



[www.senado2010.gob.mx](http://www.senado2010.gob.mx)

[www.juridicas.unam.mx](http://www.juridicas.unam.mx)

## THE STATUS OF BIOGRAPHY IN MEXICAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

HUGH M. HAMILL JR.

### I. INTRODUCTION: WHERE HAVE ALL THE SCHOLARS GONE?

Hundreds upon hundreds of biographies crowd the libraries, book stalls and uncritical bibliographies which specialize in Mexican history yet it is unlikely that a responsible list of the ten most significant contributions to historiography will give published lives of Mexico's historical figures a prominent place. This relative scarcity of distinguished works about individuals is not unique to Mexican historiography. In his germinal study of the genre, John Garraty has commented that "for a literary form with a long history, biography has produced fewer recognized masterpieces than any other type of writing. . ." <sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, the absence of many first rate biographies of Mexicans is curious in a society where personalist leadership has played such an important role.

The reasons for this phenomenon, especially in recent scholarship, have something to do with the growing vogue of the behavioral sciences on the one hand and the sustained emphasis on the history of impersonal institutions, revolutions and causes on the other. Even works which are touted as biographies are more properly classified in other ways. John Womack's admirable and exhaustive treatise on the agrarian revolt in Morelos might better have been entitled *Zapatismo and the Mexican Revolution*, for Emiliano Zapata himself emerges almost incidental to the movement. <sup>2</sup>

It is the special demands of biographical research and writing which are, however, principally to blame for the shortage of first rate biographies of Mexicans. The first problem has to do with the biographer's critical response to his subject. Truth must be his touchstone but, as in the assessment of anyone with whom we have intimate contact, it is the qualities of personality which are most difficult to describe and assess. The love-hate relationship that frequently develops between scholar and historical figure must be unsnarled through dispassionate self-criticism at the time of writing and editing. Research into impersonal institutions requires special skills, detachment and restraint but the

<sup>1</sup> John A. Garraty, *The Nature of Biography* (New York, 1957).

<sup>2</sup> John Womack, Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (New York, 1969).

temptation to fall into the gulf of polemical writing has often fatal attractions for the biographer. Moreover, good biography requires the most severe literary discipline of all historiographical writing. Writers of fiction often preëempt the place of the professional scholar because they are more adept at revealing personality. Were Carlos Fuentes to write *La muerte de Álvaro Obregón* after four years of training in the canons of historical scholarship the result might well be epic! Conversely, historians might learn much about how to treat the subtle contours of personality from novelists before attempting biography. Nor has any Mexican personage yet received the probing attention of the historian trained in psychological techniques. Erik H. Erikson's *Young Man Luther: a Study in Psychoanalysis and History* suggests perspectives which should be carefully considered by Mexicanists.<sup>3</sup>

The biographical approach to Mexican historiography is plagued by one other condition that is not necessarily shared among historians involved with impersonal studies. This is, of course, the matter of source materials. It has not been easy, especially for the non-Mexican scholar, to gain access to family archives and the private papers of important public figures, nor is there a well founded tradition of donating private collections of manuscripts to public archives where they may be freely consulted. There are certainly many exceptions to this but the condition remains. The result has been that many would-be biographers have not taken the trouble to search beyond available public records and published materials, and have relied upon secondary testimonials and autobiographies for those insights into personality which can project a three dimensional subject into two dimensional print. The determination with which Edmundo O'Gorman and his students in the Centro de Estudios de Historia de México have approached the preliminary biographical study of Carlos María de Bustamante is one of several indications, however, that the matter of source availability is being systematically attacked.<sup>4</sup>

For recent history, it should be remarked that there is an important new development in the oral history techniques developed by James Wilkie, among others. Taped interviews, if properly handled, can provide biographers with a wealth of organized personal recollections of profound importance.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> (New York, 1958).

<sup>4</sup> Edmundo O'Gorman, *Guía bibliográfica de Carlos María de Bustamante* (México, 1967).

<sup>5</sup> James W. Wilkie and Edna Monzón de Wilkie, comps., *México visto en el siglo XX: entrevistas de historia oral: Ramón Beteta, Marte R. Gómez, Manuel Gómez Morín, Vicente Lombardo Toledano, Miguel Palomar y Vizcarra, Emilio Portes Gil, Jesús Silva Herzog* (México, 1969).

## II. PURPOSE

Given that biography is a difficult genre and that it has proportionately less appeal for the serious scholar (and a proportionately greater appeal for the polemicist—the hero worshipper and the debunker) the task of assessing the status of Mexican biographical writing remains. Surely the vehicle of biography is a worthy one and it is the purpose of this paper to encourage the publication of new and imaginative lives of notable Mexicans. Such encouragement may result if the bulk of this paper devotes critical attention to recent works, indicates some research already in progress, and reveals tempting lacunae.

A secondary goal is to encourage those who are engaged in bibliographical work to make discrete identification of biographies in separate sections in future publications. My own task in preparing this paper would have been far easier if I had had a critical and well organized bibliography of biographies for the years from 1960 to 1968 to complement the section on biography in Luis González y González, *et al.*, *Fuentes de la historia contemporánea de México: Libros y folletos*.<sup>6</sup> In spite of its many admirable qualities, the new periodical *Bibliografía Histórica Mexicana* has no section on biography. Such an innovation would provide a useful cross-reference tool.<sup>7</sup>

## III. LIMITS

Although a concentrated search for biographies preceded the composition of this paper, there is no intent to make exhaustive reference to all published lives of all Mexicans. My focus has been narrowed to those biographies written with scholarly intent and methodology about Mexican figures involved in public affairs and social questions between 1800 and 1940. To achieve the purpose described earlier I have emphasized studies completed and in progress during the 1960's. Where especially significant but older books about prominent individuals stand out and have not been superseded, I have tried to mention them.

This focus has meant the exclusion of some forms which are sometimes loosely gathered under the rubric of "biography". Autobiography and the memoir are not treated on the grounds that they are really primary sources which historical biographers must relate to the rest of a man's record. Collected testimonials in honor of an individual,

<sup>6</sup> (México, 1961-62), I, 184-232.

<sup>7</sup> (México, 1967).

whether during or after his lifetime, may be useful for the students of hagiography but they seldom serve as valid biography. Likewise, polemical lives of the great and the ungrateful have been excluded. Scholarly articles in journals are also not covered in this paper because their scope is most often restricted to a single phase or episode in a man's career. The best of these, anyway, are usually sample chapters from subsequently published full-scale biographies brought out to pad personal bibliographies in the time honored fashion of academic gamesmanship. I have in such cases mentioned only the final book length study. Foreigners whose careers included involvement in Mexican affairs have not been treated on the grounds that their lives belong to the historiography of the country of origin. As the literal minded reader will perceive, however, this rule has not been strictly followed for I will discuss the lives of certain Europeans like Iturrigaray and Maximilian. There is no great consistency in my inclusion of artists, men of letters and scientists although an attempt has been made to discuss biographies of those who were also involved in public affairs. As for collective biographies like that of Villaseñor y Villaseñor and *Los gobernantes de México* by Manuel García Purón, they have no place in this discussion.<sup>8</sup> The urge to beg for a monumental dictionary of Mexican national biography, however, cannot be suppressed. Such an undertaking by a group of scholars would be warmly received by all students of Mexican history.

#### IV. BIOGRAPHIES ASSESSED: 1800-1940

Attention paid by biographers to historical figures for any given period is roughly comparable in volume to that assigned to other facets of historiography. A statistical study might demonstrate, however, that Independence, the Era of Reform and Intervention, and the Revolution of 1910 have drawn an even higher proportion of biographies. These were times of crisis in which chance and the breakdown of institutions propelled an abundance of military and personalist leaders into prominence. Ambitious and talented men who came to maturity on the eve of these crises had opportunities to win praise, eternal damnation or scholarly attention that was denied men who were born to less critical ages. Stephen Vincent Benet once indulged in a bit of whimsy when he arbitrarily set Napoleon's birthday back some thirty years. The crusty soldier, whose brain teemed with elaborate military campaigns,

<sup>8</sup> Alejandro Villaseñor y Villaseñor, *Biografías de los héroes y caudillos de la independencia*, 2 vol. (México, 1962); Manuel García Purón, *México y sus gobernantes: biografías* (México, 1964).

was too old to capitalize on the coming French Revolution and died a frustrated major of artillery in 1789.<sup>9</sup>

### A. Independence

It is not a surprise, then, that the years from 1800 to 1821 continue to attract biographers. The 150th anniversary of the Grito de Dolores in 1960 was a stimulus and one can hope that the final triumph of the Army of the Three Guarantees will be similarly noted in 1971 by new lives of Iturbide and Guerrero. It is also no surprise that recent scholarship has focused on insurgent leaders rather than their enemies. Lives of Hidalgo and Morelos continue to dominate. Castillo Ledón's two volume biography of Hidalgo remains the fullest treatment of the Cura of Dolores despite its uncritical methodology and unabashed hero worship.<sup>10</sup> My own work on the rebellion of 1810 began as a biography but developed into a history of the movement itself.<sup>11</sup> A sensitive full dress treatment of this complicated and misunderstood priest is very much needed but it will require the discovery of a fresh lode of source materials by and about Hidalgo. Morelos has drawn the attention of at least five biographers in the 1960's but only Ernesto Lemoine Villicaña and Wilbert H. Timmons have approached him with scholarly intent. Lemoine bolstered his succinct sketch of Morelos' life with a wealth of documents and Timmons has produced a balanced life in English.<sup>12</sup> Other insurgents who have been studied recently are Allende, López Rayón and Matamoros.<sup>13</sup> Except for a study in progress of Tadeo Ortiz by W. H. Timmons it appears that no new critical biographies of promoters of independence will appear in the immediate future.<sup>14</sup>

What is most reprehensible, however, is not that we are without

<sup>9</sup> "The Curfew Tolls", in S. V. Benet, *Selected Works: Prose* (New York, 1942), pp. 383-98.

<sup>10</sup> Luis Castillo Ledón, *Hidalgo: la vida del héroe*, 2 vol. (México, 1948-49).

<sup>11</sup> Hugh M. Hamill, Jr. *The Hidalgo Revolt: Prelude to Mexican Independence* (Gainesville, 1966).

<sup>12</sup> Ernesto Lemoine Villicaña, *Morelos: Su vida revolucionaria a través de sus escritos y de otros testimonios de la época* (México, 1965); Wilbert H. Timmons, *Morelos of Mexico: Priest, Soldier, Statesman* (El Paso, 1963).

<sup>13</sup> Arnando de María y Campos, *Allende: Primer soldado de la nación* (México, 1964); A. María y Campos, *Matamoros: Teniente general insurgente* (México, 1964); Luciano Alexanderson Joubanc, *Ignacio López Rayón: Libertador, unificador y primer legislador de México* (México, 1963). None of these reveals sufficient scholarly objectivity to be considered of major importance.

<sup>14</sup> Wilbert H. Timmons, "Tadeo Ortiz: Mexican Economist and Colonizer", Research in progress. See *Latin American Research Review*, II (1967), hereafter cited as LARR. The last number corresponds to research inventory, not to page.

the needed wave of definitive and balanced lives of the *insurgentes* but that the other side, the royalists and defenders of the Establishment, have been so utterly neglected. Abad y Queipo, the Bishop-elect of Michoacán who excommunicated his old friend Hidalgo, has been routinely treated,<sup>15</sup> but only by casting Iturbide up as a “defender of the status quo” is it possible to find another figure who fought against the insurgents most of his career and who has been adequately studied. Even in his case, I am not convinced that William Spence Robertson has delved as thoroughly as desirable into Iturbide’s life before his victory in September 1821.<sup>16</sup> The sage comment made by Ernesto de la Torre Villar in his brief assessment of a book about *Miramón, el caudillo conservador* applies to Independence as well as to the Reform era:

Este libro, hecho con simpatía, con conocimiento, llena una laguna dentro de la historia mexicana. Es de desearse que los historiadores se atrevan a ocuparse de esos hombres que también han hecho la historia mexicana, sin mostrarse vergonzantes, y sin injuriar a sus enemigos. Sánchez Navarro [the author] superó estas dificultades y su biografía es valiosa por su postura serena y sincera.<sup>17</sup>

There are certainly many figures who “have also made Mexican history” during the years which ended in political emancipation. The viceroys, for example, have been avoided by scholars everywhere. To be sure, Iturrigaray has been thoroughly examined by Enrique Lafuente Ferrari, but the documentation is limited to non-Mexican archives.<sup>18</sup> Besides, Iturrigaray’s flirtation with criolloism before his ouster in Yermo’s coup is sufficient to cast him on the side of nationalist righteousness. The others, however, await serious examination. It is too much to expect that Pedro Garibay and Lizana y Beaumont deserve extensive book length studies, although the latter, too that he may have been, is a figure whose life might reveal much about the clerical hierarchy and the social and political undercurrents of New Spain in the decade before the Grito de Dolores.

Francisco Javier de Venegas has been written off in curt phrases as an irascible lecher, but a study of his term as viceroy (1810-1813) —if not a full fledged life— would reveal that Venegas was a vigorous and capable leader who may have done more than any other figure

<sup>15</sup> Lillian E. Fisher, *Champion of Reform: Manuel Abad y Queipo* (New York, 1955).

<sup>16</sup> William S. Robertson, *Iturbide of Mexico* (Durham, 1952).

<sup>17</sup> E. de la Torre V. and Arturo Gómez Camacho, “La intervención francesa”, *Historia Mexicana*, xv (1965-66), 607-08.

<sup>18</sup> E. La fuente Ferrari, *El Virrey Iturrigaray y los orígenes de la independencia de Méjico* (Madrid, 1941).

including Calleja to contain the rebellion. Félix María Calleja himself deserves a dispassionate biography. The scholar who attempts a balanced life of Calleja will be able to explore the career of a peninsular who spent more than a quarter century in New Spain; who developed criollo attitudes, family ties and landed property; who was ambivalent toward independence and who developed an extraordinary capacity to frustrate the insurgent cause. Neither C. M. de Bustamante's *Campañas de Calleja*... nor the life of Calleja's wife by Núñez y Domínguez fulfill this need.<sup>19</sup> Juan Ruiz de Apodaca, who took over as viceroys from Calleja in 1816, served through five years of relative serenity... years which have been little studied by historians. Apodaca's life would provide an appropriate lever to enter Mexican politics and to understand the subtleties of restored Bourbon rule. But no one has assayed this delicate task. Lesser figures, too, deserve more attention than they have received but the lack of work at the viceregal level is sufficient to indicate the dimensions of the problem.

### B. *The Early Republic*

If we accept that peak interest in individuals conforms to the major crises in Mexican history (Independence, the Reform, the Revolution of 1910) it is no surprise to discover that the years from 1821-1854, which encompass a most significant generation, have attracted much less attention from biographers. I hold this to be understandable... but not good.

To be sure, there is some indication of research in progress which is heartening. Carlos María de Bustamante should be well served by Edmundo O'Gorman and Valentín Gómez Farías has a new biographer in C. A. Hutchinson.<sup>20</sup> Earlier appraisals of Lucas Alamán and his ideology by Arturo Arnáiz y Freg and Moisés González Navarro may be complemented by Stanley C. Green's current investigation.<sup>21</sup> David Brading and Ward M. Morton have research projects into the life and thought of Fray Servando Teresa de Mier; these would be in addition to Alfonso Junco's *El increíble Fray Servando*.<sup>22</sup> But beyond research

<sup>19</sup> Carlos María de Bustamante, *Campañas del General D. Félix María Calleja*... (México, 1828); José de Núñez y Domínguez, *La virreina mexicana: Doña María Francisca de la Gándara de Calleja* (México, 1950).

<sup>20</sup> On Bustamante, see p. 3 above; C. A. Hutchinson, "Valentín Gómez Farías: a Biography", Research in Progress, See LARR, II (1966), 346.

<sup>21</sup> A. Arnáiz y Freg, *Lucas Alamán* (México, 1939); M. González Navarro, *El pensamiento político de Lucas Alamán* (México, 1952); S. G. Green, "Lucas Alamán", Ph. D. Dissertation, In Progress, Texas Christian University.

<sup>22</sup> D. A. Brading, "The Ideology of Mexican Independence: an essay devoted to the life and thought of Fray Servando Teresa de Mier (1763-1827)..."

completed on the life of Miguel Ramos Arizpe by the ubiquitous Lillian Estelle Fisher, I find very little more to report by way of fresh studies.<sup>23</sup>

We are left then with a limited number of actual contributions in this decade. Fortunately, in the case of José María Luis Mora, the calibre is high. Charles Hale may argue that his work is a study of liberalism and not properly a traditional biography of Mora. Nevertheless, Mora has been so judiciously treated that the work will stand for a long time.<sup>24</sup> Guillermo Prieto, whose career carried over to the Porfiriato, has been the subject of several recent studies, most notably Malcolm McLean's well-balanced biography and Carlos J. Sierra's combined biography-anthology.<sup>25</sup>

There are, of course, older studies, completed before 1960, which have admirable and enduring qualities. Raymond Estep's life of Lorenzo de Zavala holds up well as does Thomas Cotner's traditional biography of José Joaquín Herrera.<sup>26</sup> Miguel A. Quintana has demonstrated in his two volume study of the entrepreneur Estevan de Antuñano that economic historians can find important subjects for biographical treatment.<sup>27</sup>

Curiously, some figures of greatest political prominence in the early republican history of Mexico have not been adequately examined. Both Vicente Guerrero and Guadalupe Victoria belong to the era of the wars for independence as well as to the 1820's and yet the responsible literature on them is slight. William Sprague's life of Guerrero lacks research in Mexican archives and is too short to be the penetrating study which is needed of a *guerrillero* caught in the broils of an unstable political environment.<sup>28</sup> Mexico's first republican president, Guadalupe Victoria, has also escaped exhaustive critical analysis. Antonio López de Santa Anna, whose name has been so often attached --for better or worse-- to the period between independence and the Reforma, has

Research in Progress, See LARR, III (1968), 838; W. M. Morton, "Biography of Fray Servando de Mier", Research in Progress, See LARR, II (1967), 598; A. Junco, *El increíble Fray Servando: Psicología y epistolario* (México, 1959).

<sup>23</sup> L. E. Fisher, "Patriot and Constitution Maker: Miguel Ramos Arizpe", Research in Progress, See LARR, III (1968), 973.

<sup>24</sup> Charles A. Hale, *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821-1853* (New Haven, 1968).

<sup>25</sup> Malcolm D. McLean, *Vida y obra de Guillermo Prieto* (México, 1960); C. J. Sierra, *Guillermo Prieto* (México, 1962).

<sup>26</sup> R. Estep, *Lorenzo de Zavala: Profeta del liberalismo mexicano* (México, 1952); T. E. Cotner, *The Military and Political Career of José Joaquín de Herrera* (Austin, 1949).

<sup>27</sup> M. A. Quintana, *Estevan de Antuñano: Fundador de la industria textil en Puebla*, 2 vols. (México, 1957).

<sup>28</sup> W. F. Sprague, *Vicente Guerrero, Mexican Liberator: a Study in Patriotism* (Chicago, 1939).



been the subject of several responsible and important studies. Those by Rafael Felipe Muñoz, Carmen Flores Mena and, especially, José Fuentes Mares in Spanish and by Wilfred H. Callcott in English are best known.<sup>29</sup> None of these biographies, however, provide the definitive work on that complex man and his times nor does the recent contribution by Oakan L. Jones, Jr.<sup>30</sup>

Spotting lacunae among the biographies of significant Mexicans from the second quarter of the nineteenth century is a good deal easier than it should be. To give some examples, there is an absence of recent and effective lives of Andrés de Quintana Roo, Manuel Gómez Pedraza, Anastasio Bustamante, Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga, Mariano Otero, Manuel Peña y Peña, Mariano Arista and José María Gutiérrez de Estrada. It may well be that documentary resources are inadequate for one or more of these figures but they are significant actors who deserve serious evaluation. Some of them, in their careers as politicians, jurists, soldiers, idologues and plotters, overlap earlier or later periods.

### C. *From Reform to Restoration*

The mid-nineteenth-century Mexican Reform generation is a rich one for biographers. Although fascination with the heroes of the Revolution of Ayutla has produced a good harvest, there is still ample room for dedicated scholars. As with the wars for independence, the lacunae are much greater among the conservatives, the opponents of the 1857 Constitution, the monarchists and the francophile interventionists. This is not to say that their liberal opponents are universally revered in the existing biographical literature. The polemical attacks on Juárez are an obvious example. But it is clear that those who "have also made Mexican history" have received short shrift. Biographically inclined scholars can choose from a long list which includes Juan Almonte, José Manuel Hidalgo y Esnaurrizar, Leandro Márquez, Tomás Mejía and Félix Zuloaga among the diplomatic-military-political types and Bishops Pelagio Antonio de Labastida y Dávalos and Clemente de Jesús Munguía among the anti-Reform clergy. To be sure, as de la Torre has reminded us, the Sánchez Navarro biography of Miguel Miramón is a mature and measured study of one foe of the Reform, but it is

<sup>29</sup> R. F. Muñoz, *Santa Anna, el que todo lo ganó y todo lo perdió* (Madrid, 1936); Carmen Flores Mena, *El general don Antonio López de Santa Anna, 1810-1833* (México, 1950); J. Fuentes Mares, *Santa Anna: Aurora y ocaso de un comediante* (México, 1956); W. H. Callcott, *Santa Anna: the Story of an Enigma Who Once Was Mexico* (Norman, 1936). The latter has been reprinted: Hamden, Conn., 1964.

<sup>30</sup> O. L. Jones, Jr., *Santa Anna* (New York, 1968).

difficult to find others.<sup>31</sup> Santiago Vidaurri, the powerful boss of Nuevo León who left the liberals to support Maximilian and faced a firing squad for his mistake, is the subject of a study by Edward Mosley.<sup>32</sup> The moderate Ignacio Comonfort, who sought to temporize between irreconcilables, is also the subject of current research by Ray F. Broussard.<sup>33</sup> This will supplement and extend the biographical sketch of Comonfort in Rosaura Hernández Rodríguez' valuable documentary compilation.<sup>34</sup> Jesús González Ortega, another Reform commander who broke with Juárez over political succession, has been studied by Eliseo Rangel Gaspar.<sup>35</sup>

Maximilian, the ultimate dupe, has, of course, attracted more attention than any other exponent of a lost cause in Mexican history. "Eventful hero" rather than "event maker", in Sidney Hook's terminology, Maximilian's romantic tragedy has stimulated biographers in abundance.<sup>36</sup> Egon C. Corti's classic study has just been reissued in its English version and one of the more compelling recent works is *Maximilien et Charlotte* by Suzanne Desternes and Henriette Chandet.<sup>37</sup>

Turning to the beneficiaries of the Ayutla revolution against Santa Anna, the figure of Benito Juárez has attracted continuous attention. It may be, however, that "the definitive biography" of Juárez will remain as illusive as the man and that any new biographer will be drawn into the polemical world of hero worship or character assassination. This is not to say that there have been no good works on Juárez and his times. There is certainly merit in the scholarly four volumes which José Fuentes Mares produced in spite of his unconcealed dislike of Juárez for his failure to support democratic principles.<sup>38</sup> Ralph Roeder's older study and the more recent examination of Juárez by Charles A. Smart err on the other side.<sup>39</sup> Roeder's ability to recreate

<sup>31</sup> Carlos Sánchez Navarro y Peón, *Miramón, el caudillo conservador* (México, 1945).

<sup>32</sup> E. H. Mosley, "Biography of Santiago Vidaurri", *Research in Progress*, See LARR, II (1967), 3.

<sup>33</sup> Ray F. Broussard, "Biography of Ignacio Comonfort", *Research in Progress*, See LARR, I (1965-66), 131.

<sup>34</sup> R. Hernández Rodríguez, *Ignacio Comonfort: Trayectoria política, Documentos* (México, 1967).

<sup>35</sup> E. Rangel Gaspar, *Jesús González Ortega: Caudillo de la Reforma* (México, 1960).

<sup>36</sup> Sidney Hook, *The Hero in History* (Boston, 1955), Ch. IX.

<sup>37</sup> E. C. Corti, *Maximilian and Charlotte of Mexico*, 2 vol. in 1 (Hamden, Conn., 1968); S. Desternes and H. Chandet, *Maximilien et Charlotte* (Paris, 1964).

<sup>38</sup> Juárez y los Estados Unidos (México, 1964); Juárez y la intervención (México, 1962); Juárez y el imperio (México, 1963); Juárez y la República (México, 1965).

<sup>39</sup> R. Roeder, *Juárez and his Mexico*, 2 vol. (New York, 1947); C. A. Smart, *Viva Juárez!* (Philadelphia, 1963).

the political and social *ambiente* of the Reform and the Intervention, however, have made the work durable in both English and Spanish editions. Not so Smart's *Viva Juárez!* which has been sharply and effectively criticized by Walter V. Scholes, among others, as infected by the "occupational disease for biographers: hero worship", an opinion I share.<sup>40</sup> Scholes' own admirable study of politics in the period, though not a biography, suggests that he or some other careful scholar should at least attempt the difficult task of an exhaustive balanced life of the Reform's most famous figure.<sup>41</sup> Will the *real* Benito Juárez please stand up?

Fortunately, some others in the Reform ranks have received adequate attention from biographers. A sensitive and carefully researched life of Melchor Ocampo was produced fifteen years ago by José Valadés.<sup>42</sup> Ocampo's complex and subtle mind, however, deserves more penetrating attention from another scholar. The journalistic and political career of Francisco Zarco has been placed in clear perspective by Óscar Castañeda Batres and Raymond C. Wheat.<sup>43</sup> Guillermo Prieto, another journalist, has already been discussed. Leandro Valle, the martyred poet, has been treated with compassion and scholarly restraint by Alfonso Teja Zabre.<sup>44</sup> The diplomat and treasury minister Matías Romero is among the bastions of the Reform who is only now being given the attention he deserves by Robert R. Miller and Harry Bernstein.<sup>45</sup>

Military men, as in other periods of crisis, have received a major share of attention. Juan Álvarez, the old soldier from the south, is the subject of a detailed but undigested biography, published ten years ago by Daniel Muñoz y Pérez. The documents gathered in the last two-thirds of the volume will be useful as a point of departure for a major life of Álvarez.<sup>46</sup> May 5, 1962, the centenary of the Battle of Puebla, occasioned the publication of at least four biographies of Ig-

<sup>40</sup> Review in *The Hispanic American Historical Review*, XLV (1965), 647-48.

<sup>41</sup> W. V. Scholes, *Mexican Politics During the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872* (Columbia, Mo., 1957). A paperback version appeared in 1969.

<sup>42</sup> J. C. Valadés, *Don Melchor Ocampo: Reformador de México* (México, 1954).

<sup>43</sup> O. Castañeda Batres, *Francisco Zarco* (México, 1961); Castañeda Batres, *Francisco Zarco ante la intervención francesa y el imperio, 1863-1864* (México, 1958); R. C. Wheat, *Francisco Zarco: El portavoz liberal de la Reforma* (México, 1957).

<sup>44</sup> A. Teja Zabre, *Leandro Valle: Un liberal romántico* (México, 1956).

<sup>45</sup> R. R. Miller, "Matías Romero: Mexican Ambassador to the United States", Research in Progress, See LARR, I (1965), 133; H. Bernstein, "Matías Romero", Research in Progress, See LARR, II (1966), 44.

<sup>46</sup> D. Muñoz y Pérez, *El General don Juan Álvarez: ensayo biográfico seguido de una selección de documentos* (México, 1959).

nacio Zaragoza. Those by Luis Ramírez Fentanes and Guillermo Colín Sánchez are the most scholarly.<sup>47</sup>

Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada moves as a vital figure through the critical twenty years from the early Reform to the Restored Republic. Happily a fellow member of this session has resurrected the president squeezed between Juárez and Díaz from the obscurity the mythologists had designed for him. Frank Knapp's 1951 biography was translated into Spanish ten years later and remains the only work of major substance on Sebastián Lerdo and one of the most readable of balanced biographies of nineteenth-century Mexicans.<sup>48</sup>

On the other hand, Sebastian's older brother, Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, has been strangely neglected. Although typhus killed him during his effort to win the presidency in 1861, Miguel's dynamic career in the Reform entitles him to the searching examination of an able biographer. Another man for whom we have no first rate extensive biography is the orator Ignacio Altamirano. One of Robert Quirk's students at Indiana, Charles A. Weeks, has, I believe, elected to do an exhaustive biography of Altamirano for his dissertation. Among the soldiers, Santos Degollado, the successful loser, awaits a skillful hand. So, too, does the more complicated Jesús González Ortega, who has so far attracted only polemical or immature treatment. The broad panorama of personalities at mid-century doubtless reveals others who are neglected but these notes will serve to suggest where some opportunities lie.

#### D. *The Porfiriato*

Recent trends in general Mexican historiography demonstrate a resurgence of interest in the decades of the Porfiriato *qua* Porfiriato. In spite of the attraction of the Mexican Revolution and its origins, the multiple volumes composed under Cosío Villegas' direction have encouraged scholars to consider the years from 1876 to 1910 as worthy of study in themselves.<sup>49</sup> No longer are they merely an opportunity to categorize the *grandes problemas nacionales* which provoked the great upheaval of 1910-1917. Unhappily this trend has had little discernible effect upon the art of biography. The Porfiriato is another trough between ridges of greater interest for biographers.

<sup>47</sup> L. Ramírez Fentanes, *Zaragoza* (México, 1962); G. Colín Sánchez, *Ignacio Zaragoza: Evocación de un héroe* (México, 1963).

<sup>48</sup> Frank A. Knapp, Jr. *The Life of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, 1823-1889: a Study in Influence and Obscurity* (Austin, 1951). Spanish translation: Jalapa, 1961.

<sup>49</sup> Daniel Cosío Villegas, et al. *Historia moderna de México: El Porfiriato*, 4 vol. in 5 (México, 1957-65).

The problem appears even with respect to the dictator himself. Porfirio Díaz has attracted scores of polemicists, sycophants and detractors, but precious few scholarly biographers. Obviously the central figure for a third of a century, it is remarkable that there is as yet no biography which might excite the critics to exclaim "Definitive!" Jorge Fernando Iturribarria has made the most recent effort to assess Don Porfirio with reasonable objectivity.<sup>50</sup> Permitting the chips to fall where they might, Iturribarria neither condemns nor deifies his subject. His research is not as profound as it might be, but the work is commendable and better defined than the interesting but cumbersome two volume memoir of Agustín Aragón.<sup>51</sup> Both José C. Valadés and Daniel Cosío Villegas have produced older works which examine the years of Díaz ascendancy with a healthy mixture of serious scholarship and literary verve. *Porfirio Díaz y la revuelta de la Noria* has the special advantage of explaining Díaz in the years before 1876 when he was learning to make the transition from soldier to politician. Both studies are biographical fragments, however, and have not preempted the field from would-be Díaz biographers.<sup>52</sup>

Men whose careers belong primarily to the Porfiriato have been even less well served than Díaz. Where, for example, is a first class biography for the 1960's and '70's of José Ives Limantour? Granted there is the 1922 life of Díaz' financial wizard by Carlos Díaz Dufoo but is it adequate to discourage a new attempt?<sup>53</sup> Manuel González was something more than a stooge who sat in for Díaz for four years as president. No probing biography exists which might illuminate the years from 1880 to 1884. And Ramón Corral, a heartbeat away from the presidency; where is a serious study of him? The members of Díaz' clique, and especially the *Científicos*, have simply not received the individual attention which would enrich our understanding of those individuals who bolstered the most durable of regimes. Another example is Justo Sierra, that most Olympian of public men in Porfirian Mexico. Sierra has never been approached by a scholar intent upon writing a thorough biography of the historian-educator-jurist. Agustín Yáñez has produced the best work on Sierra but, as Robert Potash wrote at the opening of this decade, it is "less a self-contained study than it is an encouragement to browse through the *Obras completas*".<sup>54</sup>

<sup>50</sup> J. F. Iturribarria, *Porfirio Díaz ante la historia* (México, 1967).

<sup>51</sup> A. Aragón, *Porfirio Díaz: Estudio histórico-filosófico*, 2 vol. (México, 1962).

<sup>52</sup> D. Cosío Villegas, *Porfirio Díaz y la revuelta de la Noria* (México, 1953); J. C. Valadés, *El Porfirismo: Historia de un régimen: 1. El nacimiento, 1876-1884* (México, 1941).

<sup>53</sup> C. Díaz Dufoo, *Limantour* (México, 1922).

<sup>54</sup> A. Yáñez, *Don Justo Sierra: Su vida, sus ideas y su obra* (México, 1950); R. A. Potash, "Historiography of Mexico Since 1821", *HAHR*, XL (1960), 409.

Some figures in the Porfiriato have, to be sure, drawn biographical interest. Francisco Bulnes, whose acid views and debunking tactics often concealed a dedicated and progressive spirit, has been the subject of one of the few serious studies of the period. George Lemus accomplished this in 1965.<sup>55</sup> Richard Stillinger's current research stresses Bulnes' attitudes toward the Díaz regime and may be less biographical than Lemus' when it is completed.<sup>56</sup> At least Bulnes is coming under close scrutiny. Bernardo Reyes has also been the subject of an excellent biography which meets the most rigorous of scholarly demands. This life of Reyes by E.V. Niemeyer, Jr., skillfully weaves the subject's military-political career into the fabric of Porfirian society.<sup>57</sup> In progress is another study of Reyes which the researcher, Anthony T. Bryan, calls "not simply a biography". The focus is upon the years 1900 to 1913 with an effort made to describe "the potential for [a politician's] adaptation in the last years of the Porfiriato and the early revolution".<sup>58</sup>

Although they fall within the Porfiriato time span, it has become customary to dub those who actively opposed the Díaz regime for years and even decades before 1910 as "precursors" of the Revolution. If no revolution had occurred, what would we call them? Dissenters from the Establishment, perhaps? Whatever the terminology, many did stay on to play active roles in the maderista revolution and other phases of the movement. James D. Cockcroft has written an admirable book which serves as a guide to the hard core of journalists, poets and other intellectuals who shifted along the spectrum from tolerable criticism to revolutionary preachment and organization.<sup>59</sup> To mention his work violates a ground rule of this paper but the clarity of exposition and the depth of research into the lives of six principal dissenters, among others, warrants comment here. Four of them were from the state of San Luis Potosí: Camilo Arriaga, Librado Rivera, Juan Sarabia and Antonio Díaz Soto y Gama. Two others were added by Cockcroft: Ricardo Flores Magón and Francisco Madero. In addition to Cockcroft's sensitive treatment of these men as they interacted, most, but not all, of them have been subjects of individual biographies by recent scholars. Díaz Soto y Gama is, surprisingly, neglected by researchers. Cockcroft mentions that the four interviews

<sup>55</sup> G. Lemus, *Francisco Bulnes: Su vida y sus obras* (México, 1965).

<sup>56</sup> R. I. Stillinger, "The Political, Economic and Social Thought of Francisco Bulnes, with Emphasis on his Attitudes Toward the Regime of Porfirio Díaz", Ph. D. Dissertation, In Progress, Columbia University.

<sup>57</sup> E. Víctor Niemeyer, Jr., *El General Bernardo Reyes* (Monterrey, 1966).

<sup>58</sup> A. T. Bryan, "General Bernardo Reyes and Mexican Politics, 1900-1913", Ph. D. Dissertation, In Progress, University of Nebraska.

<sup>59</sup> J. D. Cockcroft, *Intellectual Precursors of the Mexican Revolution, 1900-1913* (Austin, 1968).

he had with the octogenarian in 1965-66 were the best source of biographical information about him. One recent study, an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Blanche B. DeVore, is devoted to Díaz Soto y Gama's link to the agrarian revolution and does not seem to be a full biography.<sup>60</sup> Camilo Arriaga, the mining engineer with an elite background, is also inadequately represented and deserves a thorough study. Luis I. Mata's slim but useful biography of Filomeno Mata, published a quarter of a century ago, could well be superseded by a more extensive work.<sup>61</sup> Librado Rivera and Juan Sarabia have been examined in recent biographies by Alicia Pérez Salazar and Eugenio Martínez Núñez respectively.<sup>62</sup> Obviously the two non-Porfirians, Flores Magón and Madero, are in a special category of scholarly attention and may be treated in the context of the Revolution itself.

### E. *The Revolutionary Generation*

The richness of Mexico's character and experience is nowhere more apparent than in the history of her twentieth-century Revolution. In those years of instability and subsequent search for new political, social, economic and cultural directions the position of individuals becomes especially important. As earlier in the rhythm of Mexican history, men of ambition and vision found their talents in great demand. It is also true that the intensity of national response to events and to caudillos, statesmen and champions of cultural innovation has been so great that publications about them have been characterized more by passionate polemics than by sober analysis. Nowhere is this more true than in the realm of biography. Men of the Revolution were either the ultimate heroes or the basest scoundrels. They were invariably bigger than life. The result is that we have many lives and infinite sources but a meager list of dispassionate scholarly biographies. The passage of time and the consequent perspective has meant, however, that the decade of the 1960's has seen important steps taken to provide incisive and responsible biographies of the men of the Revolution. The work has only begun, to be sure, and the present generation of young scholars has ample invitations to contribute a battery of excellent biographies.

<sup>60</sup> B. B. De Vore, "The Influence of Antonio Díaz Soto y Gama on the Agrarian Movement in Mexico", Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963.

<sup>61</sup> L. I. Mata, *Filomeno Mata: Su vida y su labor* (México, 1945).

<sup>62</sup> A. Pérez Salazar, *Librado Rivera: Un soñador en llamas* (México, 1964); E. Martínez Núñez, *Juan Sarabia, apóstol y mártir de la revolución mexicana* (México, 1965).

In order to give the examination some coherence, let us set the limits of the Revolutionary generation as the conventional 1910 to 1940. This is not the place to debate periodization or the degrees of mortality associated with the Revolution by various scholars. Those thirty years, however, will serve to focus an assessment of twentieth century biography and will also provide a suitable time with which to terminate this historiographic overview.

What is the status of the biographer's craft with respect to the period's notables? The diminutive figure of Francisco Madero looms largest at the movement's outset as the "apostle of Mexican democracy". Dozens of portraits have been attempted and more will surely follow. José Valadés' two volumes study and A. Aguirre Benavides' sympathetic portrait and compilation of letters and newspaper accounts have added something to our store of information about Madero, but Stanley Ross' carefully written and richly detailed biography remains fundamental and is also one of the most durable of the genre in Mexican historiography.<sup>63</sup> The admirable Fabela documentary collection, among other materials, will doubtless, however, stimulate new efforts to interpret Madero for the 1970's.<sup>64</sup> The most recent book, an unscholarly study of *Madero y la democracia* by Jorge Fernández de Castro y Finck, however, suggests that greater perspective and the availability of more extensive documentation are not in themselves guarantees of excellence.<sup>65</sup>

At an opposite pole from Madero along the Revolutionary ideological spectrum was the anarchist and true believer, Ricardo Flores Magón. He has been the subject of intense research from a number of writers. James Cockcroft's concern has already been mentioned to which must be added the first of the solid biographies of Flores Magón by Ethel Duffy Turner, an unpublished Ph. D. dissertation by Ward S. Albro, III, on the precursor role his subject played and the excellent exploration of the Baja California revolution and Flores Magón's later career by Lowell L. Blaisdell.<sup>66</sup> José Muñoz Cota's treatment might

<sup>63</sup> J. C. Valadés, *Imaginación y realidad de Francisco I. Madero*, 2 vol. (México, 1960); A. Aguirre Benavides, *Madero el immaculado* (México, 1962); S. R. Ross, *Francisco I. Madero: Apostle of Mexican Democracy* (New York, 1955).

<sup>64</sup> Isidro Fabela, ed., *Documentos históricos de la revolución mexicana*, 10 vol. (México, 1960-1966).

<sup>65</sup> (México, 1966).

<sup>66</sup> E. Duffy Turner, *Ricardo Flores Magón y el Partido Liberal Mexicano* (Morelia, 1960); W. S. Albro, III, "Ricardo Flores Magón and the Liberal Party: an Inquiry into the Origins of the Mexican Revolution of 1910", Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Arizona, 1967; L. Blaisdell, *The Desert Revolution: Baja California, 1911* (Madison, 1962).



have added understanding of Flores Magón's ideology were it not so one sided in its praise and so unrelated to historical conditions.<sup>67</sup>

The early years of the Revolution were populated by many other figures. Some, like Bernardo Reyes, had national careers in Porfirian days which spurted briefly again after 1910. Others, like Pancho Villa and Pascual Orozco, transcended obscurity and local limits to become national leaders in step with the *maderista* revolt against Díaz. Orozco's break with Madero in 1912 and his subsequent rapprochement with Huerta have tarnished his image within the traditional Revolutionary mythology. Happily Michael Meyer has, in brief compass, carefully examined Orozco's career and the validity of the charges levelled against him.<sup>68</sup> One of Meyer's students, William H. Beezley, has just completed a dissertation on Orozco's Chihuahua colleague Abraham González which should complement the pro-González biography by Francisco Almada.<sup>69</sup>

Villa has, understandably, attracted a multitude of writers of all persuasions. No one has conjured up a sobriquet for Villa as harebrained as "The Crimson Jester", applied to Zapata, but someone will surely try.<sup>70</sup> There is a fair sample of responsible writing about Villa but it can safely be said that the definitive life has not yet been published. Martín Luis Guzmán's *Memoirs of Pancho Villa*, which has gone through at least three Spanish editions since 1951 and is now available in an excellent English translation, remains the most satisfying single volume.<sup>71</sup> Federico Cervantes, an ardent *villista* who served as aide to Felipe Ángeles, wrote a sympathetic but cumbersome tome in 1960 which is more useful as a collection of source materials than as a biography.<sup>72</sup> Clarence Clendenen's study of Villa's relationship with the United States has some biographical implications but eschews involvement in the Mexican milieu.<sup>73</sup> More a compilation than a creative work, Antonio Vilanova Fuentes' *Muerte de Villa* is broader

<sup>67</sup> J. Muñoz Cota, *Ricardo Flores Magón: Un sol clavado en la sombra* (México, 1963).

<sup>68</sup> M. C. Meyer, *Mexican Rebel: Pascual Orozco and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-1915* (Lincoln, 1968).

<sup>69</sup> W. H. Beezley, "Revolutionary Governor: Abraham González and the Mexican Revolution in Chihuahua, 1909-1913", Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1969; F. R. Almada, *Vida, proceso y muerte de Abraham González* (México, 1967).

<sup>70</sup> Reference is to H. H. Dunn, *The Crimson Jester: Zapata of Mexico* (New York, 1934).

<sup>71</sup> (Austin, 1965).

<sup>72</sup> F. Cervantes M., *Francisco Villa y la revolución* (México, 1960).

<sup>73</sup> C. C. Clendenen, *The United States and Pancho Villa: a Study in Unconventional Diplomacy* (Ithaca, 1961).

than the title suggests and explores many of Villa's social, moral and political attitudes.<sup>74</sup>

But if some supporters of the early Madero revolution have attracted scholars, others have not. Francisco Vázquez Gómez and José María Pino Suárez, especially the former, are among the interesting politicians who deserve thorough study. Luis Cabrera is the subject of an earnest but unscholarly appreciation by Armando Porras y López, published in 1968.<sup>75</sup> Cabrera's continuing significance into Carranza's government should attract a vigorous and sensitive biographer.

The agrarian revolution's most prominent hero is, of course, Emiliano Zapata. As indicated earlier in this paper, John Womack's exhaustive treatment of Zapatismo tends to dwarf its progenitor. This may well be an appropriate antidote to the excessive hero worship and focus upon caudillos which characterize so much of Mexican historiography. Morelos was sprinkled in Zapata's time with semi-autonomous caciques like Genovevo de la O. They and the little people from hamlets like Anenecuilco gave Zapatismo its real tonalities. These are among the many revelations of Womack's book. Nevertheless, Emiliano's life is certainly there and eager biographers should spend their talents elsewhere. They need not go far. As already indicated, Díaz Soto y Gama and Vázquez Gómez are fair game and Gildardo Magaña, Zapata's heir, would make an excellent subject for a major biography.

The *decena trágica* created a regime and a situation which recalls the concern expressed earlier for those who "have also made Mexican history". Victoriano Huerta has attracted more verbal brickbats than perhaps any other Mexican president yet the problem of a balanced assessment of his life remains unresolved. Guidelines for such a reappraisal were laid down by William L. Sherman and Richard E. Greenleaf nearly ten years ago in a brief revisionist study which has no pretensions of being definitive.<sup>76</sup> Michael Meyer's current research is focused upon the Huerta regime and we may reasonably expect that the much needed biography of Huerta will be the result.<sup>77</sup>

Felipe Ángeles is another military man who moved through those turbulent years and who has so far escaped adequate biographical attention. Venustiano Carranza has received much more attention than Ángeles but none of it of sufficiently high calibre. Alfonso Taracena and Ignacio Suárez G. have made contributions in the 1960's but the

<sup>74</sup> A. Vilanova Fuentes, *Muerte de Villa* (México, 1966).

<sup>75</sup> A. Porras y López, *Luis Cabrera: Revolucionario e intelectual* (México, 1968).

<sup>76</sup> W. L. Sherman and R. E. Greenleaf, *Victoriano Huerta: a Reappraisal* (México, 1960).

<sup>77</sup> M. C. Meyer, "The Victoriano Huerta Presidency", Research in Progress, See LARR, III (1968), 564.

first is a popular biography which fails to come to grips with the First Chief when he was in power and the second is derivative in its materials and excessively devoted to the details of Carranza's death.<sup>78</sup> Given the position Carranza had in Mexican history between 1913 and 1920 it is imperative that a major biography be devoted to him. Carranza's lieutenant, Pablo González, is another of our neglected "also mades" but the research might be too depressing to be sustained.

Obregón's career as military commander and adroit politician has attracted substantial scholarly interest. Part of this interest is suggested by a comment James Wilkie made recently with respect to the realities of political power in modern Mexico:

The president of Mexico has great power to use federal funds in almost any way he sees fit in order to carry out his programs.<sup>79</sup>

Among the current attempts to understand Obregón as one of Mexico's most powerful presidents who understood his budgets are two doctoral dissertations in progress. Nelson De Lavan is exploring Obregón's public life and Randall G. Hansis is involved with the relation of political interest groups to the president.<sup>80</sup> The most substantial recent work on Álvaro Obregón is not a full scale biography but a thoughtful study of his political thought by Narciso Bassols Batalla.<sup>81</sup>

It is curious that neither of the two major figures who quarrelled over the right to succeed Obregón in 1924, Plutarco Elías Calles who won and Adolfo de la Huerta who lost, have inspired the measured biographical treatment which they both deserve. Where have all the scholars gone, indeed!

Lázaro Cárdenas has fared somewhat better and we should soon know how much better. Albert Michaels, James Wilkie and Lyle Brown have been conducting an intensive project to study the political philosophy and methodology of Cárdenas throughout his career.<sup>82</sup> This will surely supersede the warmly appreciative Townsend biography and Brown's own study, which is not widely available.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>78</sup> A. Taracena, *Venustiano Carranza* (México, 1963); I. Suárez G., *Carranza: Forjador del México actual: su vida, su muerte: relato documentado* (México, 1965).

<sup>79</sup> J. B. Wilkie, *The Mexican Revolution: Federal Expenditure and Social Change Since 1910* (Berkeley, 1967), p. 276.

<sup>80</sup> N. De Lavan, "The Public Life of Álvaro Obregón", Ph. D. Dissertation, In Progress, Texas Technological College. R. G. Hansis, "President Alvaro Obregón and Political Interest Groups", Ph. D. Dissertation, In Progress, University of New Mexico.

<sup>81</sup> N. Bassols Batalla, *El pensamiento político de Alvaro Obregón* (México, 1967).

<sup>82</sup> A. L. Michaels, James B. Wilkie and Lyle C. Brown, "A Study of General Lázaro Cárdenas", Research in Progress. See LARR, III (1968), 1186.

<sup>83</sup> William C. Townsend, *Lázaro Cárdenas: Mexican Democrat* (Ann Arbor,

Some other men, prominent in the 1920's and 1930's have been given at least as much serious attention as the presidents. José Vasconcelos is a good example. He has been approached by Bar Lewaw Mulstock in 1965, by Gabriella de Beer in 1966 and by John Haddox in 1967.<sup>84</sup> The work by the philosopher Haddox is an admirable but overly brief exploration of Vasconcelos' complex mind. The life by de Beer is extensive but neatly avoids the philosophical works. A synthesis of these two might result in the definitive biography we need of Vasconcelos.

Other figures have been inadequately represented. Luis Morones is sorely neglected in the field of labor relations, and the efforts to produce a solid biography of Vicente Lombardo Toledano have been unavailing. Robert P. Millon's attempt might have succeeded had he examined his subject critically within the context of the Mexican experience.<sup>85</sup> Tomás Garrido Canabal and Saturnino Cedillo are powerful personalities who have been represented only in pristine white or jet black but never in the grays of reality. A significant figure throughout the whole Revolutionary generation, Francisco Múgica, has also been treated in polemical terms but never in an adequate biography. Múgica, as an architect of the Constitution of 1917 and one of Cárdenas' most influential advisers and potential heirs, is presently being examined in depth by Julia G. Shepard.<sup>86</sup>

Bertram Wolfe's *Fabulous Life of Diego Rivera* is among a few other worthy biographies which should probably be mentioned for their literary verve and scholarship.<sup>87</sup> But any further recitation of leaders, lives and lacunae would be futile. Whoever attempts an appraisal of biographies in Mexican historiography a decade from now will, I trust, encounter new books about many significant figures whose careers have thus far been distorted by friends and enemies or neglected by professional historians.

1952); L. C. Brown, *General Lázaro Cárdenas and Mexican Presidential Politics, 1933-1940: a Study in the Acquisition and Manipulation of Political Power* (Austin, 1964) (Mimeographed).

<sup>84</sup> B. L. Mulstock, *José Vasconcelos; Vida y obra* (México, 1965); G. de Beer, *José Vasconcelos and His World* (New York, 1966); J. H. Haddox, *Vasconcelos of Mexico: Philosopher and Prophet* (Austin, 1967). I was unable to consult the work by Mulstock.

<sup>85</sup> R. P. Millon, *Vicente Lombardo Toledano: Mexican Marxist* (Chapel Hill, 1966).

<sup>86</sup> J. G. Shepard, "Francisco Múgica", Ph. D. Dissertation, In Progress, University of Connecticut.

<sup>87</sup> (New York, 1963).