaz was gone, the struggle for the working classes could begin in Mexico. See "The Mexican Revolution," *St Louis Labor*, May 27, 1911; "Exit Díaz," *The Chicago Daily Socialist*, May 29, 1911. By the Spring of 1911 Madero and Flores Magón, which also split the support of the socialists and labor in the United States. Generally more radical elements of the labor movement including the IWW, along with U.S. based anarchists, such as Emma Goldman supported the PLM, and Flores Magón. After the fall of Díaz, Madero promised reforms on behalf of Mexican workers, and gained the support of labor leaders such as Samuel Gompers and Mother Jones, and the *Appeal to Reason* provided Madero with mild support. Other periodicals such as the *New York Call* was skeptical of both factions. See MacLachlan, *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution*, 36; Verter, "Biographical Sketch," 73, 80.

a more cautious government response during the anti-Díaz insurrection. The working-class critique of early U.S. economic expansion would hit on many of the same themes that would continue to have relevance in U.S. foreign policy discussions including U.S. support for repressive regimes, immigration, opposition to free trade, the actions of U.S. capitalists abroad, and the nature of U.S.-Mexican relations throughout the twentieth century.

## CONCLUSION

From the end of the U.S.-Mexico War in 1848 to the Spanish-American-Cuban War in 1898, U.S. policy shifted from territorial expansion toward informal imperialism. Mexico was the first nation to experience U.S. informal imperialism and thus served as a laboratory which shaped United States policy toward Latin America and other developing areas throughout the twentieth century. The United States appeared to have abandoned informal imperialism following its victory over Spain in 1898, when it formally annexed colonies in Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Shortly thereafter, however, Americans returned to the tactics of informal empire, as they sought to mold nations they viewed as needing guidance, often accompanied by the coercive force of the U.S. armed forces. In doing so U.S. policymakers and non-state actors built on themes and ideas they had developed in their earlier encounter with Mexico as they sought to accomplish their self-imposed mission to transform the world.

The election of Woodrow Wilson in 1912 signaled a temporary change in U.S. government policy toward Mexico, as the new president challenged the traditional view that Mexicans were unfit for republican government. Rather Wilson asserted that, “when properly directed,” there were no people unfit for “self-government.”<sup>1</sup> At the same time Wilson had little confidence in the ability of Mexicans to create a peaceful, stable, democratic government on their own and believed it was the mission of the United States to shape the outcome of the Mexican Revolution.<sup>2</sup> Wilson hoped to pressure Mexicans to

---

<sup>1</sup> Walter La Feber, *The American Age: U.S. Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad* Volume 2: Since 1896 (New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1994), 281.

<sup>2</sup> Alan Dawley, *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003), 102.



create a stable government committed to U.S.-style capitalism and democracy that would be “responsive, if not completely subservient to his suggestions.”<sup>3</sup> Wilson was so invested in shaping the Mexican Revolution precisely because he believed that a U.S.-led transformation of Mexico would be the first step to the Americanization of all of Latin America.<sup>4</sup>

Because of this goal, Wilson refused to recognize the government of Victoriano Huerta. This former Porfirian general had taken power in 1913 by overthrowing- and killing Francisco Madero, the constitutionally elected president of Mexico. Huerta followed the Díaz model believing that only a strong government could control Mexico, arguing that the Mexican people were “not ready for any government save a dictatorship.”<sup>5</sup> Wilson saw the overthrow of Madero as a “heavy blow to the solutions of Mexico’s problems,” which he believed were found in free enterprise and representative democracy. Similar to the assessments of earlier analysts, Wilson believed that Mexico would not be able to accomplish these goals on its own and needed to be taught the “arts of self-help, self-control, and self-government,” under the tutelage of the United States.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Friedrich Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 502.

<sup>4</sup> James William Park, *Latin American Underdevelopment: A History of Perspectives in the United States, 1870-1965* (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1995), 97.

<sup>5</sup> Kenneth J. Grieb, *The United States and Huerta* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969), 51.

<sup>6</sup> Dirk W. Raat and Michael M. Brescia, *Mexico and the United States: Ambivalent Vistas* Fourth Edition (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2010), 120.

The rapid collapse of the Díaz dictatorship helped to convince the Wilson administration that a dictator in the Díaz mold was not the answer to revolutionary troubles in Mexico. One convert to this thinking was U.S. Secretary of State, William Jennings Bryan. Bryan, who had travelled to Mexico three times during the Díaz dictatorship and met Díaz on several occasions, had earlier been complimentary of Díaz and the progress he had brought in Mexico.<sup>7</sup> In his memoirs, Bryan noted that much of his first months as Secretary of State were occupied by entreaties from Americans with business interests in Mexico who sought U.S. recognition of the Huerta regime. Bryan stated that these businessmen did not care about Huerta or the way he had come to office. They simply insisted that “a strong man” was necessary to preserve order in Mexico, and he was the “only strong man in sight.” American business interests believed that with U.S. recognition, Huerta would get loans and through this would be able to defeat revolutionaries led by Venustiano Carranza, Emiliano Zapata, and Pancho Villa.<sup>8</sup> Bryan wrote that these entreaties were so similar that he adopted a “stereotyped reply.” He asked his petitioners whether they believed that Díaz was the kind of man “needed to preserve order” in Mexico, to which they replied yes, and then he asked if they thought Huerta would imitate the same methods of Díaz and reestablish his regime, to which they also replied yes. Bryan would then respond that “If, after thirty years of experiment with his policy, Díaz with worldwide prestige and splendid credit, could not maintain himself

---

<sup>7</sup> See discussion in Chapter 5, pages 300-301. See also Edward S. Kaplan, *U.S. Imperialism in Latin America: Bryan's Challenges and Contributions, 1900-1920* (Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1998), 89.

<sup>8</sup> William Jennings Bryan, *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan* (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston, Co., 1925), 357-358.

against Madero but saw his government crushed like an eggshell, what reason have you to believe that Huerta, not only without the prestige and credit, but guilty of high treason, and blamed for the death of Madero, will be able to succeed where Díaz had failed?” Bryan reported that his petitioners had no answer to this question.<sup>9</sup> Bryan, like Wilson, called on Huerta to give up power, stating that Mexicans would never accept his dictatorial rule.<sup>10</sup>

Yet in his mission to “help other peoples become democratic and orderly,” Wilson became the “greatest military interventionist’ in U.S. history.<sup>11</sup> Wilson distinguished between military interventions for “selfish gain,” which he described as immoral, and interventions taken to strengthen democracy, which in his view were not “interventions in the traditional imperialistic sense.”<sup>12</sup> In the case of Mexico, Wilson sent U.S. forces twice to the country in order to affect the course of its revolution. In April 1914 Wilson ordered U.S. Marines to occupy the port city of Veracruz, in response to detention of American sailors by soldiers loyal to Huerta, but with the goal of undermining, if not directly overthrowing the Huerta government. The U.S. occupation did contribute to Huerta’s downfall in July 1914.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 358.

<sup>10</sup> Kaplan, *U.S. Imperialism in Latin America*, 95.

<sup>11</sup> La Feber, *The American Age*, 277. Wilson also ordered interventions in Russia and to a “half-dozen” Latin American countries.

<sup>12</sup> Mark Benbow, *Leading Them to the Promised Land: Woodrow Wilson, Covenant Theology, and the Mexican Revolution, 1913-1915* (Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2010), xii.

<sup>13</sup> MacLachlan and Beezley, *El Gran Pueblo*, 236-237.

Less than two years later, Wilson began another intervention in response to Pancho Villa's raid on Columbus, New Mexico in March 1916. Resisting pressure for a large-scale invasion, particularly from U.S. businesses interests, Wilson adopted a "middle course" in the form of a punitive expedition intended to capture Villa and prevent further raids.<sup>14</sup> While Pershing's forces were initially successful in dispersing his bands, they had less luck finding Villa. Despite advice from military leaders to withdraw the expedition, Wilson attempted to use the continued presence of the expedition as a way to get concessions from the Mexican government and ultimately control the course of the revolution in accordance to the principles of liberal capitalism.<sup>15</sup> The Wilson Administration sought to pressure the Mexican government to accept conditions similar to the Platt Amendment of 1903, which had turned Cuba into a U.S. protectorate, as a condition for the army's departure.<sup>16</sup> In the end Mexican intransigence to these conditions, as well as the deepening U.S. involvement in World War I, prompted Wilson to withdraw the troops from Mexico without his conditions met. This allowed Mexicans to determine the outcome of the Revolution.

At the same time the destruction and bloodshed of the Mexican Revolution (1910-1920), which resulted in an estimated 1.5 million deaths, about ten percent of the

---

<sup>14</sup> Mark T. Gilderhus, *Diplomacy and Revolution: U.S.-Mexican Relations Under Wilson and Carranza* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1977), 35-37.

<sup>15</sup> Gilderhus, *Diplomacy and Revolution*, 52; Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 577-578; Linda Hall and Don M. Coerver, *Revolution on the Border; The United States and Mexico, 1910-1920* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988), 76; P. Edward Haley, *Revolution and Intervention: The Diplomacy of Taft and Wilson with Mexico, 1910-1917* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1970), 198.

<sup>16</sup> Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 578-579.

population, caused formerly optimistic Americans to become disillusioned with the ability of Mexicans to become rapidly Americanized.<sup>17</sup> One historian has noted that the passion of the Progressive Era to Americanize Latin America, through the “wholesale transfer of U.S. institutions, ideals and values,” ended by 1920, and would lay dormant for several decades.<sup>18</sup> This succession of hope that Mexico would embrace U.S. models, followed by disillusionment when Mexico did not live up to U.S. expectations, harkened back to earlier U.S. cycles, particularly evident during the Wars of the Reform and French Intervention in the mid-nineteenth century.

#### U.S. Cold War Policy toward Latin America

The U.S. experience with Porfirian Mexico in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century powerfully shaped U.S. policy toward Latin America during the Cold War, particularly its support for right-wing dictatorships. In the aftermath of U.S. failures to Americanize Latin Americans during the Progressive Era, U.S. policymakers became convinced that Latin Americans were fundamentally different from Americans. This belief led to an approach similar to U.S. policies prevalent during the Porfiriato. U.S. administrations after Wilson shared little reluctance to ally with and support right-wing dictatorships when they believed it served the interests of the United States. Beginning in the 1920s, then, American policymakers “developed and institutionalized the logic,

---

<sup>17</sup> Park, *Latin American Underdevelopment*, 97-98.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 99, 128.

rationale, and ideological justification for U.S. support for right-wing dictatorships that have influenced U.S. policy ever since.”<sup>19</sup>

While U.S. officials still frequently used the discourse of democracy, their support for right-wing dictatorships violated the stated ideals of the United States. Similar to U.S. policy during the Díaz dictatorship, the United States supported regimes that could maintain stability and provide protection for U.S. investments.<sup>20</sup> As with Mexico in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, American leaders were concerned with “order,” which during the Cold War included not only internal order within these countries but a preservation of the international order by the United States.<sup>21</sup> Like U.S. political leaders and many U.S. analysts during the Porfiriato, American policymakers would be skeptical of the ability of Latin American countries to institute democracies, and believed that strong dictators would be the “necessary antidote for political and social disorder,” thereby helping their countries achieve modernization and development.<sup>22</sup>

These trends would become particularly important during the Cold War, when support for dictatorships was linked with U.S. attempts to “modernize” Latin America and other regions of the Third World. In the wake of the Second World War, Americans expressed a renewed confidence in their ability to transform other peoples, which

---

<sup>19</sup> David F. Schmitz, *Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States & Right-Wing Dictatorships* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 4; David F. Schmitz, *The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1.

<sup>20</sup> Schmitz, *Thank God They're on Our Side*, 6.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

reaffirmed the long-held idea that the United States had a special mission to the world.<sup>23</sup> American policymakers, in cooperation with academic scholars, were confident that the U.S. would be able to promote democracy, create economic growth and prevent the spread of communism, while “dramatically improving the lives of millions of people in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America.”<sup>24</sup>

Reminiscent of the promotional campaigns of the Díaz administration, the “concept of modernization” provided U.S.-supported dictatorships with a “powerful narrative” that they used to defend their legitimacy, receive external support and “crush their opponents.”<sup>25</sup> Contrary to their stated goals of democracy promotion, U.S. policymakers aligned with authoritarian regimes, thereby abandoning any commitment to political liberalization. In cases such as Guatemala, South Vietnam and Iran the United States even supported dictatorships that “devastated their own populations in the name of development.”<sup>26</sup>

During the Cold War U.S. policymakers accepted pro-U.S., anticommunist dictators as the “most reliable defense” against communism. U.S. leaders believed such dictators provided stability and a climate favorable for foreign investment and economic development.<sup>27</sup> When leftist political leaders and revolutionaries in the Third World

---

<sup>23</sup> Michael E. Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2011), 4, 12.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Park, *Latin American Underdevelopment*, 176.



challenged the U.S. vision of modernization, and social and economic inequality in their countries, American leaders used counterinsurgency tactics and covert operations, which became part of the “American mission of modernization.”<sup>28</sup>

The Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson administrations actively destabilized constitutional governments in Latin America, which were replaced by military dictatorships supported by the U.S. government. President Nixon and his Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, went further than their predecessors, ridiculing the idea that Latin Americans “could build orderly societies based on democratic values,” thereby justifying their support for military dictatorships as being in the best interests of Latin Americans.<sup>29</sup> This included the destabilization of the democratically elected Allende government in Chile, which was replaced by a repressive military regime supported by the United States.<sup>30</sup>

In the late 1970s the political scientist Jeane Kirkpatrick would utilize arguments remarkably similar to U.S. support for the Díaz regime in a series of articles which would form the intellectual framework for the Reagan administration’s Central American policy.<sup>31</sup> In what became known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, she justified support for

---

<sup>28</sup> Thomas F. O’Brien, *Making the Americas: The United States and Latin America from the Age of revolution to the Era of Globalization* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), 210.

<sup>29</sup> Stephen G. Rabe, *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 114, 119, 143.

<sup>30</sup> O’Brien, *Making the Americas*, 242.

<sup>31</sup> Greg Grandin, *Empire’s Workshop: Latin America, the United States and the Rise of the New Imperialism* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006), 73; Virginia

authoritarian regimes by rejecting the notion that it was possible to “democratize governments, anytime, anywhere, under any circumstances.” Echoing U.S. sentiments during the Porfiriato, Kirkpatrick argued that “decades, if not centuries are normally required for people to acquire the necessary disciplines and habits” in order to be prepared for democratic government.<sup>32</sup> Until this happened, Kirkpatrick suggested, it was important for the United States to support authoritarian governments, which might allow slow gradual reforms that could one day lead to democracy.<sup>33</sup> As a member of Reagan’s foreign policy team, Kirkpatrick urged him to support the El Salvadoran military’s “efforts to impose order through repression, even if it meant the use of death squads.”<sup>34</sup>

U.S. policy had devastating effects for Central Americans. During Reagan’s two terms U.S.-supported forces in Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua killed over 300,000 people, and “tortured hundreds of thousands, and drove millions into exile.”<sup>35</sup> U.S. policy during the Cold War would have tragic results as “authoritarian policies of modernization empowered governments that destroyed democratic institutions and

---

Garrard-Burnett, *Terror in the Land of the Holy Spirit: Guatemala under General Efraín Rios Montt, 1982-1983* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 146.

<sup>32</sup> Jeane Kirkpatrick, “Dictatorships and Double Standards,” *Commentary* (November 1979), 37-38. See also “U.S. Security & Latin America,” *Commentary* (January 1981), 29-40.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>34</sup> Grandin, *Empire’s Workshop*, 73. Kirkpatrick served as Reagan’s ambassador to the United Nations during his first term.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 71.

contributed to cultures of corruption and rampant violence deepening problems that endured in many societies long after the Cold War ended.”<sup>36</sup>

This policy of supporting authoritarian regimes and modernization, coupled with a simultaneous disregard for democracy and human rights had its roots in U.S. relations with the Díaz dictatorship during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The U.S. experiment in Mexico, as during the Cold War, did allow the United States to temporarily secure its geopolitical and economic interests. Yet, ultimately Americans failed in their larger goal in transforming Latin America, because they did not learn important lessons from their Mexican experiment. “Stability,” “progress,” and modernization are hollow and unsustainable, if large sectors of the population are denied participation in the political system and the benefits of economic growth and if this attempted transformation is not accompanied by respect for human rights.

---

<sup>36</sup> Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution*, 153.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Primary Sources***Unpublished Manuscript Collections and Microfilms***Benson Latin American Collection*, The University of Texas at Austin

José Yves Limantour Papers

Matías Romero Papers (Microfilm)

Ignacio L. Vallarta Papers

*Bentley Historical Library*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Henry Brooks Baker Papers

James A. LeRoy Papers

John Harvey Kellogg Papers

McCreery-Fenton Family Papers

Henry Romaine Pattengill Papers

John C. Patterson Papers

Andrew W. Tanner Photographs

Wright Family Papers

*Iowa State Historical Society*, Iowa City, Iowa

William Larrabee Papers

*Kansas Historical Society*, Topeka

George Tobey Anthony Misc. Papers

Atchison, Topeka &amp; Santa Fe Railway Company Records

Chicago, Rock Island &amp; Pacific Railway Records

Richard Josiah Hinton Papers

Lewis Kingman Papers

*Lenoard H. Axe Library*, Pittsburgh State University, Pittsburgh Kansas

Eugene Victor Debs Collection

J.A. Wayland Collection

*Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division*

Jane Adams Papers (microfilm)

Chester A. Arthur Papers (microfilm)

Thomas F. Bayard Papers

James G. Blaine Papers (microfilm)

William Jennings Bryan Papers

Grover Cleveland Papers (microfilm)

William M. Evarts Papers

Hamilton Fish Papers

John W. Foster Papers

James Garfield Papers (microfilm)

Ulysses S. Grant Papers (microfilm)

Benjamin Harrison Papers (microfilm)

Philander C. Knox Papers

La Follette Family Papers

William McKinley Papers (microfilm)

Theodore Roosevelt Papers (microfilm)

Elihu Root Papers

William Henry Seward Papers

William Howard Taft Papers (microfilm)

*Missouri History Museum, St Louis*

August H. Boette Biographical Sketch

Clubs and Societies Collection

Commercial Club of St Louis Records

Porfirio Diaz Papers

James Eads Papers

David Rowland Francis Papers

Louisiana Purchase Exposition: St Louis World's Fair Albums

McEwen Family Papers

Necrology Scrapbooks

James Reardon Papers

Journal and Diaries Collection

L.U. Reavis Collection

Thomas C. Reynolds Papers

St Louis Business Collection

St Louis Club Minute Books

St Louis History Collection

St Louis Merchants Exchange Papers

Uhri Family Collection

U.S., Foreign and Genre Stenographs

*Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City*

Frederick Barde Collection

Jessie J. McDermott Collection

*Rutherford B. Hayes Presidential Library*, Fremont Ohio

Rutherford B Hayes Papers

*Southern Methodist University*, Dallas, Texas Special Collections, DeGolyer Library

Letters of Governor Sheldon Written to the Santa Fe Mexican While on a Visit to  
Mexico City

U.S. Tourism to Mexico Collections

*Texas State Library*, Austin, Texas

Governor Richard Coke Papers

Governor Richard B. Hubbard Papers

Governor Thomas Mitchell Campbell Papers

Governor John Ireland Papers

Texas Secretary of State Executive Record Books

*University of Kansas*, Lawrence

Newspaper Clippings: Kansans in Mexico, Clifford C. Baker Collection, Kansas  
Collection, Kenneth Spencer Research Library

*University of Missouri at St Louis*

Mercantile Library Reading Room

*University of Oklahoma*, Bizzell Memorial Library

Microfilm Room

*U.S. Department of Labor*, Washington D.C.

Wirtz Labor Library, Microfilm Collection

*U.S. National Archives*, College Park, MD

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Acapulco*



*Despatches from United States Consuls in Aguascalientes*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Camargo*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Campeche*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Chihuahua*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Ciudad Juarez*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Durango*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Ensenada*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Guaymas*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Guerrero*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Hermosillo*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Jalapa Enríquez*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in La Paz*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Manzanillo*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Matamoros*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Merida*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Mexico City*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Mier*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Minatitlan*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Monterrey*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Nogales*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Nuevo Laredo*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Oaxaca*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Piedras Negras*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Saltillo*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in San Blas*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in San Luis Potosi*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Tabasco*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Tampico*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Tehuantepec*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Tuxpan*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Veracruz*

*Despatches from United States Consuls in Zacatecas*

*Despatches from United States Ministers to Mexico*

*Diplomatic Despatches from the United States Legation in Mexico*

*Diplomatic Instructions of the United States Legation, Mexico*

*Domestic Letters of the Department of State*

*Miscellaneous Letters of the Department of State*

*Notes from the Foreign Mexican Legation in the United States*

*Notes to Foreign Legation in the United States from the Department of State*

*Notes to Foreign Consuls in the United States from the Department of State*

*Notes to the Mexican Legation in the United States*

*Records of the Department of State, Decimal File, 1910-1963*

*Records of the Department of State, Numerical Files, 1906-1910*

*Records of the Department of State Relating to the Internal Affairs of Mexico, 1910-1929*

Western History Collection, University of Oklahoma

Edward Everett Dale Collection

Charles W. Hamilton Papers

Arthur Irving Ortenburger Papers

*Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, Wisconsin*

Victor Berger Papers (Microfilm)

Edward S. Bragg Papers

Morris Hillquit Papers (Microfilm)

Robert M. LaFollette Papers

Socialist Labor Party Archives

Socialist Labor Party Papers (Microfilm)

Socialist Party of the United States Records

Socialist Party of the United States Records (Microfilm)

### *Newspapers*

*Aberdeen American*

*Albany Evening Journal*

*Albuquerque Journal*

*The Allen County Democrat*

*Anaconda Standard*

*The Atchison Daily Globe*

*The Athens Messenger*

*The Atlanta Daily Constitution*

*The Atlanta Daily Sun*

*Auburn Morning News*

*Baltimore Sun*

*The Bangor Daily Whig and Courier*

*The Barre Gazette*

*Bellingham Herald*

*Bismarck Daily Tribune*

*Boston Daily Advertiser*

*Boston Daily Globe*

*Boston Evening Journal*

*Boston Investigator*

*Boulder County Courier*

*Brooklyn Eagle*

*Burlington Hawk Eye*

*Butte Daily Miner*

*The Cambridge City Tribune*

*The Carthage Republican and the Northern New Yorker*

*The Cedar Rapids Times*

*Cedar Rapids Tribune*

*Centralia Sentinel*

*The Charleston Courier*

*The Charlotte Daily Observer*

*Chester Daily Times*

*Chicago Daily Tribune*

*Christian Science Monitor*

*Cincinnati Commercial*  
*Cincinnati Daily Gazette*  
*The Cincinnati Enquirer*  
*Cleveland Plain Dealer*  
*The Coconino Sun*  
*Colorado Springs Gazette*  
*Colorado Weekly Chieftain*  
*Columbus Enquirer- Sun*  
*Coshocton Age*  
*Daily Alta California*  
*Daily Arkansas Gazette*  
*Daily Central City Register*  
*The Daily Cleveland Herald*  
*The Daily Commonweal*  
*Daily Evening Bulletin*  
*Daily Free Press*  
*Daily Gazette*  
*Daily Globe*  
*Daily Iowa State Register*  
*Daily Kennebec Journal*  
*The Daily Miners' Register*  
*Daily Missouri Republican*  
*Daily National Intelligencer*

*Daily Nevada State Journal*

*The Daily New Mexican*

*The Daily News and Herald*

*The Daily Northwestern*

*The Daily Oregonian*

*The Daily Palladium*

*The Daily Patriot*

*The Daily Picayune*

*The Daily Republican*

*Daily Trenton State Gazette*

*Dallas Morning News*

*Davenport Gazette*

*Decatur Review*

*Decatur Weekly Republican*

*The Denton Journal*

*Denver Daily News*

*Denver Daily Tribune*

*The Denver Evening Post*

*The Des Moines Capital*

*The Des Moines News*

*The Dubuque Herald*

*The Duluth News-Tribune*

*Elyria Constitution*

*Elyria Republic*

*Emporia Daily Gazette*

*The Evening Auburnian*

*The Evening Independent*

*The Evening Observer*

*The Franklin Gazette*

*Freedom's Champion*

*The Fort Wayne Daily Gazette*

*The Fort Wayne Daily News*

*The Fort Wayne Sentinel*

*The Fort Worth Journal Gazette*

*The Fort Worth Telegram*

*The Fresno Republican*

*The Galveston News*

*Gazette- Telegraph*

*Georgia Weekly Telegraph and Georgia Journal & Messenger*

*The Glendive Times*

*Grand Forks Daily Herald*

*Hagerstown Mail*

*Hamilton Evening Democrat*

*Hancock Herald*

*Hartford Daily Courant*

*The Hawaiian Gazette*

*The Helena Independent*

*The Hornellsville Tribune*

*Hillsdale Standard*

*The Hinds County Gazette*

*Houston Daily Post*

*The Huntington Journal*

*The Idaho Avalanche*

*Independent Statesman*

*The Indiana Democrat*

*The Indiana Progress*

*Inter Ocean*

*Iowa State Reporter: Waterloo*

*Jackson Sentinel*

*Jackson Citizen*

*The Janesville Gazette*

*Kalamazoo Gazette*

*The Kansas City Star*

*The La Crosse Tribune*

*The Lexington Herald*

*Logansport Daily Journal*

*Logansport Daily Reporter*

*The Long Island Traveler*

*Los Angeles Times*



*Louisiana Democrat*  
*Louisville Courier Journal*  
*Lowell Daily Citizen*  
*The Ohio Democrat*  
*The Madison County Weekly Courier*  
*The Marshfield Times*  
*The Maysville Republican*  
*Memphis Commercial Appeal*  
*Mesilla News*  
*The Mexican Herald*  
*Milwaukee Daily Sentinel*  
*Milwaukee Daily News*  
*The Milwaukee Journal*  
*The Minneapolis Journal*  
*M'Kean Miner*  
*Montgomery Advertiser*  
*The Morning Oregonian*  
*Morning Republican*  
*The National Tribune*  
*Newark Advocate*  
*New Brunswick Daily Times*  
*New Hampshire Sentinel*  
*The New Orleans Daily Picayune*

*Newport Daily News*  
*The New York Herald*  
*New York Sun*  
*New York Times*  
*New York Tribune*  
*North American and U.S. Gazette*  
*Northern Vindicator*  
*The Ogdensburg Advance*  
*Ohio Farmer*  
*Olympia Record*  
*Omaha World Herald*  
*The Oshkosh Daily Northwestern*  
*Oswego Daily Times*  
*The Palladium*  
*The Palo Alto Pilot*  
*Petersburg Index-Appeal*  
*Philadelphia Inquirer*  
*The Plaindealer*  
*Plattsburg Sentinel*  
*The Portsmouth Times*  
*The Post-Standard*  
*Potsdam Courier Freeman*  
*The Racine Argus*

*Reno Evening Gazette*

*The Republican Sentinel*

*The Richwood Gazette*

*Rock County Recorder Weekly*

*Rocky Mountain News*

*The Rolla New Era*

*Roman Citizen*

*Salt Lake Daily Telegraph*

*The Salt Lake Daily Tribune*

*Sandusky Commercial Register*

*Sandusky Daily Register*

*The San Francisco Call*

*San Francisco Chronicle*

*The San Jose Evening News*

*Santa Fe New Mexican*

*Sedalia Daily Democrat*

*Semi-Weekly Wisconsin*

*Spirit Lake Beacon*

*Springfield Republican*

*St Alban's Daily Messenger*

*St Louis Advocate*

*St Louis Globe-Democrat*

*St Louis Republic*

*Star and Sentinel*

*The State*

*The Syracuse Morning Standard*

*The Tacoma Times*

*Thirty-Four*

*The Tipton Daily Tribune*

*Titusville Herald*

*Traveler Herald*

*Trenton Evening Times*

*Trenton State Gazette*

*The Two Republics*

*Union and Advertiser*

*Union County Journal*

*Unity Pulpit*

*Utica Weekly Herald*

*Vermont Watchman and Journal*

*Wall Street Journal*

*Washington Post*

*The Washington Times*

*The Waterloo Courier*

*The Waukesha Freeman*

*The Weekly Arizona Miner*

*Weekly Eastern Argus*

*Weekly Nevada State Journal*

*Weekly State Spirit and Dakota Huronite*

*Weekly Wisconsin Patriot*

*Wheeling Daily Register*

*Wooster Republican*

*Worth County Index*

### ***Journals***

*Advocate of Peace*

*The Albion, A Journal of News, Politics, and Literature*

*The American Monthly Review of Reviews*

*The Atlantic Monthly*

*The American Farmer*

*The American Magazine*

*The American Socialist*

*Ballou's Monthly Magazine*

*Banker's Magazine*

*Boletín de la Asociación Financiera Internacional*

*The Booklover's Magazine*

*Bostonia*

*Bradstreet's*

*Bulletin of the Pan-American Union*

*The Business Man's Magazine*

*Californian*

*California Illustrated Magazine*  
*The Century Magazine*  
*The Chautauquan*  
*Circular*  
*Collier's: The National Weekly*  
*Colman's Rural World*  
*Commercial and Financial Chronicle*  
*Cosmopolitan*  
*Current Literature*  
*DeBow's Review*  
*Dun's Review*  
*Eclectic Magazine of Foreign Literature*  
*The Editorial Review*  
*Ellingwood's Therapist*  
*The Engineering Magazine*  
*Every Where*  
*Everybody's Magazine*  
*Farmer's Cabinet*  
*Flag of Our Union*  
*Forum*  
*Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*  
*Forest and Stream*  
*The Friend of Progress*

*The Galaxy: A Magazine of Entertaining Reading*  
*Goodwin's Weekly*  
*Graham's Magazine*  
*The Great Round World*  
*Harper's Bazaar*  
*Harper's New Monthly Magazine*  
*Harper's Weekly*  
*The Harvard Monthly*  
*The Illustrated American*  
*The International Review*  
*The Iowa Engineer*  
*The Knickerbocker; or New York Monthly Magazine*  
*The Ladies Repository*  
*La Follette's Weekly Magazine*  
*The Land of Sunshine: The Magazine of California and the West*  
*The Land We Love*  
*Leslie's Monthly Magazine*  
*Life Magazine*  
*Lippincott's Magazine of Popular Literature and Science*  
*Literary Digest*  
*The Literary World*  
*Littell's Living Age*  
*Locomotive Engineering*

*Macmillan's Magazine*

*Magazine of Western History*

*Massachusetts Ploughman and New England Journal of Agriculture*

*McClure's Magazine*

*The Merchant's Magazine and Commercial Review*

*Metropolitan Magazine*

*The Mexican Financier*

*The Mexican Investor*

*Michigan Farmer*

*Mining and Scientific Press*

*Mining Reporter*

*The Mining World*

*Modern Mexico*

*Moody's Monthly Magazine*

*Munsey's Magazine*

*The Nation*

*The National Geographic Magazine*

*The Nassau Literary Magazine*

*National Era*

*The National Magazine*

*National Repository*

*The New Bohemian*

*The New Englander*



*The North American Review*

*The Old Guard*

*Oregon Teacher's Monthly*

*The Guardian*

*Outing and Wheelman*

*The Outlook*

*Overland Monthly and Out West Magazine*

*Potter's American Monthly*

*Prairie Farmer*

*The Phrenological Journal*

*The Public*

*Railway Intelligence*

*Railroad Trainmen's Journal*

*The Reform Advocate*

*The Republic: A Monthly Magazine, Devoted to the Dissemination of Political Information*

*The Republican Magazine*

*Reviews of Reviews*

*The Round Table: A Saturday Review of Politics, Finance, Literature, Society*

*Russell's Magazine*

*Saturday Evening Post*

*Scientific American*

*Scott's Monthly Magazine*

*The Sewanee Review*

*Southern Cultivator*

*The Southern Immigrant*

*The Southern Review*

*Success*

*Sunset Magazine*

*Town and Country*

*Tropical and Subtropical America*

*Twentieth Century Magazine*

*The United States Democratic Review*

*The United States Service Magazine*

*The Virginias*

*The World To-Day*

*World's Work*

*The Youth's Companion*

***Labor, Union, Socialist and Leftist Publications***

*The Agitator*

*Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Journal*

*The American Federationist*

*Appeal to Reason*

*The Blacksmiths' Journal*

*The Brotherhood Journal*

*The Carpenter*

*Chicago Daily Socialist*

*The Christian Socialist*

*The Cleveland Citizen*

*The Coming Nation*

*The Demonstrator*

*El Paso Labor Advocate*

*The Fort Worth Union Banner*

*Industrial Union Bulletin*

*Industrial Worker*

*International Socialist Review*

*International Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' Union Journal*

*The International Woodworker*

*Iron City Trades Journal*

*Journal of the Knights of Labor*

*The Labor Leader*

*Los Angeles Citizen*

*The Masses*

*Michigan Union Advocate*

*Miners' Magazine*

*Mother Earth*

*Nashville Labor Advocate*

*New York Evening Call*

*Oakland World*

*The Oklahoma Labor Unit*

*The Painter and Decorator*

*The People's Paper*

*Portland Labor Press*

*Plumbers', Gas and Steam Fitters' Journal*

*The Progressive Woman*

*The Prolocutor*

*Revolt*

*Rochester Labor Journal*

*San Diego Labor Leader*

*San Francisco Labor Clarion*

*San Francisco Organized Labor*

*Seattle Union Record*

*Social-Democratic Herald*

*The Socialist*

*Socialist Party Official Bulletin*

*The Socialist Woman*

*Solidarity*

*St Louis Labor*

*Toledo Union*

*Trenton Trades Union Advocate*

*Vanguard*

*Weekly People*

*Wheeling Majority*

*Wilshire's Magazine*

*Young Socialists' Magazine*

***Religious Periodicals***

*America*

*American Church Review*

*The American Protestant*

*Baptist Home Missionary Monthly*

*Baptist Missionary Magazine*

*The Catholic World: A Monthly Magazine of General Literature and Science*

*Christian Advocate*

*Christian Observer*

*The Christian Union*

*The Christian Recorder*

*The Christian World: The American Foreign and Christian Union*

*Church Bells*

*The Churchman*

*The Congregationalist*

*The Domestic Missionary Chronicle*

*Friend's Intelligencer*

*Friend's Review*

*Foreign Missionary Chronicle*

*The Home Missionary*

*Gospel in All Lands*

*The Independent*

*Life and Light for Women*

*The Methodist Quarterly Review*

*The Methodist Review*

*The Methodist Visitor*

*The Missionary Herald: Containing the Proceedings of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions*

*The Missionary: A Monthly Journal, Issued in Behalf of the Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*

*The Missionary Magazine*

*The Missionary Review of the World*

*New York Evangelist*

*New York Observer and Chronicle*

*The Preacher and Homiletic Monthly*

*Reformed Church Messenger*

*The Southern Baptist Missionary Journal*

*Southwestern Christian Advocate*

*The Spirit of Missions: Foreign Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church*

*The United States Catholic Magazine and Monthly Review*

*Western Christian Advocate*

*Zion's Herald*

### **Published Primary Sources**

*Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Church Missionary Society.* New York: American Church Missionary Society, 1873.

*The 19<sup>th</sup> Century: A Review of Progress.* London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.

*81<sup>st</sup> Annual Report of the Religious Tract Society*

Abbott, Gorham D. *Mexico and the United States: Their Mutual Relations and Common Interests.* New York: G. P. Putnam and Son, 1869.

*The Age of Porfirio Diaz: Selected Readings,* edited by Carlos B. Gil. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977.

“Address by Hon. Joseph G. Cannon,” *The Union League of Philadelphia, 1906.* Philadelphia: Union League of Philadelphia, 1906.

“An Address to the People of the United States and Particularly to the People of the States Which Adhere to the Federal Government.” In *The American Party Battle: Election Campaign Pamphlets 1828-1876: Volume 2, 1854-1876,* edited by Joel H. Silbey, 153-185. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Aguas, Manuel. *Letter from Manuel Aguas.* New York: T. Whittaker Publisher and Bookseller, 1874.

*Annual Report of the American Board of the Commissioners for Foreign Missions 1848-1911.*

*Annual Report on the Commercial Relations Between the United States and Foreign Nations 1870-1911.*

*Annual Statement of the Trade and Commerce of St Louis for the Year 1883 Reported to the Merchants' Exchange.* St Louis: R.P. Studley, 1884.

*Annual Statement of the Trade and Commerce of St Louis for the Year 1894 Reported to the Merchants' Exchange of St Louis.* St Louis: Press of R. P. Studley & Co., 1895.

*Appleton's Annual Cyclopeda and Register of Important Events of the Year 1878.* New Series Volume III. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1885.

*Archivo del General Porfirio Diaz: Memorias y Documentos.* México: Instituto de Historia de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1947-1961. Volumes 1-30.

- Arnold, Channing and Frederick J. Tabor Frost, *The American Egypt: A Record of Travel in Yucatan*. New York: Doubleday Page & Co., 1909.
- Arguments in Favor of the Monroe Doctrine*. New Orleans: Era Book and Job Office, 1864.
- Atkinson, Edward. *The Railroads of the United States: A Potent Factor in the Politics of that Country and of Great Britain*. Boston: A. Williams and Company, 1881.
- Bacon, Robert, and James Brown Scott, eds. *Latin America and the United States: Addresses by Elihu Root*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917.
- Badeau, Adam. *Grant in Peace From Appomattox to Mount McGregor. A Personal Memoir*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1971. (1887 reprint).
- Baine, A.C. *An Essay on the Harmonious Relations between Divine Faith and Natural Reason*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1861.
- Baker, Ray Stannard. *American Chronicle: The Autobiography of Ray Stannard Baker*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945.
- Ballou, Martin. *Aztec Land*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1890.
- Baptist Home Missions in North America*. New York: Baptist Home Mission Rooms, 1883.
- Barnum, Samuel W. *Romanism as it is: An Exposition of the Roman Catholic System, for the American People...* Hartford, CN: Connecticut Publishing Company, 1882.
- Beach, Harlan P. *A Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions Volume 1: Geography*. New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1901.
- Bianchi, Alberto G. *Los Estados Unidos, Descripciones de Viaje*. Mexico: N. Lugo Vina, 1887.
- Birkhaeuser, J.A. *History of the Church, From the First Establishment to our Own Times, Sixth Edition*. New York and Cincinnati: F.R. Pustet, 1898.
- Bishop, William Henry. *Old Mexico and Her Lost Provinces: A Journey in Mexico, Southern California and Arizona by Way of Cuba*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883.
- Blake, Mary Elizabeth, and Margaret F. Sullivan, *Mexico: Picturesque, Political, Progressive*. Boston: Lee and Shepard Publishers, 1888.



- Boynton, C.B. *The Four Great Powers: England, France, Russia and America: Their Policy, Resources, and Probable Future*. Cincinnati: C.F. Vest & Co., 1866.
- Brinkerhoff, General Roeliff. *Recollections of a Lifetime*. Cincinnati: The Robert Clarke Company, 1900.
- British and Foreign State Papers, 1875-1911*
- Brown, Hubert W. *Latin America: The Pagans The Papists The Patriots The Protestants and the Present Problem*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1901.
- Bryan, William Jennings. *The Memoirs of William Jennings Bryan*. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston, Co., 1925.
- . *Under Other Flags: Travels, Lectures, Speeches*. Lincoln, NE: The Woodruff-Collins Printing, Co., 1904.
- Bryce, James. *The American Commonwealth Volume II*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1910.
- Bufe, Chaz and Mitchell Cowen Verter, eds. *Dreams of Freedom: A Ricardo Flores Magón Reader*. Edinburgh: AK Press, 2005.
- Burges, William H. "A Comparative Study of the Constitutions of the United States of Mexico and the United States of America," *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Session of the Texas Bar Association*. Austin Texas Bar Association, 1905. 193-205.
- Butler, John Wesley. *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Mexico: Personal Reminiscences, Present Conditions and Future Outlook*. New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern, 1918.
- Butler, John Wesley, *Sketches of Mexico*. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis, 1894.
- Butler, William. *Mexico in Transition from the Power of Political Romanism to Civil and Religious Liberty*. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1892.
- Butterfield, Carlos, *United States and Mexico: Commerce, Trade, and Postal Facilities Between the Two Countries. Statistics of Mexico*. New York: JAH Hasbrouck & Co., 1861.
- Byam, W.W. *A Sketch of the State of Chiapas*. Los Angeles: Geo. Rice & Sons, 1897.
- The Campaign Textbook of the Democratic Party for the Presidential Election of 1892*. New York: Democratic National Committee, 1892.

- Carlen, Claudia, ed. *The Papal Encyclopedia, 1740-1878*. Wilmington: McGrath Publishing Company, 1981.
- Carson, William English, *Mexico: Wonderland of the South*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1909.
- Church, George E. *Mexico. Its Revolutions: Are They Evidences of Retrogression or of Progress?* New York: Baker & Goodwin, 1866.
- A Citizen of California, *Mexico and the United States: An American View of the Mexican Question*. San Francisco: H.H. Bancroft and Company, 1866.
- Clark, William Newton. *A Study of Christian Missions*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900.
- Cloud, W.F. *The Heart of Mexico: Politics! Religion! War! Pain and Her Methods Overthrown*. Kansas City, MO: Hailman & Company Printers, 1898.
- Cluseret, General G. *Mexico and the Solidarity of Nations*. New York: Blackwell, 1866.
- Commercial Relations with Mexico*, House Miscellaneous Document, January 7, 1879, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Session No. 15. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1879.
- Congressional Record*. 1875-1911.
- Conkling, Howard. *Mexico and the Mexican's or, Notes of Travel in the Winter and Spring of 1883*. New York: Tantor Brothers, Merrill and Co., 1883.
- Constantine, J. Robert, ed. *Letters of Eugene Debs, Volume 1*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Cook, Joseph. *Transcendentalism with Preludes on Current Events*. Boston: James R. Osgood and Co, 1877.
- The Copper Handbook: A Manual of the Copper Industry of the World VI*. Houghton, MI: Horace J. Stevens, 1906.
- Correspondencia Diplomática Relativa A Las Invasiones Del Territorio Mexicano Por Fuerzas De Los Estados-Unidos De 1873 A 1877*. México: Imprenta de Ignacio Cumplido, 1878.
- Correspondencia Diplomática Cambiada Entre el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos y los de varias Potencias Extranjeras, Desde El 1 de Julio de 1878 de Junio de 1881* Tomo II. México: Tip. De Gonzalo a. Esteva, San Juan de Letrán Numero 6, 1882.

- Correspondence Respecting the Renewal of Diplomatic Relations with Mexico, 1880-1883.* London: British Foreign Office, 1884.
- Corthell, E. L. "The Tehuantepec Ship Railway," *Journal of the Franklin Institute* CXIX: 714 [Third Series] (June 1885): 457-489.
- Cox, Samuel S. *Union-disunion-reunion: Three Decades of Federal Legislation, 1855 to 1885.* San Francisco: Occidental Publishing Co, 1885.
- Creelman, James. *Diaz, Master of Mexico.* New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1911.
- Crichfield, George W. *American Supremacy: The Rise and Progress of the Latin American Republics and their Relations to the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, Volume 1.* New York: Brentano's, 1908.
- Crichfield, George W. *American Supremacy: The Rise and Progress of the Latin American Republics and their Relations to the United States under the Monroe Doctrine, Volume 2.* New York: Brentano's, 1908.
- Cuestión Americana: Negocios diplomáticos con los Estados Unidos; notas y documentos relativos.* Guadalajara: Banda, 1878.
- Curtis, William Eleroy. *Trade and Transportation between the United States and Latin America.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1889.
- Dale, James G. *Mexico and Our Mission.* Lebanon, PA: Sowers Printing Company, 1910.
- Davis Thomas B., and Amado Ricon Virulegio, eds. *Political Plans of Mexico.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
- de la Torre Villar, Ernesto, Moisés González Navarro and Stanley Ross, eds. *Historia Documental de México II.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México 1964.
- Democratic National Committee. *The Political Reformation of 1884.* New York: Democratic National Committee, 1884.
- Depredations on the Texas Frontier. Resolutions and Memorial of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Texas Asking the Attention of Congress to the Condition of Texas frontiers, and praying compensation for losses sustained by the People of Texas, by reason of the incursion of Indians and Mexicans, and reimbursement for sums of money expended by that State in defending the frontier.* House Miscellaneous Document No. 37, 44<sup>th</sup> Congress 1<sup>st</sup> Sess., January 12, 1876. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876.

- Draper, John William. *History of the American Civil War Volume II*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1868.
- . *History of the American Civil War Volume III*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1870.
- DuBose, John Witherspoon. *The Life and Times of William Loundes Yancey, A History of Political Parties in the United States, from 1834 to 1864: Especially as to the Origin of the Confederate States*. Birmingham, AL: Roberts & Son, 1892.
- Dunbar, Edward E. *The Mexican Papers* No. 1 (August 15, 1860)
- Dwight, Henry Otis *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society, Volume I*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- . *The Centennial History of the American Bible Society, Volume II*. New York: The Macmillan, Company, 1916.
- Dyer, Herman, Albert Zabriskie Gray, Manuel Aguas and Alfred Lee, *The Mexican Branch of the Church, Described by Eye Witnesses*. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1876.
- Estrada, Genaro. *Archivo Histórico Diplomático Mexicano: Un Siglo de Relaciones Internacionales de México (A Través de los Mensajes Presidenciales)*. México: Publicaciones de la Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 1935.
- Facts and Figures about Mexico and Her Great Railroad, the Mexican Central* Third Edition. Mexico City: The Mexican Central Railway Company Limited, 1900.
- Fairall, Herbert S. *The World's Industrial and Cotton Exposition, New Orleans, 1884-1885*. Iowa City, Iowa: Republican Publishing Co, 1885.
- Ferguson's Anecdotal Guide to Mexico*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfiger, 1876.
- Filsinger, Ernst B. *St Louis and Mexico with Special Reference to Latin-America in General*. St Louis: Latin American Club and Foreign Trade Association, 1907.
- Fitzgerrell, James Joseph. *Fitzgerrell's Guide to Tropical Mexico: The Health and Wealth of the Tropics*. St Louis: Perrier & Smith, 1905.
- Flandrau, Charles Macomb. *Viva Mexico!* New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1908.
- Flichtner, George F. *Some Facts about Mexico*. New York: No Publisher Listed, 1891.

Flint, Henry M. *Mexico under Maximilian*. Philadelphia: National Publishing Company, 1867.

Flower, Frank A. *Life of Matthew Hale Carpenter*. Madison, WI: David Atwood and Co, 1884.

*Foreign Relations of the United States, 1861-1911*

Fornaro, Carlo De. *Diaz, Czar of Mexico: An Arraignment*. New York: Carlo De Fornaro, 1909.

---. *A Modern Purgatory*. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1917.

Foster, John W. *Diplomatic Memoirs Volume I*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co, 1909.

*Fourteenth Annual Report of the American Church Missionary Society*. New York: American Church Missionary Society, 1873.

Furlong, Thomas. *Fifty Years a Detective*. St Louis: C.E. Barnett, 1912.

Gamboa, José M. *Leyes Constitucionales de México durante El Siglo XIX*. México: Oficina Tip. De la Secretaria De Fomento, 1901.

García Cubas, Antonio. *The Republic of Mexico in 1876*, translated by George F. Henderson. Mexico: "La Esperanza" Printing Office, 1876.

*General Laws of the State of Texas Passed at the Second Session of the Fourteenth Legislature*. Houston: A.C. Gray State Printing, 1875.

*A Geography and Atlas of Protestant Missions: Volume I, Geography*. New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1901.

Gibson, Charles, ed. *The Black Legend: Anti-Spanish Attitudes in the Old World and the New*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

Gompers, Samuel. *Seventy Years of Life and Labour: An Autobiography Volume II*. New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1925, 1967 Reprint.

Gooch, Fanny Chambers. *Face to Face with the Mexicans: The Domestic Life, Educational, Social and Business Ways, Statemanship and Literature, Legendary and General History of the Mexican People, As Seen and Studied by an American Woman During Seven Years of Intercourse with Them*. New York: Fords, Howard & Hubert, 1887.

- Goodwin, Thomas Shepherd. *The Natural History of Secession, or Despotism and Democracy as Necessary, Eternal, Exterminating War*. New York: John Bradburn, 1864.
- Gorsuch, Robert B. *The Mexican Southern Railway, to be Constructed Under a Charter from the Mexican Government, Through the States of Vera Cruz and Oaxaca*. New York: Hosford & Sons, 1881.
- Graham, A.A. *Mexico with Comparisons and Conclusions*. Topeka, KS: Crane and Co., 1907.
- Gray, Albert Zabriskie. *Mexico as it is, Being Notes of a Recent Tour in that Country with Some Practical Information for Travelers in the Direction, as also some study of the Church Question*. New York: E. P. Button & Co, 1878.
- Griffin, Solomon Buckley. *Mexico of To-Day*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1886.
- Hale, Susan. *Mexico*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1888.
- Halstead, M. *The War Claims of the South. The Southern Confederacy, with the Democratic Party as its Claim Agency, Demanding Indemnity for Conquest, and Threatening a Disputed Presidential Election*. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co, 1876.
- Hanke, Lewis, ed. *Latin America: A Historical Reader*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.
- Hanke, Lewis and Jane M. Rausch. *People and Issues in Latin American History*. New York and Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishing, Inc., 1990.
- Haven, Gilbert. *Our Next Door Neighbor: A Winter in Mexico*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1875.
- Haworth, Paul Leland. *The Hayes-Tilden Disputed Presidential Election of 1876*. Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company, 1906.
- Hawthorne, Julian. *History of Spanish America from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*. New York: Peter Fenelon, 1899.
- Headley, J.T. *Life and Travels of General Grant*. Philadelphia: Hubbard Bros., 1879.
- Hearings on H.J. Res. 201, Providing for a Joint Committee to Investigate Alleged Persecutions of Mexican Citizens by the Government of Mexico, Hearings Held Before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, United States, June 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 1910*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1910.

- Hofstadter, Richard, ed. *The Progressive Movement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Hurd, John C. *The Theory of Our National Existence as Shown by the Action of the Government of the United States since 1861*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1881.
- Irelan, John Robert. *The Republic or a History of the United States of America in the Administrations from the Monarchic Colonial Days to the Present Times Volume XVII*. Chicago: Fairbanks and Palmer Publishing Co, 1888.
- Johnson, Hannah More. *About Mexico, Past and Present*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1887.
- Jordan, David Starr. *The Question of the Philippines*. Palo Alto, CA: John J. Valentine, 1899.
- Joseph, Gilbert M., and Timothy J. Henderson, eds. *The Mexico Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Journal of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois*. Springfield: Weber & Co, State Printers, 1879.
- Journal of the Senate of the Thirty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois*. Springfield: Weber & Co, State Printers, 1879.
- Journal of the Senate of the Senate of Minnesota, Sitting as a High Court of Impeachment, for the Trial of Hon. E. St. Julien Cox, Judge of the Ninth Judicial District Volume III*. St Paul: Printing House O. G. Miller, 1882.
- King, James Marcus. *Facing the Twentieth Century: Our Country, Its Power and Peril*. New York: American Union League Society, 1899.
- Kingsley, Vine Wright. *French Intervention in America; or, a Review of La France, Le Mexique, Et Les Etats-Confederes*. New York: C.B. Richardson, 1863.
- Kirkham, Stanton Davis. *Mexican Trails: A Record of Travel in Mexico, 1904-1907, and a Glimpse at the Life of the Mexican Indian* (New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1909.
- Laws of the State of Illinois: Enacted by the Thirty-First General Assembly*. Springfield: Weber & Co, State Printers, 1879.
- Laws of the State of New York Passed at the One Hundred and Fourth Session of the Legislature Volume I*. Albany: Weed, Parsons and Company Printers, 1881.



- Leavitt, Joshua, *The Monroe Doctrine*. New York: Sinclair Tousey, 1863.
- Lester, C. Edwards. *The Mexican Republic: An Historic Study*. New York: The American News Company, 1878.
- “Letter from the Attorney-General,” Responding to the Inquiry of the House as to the Trial, Imprisonment, Etc., of Antonio I. Villareal and Others, House of Representatives Document No. 876, 61<sup>st</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Session.
- Letters and Messages of Rutherford B. Hayes, President of the United States, Together with Letter of Acceptance and Inaugural Address*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881.
- Levillain, Philippe, ed. *The Papacy: An Encyclopedia Volume 3* New York and London: Routledge, 2002.
- Lisec, Aaron M, ed. *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant Volume 29: October 1, 1878-September 30, 1880*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- , ed. *The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant Volume 30: October 1, 1880- December 31, 1882*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Logan, Walter S. “The Nation-Maker,” *A Mexican Night: The Toasts and Responses at a Complimentary Dinner Given by Walter S. Logan at the Democratic Club, New York City*. New York: A.B. King, 1892.
- Lummis, Charles F. *The Awakening of a Nation: Mexico of To-day*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1902.
- . “Mexico,” *The 19<sup>th</sup> Century: A Review of Progress*. London and New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1901.
- Mallen, Bernardo. *Mexico: Yesterday and Today, 1876-1904*. Mexico: NP, 1904.
- Manning, William R., ed. *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States: Inter-American Affairs, 1831-1860*. Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1937.
- Margati, Jose. *A Trip to the City of Mexico*. Boston: Putnam, Messervy & Co. 1885.
- Martin, Percy F. *Mexico’s Treasure-House- (Guanajuato)*. New York: Cheltenham Press, 1906.
- Matovina, Timothy, and Gerald E. Poyo, eds. *¡Presente! U.S. Latino Catholics from Colonial Origins to the Present*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000.



- McClintock, John and James Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1890.
- McGary, Elizabeth Visere. *An American Girl in Mexico*. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1904.
- McGee, Thomas D'Arcy. *The Catholic History of North America*. Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1855.
- Message from the President of the United States Communicating, In answer to a Senate resolution of February 20, 1879, information in relation to the construction of railroads in Mexico* Senate Executive Document No. 73, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., March 1, 1879. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1879.
- Message of the President of the United States to the Two Houses of Congress at the Commencement of the Second Session of the Thirty-Seventh Congress*, Volume 1 House of Representatives Ex.Doc. 37<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1861.
- México en el Siglo XIX: Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas*. edited by Álvaro Matute. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1972.
- The Mexican Episcopal Church*. New York: Provisional Committee on Church Work in Mexico, 1894.
- The Mexican Missionary Association: Its Origin and Work*. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1871.
- "Mexico," *The Encyclopedia Britannica*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Mexico: Its Present Government, and its Political Parties*. Washington, D.C.: Lemuel Towers, 1860.
- Mexico. No 2. Historical and Financial Items*. N.P.: Friends of Mexico, 1866.
- Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. Volume XIII Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1853.
- Mission Stories of Many Lands: A Book for Young People*. Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1885.
- Moore, Frank, ed. *The Rebellion Record: A Diary of American Events, with Documentary Narrative, Illustrative Incidents, Poetry, etc.* First Volume (New York: G.P. Putnam, 1861.

- Morris, Ida Dorman and James Edwin Morris, *A Tour in Mexico*. London and New York: The Abbey Press, 1902.
- Moses, Bernard. *The Railway Revolution in Mexico*. San Francisco: The Berkeley Press, 1895.
- Moses, Jasper T. *Today in the Land of Tomorrow: Sketches of Life in Mexico*. Indianapolis, IN: The Christian Woman's Board of Missions, 1907.
- "A New England College in the West," *The New England Magazine* New Series XVIII, no. 4 (June 1898): 457-478.
- New York State Education Department, *Advance Sheets of Syllabus for Secondary Schools 1910: History and Social Science*. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1910.
- Nimmo, Joseph Jr. *Report on the Internal Commerce of the United States: Commerce and Navigation*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1881.
- Noel, John Vavasour. *History of the Second Pan-American Conference*. Baltimore: Guggenheimer Weil & Co., 1902.
- Noll, Arthur Howard. *From Empire to Republic: The Story of the Struggle for Constitutional Government in Mexico*. Chicago: AC McClurg & Co., 1903.
- Our Future Foreign Policy, an Address by Hon. Carl Schurz at the National Conference at Saratoga, N.Y.* NP: 1898.
- Palmer, Frederick. *Central America and its Problems: An Account of a Journey from the Rio Grande to Panama with Introductory Chapter on Mexico and Her Relations with Her Neighbors*. New York: Moffat, Yard & Co., 1910.
- Pan American Union, *Mexico: A General Sketch*. Washington DC: Pan American Union, 1911.
- Pearson, Henry Greenleaf. *The Life of John A. Andrew Governor of Massachusetts, 1861-1865*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co, 1904.
- People, ETC v. Fornaro, Supreme Court, New York County, Special Term, November, 1909, *New York Current Court Decisions Volume II*, edited by Frederick W. Noble New York: Francis C. Hill, 1909.
- Pettengill's Newspaper Directory and Advertiser's Handbook for 1878*. New York: S.M. Pettengill & Co, Publishers, 1878.

- Philadelphia International Exhibition, 1876, Mexican Section.* Philadelphia: Dan F. Gillin, Printer, 1876.
- Pierson, Arthur T. *The Crisis of Missions: or the Voice Out of the Cloud.* New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1886.
- The Pilgrim of Our Lady Martyrs.* Troy, NY: Catholic Protectory for St. Joseph's Church, 1902.
- Plumley, Gardiner Spring. *The Presbyterian Church Throughout the World: From the Earliest Times to the Present Times, in a Series of Biographical and Historical Sketches.* New York: DeWitt C. Lent & Co., 1875.
- Political Speeches of Robert G. Ingersoll.* New York: C.P. Farrell, 1914.
- "President Diaz of Mexico," *Public Ledger Almanac* (Philadelphia: Public Ledger, 1898), 11.
- Proceedings of a Meeting of Citizens of New York to Express Sympathy and Respect for the Mexican Republican Exiles.* New York: John A. Gray & Green, Printers, 1865.
- Proceedings of the Convention of the American Bankers Association, August 11-13, 1880.* New York: Banker's Publishing Association, 1880.
- Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the National Board of Trade Held in New York June 1876.* Chicago: Knight & Leonard Printers, 1876.
- Proceedings of the General Conference of Foreign Missions.* London: John F. Shaw, 1878.
- Proceedings of the National Railroad Convention at St Louis, Nov 23 and 24, 1875 in Regard to the Construction of a Southern Trans-Continental Railway Line from the Mississippi Valley to the Pacific Ocean.* St Louis: Woodward, Tiernan and Hale, 1875.
- Proceedings of the Republican National Convention Held at Cincinnati, Ohio.* Concord, NH: Republican Press Association, 1876.
- Purdie, Samuel A. *Memories of Angela Aguilar de Mascorro: And Sketches of the Friends' Mexican Mission.* Chicago: Publishing Association of Friends, 1885.
- Rankin, J.E. "A New England Woman," *The Granite Monthly* XVI, no. 4 (April 1894): 248-252.
- Rankin, Melinda. *Texas in 1850.* Boston: Damrell & Moore, 1852.

- . *Twenty Years among the Mexicans, A Narrative of Missionary Labor*. Cincinnati: Chase & Hall, Publishers, 1875.
- Reavis, L.U. *The Great Empire of the West: Beyond the Mississippi*. St Louis: Nixon-Jones Printing, Co., 1882.
- . *An International Railway to the City of Mexico: An Address*. St Louis: Woodward, Tiernan & Hale, 1879.
- . *The North and South: An Address*. St Louis: Woodward, Tiernan & Hale, 1878.
- . *Saint Louis: The Future Great City of the World*. St Louis: C.R. Barns, 1876.
- Recent Visit of American Merchants to Mexico* House of Representatives Report No. 1015, 46<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., April 9, 1880. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.
- The Reformation in Mexico*. Hartford, CN: Junior Auxiliary Publishing Co., 1894.
- Relations between the Central Pacific Railroad Company and the United States Government*. San Francisco: H.S. Crocker & Co, 1889.
- Report of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration*. Lake Mohonk, NY: Conference on International Arbitration, 1905.
- Report of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration*. Lake Mohonk, NY: Conference on International Arbitration, 1908.
- Report and Accompanying Documents of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Relations of the United States with Mexico* House of Representatives No. 701, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., April 25, 1878 Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878.
- Reports from the Consuls of the United States on the Commerce, Manufactures, Etc., of their Consular Districts (Consular Reports)* 1881-1911.
- Report of the New York Produce Exchange from June 1, 1876 to December 31, 1877*. New York: Jones Printing, Co., 1878.
- Report and Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor*. Washington DC: The National Tribune Company, 1908.
- Report and Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor*. Washington DC: The National Tribune Company, 1909.

- Report of the Central and South American Commissioners.* House of Representatives Executive Document No. 266, 48<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Session. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1884.
- Report of the Committee of Investigation Sent in 1873 by the Mexican Government to the Frontier of Texas. Translated from the Official Edition Made in Mexico.* New York: Baker & Godwin, Printers, 1875.
- Report of the Secretary of War for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1877.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1877.
- Report of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration.* Lake Mohonk, NY: Conference on International Arbitration, 1906.
- Reports (Nos. 1, 2 and 3) from the Consuls of the United States of the Commerce, Manufactures, Etc., of their Consular Districts.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881.
- Report upon the Commercial Relations of the United States with Foreign Countries for the Year (1872-1911).*
- Republican Campaign Textbook for 1878.* Washington D.C.: Republican Congressional Committee, 1878.
- Republic or Empire: The Philippine Question.* Chicago: The Independence Company, 1899.
- Rhodes, James Ford. *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the Final Restoration of Home Rule at the South in 1877 Volume VII.* New York: The MacMillan Co, 1906.
- Rhodes, James Ford. *History of the United States from Hayes to McKinley.* New York: The MacMillan Company, 1919.
- Richardson, Albert D. *A Personal History of Ulysses S. Grant.* Boston: D.L. Guernsey, 1885.
- Richardson, James A. *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents: Prepared Under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing of the House and Senate, Pursuant to an Act of the Fifty-Second Congress of the United States IV.* Washington: Bureau of National Literature, 1897.
- Rice, John A. "Mexico: The Great West of the Near Future," *Transactions of the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society XVII (1878-1879): 357-380.*

Romero, Matías. *Coffee and India Rubber Culture in Mexico: Preceded by Geographical and Statistical Notes on Mexico*. New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1898.

---. *Railways in Mexico in Answer to an Article of the Hon, John Bigelow Entitled 'The Railway Invasion of Mexico'*. Washington D.C.: Harper's Monthly Magazine, 1882.

---. *Report of the Secretary of Finance of the United States of Mexico of the 15<sup>th</sup> of January, on the Actual Condition of Mexico, and the Increase of Commerce with the United States. Rectifying the Report of the Hon. John W. Foster, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States in Mexico, the 9<sup>th</sup> of October, 1878*. N. Ponce De Leon, Publisher and Printer, 1880.

*Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Merchants Exchange of Saint Louis, Missouri, in Favor of Granting aid in the construction of a railroad from San Antonio, Tex., to the Rio Grande, at or near Laredo, Mexico*, January 28, 1879, Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 54, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1879.

Sample, Robert F. *Beacon-Lights of the Reformation; or Romanism and the Reformers*. Second Edition. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1889.

*San Antonio and Mexican Border Railway Company*, April 7, 1880, House of Representatives Report No. 756, 46<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880.

Sanderson, Edgar, J. P. Lamberton and John McGovern, *The World's History and its Makers, Volume III* (Chicago: Universal History Publishing, Co., 1900.

Schultz, Alfred P. *Race or Mongrel*. Boston: L.C. Page & Company, 1908.

Schurz, Carl. *The Policy of Imperialism*. Chicago: American Anti-Imperialist League, 1899.

Scott, Charles F. *Letters*. Iola, KS: Iola Register Print, 1892.

Scott, James Brown. "The Government of the United States and American Foreign Missionaries," *The American Journal of International Law* 6, no. 1 (January 1912): 70-85.

Scudder, Mrs. William W. *Nineteen Centuries of Missions: A Handbook Primarily Prepared for Young People*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, Co., 1899.

Seward, Frederick W. *Reminiscences of a War-time Statesman and Diplomat, 1830-1915*. New York and London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.

- . *Seward at Washington, Senator and Secretary of State: A Memoir of His Life, with Selections from His Letters, 1846-1861*. New York: Derby and Miller, 1891.
- Sheldon, Henry Steele. *History of the Christian Church: Volume V, The Modern Church*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1894.
- Shepherd, A.K. *The Land of the Aztecs: or Two Years in Mexico*. Albany, NY: Weed, Parsons and Co., 1859.
- Schoonover, Thomas D., ed. *Mexican Lobby: Matías Romero in Washington, 1861-1867*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1986.
- Sierra, Justo. *Evolución política del pueblo mexicano*. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1957.
- Sixty-Eighth Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan*. Lansing, MI: Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford, State Printers, 1905.
- Smith, Charles Stewart. *Report of Charles Stewart Smith to the Arkwright Club of Boston*. New York: Press of the Chamber of Commerce, 1884.
- Smith, F. Hopkinson. *A White Umbrella in Mexico*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894.
- Spanish American Commercial Company*, February 6, 1879, Senate Report 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., Report No. Government Printing Office, 1879.
- Speech of Mr. Calhoun, of South Carolina on His Resolutions in Reference to the War with Mexico*. Washington: John T. Tower, 1848.
- Speech of Senor Don Matias Romero, Mexican Minister at Washington on the 65<sup>th</sup> Anniversary on the 65<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of General Ulysses S. Grant*. New York: NP, 1887.
- Spring, Arthur. *Beyond the Rio Grande*. Lebanon, NH: NP, 1885.
- State Gazette Appendix, Containing Debates in the House of Representatives of the Eighth Legislature of the State of Texas Volume IV*. Austin: John Marshall & Co., State Printers, 1860.
- The State of the Union Messages of the Presidents, Volume I: 1790-1860*. New York: Chelsea House, 1966.
- The Statutes of California Passed at the Twenty-Second Session of the Legislature, 1877-8*. Sacramento: State Office, 1878.



- Statutes of the United States of America, Passed at the First Session of the Forty-Seventh Congress, 1881-'82 and Recent Treaties and Executive Proclamations.* Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1882.
- Steel, Edward M., ed. *The Speeches and Writings of Mother Jones.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988.
- Steele, James W. *To Mexico by Palace Car: Intended as a Guide to Her Principle Cities and Capital, and Generally as a Tourist Introduction to Her Life and People.* Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Company, 1884.
- Stiles, Edward H. "General Fitz Henry Warren," *Annals of Iowa* 3<sup>rd</sup> Series VI: 7 (October 1901): 548-549.
- Storrs, Richard S. Jr. *A Sermon Preached at Cleveland, Ohio, October 1, 1861 before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions at their Fifty-Second Annual Meeting.* New York: John A. Gray, 1861.
- Strong, Josiah. *Our Country: Its Possible Future and its Present Crisis.* New York: The Baker & Taylor, Co, 1891.
- Strong, William E. *The Story of the American Board: An Account of the First Hundred Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.* Boston: American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1910.
- The Student Missionary Appeal: Addresses at the Third International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions Held at Cleveland, Ohio, February 23-27, 1898.* New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1898.
- Stryker, M.W. "Missions in Mexico," *Historical Sketches of the Missions under the Care of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church.* Third Edition, 135-154. Philadelphia: Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, 1891.
- The Survey of the Austin-Topolovampo Pacific Route: Memorial of A.K. Owen, C.E.* House of Representative Miscellaneous Document No. 20, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess., February 13, 1879. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1879.
- Tamayo, Jorge L., ed. *Benito Juarez: Documentos, Discursos y Correspondencia IV.* México: Secretaria del Patrimonio Nacional, 1965.
- Tenney, Edward Payson. *The New West as Related to the Christian College and the Home Missionary.* Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1878.



- Texas Frontier Troubles* House of Representatives No. 343, 44<sup>th</sup> Congress 1<sup>st</sup> Sess., February 29, 1876. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876.
- Texas Testimony Taken by the Committee on Military Affairs in Relation to the Texas Border Troubles* House of Representatives No. 64, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess., January 12, 1878. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1878.
- Thomas, Robert H., ed. *Journalist's Letters Descriptive of Texas and Mexico*. Mechanicsburg, PA: Farmer's Friend Print, 1888.
- Timmons, Wilbert H. ed. *John Finerty Reports Porfirian Mexico 1879*. El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1974.
- Trade between Mexico and the United States, Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury*, February 8, 1884, House of Representatives Executive Document No. 86, 48<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Sess., Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1884.
- Trade with Mexico. Correspondence between the Manufacturers' Association of the Northwest, Chicago and Hon. John W. Foster*. Chicago: Manufacturers Association of the Northwest, 1878.
- Train, George Francis. *Showing Up the Monroe Doctrine. War with Mexico, and France is the Death of Irish Nationality*. Washington: Constitutional Union Press, 1866.
- Transportation of United States Mails between Galveston and Vera Cruz*, May 27, 1878, House of Representatives Report No. 886, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 2<sup>nd</sup> Sess. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1878.
- Treaty with Mexico* House of Representatives Report No. 108, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress 3<sup>rd</sup> Sess. February 13, 1879. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1879.
- Tropical Tours to Toltec Towns in Mexico*. New York: Mexican National Railroad, 1893.
- Turner, John Kenneth. *Barbarous Mexico*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr & Company, 1910.
- Tweedie, Mrs Alec. *The Maker of Modern Mexico: Porfirio Diaz*. New York: John Lane Company, 1906.
- . *Mexico As I Saw It*. London and Kingston: Kelly's Directors LTD., 1901.
- Twelfth Annual Report of the American Church Missionary Society*. New York: American Church Missionary Society, 1871.
- Twentieth Annual Report of the Corporation of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York for the Year 1877-1878*. New York: Press of the Chamber of Commerce, 1878.

“‘Union’ on Dis-Union Principles! The Chicago Platform, McCellan’s Letter of Acceptance, and Pendelton’s Haskin Letter , Reviewed and Exposed. A Speech Delivered by Abraham Wakeman of New York, at Greenfield Hill, Conn., Nov. 3, 1864.” In *The American Party Battle: Election Campaign Pamphlets 1828-1876: Volume 2, 1854-1876*, edited by Joel H. Silbey, 186-220. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1999.

United States Congress, House, *Investigation of Alleged Frauds in the Late Presidential Election*, House Report 140, 45<sup>th</sup> Congress, 3<sup>rd</sup> Session, 1879.

*The Urgent Business of the Church: Address Delievered Before the Fourth International Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions Toronto, Canada, February 26-March 2, 1902*. New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1902.

Vallarta, Ignacio L. *Memoria Que en Cumplimiento Del Precepto Constitucional Presento Al Congreso De La Unión En El Primer Periodo De Sus Sesiones*. Mexico: Imprenta de Gonzalo A. Esteva, 1878.

*Volunteers: The Mexican War Journals of Private Richard Coulter and Sergeant Thomas Barclay, Company E, Second Pennsylvania Infantry*. edited by Allen Peskin. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1991.

Walker, Edward. *A Voice to America, or the Model Republic, its glory or its Fall*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, New York: Edward Walker, 1855.

Wells, Amos R. *Into All the World*. Boston and Chicago: United Society of Christian Endeavor, 1903.

Wells, David A. *A Study of Mexico*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1890.

Wendover, R.H. *Views on the Monroe Doctrine*. St Louis: George Knapp & Co., 1865.

Whitaker, Herman. *The Planter: A Novel*. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1909.

Williams, Charles Richard, ed. *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes Volume III, 1865-1881*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1924.

Williams, T. Harry, ed. *Hayes: The Diary of a President, 1875-1881*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964.

Wilson, Bourdon. *In the Region of Hermosillo Mexico*. San Francisco: Sunset Magazine Homeseekers’ Bureau, ND.

- Wilson, Robert A. *Mexico: Its Peasants and its Priests; or Adventures and Historical Researches in Mexico and its Silver Mines during Parts of the Years 1851-52-53-54, with an Expose of the Fabulous Character of the Story of the Conquest of Mexico by Cortez*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1856.
- Wineburgh, M. *Where to Spend the Winter Months: A Birdseye View of a Trip to Mexico Via Havana*. New York: M. Wineburgh & Co., 1880.
- Winter, Nevin O. *Mexico and Her People of Today*. Boston: L.C. Page and Company, 1907.
- Winton, G. B. *A New Era in Old Mexico*. Nashville, TN: Publishing House Methodist Episcopal Church, 1905.
- Winton, George B. "Roman Catholicism." In *Religions of Missions Fields, as Viewed by Protestant Missionaries*. New York : Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 1905.
- Worcester, Isaac R. *Historical Sketch of the Missions of the American Board in Papal Lands*. Boston: American Board, 1879.
- The Works of Hubert Howe Bancroft, Volume XIV: History of Mexico Volume VI, 1861-1887*. San Francisco: The History Company, 1887.
- Wright, Marie Robinson, *Picturesque Mexico*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1897.
- Young, Alfred. *Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared in Civilization, Popular Happiness, General Intelligence, and Morality*. New York: The Catholic Book Exchange, 1895.
- Young, Philip. *History of Mexico; Her Civil Wars and Colonial and Revolutionary Annals; from the period of the Spanish Conquest, 1520, to the present time, 1847: Including an account of the War with the United States, the causes and military Achievement*. Cincinnati: J.A. & U.P. James, 1847.
- Zarco, Francisco. *Historia del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente*. México: El Colegio de México, 1956.

#### *Secondary Sources*

- Abrahamson, James L. *The Men of Secession and the Civil War, 1859-1861*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, Inc., 2000.
- Ackerman, Kenneth D. *Dark Horse: The Surprise Election and Political Murder of President James A. Garfield*. New York: Carroll& Graf Publishers, 2003.

- Acuna, Rodolfo. *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*. Fifth Edition. New York: Pearson Longman, 2004.
- Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence: University of Kansas, 1995.
- Adams, Jerome R. *Greasers and Gringos: The Historical Roots of Anglo-Hispanic Prejudice*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2006.
- Adas, Michael. "From Settler Colony to Global Hegemon: Integrating the Exceptionalist Narrative of the American Experience into World History," *American Historical Review* 106 (December 2001): 1692-1720.
- Albro, Ward S. *Always a Rebel: Ricardo Flores Magón and the Mexican Revolution*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1992.
- Alonzo, Armando C. *Tejano Legacy: Rancheros and Settlers in South Texas, 1734-1900*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- Altschuler, Glen C. and Stuart M. Blumin. *Rude Republic: Americans and Their Politics in the Nineteenth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Ambrosius, Lloyd E. "Introduction." In *A Crisis of Republicanism: American Politics in the Civil War Era*, edited by Lloyd E. Ambrosius, 1-16. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.
- Andrade, Alfredo Rolando. "Mexican Liberalism and the United States during the Era of La Reforma: A History of Attitudes and Policy, 1855-1861." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1975.
- Andrews, Gregg. *Shoulder to Shoulder?: The American Federation of Labor, The United States, and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-1924*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.
- Anna, Timothy E. *Forging Mexico, 1821-1835*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Appleby, Joyce. "Recovering America's Historic Diversity: Beyond Exceptionalism." *The Journal of American History* 79, no. 2 (September 1992): 419-431.
- Appleby, R. Scott. "Missions and the Making of American: Religious Competition for Souls and Citizens." In *Minority Faiths and the American Protestant Mainstream*, edited by Jonathan D. Sarna, 232-278. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

- Archer, Christon I. "Discord Disjunction, and Reveries of Past and Future Glories: Mexico's First Decades of Independence, 1810-1853." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 16, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 189-211.
- Astíe-Burgos, Walter. *Encuentros y desencuentros entre México y Estados Unidos en el siglo XX: del porfiriato a la posguerra fría*. México: Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2007.
- Baez Camargo, G., and Kenneth G. Grubb, *Religion in the Republic of Mexico*. London & New York: World Dominion Press, 1935.
- Bailey, Thomas A. *A Diplomatic History of the American People*. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Baldwin, Deborah J. *Protestants and the Mexican Revolution: Missionaries, Ministers, and Social Change*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Baldwin, Leland D. *The American Quest for the City of God*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1981.
- Baldwin, Neil. *The American Revelation: Ten Ideals That Shaped Our Country from the Puritans to the Cold War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2005.
- Ballard, Martin. *White Men's God: The Extraordinary Story of Missions in Africa*. Oxford and Westport, CN: Greenwood World Publishing, 2008.
- Banker, Mark T. *Presbyterian Missions and Cultural Interaction in the Far Southwest, 1850-1950*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Barnes, Kenneth C. *Who Killed John Clayton? Political Violence and the Emergence of the New South, 1861-1893*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Barney, William L. *Battleground for the Union: The Era of the Civil War and Reconstruction, 1848-1877*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1990.
- . *The Passage of the Republic: An Interdisciplinary History of Nineteenth-Century America*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1987.
- Barrows, Chester L. *William M. Evarts: Lawyer, Diplomat and Statesman*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941.
- Bastian, Jean-Pierre. *Los Disidentes: sociedades protestantes y revolución en México, 1872-1911*. México: El Colegio de México, 1989.
- . *Protestantismo y sociedad en México*. México: Casa Unida de Publicaciones, 1983.

- Bays, Daniel H. and Grant Wacker, "Introduction." in *The Foreign Missionary Enterprise at Home: Explorations in North American Cultural History*, edited by Daniel H. Bays and Grant Wacker, 1-9. Tuscaloosa and London: The University of Alabama Press, 2003.
- Bazant, Jan. "From Independence to the Liberal Republic, 1821-1867." In *Mexico Since Independence*, edited by Leslie Bethell, 1-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Beatty, Edward. *Institutions and Investment: The Political Basis of Industrializations in Mexico before 1911*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Becker, William H. *The Dynamics of Business-Government Relations: Industry & Exports, 1893-1921*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Beezley, William H. *Judas at the Jockey Club and other Episodes of Porfirian Mexico*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2004.
- Beisner, Robert L. *From the Old Diplomacy to the New, 1865-1900*. 2nd Edition. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1986.
- . *Twelve Against Empire: The Anti-Imperialists, 1898-1900*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Bellah, Robert Neely. *The Broken Covenant: American Civil Religion in Time of Trial*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . "Civil Religion in America." *Journal of the Academy of the Arts and Sciences* 96, no. 1 (Winter 1967): 1-21.
- Benbow, Mark. *Leading Them to the Promised Land: Woodrow Wilson, Covenant Theology, and the Mexican Revolution, 1913-1915*. Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 2010.
- Benedict, Michael Les. "The Politics of Reconstruction." In *American Political History: Essays on the State of the Discipline*, edited by John F. Marszalek and Wilson D. Miscamble, 54-107. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997.
- Benjamin, Thomas. "Introduction: Approaching the Porfiriato." In *Other Mexicos: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876-1911*, edited by Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie, 3-25. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.
- . *La Revolución: Mexico's Great Revolution as Memory, Myth, and History*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000.



- Benjamin, Thomas and Jesús Velasco Márquez, "The War between the United States and Mexico, 1846-1848." In *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*, edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent, 97-134. Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997.
- Bennett, David H. *The Party of Fear: The American Far Right from Nativism to the Militia Movement*, revised and updated. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Berger, Mark. *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and U.S. Hegemony in the Americas, 1898-1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
- Berkhofer, Robert F. Jr. *Salvation and the Salvation: An Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Responses, 1787-1862*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1965.
- Berninger, Dieter. "Immigration and Religious Toleration: A Mexican Dilemma, 1821-1860." *The Americas* 32, no. 4 (April 1976): 549-565.
- Bernstein, Harry. *Matías Romero, 1837-1898*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973.
- Berry, Charles R. *The Reform in Oaxaca, 1856-1876: A Microhistory of the Liberal Revolution*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1981.
- Billington, Ray A. "Anti-Catholic Propaganda and the Home Missionary Movement, 1800-1860." *The Missouri Valley Historical Review* 22, no. 3 (December 1935): 361-384.
- . *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism*. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1938.
- Binder, Frederick Moore. *James Buchanan and the American Empire*. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1994.
- Blum, Edward J. *Reforging the White Republic: Race, Religion and American Nationalism, 1865-1898*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005.
- Blumenthal, Henry. *A Reappraisal of Franco-American Relations, 1830-1871*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Boardman, Andrea. *Destination México: "A Foreign Land a Step Away." U.S. Tourism to Mexico, 1880s-1950s*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University, 2001.

- Bosch García, Carlos. "El conflicto del siglo XIX con los Estados Unidos." in *Relaciones México-Estados Unidos: Una Visión Interdisciplinaria*. 17-42. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1981.
- Bowman, Shearer Davis. *At the Precipice: Americans North and South during the Secession Crisis*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Boyd, Nancy, *Emissaries: The Overseas Work of the American YWCA, 1895-1970*. New York: The Woman's Press, 1986.
- Brack, Gene M. *Mexico Views Manifest Destiny, 1821-1846: An Essay on the Origins of the Mexican War*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1975.
- Brackenridge, R. Douglas, and Francisco O. García-Treto. *Iglesia Presbiteriana: A History of Presbyterians and Mexican Americans in the Southwest*. San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1974.
- Brading, D. A. *Mexican Phoenix: Our Lady of Guadalupe: Image and Tradition Across Five Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Breinig, Helmbrecht. "Invasive Methods: The Opening of Latin America in Nineteenth-Century U.S. Literature." *Amerikatudien/American Studies* 53, no. 1 (2008): 13-36.
- Brewer, Mark D. and Jeffrey M. Stonecash, *Dynamics of American Political Parties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Bridgers, Lynn. *The American Religious Experience: A Concise History*. Lanham, MD: Rowan Littlefield, 2006.
- Bromley, Michael L. *William Howard Taft and the First Motoring Presidency*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2003.
- Brummett, Barry. "Social Issues in Disguise: An Introduction to Sneaky Rhetoric." In *Uncovering Hidden Rhetorics: Social Issues in Disguise*, edited by Barry Brummett, 1-12. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008.
- Brunk Samuel. *¡Emiliano Zapata! Revolution and Betrayal in Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995.
- Buchenau, Jurgen. *In the Shadow of the Giant: The Making of Mexico's Central America Policy, 1876-1930*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1996.
- . *Mexican Mosaic: A Brief History of Mexico*. Wheeling, IL: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 2008.



- Buffington, Robert M., and William E. French, "The Culture of Modernity." In *The Oxford History of Mexico*, edited by Michael C. Meyer and William H. Beezley, 397-432. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bulmer-Thomas, Victor. *The Economic History of Latin America Since Independence*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Burden, David K. "Reform Before *La Reforma*: Liberals, Conservatives and the Debate over Immigration, 1846-1855." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 23 no. 2 (Summer 2007): 283-316.
- Burgoon, Brian, Janice Fine, Wade Jacoby, and Daniel Tichener, "Immigration and the Transformation of American Unionism." *International Migration Review* 44, no. 4 (Winter 2010): 933-973.
- Butler, Jon. *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Butler, Matthew E.S. "Railroads, Commodities, and Informal Empire in Latin American History." *Latin American Politics & Society* 53, no.1 (Spring 2011): 157-168.
- Buzzanco, Robert . "Where's the Beef? Culture without Power in the Study of U.S. Foreign Relations." *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (Fall 2000): 623-632.
- Cahn, Peter S. *All Religions Are Good in Tzintzuntzan: Evangelicals in Catholic Mexico*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.
- Calhoun, Charles W. *Conceiving a New Republic: The Republican Party and the Southern Question, 1869-1900*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006.
- . *Minority Victory: Gilded Age Politics and the Front Porch Campaign of 1888*. Lawrence: The University of Kansas Press, 2008.
- . "The Political Culture: Public Life and the Conduct of Politics." In *The Gilded Age: Perspectives on the Origins of Modern America*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, edited by Charles W. Calhoun, 239-264. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Callahan, James Morton. *American Foreign Policy in Mexican Relations*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1967.
- Callahan, Manuel. "Mexican Border Troubles: Social War, Settler Colonialism and the Production of Frontier Discourses, 1848-1880." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2003.
- Callcott, Wilfrid Hardy. *Church and State in Mexico, 1822-1857*. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1965.

- . *Liberalism in Mexico, 1857-1929*. Hamden, CN: Archon Books, 1965.
- Calvert, Robert A., and Arnolde De Leon, *The History of Texas*. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson, 1990.
- Camp, Roderic A. *Mexican Political Biographies, 1884-1935*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.
- Campbell, Charles S. *The Transformation of American Foreign Relations, 1865-1900*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Campbell, Randolph B. *An Empire for Slavery: The Peculiar Institution in Texas, 1821-1865*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1989.
- . *Gone to Texas: A History of the Lone Star State*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Carlson, W. Bernard. "Technology and America as a Consumer Society, 1870-1900." In *The Gilded Age: Perspectives on the Origins of Modern America*. Second Edition, edited by Charles W. Calhoun, 29-52. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Carrigan, William D. *The Making of a Lynching Culture: Violence and Vigilantism in Central Texas, 1836-1916*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Carrigan, William D. and Clive Webb, "The Lynching of Persons of Mexican Origin or Descent in the United States, 1848 to 1928." *Journal of Social History* 37, no. 2 (Winter 2003): 411-438.
- Carroll, Daniel B. *Henri Mercier and the American Civil War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Carter, Paul A. *Revolt against Destiny: An Intellectual History of the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.
- . *The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois Press, 1971.
- Carwardine, Richard J. *Evangelicals and Politics in Antebellum America*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Case, Lynn M., and Warren F. Spencer, *The United States and France: Civil War Diplomacy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

- Case, Theresa A. *The Great Southwest Railroad Strike and Free Labor*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2010.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Cavalcanti, H.B. "Human Agency in Mission Work: Missionary Styles and Their Political Consequences." *Sociology of Religion* 66, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 381-398.
- Chamberlin, Paul. "A World Restored: Religion and Counterrevolution, and the Search for Order in the Middle East." *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 3 (June 2008): 441-469.
- Chance, Joseph E. *José María de Jesús Carvaja: The Life and Times of a Mexican Revolutionary*. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 2006.
- Chassen-Lopez, Francie R. *From Liberal to Revolutionary Oaxaca: The View from the South, Mexico, 1867-1911*. University Park, PA: The Penn State University Press, 2004.
- Chasteen, John Charles. *Born in Blood and Fire: A Concise History of Latin America*. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 2001.
- Cheng, Eileen Ka-May. *The Plain and Noble Garb of Truth: Nationalism & Impartiality in American Historical Writing, 1784-1860*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2008.
- Cherry, Conrad. "Introduction." In *God's New Israel: Religious Interpretations of American Destiny*, revised and updated edition, edited by Conrad Cherry, 1-21. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Christopoulos, Diana K. "American Radicals and the Mexican Revolution, 1900-1925." Ph.D. Dissertation. State University of New York, Binghamton, 1980.
- Clancy, Herbert J. *The Presidential Election of 1880*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1958.
- Clanton, Gene. *Populism: The Humane Preference in America, 1890-1900*. (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.
- Clark, Rufus W. *Romanism in America*. Boston: J.E. Tilton and Company, 1859.
- Clendenen, Clarence C. *Blood on the Border: The United States Army and the Mexican Irregulars*. London: The Macmillan Company, 1969.

- Clymer, Kenton J. *Protestant Missionaries in the Philippines, 1898-1916: An Inquiry Into the American Colonial Mentality*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Coatsworth, John H. *Growth Against Development: The Economic Impact of Railroads in Porfirian Mexico*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois Press, 1981.
- Cobb, James C. *Away Down South: A History of Southern Identity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Coerver, Don M. "From Confrontation to Conciliation: Church-State Relations in Mexico, 1867-1884." In *Church-State Relations and Religious Liberty in Mexico: Historical & Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Derek H. Davis, 17-32. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2002.
- *The Porfirian Interregnum: The Presidency of Manuel Gonzalez of Mexico, 1880-1884*. Fort Worth, TX: The Texas Christian University Press, 1979.
- Coerver, Don and Linda Hall. *Revolution on the Border: The United States and Mexico, 1910-1920*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988.
- Coerver, Don and Linda Hall. *Tangled Destinies: Latin America and the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999.
- Downing, Todd. *The Mexican Earth*. 2nd Edition. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996.
- Cogliano, Francis D. *No King, No Popery: Anti-Catholicism in Revolutionary New England*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Cole, Garold. *American Travelers to Mexico, 1821-1972: A Descriptive Bibliography*. Troy, NY: Whitston Publishing Company, 1978.
- Coletta, Paolo E. "Recognition." In *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume 3, edited by Alexander DeConde, Richard Dean Burns, and Frederick Logervall, 345-354. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2002.
- Conger, Robert D. "Porfirio Diaz and the Church Hierarchy, 1876-1911." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1985.
- Connaughton, Brian F. *Clerical Ideology in a Revolutionary Age: The Guadalajara Church and the Idea of the Mexican Nation (1788-1853)*, translated by Mark Alan Healey. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2003.
- Cook, D.P. *The North, the South and the Powers, 1861-1865*. New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.

- Cornell, Sarah E. "Americans in the U.S. South and Mexico: A Transnational History of Race, Slavery, and Freedom, 1810-1910." Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 2008.
- Cosío Villegas, Daniel. *Historia Moderna de México: La República Restaurada*. Vol. 3 Mexico: Editorial Hermes, 1970.
- . *The United States Versus Porfirio Díaz*, translated by Nettie Lee Benson. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.
- Costeloe, Michael P. *Bond and Bondholders: British Investors and Mexico's Foreign Debt, 1824-1888*. Westport, CN and London: Praeger, 2003.
- . *Church and State in Independent Mexico: A Study in the Patronage Debate, 1821- 1857*. London: Royal Historical Society, 1978.
- Cott, Kenneth S. "Porfirian Investment Policies, 1876-1910." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1979.
- Craib, Raymond B. *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Crapol, Edward P. *America for Americans: Economic Nationalism and Anglophobia in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1973.
- . "Coming to Terms with Empire: The Historiography of Late Nineteenth-Century American Foreign Relations." In *Paths to Power: The Historiography of American Foreign Relations to 1941*, edited by Michael J. Hogan, 79-116. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Crapol, Edward P. and Howard Schonberger, "The Shift to Global Expansion, 1865-1900." In *From Colony to Empire: Essays in the History of American Foreign Relations*, edited by William Appleman Williams, 135-202. New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.
- Crook, D.P. *The North, the South and the Great Powers*. New York and London: John Wiley & Sons, 1974.
- Crook, Robert, *Civil War America: Making a Nation, 1848-1877*. London and New York: Pearson, Longman, 2003.
- Crunden, Robert M. *A Brief History of American Culture*. (New York: Paragon House, 1994.

- Cullen, Jim. *The Art of Democracy: A Concise History of Popular Culture in the United States*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002.
- Dabbs, Jack Autrey. *The French Army in Mexico, 1861-1867*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1963.
- Daughton, J.P. *An Empire Divided: Religion, Republicanism, and the Making of French Colonialism, 1880-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Davidann, Jon Thares. *A World of Crisis and Progress: The American YMCA in Japan, 1890-1930*. Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 1998.
- Davis, David Brion. "Some Themes of Counter-Subversion: An Analysis of Anti-Masonic, Anti-Catholic, and Anti-Mormon Literature." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 47, no. 2 (September 1960): 205-224.
- Davis, Derek H. "Introduction, In Search of the Good Society: An Historical Overview of Church-State Relations in Mexico." In *Church-State Relations and Religious Liberty in Mexico: Historical & Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Derek H. Davis, 1-15. Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2002.
- Dawley, Alan. *Changing the World: American Progressives in War and Revolution*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- DeConde, Alexander. *Ethnicity, Race and American Foreign Policy: A History*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992.
- Deichmann Edwards, Wendy J. "Forging an Ideology for American Missions: Josiah Strong and Manifest Destiny." In *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy*, edited by William R. Shenk, 163-191. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- Del Carmen Collado, María. "Antonio García Cubas." In *Historiografía Mexicana Volumen IV: En Busca de un Discurso Integrador de la Nación, 1848-1884*, edited by Juan A. Ortega y Medina and Rosa Camelo, 430-432. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1996.
- De Leon, Arnaldo. *They Called Them Greasers*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983.
- Delpar, Helen. *The Enormous Vogue of Things Mexican: Cultural Relations Between the United States and Mexico, 1920-1935*. Tuscaloosa and London: The University of Alabama Press, 1992.



- Dent, David W. *The Legacy of the Monroe Doctrine: A Reference Guide to U.S. Involvement in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.
- DeSantis, Vincent P. *The Shaping of Modern America: 1877-1920*. 2nd Edition. Arlington Heights, IL: Forum Press, 1989.
- Deutsch, Sarah. *No Separate Refuge: Culture, Class, and Gender on an Anglo-Hispanic Frontier in the American Southwest, 1880-1940*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Devine, Michael J. *John W. Foster: Politics and Diplomacy in the Imperial Era, 1873-1917*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1981.
- Diccionario Porrúa de Historia, Biografía y Geografía de México*. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1986.
- Diggins, John Patrick. *On Hallowed Ground: Abraham Lincoln and the Foundation of American History*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Diplomatic Records: A Select Catalog of National Archives Microfilm Publications*. Washington D.C.: NARA, 1986.
- “Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Mexico.” In *The Encyclopedia Americana*. New York and Chicago: The Encyclopedia Americana Corporation, 1919. 799.
- Domínguez, Jorge I., and Rafael Fernández de Castro, *The United States and Mexico: Between Partnership and Conflict*. New York and London: Routledge, 2009.
- Domosh, Mona. “Selling Civilization: Toward a Cultural Analysis of America’s Economic Empire in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries.” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. New Series 29, no. 4 (December 2004): 453-467.
- Doolen, Andy. *Fugitive Empire: Locating Early American Imperialism*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Dries, Angelyn. *The Missionary Movement in American Catholic History*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998.
- Dueling Eagles: Reinterpreting the U.S.-Mexican War, 1846-1848*, edited by Richard V. Francaviglia and Douglas W. Richmond. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2000.

- Duncan, Jason K. *Citizens or Papists? The Politics of Anti-Catholicism in New York*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2005.
- Duncan, Robert H. "For the Good of the Country: State and Nation Building during Maximilian's Mexican Empire, 1864-1867." Ph.D Dissertation, University of California at Irvine, 2001.
- Dunlop, M.H. *Sixty Miles from Contentment: Traveling the Nineteenth-Century American Interior*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
- Eckes, Jr., Alfred E. *Opening America's Market: U.S. Foreign Trade Policy Since 1776*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Eckes, Jr., Alfred E. and Thomas W. Zieiler, *Globalization and the American Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ellsworth, Clayton Sumner. "The American Churches and the Mexican War," *The American Historical Review* 45, no. 2 (January 1940): 301-326.
- Elson, Ruth Miller. *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.
- Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists Volume II*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1958.
- Erfani, Julie A. *The Paradox of the Mexican State: Rereading Sovereignty from Independence to NAFTA*. Boulder, CO and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1995.
- Fairbank, John K. "Introduction: The Many Faces of Protestant Missions in China and the United States." In *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*, edited by John K. Fairbank. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Faust, Drew Gilpin. *The Creation of Confederate Nationalism: Ideology and Identity in the Civil War South*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.
- Fehrenbach, T.R. *Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans*, updated edition. Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press, 2000.
- Ferreira, Leonardo. *Centuries of Silence: The Story of Latin American Journalism*. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers, 2006.
- Fessenden, Tracy. *Culture and Redemption: Religion, the Secular, and American Literature*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.



- Fetherling, Dale. *Mother Jones the Miners' Angel: A Portrait*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois Press, 1974.
- Fine, Janice, and Daniel J. Tichenor, "A Movement Wrestling: American Labor's Enduring Struggle with Immigration, 1866-2007." *Studies in American Political Development* 23 (April 2009): 84-113.
- Flick, Alexander Clarence. *Samuel Jones Tilden: A Study in Political Sagacity*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1939.
- Flores Caballero, Romeo R. *evolución de la frontera norte*. Monterrey: Centro de Investigaciones Económicas, 1982.
- Florescano, Enrique. *National Narratives in Mexico: A History*, translated by Nancy Hancock. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2006.
- Flynt, Wayne and Gerald W. Berkley, *Taking Christianity to China: Alabama Missionaries in the Middle Kingdom, 1850-1950*. Tuscaloosa and London: The University of Alabama Press, 1997.
- Foley, Neil. *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Foner, Eric. *Free Soil, Free Men, Free Labor: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- . *Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- . *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1865-1877*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.
- Foner, Phillip S. *History of the Labor Movement in the United States. Volume V: The AFL in the Progressive Era, 1910-1915*. New York: International Publishers, 1980.
- . *The U.S. Labor Movement and Latin America: A History of Workers' Response to Intervention, Volume I, 1846-1919*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, 1988.
- Foos, Paul. *A Short, Offhand Killing Affair*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Forceville, Charles. "Metaphor." In *Encyclopedia of Semiotics*, edited by Paul Bouissac, 411-412. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

- Foreigners in Their Native Land: Historical Roots of the Mexican Americans*, edited by David J. Weber. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003.
- Fowler, Will. *Santa Anna of Mexico*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.
- Fox, Jonathan. "Religion as an Overlooked Element of International Relations." *International Studies Review* 3, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 53-73.
- Franchot, Jenny. *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Frank, Dana. *Buy American: The Untold Story of Economic Nationalism*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1999.
- French, William E. "In the Path of Progress: Railroads and Moral Reform in Porfirian Mexico." In *Railway Imperialism*, edited by Clarence B. Davis and Kenneth E. Wilburn, Jr., 85-102. New York and Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Frieden, Jeffrey A. *Banking on the World: The Politics of American International Finance*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Friedman, Leon. "The Democratic Party, 1860-1884." In *History of U.S. Political Parties, Volume II 1860-1910: The Gilded Age of Politics*, edited by Arthur Schlesinger Jr., 894-905. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1973.
- Fry, Joseph A. *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789-1973*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002.
- . "Imperialism, American Style, 1890-1916." *American Foreign Relations Reconsidered*, edited by Gordon Martel, 52-70. London: Routledge, 1994.
- . "In Search of an Orderly World." In *Modern American Diplomacy*, edited John M. Carroll and George C. Herring, 1-20. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1996.
- . "Phases of Empire: Late Nineteenth-Century U.S. Foreign Relations." In *The Gilded Age: Essays on the Origins of Modern America*, edited Charles W. Calhoun, 261-288. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, 1996.
- Fry, Michael Andrew. "The Mexicanization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1873-1919." Master's Thesis. University of Calgary, 2009.
- Gabriel, Ralph Henry, with Robert H. Walker. *The Course of American Democratic Thought*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New York and Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1986.

- Gaddis, John Lewis. *Surprise, Security and the American Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- . *We Know Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. New York and Oxford: Clarendon Press, and Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Gambill, Edward L. *Conservative Ordeal: Northern Democrats and Reconstruction, 1865-1868*. Ames: The Iowa State University Press, 1981.
- Ganster, Paul and David E. Lorey, *The U.S.-Mexican Border into the Twenty-First Century*. Second Edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008.
- García Cantú, Gastón. *Las invasiones Norteamericanas en México*. 2nd edition, Mexico: Ediciones Era, 1974.
- García, Mario T. *Católicos: Resistance and Affirmation in Chicano Catholic History*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008.
- . *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981.
- . "Porfirian Diplomacy and the Administration of Justice in Texas, 1877-1900." *Aztlan* 16, no. 1-2 (1987): 1-25.
- Garcia, Ramona. "'Most wicked superstition and idolatry': John Foxe, his Predecessors and the Development of an Anti-Catholic Polemic in the Sixteenth-Century Accounts of the Reign of Mary I." In *John Foxe at Home and Abroad*, edited by David Loades, 79-90. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004.
- Garner, Paul. *Porfirio Diaz: Profiles in Power*. London: Longman, 2001.
- Gaustad, Edwin S and Leigh E. Schmidt. *A Religious History of America*, revised Edition. New York: Harper Collins, 2002.
- Gavrinsky, Serge. *The French Liberal Opposition and the American Civil War*. New York: Humanities Press, 1968.
- Gemme, Paola. *Domesticating Foreign Struggles*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2005.
- Gibbs, William E. "Diaz' Executive Agents and United States Foreign Policy," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 20, no.2 (May 1978): 165-190.
- . "Spadework Diplomacy: United States-Mexican Relations during the Hayes Administration, 1877-1881." Ph.D Dissertation, Kent State University, 1973.

- Gilbert, David Allen. "“Long Live the True Religion!’: Contesting the Meaning of Catholicism in the Mexican Reforma (1855-1860).” Ph.D. Dissertation: University of Iowa, 2003.
- Gilderhus, Mark T. *Diplomacy and Revolution: U.S.-Mexican Relations under Wilson and Carranza*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press 1977.
- . “Forming an Informal Empire without Colonies: U.S.-Latin American Relations.” *Latin American Research Review* 40, no. 3 (October 2005): 312-325.
- . “Revolution, War, and Expansion: Woodrow Wilson in Latin America.” *Reconsidering Woodrow Wilson: Progressivism, Internationalism, War, and Peace*, edited by John Milton Cooper Jr., 165-188. Washington D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2008.
- . “U.S. Latin American Relations, 1898-1941: A Historiographical Review.” In *A Companion to American Foreign Relations*, edited by Robert Schulzinger, 134-148. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Ginger, Ray. *Age of Excess: The United States from 1877 to 1914*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Gleason, Philip. “American Catholics and Liberalism, 1789-1960.” In *Catholicism and Liberalism: Contributions to American Public Philosophy*, edited by R. Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach, 45-75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Gobat, Michel. *Confronting the American Dream: Nicaragua under U.S. Imperial Rule*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Goffin, Alvin M. *The Rise of Protestant Evangelism in Ecuador, 1895-1990*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994.
- Gómez-Quiñones, Juan. *Mexican American Labor, 1790-1990*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1994.
- Gonzales-Day, Ken. *Lynching in the West, 1850-1935*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Gonzales, Manuel G. *Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States*. 2nd Edition. Bloomington & Indianapolis, 2009.
- Gonzales, Michael J. *The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1940*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002.
- . “Imagining Mexico in 1910: Visions of the *Patria* in the Centennial

Celebration in Mexico City.” *Journal of Latin American Studies* 39, no. 3 (August 2007): 495-533.

González, Gilbert G. *Culture of Empire: American Writers, Mexico and Mexican Immigration, 1880-1930*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.

---. “Mexican Labor Migration, 1876-1924.” *Beyond La Frontera: The History of Mexico-U.S. Migration*, edited by Mark Overmyer-Velázquez, 28-50. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

González, Gilbert G. and Raul A. Fernandez, *A Century of Chicano History: Empire, Nations and Migration*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.

González, Juan. *Harvest of Empire: A History of Latinos in America*. New York: Viking, 2000.

González Navarro, Moisés. *Los Extranjeros en México y Los Mexicanos en El Extranjero, 1821-1970*, Volume II. México: El Colegio de México, 1993.

González, Ondina E., and Justo L. González, *Christianity in Latin America: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Gorn, Elliott J. *Mother Jones: The Most Dangerous Woman in America*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.

Grandin, Greg. *Empire’s Workshop: Latin America, the United States, and the Rise of the New Imperialism*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006.

Gravely, Gilbert Haven, *Methodist Abolitionist: A Study in Race, Religion, and Reform, 1850-1880*. Nashville and New York: Abingdon Press, 1973.

Greeley, Andrew M. *An Ugly Little Secret: Anti-Catholicism in North America*. Kansas City: Sheed Andrews and McMeel, Inc, 1977.

Green, Stanley C. *The Mexican Republic: The First Decade, 1823-1832*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987.

Greenberg, Amy S., *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Greer, Margaret R., Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan. “Introduction.” In *Rereading the Black Legend: The Discourses of Religious and Racial Difference in the Renaissance Empires*, edited by Margaret R. Greer, Walter D. Mignolo, and Maureen Quilligan, 1-26. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

- Gregg, Robert D. *The Influence of Border Troubles on Relations between the United States and Mexico*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937.
- Grieb, Kenneth J. *The United States and Huerta*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1969.
- Griffin, Jr., Albert Joseph. "Intelligence Versus Impulse: William H. Seward and the Threat of War with France over Mexico, 1861-1867." Ph.D Dissertation, University of New Hampshire Press, 2003.
- Griffin, Susan M. *Anti-Catholicism and Nineteenth Century Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Grimsted, David. *American Mobbing, 1828-1861: Toward Civil War*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Guardino, Peter. *Peasants, Politics and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Guedea, Virginia, and Jaime E. Rodríguez O., "How Relations between Mexico and the United States Began." In *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*, edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent, 17-46. Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997.
- Gutiérrez, David G. *Walls and Mirrors: Mexican Americans, Mexican Immigrants, and the Politics of Ethnicity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.
- Gutiérrez, Natividad. *Nationalist Myths and Ethnic Identities: Indigenous Intellectuals and the Mexican State*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.
- Gutfeld, Arnon. *American Exceptionalism: The Effects of Plenty on the American Experience*. Brighton and Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2002.
- Guyatt, Nicholas. *Providence and the Invention of the United States, 1607-1876*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Haake, Claudia B. *The State, Removal and Indigenous Peoples in the United States and Mexico, 1620-2000*. New York and London: Routledge, 2007.
- Haddad, John Rogers. *The Romance of China: Excursions to China in U.S. Culture, 1776-1876*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Hale, Charles A. *Emilio Rabasa and the Survival of Porfirian Liberalism: The Man, His Career, and His Ideas, 1856-1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.



---. *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821-1853*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968.

---. "The War with the United States and the Crisis in Mexican Thought." *The Americas* 14, no. 2 (October 1957): 153-173.

Haley, James L. *Houston*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002.

Haley, P. Edward. *Revolution and Intervention: The Diplomacy of Taft and Wilson with Mexico, 1910-1917*. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1970.

Hall, Linda B., and Don M. Coerver, *Revolution on the Border: The United States and Mexico, 1910-1920*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988.

Halvorson, Peter L. *Atlas of American Religion: The Denominational Era, 1776-1990*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press, 2000.

Hamnet, Brian R. *A Concise History of Mexico* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

---. *Juárez*. London and New York: Longman, 1993.

---. "Liberalism Divided: Regional Politics and the National Project during the Mexican Restored Republic, 1867-1876." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 76, no. 4 (November 1996): 658-689.

---. "Mexican Conservatives, Clericals, and Soldiers: the 'Traitor' Tomás Mejía through Reform and Empire, 1855-1867." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 20, no. 2 (2001): 187-210.

Hanley, Mark Y. *Beyond a Christian Commonwealth: The Protestant Quarrel with the American Republic, 1830-1860*. Chapel Hill and London: The University Of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Hanna, Alfred Jackson and Kathryn Abbey Hanna, *Napoleon III and Mexico: American Triumph Over Monarchy*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971.

Hannay, David. *Diaz*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1917.

Hansen, Jonathan M. *The Lost Promise of Patriotism: Debating American Identity, 1890-1920*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Hansen, Roger D. *The Politics of Mexican Development*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

- Harpine, William D. *From the Front Porch to the Front Page: McKinley and Bryan in the 1896 Presidential Campaign*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2005.
- Hart, John Mason. *Empire and Revolution: The Americans in Mexico since the Civil War*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Hart, Paul. *Bitter Harvest: The Social Transformation of Morelos, Mexico, and the Origins of the Zapatista Revolution, 1840-1910*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005.
- Harvey, Bruce A. *American Geographies: U.S. National Narratives and the Representation of the Non-European World, 1830-1865*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Hatfield, Shelley Bowen. *Chasing Shadows: Indians along the United States-Mexico Border, 1876-1911*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1998.
- Heide, Markus and Gabriele Pisarz-Ramírez, "Introduction: Inter-American Studies and Nineteenth-Century Literature." *Amerikatudien/American Studies* 53, no. 1 (2008): 5-11.
- Heiss, Mary Ann. "The Evolution of the Imperial Idea and U.S. National Identity." *Diplomatic History* 26, no. 4 (Fall 2002): 511-540.
- Hendrickson, David C. *Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789-1941*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2009.
- Hernandez Chavez, Alicia. *Mexico: A Brief History*, translated by Andy Klatt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Hietala, Thomas R. *Manifest Design: Anxious Aggrandizement in late Jacksonian America*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Higonnet, Patrice. *Attendant Cruelties: Nation and Nationalism in American History*. New York: Other Press, 2007.
- Hingham, C. L. *Noble, Wretched & Redeemable: Protestant Missionaries to the Indians in Canada and the United States, 1820-1900*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, and Alberta: University of Calgary Press, 2000.
- Hingham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1955.



- Hill, Patricia R. "Religion as a Category of Diplomatic Analysis." *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 4 (Fall 2000): 633-640.
- Hinckley, Ted C. "American Anti-Catholicism during the Mexican War." *Pacific Historical Review* 31, no. 2 (May 1962): 121-137.
- Hirshson, Stanley P. *Farewell to the Bloody Shirt: Northern Republicans & the Southern Negro, 1877-1893*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962.
- Hodgson, Godfrey. *The Myth of American Exceptionalism*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Hoenicke Moore, Michaela. *Know Your Enemy: The American Debate on Nazism, 1933-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Hogan, Michael J. "'The Next Big Thing': The Future of Diplomatic History in a Global Age." *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 1 (January 2004): 1-21.
- Hoganson, Kristen. *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Holden, Robert H. *Mexico and the survey of Public Lands: The Management of Modernization, 1876-1911*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1994.
- Holifield, E. Brooks. *God's Ambassadors: A History of the Christian Clergy in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.
- Holt, Michael F. *By One Vote: The Disputed Presidential Election of 1876*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2008.
- Hoogenboom, Ari. *The Presidency of Rutherford B. Hayes*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 1988.
- . *Rutherford B. Hayes: Warrior and President*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.
- Hopkins, C. Howard. *John R. Mott, 1865-1955: A Biography*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origin of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Horton, Justin. "The Second Lost Cause: Post-National Confederate Imperialism in the

- Americas.” Master’s Thesis, East Tennessee State University, 2007.
- House, Richard W. *Frontier on the Rio Grande: A Political Geography of Development and Social Deprivation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- Howard, Victor B. *Religion and the Radical Republican Movement, 1860-1870*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1990.
- Hu-De Hart, Evelyn. “Sonora: Indians and Immigrants on a Developing Frontier.” In *Other Mexicos: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876-1911*, edited by Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie, 177-211. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.
- . *Yaqui Resistance and Survival: The Struggle for Land and Autonomy*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984.
- Hughes, Richard T. *Myths America Lives By*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Hunt, Michael H. *The American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained & Wielded Global Dominance*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2007.
- . “Ideology.” In *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, edited by Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, 221-240. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Hutchison, William R. *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- . *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003.
- Iriye, Akira. “Culture and International History.” In *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, 2nd Edition, edited by Michael J. Hogan and Thomas G. Paterson, 241-256. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2000.
- Jaffa, Henry V. *A New Birth of Freedom: Abraham Lincoln and the Coming of the Civil War*. Lanhan and Boulder: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2000.
- Jaynes, Janice Lee. *The Illusion of Ignorance: Constructing the American Encounter*

- with Mexico, 1877-1920*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2011.
- . "'Strangers to Each Other': The American Encounter with Mexico, 1877-1910." Ph.D. Dissertation, The American University, 1999.
- Johannsen, Robert W. "Introduction." In *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Expansionism*, edited by Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris, 7-20. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997.
- . *Stephen A. Douglas*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- . *To the Halls of the Montezumas: The Mexican War in the American Imagination*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Johnson, John J. *Latin America in Caricature*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1980.
- Johnson, Timothy D. *A Gallant Little Army: The Mexico City Campaign*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2007.
- Joseph, Gilbert M. "Close Encounters: Toward a New Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations." In *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, 3-46. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- . *Rediscovering the Past at Mexico's Periphery: Essays on the History of Modern Yucatan*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1986.
- Kaestle, Carl F. *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1983.
- Kagan, Richard L. "From Noah to Moses: The Genesis of Historical Scholarship on Spain in the United States." In *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States*, edited by Richard L. Kagan, 21-48. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002.
- Kagan, Robert. *Dangerous Nation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006.
- Kamen, Henry. *Imagining Spain: Historical Myth & National Identity*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Kane, John. *Between Virtue and Power: The Persistent Moral Dilemma of U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2008.

- Kaplan, Amy. "‘Left Alone with America’: The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture." In *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, edited by Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease, 3-21. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.
- Kaplan, Edward S. *U.S. Imperialism in Latin America: Bryan’s Challenges and Contributions, 1900-1920*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Kasson, John F. *Rudeness & Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century America*. New York: Hill & Wang, 1990.
- Katz, Friedrich. "The Liberal Republic and the Porfiriato." In *Mexico since Independence*, edited by Leslie Bethell, 49-124. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- . *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- . *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States and the Mexican Revolution*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Kazin, Michael. *The Populist Persuasion: An American History*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- Keane, Webb. *Christian Moderns: Freedom & Fetish in the Mission Encounter*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Keller, Morton. *America’s Three Regimes: A New Political History*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Kelly, George Armstrong. *Politics & Religious Consciousness in America*. New Brunswick, NJ and London: Transaction Publishers, 2005.
- Kennedy, Philip W. "Race and American Expansion in Cuba and Puerto Rico, 1895-1905." *Journal of Black Studies* 1, no. 3 (March 1971): 306-316.
- Kenworthy, Eldon. *America/Americas: Myth in the Making of U.S. toward Latin America*. University Park, PN: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- Kessler, Lawrence D. "Foreign Missions and Home Support." In *U.S. Attitudes and Policies toward China: The Impact of American Missionaries*, edited by Patricia Neils, 78-96. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 1990.
- Keyssar, Alexander. *The Right to Vote: The Contested History of Democracy in the United States*, revised edition. New York: Basic Books, 2009.
- Kinzer, Donald L. *An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.

- Kling, David W. "The New Divinity and the Origins of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions." In *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy*, edited by William R. Shenk, 11-38. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- Kluger, Richard. *Seizing Destiny: How America Grew from Sea to Shining Sea*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.
- Knapp, Jr., Frank Averill. *The Life of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, 1823-1889: A Study in Influence and Obscurity*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.
- Knight, Alan. *The Mexican Revolution*, Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- . "U.S. Imperialism/Hegemony and Latin American Resistance." In *Empire and Dissent: The United States and Latin America*, edited by Fred Rosen, 24-52. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2008.
- Knowlton, Robert J. "Some Practical Effects of Clerical Opposition to the Mexican Reform, 1856-1860." *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 45, no. 2 (May 1965): 246-256.
- Kramer, Paul A. *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States & the Philippines*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Krauze, Enrique. *Mexico Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996*, translated by Hank Heifetz. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc., 1997.
- La Feber, Walter. *The American Age: U.S. Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad, Volume 1 to 1920*. Second Edition. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Co., 1994.
- . *The American Age: U.S. Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad, Volume 2: Since 1896*. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1994.
- . *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations Volume II: The American Search for Opportunity, 1865-1913*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York and London: W.W. Norton, 1993.
- . *The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1963.

- LaFrance, David G. *The Mexican Revolution in Puebla, 1908-1913: The Maderista Movement and the Failure of Liberal Reform*. Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Imprint, 1989.
- Lake, David A. *Power, Protection, and Free Trade: International Sources of U.S. Commercial Strategy, 1887-1939*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lane, Wilford H. "United States Conquest of the Mexican Market as Seen by British Officials, 1895-1905." *Militarists, Merchants and Missionaries: United States Expansion in Middle America*, edited by Eugene R. Huck & Edward H. Moseley, 81-92. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1970.
- Lasch, Christopher. "The Anti-Imperialists, the Philippines and the Inequity of Man." *Journal of Southern History* 24, no. 3 (August 1958): 319-331.
- Latham, Michael E., *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011.
- Latorre, Felipe A. & Dolores L. Latorre, *The Mexican Kickapoo Indians*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1976.
- Lauren, Paul Gordon. *Power and Prejudice: The Politics and Diplomacy of Racial Discrimination*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.
- Lear, John. *Workers, Neighbors, and Citizens: The Revolution in Mexico City*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2001.
- Lee, James H. "Bishop Clemente Munguía and Clerical Resistance to the Mexican Reform, 1855-1857." *The Catholic Historical Review* 66, no. 3 (July 1980): 374-391.
- Lehmann, Nicholas. *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.
- Leonard, John W. *The Industries of Saint Louis*. St Louis: J.M. Elster, 1887.
- León, Luis D. *La Llorona's Children: Religion, Life, and Death in the U.S.-Mexican Borderlands*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Levine, Allan. *The Devil in Babylon: Fear of Progress and the Birth of Modern Life*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Ltd, 2005.



- Levinson, Irving W. *Wars within War: Mexican Guerillas, Domestic Elites, and the United States of America, 1846-1848*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press, 2005.
- Lewis, Daniel. *Iron Horse Imperialism: The Southern Pacific of Mexico, 1880-1951*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2007.
- Lewis Jr., James E. *The American Union and the Problem of Neighborhood: The United States and the Collapse of the Spanish Empire, 1783-1829*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Lewis, William Ray. "The Hayes Administration and Mexico." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly* XXIV, no. 2 (October 1920): 140-153.
- Lindaman, Dana and Kyle Ward. *History Lessons: How Textbooks from Around the World Portray U.S. History*. New York and London: The New Press, 2007.
- Lindenfeld, David. "Indigenous Encounters with Christian Missionaries in China and West Africa, 1800-1920: A Comparative Study." *Journal of World History* 16, no. 3 (September 2005): 327-369.
- Litwicki, Ellen M. "The Influence of Commerce, Technology, and Race on Popular Culture in the Gilded Age." In *The Gilded Age: Perspectives on the Origins of Modern America*. 2nd Edition, edited by Charles W. Calhoun, 187-210. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- Long, Kathryn Teresa. *The Revival of 1857-1858: Interpreting an American Religious Awakening*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Lorey, David E. *The U.S.-Mexican Border in the Twentieth Century*. Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999.
- Loveman, Brian. *No Higher Law: American Foreign Policy and the Western Hemisphere since 1776*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.
- Lutz, Catherine A., and Jane L. Collins, *Reading National Geographic*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Mac Gregor, Josefina. "Matías Romero." In *Historiografía Mexicana Volumen IV: En Busca de un Discurso Integrador de la Nación, 1848-1884*, edited by Juan A. Ortega y Medina and Rosa Camelo. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico, 1996.

- Machado, Daisy L. "Kingdom Building in the Borderlands: The Church and Manifest Destiny." *Hispanic/Latino Theology: Challenge and Promise*, edited by Ada María Isasi-Díaz and Fernando F. Segovia, 63-72. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Machado, Daisy L. *Of Borders and Margins: Hispanic Disciples in Texas, 1888-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Machado, Daisy L. "Women and Religion in the Borderlands." *Encyclopedia of Women and Religion in North America Volume III*, edited by Rosemary Skinner Keller and Rosemary Radford Ruether, 1134-1140. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.
- MacLachlan, Colin M. *Anarchism and the Mexican Revolution: The Political Trials of Ricardo Flores Magón in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- MacLachlan, Colin M., and William H. Beezley. *El Gran Pueblo: A History of Greater Mexico*, 2nd edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1999.
- . *El Gran Pueblo: A History of Greater Mexico*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2004.
- . *Mexico's Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.
- Madsen, Deborah L. *American Exceptionalism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1998.
- Mah, Harold. "Phantasies of the Public Sphere: Rethinking the Habermas of Historians." *The Journal of Modern History* 72 (March 2000): 153-182.
- Makin, Dean B. *Olive Branch and Sword: The United States and Mexico, 1845-1848*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland & Company, 1997.
- Makin, Dean B. *One War at a Time: The International Dimensions of the American Civil War*. Washington DC: Brassey's, 1999.
- Martin, Albro. *Railroads Triumphant: The Growth, Rejection, and Rebirth of a Vital American Force*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Martínez, Juan Francisco. *Sea la Luz: The Making of Mexican Protestantism in the American Southwest, 1829-1900*. Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2006.
- Martinez, Oscar J. *Border People: Life and Society in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1994.



- Marty, Martin E. *Pilgrims in Their Own Land: 500 Years of Religion in America*. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1989.
- . "Religion in Nineteenth-Century America." In *Encyclopedia of the United States in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by Paul Finkelman. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2001.
- . *Righteous Empire: The Protestant Experience in America*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1970.
- Mary-Grant, Susan. *North Over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- Matovina, Timothy. "Conquest, Faith, and Resistance in the Southwest." In *Latino Religions and Civic Activism in the United States*, edited by Gastón Espinoza, Virgilio Elizando and Jesse Miranda, 19-33. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Matthews, Michael. "De Viaje: Elite Views of Modernity and the Porfirian Railway Boom." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 26, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 251-289.
- . "Railway Culture and the Civilizing Mission in Mexico." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Arizona, 2008.
- May, Ernest R. *Imperial Democracy: The Emergence of America as a Great Power*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.
- May, Robert E. *Manifest Destiny's Underworld: Filibustering in Antebellum America*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Mayer, George H. *The Republican Party, 1854-1966*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- McAfee, Ward M. *Religion, Race, and Reconstruction: The Public School in the Politics of the 1870s*. New York: SUNY Press, 1998.
- McAvoy, Thomas T. *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- McCaffrey, Lawrence J. *The Irish Catholic Diaspora in America*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997.
- McCartin, James P. "Anti-Catholicism." *Dictionary of American History*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Volume 1, edited by Stanley I. Kutler, 195-197. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2003.

- McClintock, Russell. *Lincoln and the Decision for War: The Northern Response to Secession*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008.
- McDonough, Matthew Davitian. "Manifestly Uncertain Destiny: The Debate Over American Expansionism, 1803-1848." Ph.D. Dissertation. Kansas State University Press, 2011.
- McDougal, Dennis. *Privileged Son: Otis Chandler and the Rise and Fall of the L.A. Times Dynasty*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing, 2001.
- McEniry, Blanche Marie. *American Catholics in the War with Mexico*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1937.
- McGowan, Brian M. "The Second Conquest of Mexico: American Volunteers, Republicanism, and the Mexican War." Ph.D. Dissertation. Tulane University. 2011.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Christianity's Dangerous Idea: The Protestant Revolution-A History from the Sixteenth Century to the Twenty-First*. New York: Harper Collins, 2007.
- McFarland, Gerald W. *Mugwumps, Morals & Politics, 1884-1920*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1975.
- McMath, Robert C. Jr. *American Populism: A Social History, 1877-1898*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.
- McNeely, John H. *The Railways of Mexico: A Study in Nationalization*. El Paso: Texas Western College, 1964.
- Mead, Sidney E. *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America*. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Mead, Walter Russell. "God's Country?" *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 47, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 5-15.
- . *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World*. New York and London: Routledge, 2002.
- Mecham, Lloyd J. *The United States and Inter-American Security, 1889-1960*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1961.
- Meier, Matt S., and Margo Gutiérrez, *Encyclopedia of the Mexican American Civil Rights Movement*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000.

- Merk, Frederick. *Manifest Destiny and Mission in American History: A Reinterpretation*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Merrill, Dennis. *Negotiating Paradise: U.S. Tourism and Empire in Twentieth Century Latin America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Merwin, Bannister. *A Continuous History of the Twentieth Century, Volume I*. New York: J.A. Hill & Co., 1904.
- Metz, Leon C. *Border: The U.S.-Mexico Line*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2008.
- Meyer, Eugenia. *John Kenneth Turner: Periodista de México*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2005.
- Meyer, Michael C., and William L. Sherman, *The Course of Mexican History*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Meyer, Michael C., William L. Sherman and Susan M. Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History*. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Michaels, Albert L., and Marvin Bernstein, "The Modernization of the Old Order: Organization and Periodization of Twentieth-Century Mexican History." In *Contemporary Mexico: Papers of the IV International Congress of Mexican History*, edited by James W. Wilkie, Michael C. Meyer and Edna Monzón de Wilkie, 687-710. Berkeley and Mexico City: University of California Press and El Colegio de Mexico, 1976.
- Miraldi, Robert. *Muckraking and Objectivity: Journalism's Colliding Traditions*. New York and Westport: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Montejano, David. *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.
- Montgomery, Robert L. *Introduction to the Sociology of Missions*. Westport, CN: and London: Praeger, 1999.
- Mora-Torres, Juan. *The Making of the Mexican Border*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001.
- Moore, R. Laurence. *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Moorhead, James H. "The American Israel: Protestant Tribalism and Universal Mission." *Many are Chosen: Divine Election & Western Nationalism*, edited by William R. Hutchison and Hartmut Lehmann, 145-166. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

- Morales Cruz, Joel. "The Origins of Mexican Protestantism: Catholic Pluralism, Enlightenment Religion and the *Iglesia de Jesus* Movement in Nineteenth-Century Mexico (1859-1872)." Ph.D. Dissertation, The Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 2009.
- Mora-Torres, Juan. "Los de casa se van, los de fuera no vienen': The First Mexican Immigrants, 1848-1900." In *Beyond La Frontera: The History of Mexico-U.S. Migration*, edited by Mark Overmyer-Velázquez, 3-27. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Moreno-Bird, Juan Carlos and Jaime Ros. *Development and Growth in the Mexican Economy: A Historical Perspective*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Morgan, David. *Visual Piety: A History and Theory of Popular Religious Images*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Morgan, H. Wayne. *From Hayes to McKinley: National Party Politics, 1877-1896*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1969.
- Moseley, Edward H. "The Religious Impact of the American Occupation of Mexico City, 1847-1848." In *Militarists, Merchants and Missionaries: United States Expansion in Middle America* edited by Eugene R. Huck & Edward H. Moseley, 39-52. Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1970.
- Mostkoff, Aida. "Foreign Visions and Images of Mexico: One Hundred Years of International Tourism, 1821-1921. PhD Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1999.
- Mott, Frank Luther. *A History of American Magazines 1885-1905 Volume IV*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Mulkern, John R. *The Know-Nothing Party in Massachusetts: The Rise and Fall of a People's Movement*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990.
- Murphy, Douglas A. "Mexican Tourism, 1876-1940: Socio-Economic, Political and Infrastructural Effects of a Developing Leisure Industry." MA Thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1988.
- Murray, Paul V. *The Catholic Church in Mexico: Historical Essays for the General Reader Volume I (1519-1910)*. Mexico: Editorial E.P.M., 1965.
- Neely, Jr., Mark E. *The Last Best Hope of Earth: Abraham Lincoln and the Promise of America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

- Neils, Patricia, ed. *U.S. Attitudes and Policies toward China: The Impact of American Missionaries*, edited by Patricia Neils. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc, 1990.
- Niemeyer, Jr., E.V. *Revolution at Querétaro: The Mexican Constitutional Convention of 1916-1917*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1974.
- Ninkovich, Frank. *Global Dawn: The Cultural Foundation of American Internationalism, 1865-1890*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- . *The United States and Imperialism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Noll, Mark A. *The Old Religion in a New World: The History of North American Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Nordstrom, Justin. *Danger on the Doorstep: Anti-Catholicism and American Print Culture in the Progressive Era*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2006.
- Norman, Matthew. "Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, the Model Republic and the Right of Revolution, 1848-61." *Politics and Culture of the Civil War Era: Essays in Honor of Robert W. Johannsen*, edited by Daniel McDonough and Kenneth W. Noe, 154-177. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2006.
- O'Brien, Thomas, F. *Making the Americas: The United States and Latin America from the Age of Revolutions to the Era of Globalization*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2007.
- . *The Revolutionary Mission: American Enterprises in Latin America, 1900-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- O'Connor, Daniel. *Three Centuries of Mission: The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1701-2000*. London and New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Oberdeck, Kathryn J. *The Evangelist and the Impresario: Religion, Entertainment, and Cultural Politics in America, 1884-1914*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Ogle, Ralph Hedrick. *Federal Control of the Western Apaches, 1848-1886*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.
- Olliff, Donathon C. *Reforma Mexico and the United States: A Search for Alternatives to Annexation, 1854-1861*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1981.
- Olson, James S. *Catholic Immigrants in America*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1987.

- Onuf, Nicholas and Peter Onuf, *Nations, Markets, and War: Modern History and the American Civil War*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2006.
- Orozco Linares, Fernando. *Porfirio Díaz y su tiempo*. México: Panorama Editorial, 1986.
- Orozco, Monica I. "Protestant Missionaries, Mexican Liberals, Nationalism and the Issue of Cultural Incorporation of Indigenous People in Mexico, 1870-1900." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Santa Barbara, 1999.
- Overmyer-Velazquez, Mark. *Visions of the Emerald City: Modernity, Tradition, and the Formation of Porfirian Oaxaca, Mexico*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006.
- Owsley, Sr. Frank Lawrence, *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America*, 3rd Edition, revised by Harriet Chappell Owsley. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2008.
- Painter, Nell Irvin. *Standing at Armageddon: The United States, 1877-1919*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co, 1987.
- Paludan, Phillip Shaw. *The Presidency of Abraham Lincoln*. Lawrence: The University Press of Kansas, 1994.
- Pardo, Osvaldo F. *The Origins of Mexican Catholicism: Nahua Rituals and Christian Sacraments in Sixteenth- Century Mexico*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Paredes, Raymund A. "The Origins of Anti-Mexican Sentiment in the United States." In *New Directions in Chicano Scholarship*, 139-165. La Jolla: University of California Press, 1978.
- Park, James William. *Latin American Underdevelopment: A History of Perspectives in the United States, 1870-1965*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1995.
- Parlee, Lorena M. "The Impact of United States Railroad Unions on Organized Labor and Government Policy in Mexico (1880-1911)." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 64, no. 3 (August 1984): 443-475.
- . "Porfirio Diaz, Railroads, and Development in Northern Mexico: A Study of Government Policy toward the Central and National Railroads, 1876-1910." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at San Diego, 1981.
- Passananti, Thomas P. "Dynamizing the Economy in a *facon irreguliere*: A New Look at



- Financial Politics in Porfirian Mexico.” *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 24, no. 1 (Winter 2008): 1-29.
- . “‘Nada de Papeluchos!’ Managing Globalization in Early Porfirian Mexico,” *Latin American Research Review* 42, no. 3 (October 2007): 101-128.
- Pasztor, Suzanne B. *The Spirit of Hidalgo: The Mexican Revolution in Coahuila*. Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Press, 2002.
- Paz, Octavio. *The Labyrinth of Solitude and Other Writings*. New York: Grove Press, 1985.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
- Pennanen, Gary Alvin. “The Foreign Policy of William Maxwell Evarts.” Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1969.
- Penton, Marvin James. “Mexico’s Reformation: A History of Mexican Protestantism from its Inception to the Present.” Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1965.
- Pérez, Louis A. Jr. *Cuba in the American Imagination: Metaphor and the Imperial Ethos*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, 2008.
- Perkins, Bradford. *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations: Volume I, The Creation of a Republican Empire, 1776-1865*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Perkins, Mary Anne. *Christendom and European Identity: The Legacy of a Grand Narrative since 1789*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Perry, Richard J. *Western Apache Heritage: People of the Mountain Corridor*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.
- Pettit, Arthur G. *Images of the Mexican American in Fiction and Film*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1980.
- Pfeifer, Michael J. *Rough Justice: Lynching and American Society, 1874-1947*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004.
- Phillips, Clifton Jackson. *Protestant America and the Pagan World: The First Half-Century of the America Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1810-1860*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Piccato, Pablo. *The Tyranny of Opinion: Honor in the Construction of the Mexican Public Sphere*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

- Pike, Frederick, B. *The United States and Latin America*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1992.
- Pinheiro, John C. "Extending the Light and Blessings of Our Purer Faith": Anti-Catholic Sentiment among American Soldiers in the U.S.-Mexican War." *Journal of Popular Culture* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 129-153.
- *Manifest Ambition: James K. Polk and Civil-Military Relations During the Mexican War*. Westport, CN: Praeger Security International 2007.
- "On Their Knees to Jesuits': Nativist Conspiracy Theories and the Mexican War," *Nineteenth-Century America: Essays in Honor of Paul H. Bergeron*, edited by W. Todd Groce and Stephen V. Ash, 35-54. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 2005.
- "'Religion Without Restriction': Anti-Catholicism, All Mexico and the Treaty Of Guadalupe Hidalgo." *Journal of the Early Republic* 23, no.1 (Spring 2007): 69-97.
- Piper, John F. "The Development of the Missionary Ideas of Robert E. Speer." In *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy*, edited by Wilbert R. Shenk, 261-280. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- Porter, Eugene O. "The Beginning of the Protestant Movement in Mexico." *The Historian* 3 (Autumn 1940): 15-21.
- Pletcher, David M. "1861-1898, Economic Growth and Diplomats Adjustment." In *Economics & World Power: An Assessment of American Diplomacy since 1789*, edited by William H. Becker and Samuel F. Wells, Jr., 119-171. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- . *Awkward Years: American Foreign Relations under Garfield and Arthur*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1962.
- . *The Diplomacy of Trade and Investment: American Economic Expansion in the Hemisphere, 1865-1900*. Columbia and London: The University of Missouri Press, 1998.
- . "Manifest Destiny." *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy*, Alexander DeConde, 526-534. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
- . "Mexico Opens the Door to American Capital, 1877-1880." *The Americas* 16, no. 1 (July 1959): 1-14.



- Postel, Charles. *The Populist Vision*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Powell, Philip Wayne. *Tree of Hate: Propaganda and Prejudices Affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World*. New York and London: Basic Books, Inc, 1971.
- Powell, T.G. "Priests and Peasants in Central Mexico: Social Conflict during 'La Reforma.'" *Hispanic American Historical Review* 57, no 2 (May 1977): 296-313.
- Pratt, Julius W. *A History of United States Foreign Policy* 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London and New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Preston, Andrew. "Bridging the Gap between the Sacred and the Secular in the History of American Foreign Relations." *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 5 (November 2006): 783-812.
- Raat, W. Dirk. *Mexico and the United States: Ambivalent Vistas* Third Edition. Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- . *Revoltosos: Mexico's Rebels in the United States, 1903-1923*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1981.
- Rabe, Stephen G., *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Rable, George C. *The Confederate Republic: A Revolution against Politics*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Rahe, Paul A. *Republics. Ancient and Modern: Classical Republicanism and the American Revolution*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Ramirez, Felipe Tena. *Leyes fundamentales de México, 1808-1999*. México: Editorial Porrúa, 1999.
- Ratner, Lorman A., and Dwight L. Teeter, Jr., *Fanatics and Fire-eaters: Newspapers and the Coming of the Civil War*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003.
- Rebert, Paula. *La Gran Línea: Mapping the United States-Mexico Boundary, 1849-1857*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001.

- Redinger, Matthew A. *American Catholics and the Mexican Revolution, 1924-1936*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.
- Reed, James. *The Missionary Mind and American East Asia Policy, 1911-1915*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Reeves, Thomas C. *Twentieth Century America: A Brief History*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Renda, Mary A. *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation and the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1940*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Ribuffo, Leo P. "Religion." In *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Volume 3, edited by Alexander De Conde and Frederick Logevall, 371-392. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2002.
- Rice, John Steven. "Evangelical Episcopalians and the Church of Jesus in Mexico, 1857-1906." Master's Thesis: University of Texas, Pan American, 2000.
- Richardson, Joe, M. *Christian Reconstruction: The American Missionary Association and Southern Blacks, 1861-1890*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Ridley, Jasper. *Maximilian and Juarez*. New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1992.
- Rifkin, Mark. *Manifesting America: The Imperial Construction of U.S. National Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Riguzzi, Paolo. "La gestión política de las relaciones comerciales de México con Estados Unidos." In *En busca de una nación soberana: Relaciones internacionales de México, siglos XIX y XX*, edited by Jorge A. Shiavon, Daniela Spenser y Mario Vázquez Olivera. México: Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 2006.
- Rippy, J. Fred. *The United States and Mexico*. New York: F.S. Crofts & Co, 1931.
- Rivera, John-Michael. *The Emergence of Mexican America: Recovering Stories of Mexican Peoplehood in U.S. Culture*. New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. *Contested Truths: Keywords in American Politics since Independence*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1987.
- Rodríguez Díaz, María del Rosario. "Mexico's Vision of Manifest Destiny during the 1847 War." *Journal of Popular Culture* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 41-51.

- Rodríguez O., Jaime E. *The Emergence of Spanish America; Vicente Rocafuerte and Spanish Americanism, 1808-1832*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1975.
- Rodríguez O., Jaime E., and Kathryn Vincent, "Back to the Future: Racism and National Culture in U.S.-Mexican Relations." *Common Border, Uncommon Paths: Race, Culture, and National Identity in U.S.-Mexican Relations*, edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent, 1-14. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997.
- Rodríguez Piña, Javier. "Conservatives Contest the Meaning of Independence, 1846-1855." *¡Viva México! ¡Viva La Independencia! Celebrations of September 16*, edited by William H. Beezley and David E. Lorey, 101-130. Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 2001.
- Romney, Joseph Barnard. "American Interests in Mexico: Development and Impact during the Rule of Porfirio Diaz, 1876-1911." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Utah, 1969.
- Rosales, F. Arturo. *¡Pobre Raza! Violence, Justice, and Mobilization among México Lindo Immigrants, 1900-1936*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999.
- Rosales, F. Arturo. *Testimonio: A Documentary History of the Mexican American Struggle for Civil Rights*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press, 2000.
- Rosenberg, Emily. *Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- . "Gender." *The Journal of American History* 77, no. 1 (June 1990): 116-124.
- . *Spreading the American Dream: American Economic and Cultural Expansion, 1890-1945*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1982.
- Ross Dorothy. "Grand Narrative in American Historical Writing: From Romance to Uncertainty." *American Historical Review* 100, no. 3 (June 1995): 651-677.
- . "Historical Consciousness in Nineteenth-Century America." *American Historical Review* 89, no 4 (October 1984): 909-928.
- . *The Origins of American Social Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Rubin, Anne Sarah. *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- Ruff, Allen "We Called Each Other Comrade": Charles H. Kerr & Company, Radical

- Publishers*. Urbana and Chicago: The University of Illinois Press, 1997.
- Ruíz, Jason. "Americans in the Treasure House: Travel to Mexico in the U.S. Popular Imagination, 1876-1920." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 2008.
- Ruíz, Ramón Eduardo. *The Great Rebellion: Mexico, 1905-1924*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1980.
- . *The People of Sonora and Yankee Capitalists*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1988.
- Ruíz Guerra, Rubén. *Más allá de la diplomacia. relaciones de México con Bolivia, Ecuador y Perú, 1821-1994*. Mexico: Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, 2007.
- Ryan, David. *US Foreign Policy in World History*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876-1916*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Rydell, Robert W., John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle. *Fair America*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
- Salisbury, Joyce E. *The Blood of Martyrs: Unintended Consequences of Ancient Violence*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004.
- Salvatore, Nick. *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen Socialist*. Urbana and Chicago: university of Illinois Press, 1982.
- Salvatore, Ricardo D. "The Enterprise of Knowledge: Representational Machines of Informal Empire." In *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, 69-104. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Salzman, Neil *Reform & Revolution: The Life and Times of Raymond Robins*. Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1991.
- Sánchez, George J. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

- Sánchez, José. *Anticlericalism: A Brief History*. Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1972.
- Sandos, James A. *Rebellion in the Borderlands: Anarchism and the Plan of San Diego, 1904-1923*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992.
- Sandoval, Moises. *On the Move: A History of the Hispanic Church in the United States*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2006.
- Sandoz, Ellis. *Republicanism, Religion, and the Soul of America*. Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2006.
- Saner, R.E.L. "When President Diaz Sought Recognition," *American Bar Association Journal* VI (December 1920): 195-197.
- Santoni, Pedro. *Mexicans at Arms: Puro Federalists and the Politics of War, 1845-1848*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1996.
- Saragoza, Alex M. *The Monterrey Elite and the Mexican State, 1880-1940*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988.
- Schell Jr., William. *Integral Outsiders: The American Colony in Mexico City, 1876-1911*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc., 2001.
- Schmitt, Karl M. "Catholic Adjustment to the Secular State: The Case of Mexico, 1867-1911." *The Catholic Historical Review* 48, no. 2 (July 1962): 182-204.
- . *Mexico and the United States, 1821-1973: Conflict and Coexistence*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1974.
- Schmitz, David F. *Thank God They're on Our Side: The United States & Right-Wing Dictatorships*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- . *The United States and Right-Wing Dictatorships*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Scholes, Walter V. "Church and State at the Mexican Constitutional Convention, 1856-1857." *The Americas* 4, no. 2 (October 1947): 151-174.
- Schonberger, Howard B. *Transportation to the Seaboard: The "Communication Revolution" and American Foreign Policy, 1860-1900*. Westport, CN: Greenwood Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- Schoultz, Lars, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy toward Latin America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.

- Schroeder, Susan "Father José María Mora, Liberalism, and the British and Foreign Bible Society in Nineteenth-Century Mexico," *The Americas* 50, no. 3 (January 1994): 377-397.
- Schwartz, Michael. *The Persistent Prejudice: Anti-Catholicism in America*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1984.
- Schoonover, Thomas David. *Dollars over Dominion: The Triumph of Liberalism in Mexican-United States Relations, 1861-1867*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.
- Schoonover, Thomas. "Napoleon is Coming! Maximilian is Coming? The International History of the Civil War in the Caribbean Basin." In *The Union, The Confederacy, and the Atlantic Rim*, edited by Robert E. May, 101-130. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1995.
- Schoonover, Thomas. *Uncle Sam's War of 1898 and the Origins of Globalization*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2003.
- Seat, Karen K. "*Providence Has Freed Our Hands*": *Women's Missions and the American Encounter with Japan*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2008.
- Semonche, John E. "The American Magazine of 1906-1915: Principle vs. Profit." *Journalism Quarterly* 40 (Winter 1963): 36-44.
- Sharkey, Heather J. *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empire*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Shenk, Wilbert R. "Introduction." *North American Foreign Missions, 1810-1914: Theology, Theory, and Policy*, edited by William R. Shenk, 1-8. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.
- Shore, Elliott. *Talkin' Socialism: J.A. Wayland and the Role of the Press in American Radicalism, 1890-1912*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1988.
- Silbey, Joel. *The American Political Nation, 1838-1893*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Silverstone, Scott A. *Divided Union: The Politics of War in the Early American Republic*. Ithaca, NY and London: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Simmons, Merle E., *The Mexican Corrido as a Source for Interpretive Study of Modern Mexico (1870- 1950)*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1957.
- Sinkin, Richard N. *The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876: A Study in Liberal Nation-Building*. Austin: Institute of Latin American Studies, 1979.



- Smith, Peter H. *Talons of the Eagle: Dynamics of U.S.-Latin American Relations*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Smith, Phyllis Lynn. "Contentious Voices Amid the Order: The Porfirian Press in Mexico City, 1876-1911." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Arizona Press, 1996.
- Smith, Joseph. *Illusions of Conflict: Anglo-American Diplomacy toward Latin America, 1865-1896*. Pittsburg, PN: University of Pittsburg Press, 1979.
- Smith, Ryan K. *Gothic Arches, Latin Crosses: Anti-Catholicism and American Church Designs in the Nineteenth Century*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Solomon, Michael. "Saving the 'Slaves of Kings and Priests': The United States, Manifest Destiny and the Rhetoric of Anti-Catholicism." Master's Thesis, Duquesne University, 2009.
- Stagg, J.C.A. *Borderlines in Borderlands: James Madison and the Spanish-American Frontier, 1776-1821*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Standish, Peter. *A Companion to Mexican Studies*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Tamesis, 2006.
- Stanley, Brian. "Christian Missions and the Enlightenment: A Reevaluation." *Christian Missions and the Enlightenment*, edited by Brian Stanley. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2001.
- Stephanson, Anders. *Manifest Destiny: American Expansion and the Empire of Right*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1995.
- Stevens, Donald Fithian. *Origins of Instability in Early Republican Mexico*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Stout, Jr., Joseph A. *Schemers & Dreamers: Filibustering in Mexico, 1848-1921*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 2002.
- Stover, John F. *American Railroads*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.
- Streitmatter, Rodge. *Voices of Revolution: The Dissident Press in America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Summers, Mark Wahlgren. *A Dangerous Stir: Fear, Paranoia and the Making of Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.

- . *Party Games: Getting, Keeping and Using Power in Gilded Age Politics*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- . *The Press Gang: Newspapers & Politics, 1865-1878*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Sylvest, Ed. "Bordering Cultures and the Origins of Hispanic Protestant Christianity." *Protestantes? Protestants: Hispanic Christianity within Mainline Traditions*, edited by David Maldonado Jr., 21-37. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999.
- Taft, Philip. *The A.F.L. in the Time of Gompers*. New York: Octagon Books, 1970.
- Temple, Henry W. "William H. Seward." *The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, Volume VII, edited by Samuel Flagg Bemis, 3-115. New York: Copper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963.
- Thomson, Guy P.C. "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 10, no. 3 (1991): 265-292.
- Tenenbaum, Barbara A. "The Return of the *Lumpen*: Reflections on the Mexican Bourgeoisie, 1760-1867." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 2 no.1 (Winter 1986): 153-166.
- Tenorio-Trillo, Mauricio. *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: The University of California Press, 1996.
- Terrill, Thomas E. *The American South: A History*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Lanhan, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2009.
- Tichi, Cecilia. *Civic Passions: Seven Who Launched Progressive America*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009.
- Tinker, George E. *Missionary conquest: The Gospel and Native American Cultural Genocide*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Tischendorf, Alfred. *Great Britain and Mexico in the Era of Porfirio Diaz*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1961.
- Topik, Steven C. *Trade and Gunboats: The United States and Brazil in the Age of Empire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Topik, Steven C., and Allen Wells. "Introduction: Latin America's Response to International Markets during the Export Boom." In *The Second Conquest of Latin America: Coffee, Henequen, and Oil during the Export Boom, 1850-1930*, edited by Steven C. Topik and Allen Wells, 1-36. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1998.



- Trefousse, Hans L. *President Hayes*. New York: Henry Holt and Co, 2002.
- Troyer, Loris. *Portage Pathways*. Kent, OH: The Kent State University Press, 1998.
- Truett, Samuel. *Fugitive Landscapes: The Forgotten History of the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Truett, Samuel, and Elliott Young, "Making Transnational History: Nations, Regions, and Borderlands." In *Continental Crossroads: Remapping U.S.-Mexico Borderlands History*, edited by Samuel Truett and Elliott Young, 1-32. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004.
- Truxillo, Charles A. *By the Sword and the Cross: The Historical Evolution of the Catholic World Monarchy in Spain and the New World, 1492-1825*. Westport, CN and London: Greenwood Press, 2001.
- Turner, Ethel Duffy. *Revolution in Baja California: Ricardo Flores Magon's High Noon*. Detroit: Blaine Ethridge Books, 1981.
- Turner, Frederick C. *The Dynamic of Mexican Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1968.
- Tyrell, Ian. *Reforming the World: The Creation of America's Moral Empire*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- . *Transnational Nation: United States History in Global Perspective since 1789*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Underwood, Kenneth Dale. "Mining Wars: Corporate Expansion and Labor Violence in the Western Desert, 1876-1920." Ph.D diss., University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 2009.
- Unger, Nancy C. *Fighting Bob La Follette: The Righteous Reformer*. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Utley, Robert M. *Lone Star Justice: The First Century of the Texas Rangers*. Oxford and London: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Valadés, José C. *El Porfirismo: historia de un régimen, el nacimiento 1876-1884*. Mexico: Antigua librería Robredo, 1941.
- Vanderwood, Paul. "Betterment for Whom? The Reform Period: 1855-1875." *The Oxford History of Mexico*, edited by Michael C. Meyer and Williams H. Beezley, 371-396. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- . *Disorder and Progress: Bandits, Police and Mexican Development*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1981.
- Van Wagenen, Michael Scott. "Remembering the Forgotten War: Memory and the United States-Mexican War, 1848-2008." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Utah, 2009.
- Varg, Paul A. *America, from Client State to World Power: Six Major Transitions in United States Foreign Relations*. Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990.
- . *Missionaries, Chinese, and Diplomats: The American Protestant Missionary Movement in China, 1890-1952*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Vázquez Gómez, Juana. *Dictionary of Mexican Rulers, 1325-1997*. Westport, CN and London: Greenwood Press, 1997.
- Vázquez Palacios, Felipe. "Democratic Activity and Religious Practices of Evangelicals in Mexico." In *Evangelical Christianity and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by Paul Preston, 37-61. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Vazzano, Frank P. "The Louisiana Question Resurrected: The Potter Commission and the Election of 1876." *Louisiana History* 16, no. 1 (Winter 1975): 39-57.
- Verter, Mitchell Cowen. "Biographical Sketch." *Dreams of Freedom: A Ricardo Flores Magón Reader*, edited Chaz Bufe and Mitchell Cowen Verter, 21-105. Edinburgh and Oakland: AK Press, 2005.
- The View from Chapultepec: Mexican Writers on the Mexican American War*, edited by Cecil Robinson. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1989.
- Walker, Randi Jones. *Protestantism in the Sangre de Cristos, 1850-1920*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991.
- Walls, Andrew F. "The American Dimension in the History of the Missionary Movement." In *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880-1980*, edited by Joel A. Carpenter and Wilbert R. Shenk, 1-25. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1990.
- Wang, Xi. *The Trial of Democracy: Black Suffrage and Northern Republicans, 1860-1910*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 2000.
- Ward, James A. *Railroads and the Character of America, 1820-1887*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1986.

- Wasserman, Mark. *Everyday Life and Politics in Nineteenth Century Mexico: Men, Women and War*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000.
- Watson, Harry L. *Liberty and Power: The Politics of Jacksonian America*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1990.
- Webb, Stephen H. *American Providence: A Nation with a Mission*. New York and London: Continuum, 2004.
- Weber, David J. "'Scarce more than Apes.' Historical Roots of Anglo American Stereotypes of Mexicans in the Border Region." In *New Spain's Far Northern Frontier: Essays on Spain in the American West*, edited by David J. Weber, 295-307. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979.
- Webster, Michael Gordon. "Texan Manifest Destiny and the Mexican Border Conflict, 1865-1880." Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1972.
- Weiner, Richard. *Race, Nation, and Market: Economic Culture in Porfirian Mexico*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2004.
- Weintraub, Sidney. *Un-Equal Partners: The United States and Mexico*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.
- Wells, Allen. "Yucatan, Violence and Social Control on Henequen Plantations." *Other Mexico's: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876-1911*, edited by Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie, 213-241. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984.
- Wells, Allen, and Gilbert M. Joseph. *Summer of Discontent, Seasons of Upheaval: Elite Politics and Rural Insurgency in Yucatán, 1876-1915*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.
- Williams, Charles R. *The Life of Rutherford Birchard Hayes Volume II*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914.
- Williams, David R. *Wilderness Lost: The Religious Origins of the American Mind*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1987.
- Williams, William Appleman. *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Second Edition Revised. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.
- Winn, Wilkins B. "The Efforts of the United States to Secure Religious Liberty in a Commercial Treaty with Mexico, 1825-1831." *The Americas* 28, no. 3 (January 1972): 311-332.
- Womack, John Jr. *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1968.

- Wrobel, David M. *The End of American Exceptionalism: Frontier Anxiety from the Old West to the New Deal*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.
- Yaremko, Jason M. *U.S. Protestant Missions in Cuba: From Independence to Castro*. Gainesville: University Press, of Florida, 2000.
- Yates, Timothy. *Christian Mission in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Yeager, Gene. "Porfirian Commercial Propaganda: Mexico in the World Industrial Expositions," *The Americas* 34, no. 2 (October 1977): 230-243.
- Yohn, Susan M. *A Contest of Faiths: Missionary Women and Pluralism in the American Southwest*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Young, Daniel James. "The Cincinnati Plan and the National Presbyterian Church of Mexico: A Brief Study of Relations Between American Mission Boards and Mexican Protestant Churches During the Mexican Revolution." Master's Thesis: The University of Texas at El Paso, 2006.
- Young, Elliott. *Catarino Garza's Revolution on the Texas-Mexico Border*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
- . "Imagining Alternative Modernities: Ignacio Martinez's Travel Narratives." *Continental Crossroads: Remapping U.S.-Mexico Borderlands History*, edited by Samuel Truett and Elliott Young, 151-179. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004.
- "*Yours for the Revolution:*" *The Appeal to Reason, 1895-1922*, edited by John Graham. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.
- Zea, Leopoldo. *Positivism in Mexico*, translated by Josephine H. Schulte. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1974.
- Zoraida Vázquez, Josefina. "The Colonization and Loss of Texas: A Mexican Perspective." *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*, edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent, 47-78. Wilmington, DE: A Scholarly Resources Inc., 1997.
- Zoraida Vázquez, Josefina and Lorenzo Meyer, *The United States and Mexico*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1985.