



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

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

## RELACIONES INTERNACIONALES DE MÉXICO: ¿DÓNDE ESTÁN LOS YANQUIS?

SHELDON B. LISS

In the recently published historical literature of Mexico, international relations have generally been eclipsed by the vital debates on the Revolution. The history of ideas, with economic, political and social themes, has taken precedence over international politics. Few historians have viewed the Mexican Revolution as an international experience and new attempts to do so might prove pointless. Despite recent United States emphasis on training diplomatic historians, university programs devoted to Latin America, easier access to archival collections, and new research libraries, individuals who have utilized these resources have concentrated on Mexican-United States relations to the exclusion of Mexico's dealings with the rest of the world.

Within the past decade many traditional political scientist have been replaced by data quantifiers or sociologically oriented technicians. This has been particularly so in the United States where as a consequence diplomacy and the study of international politics has been hindered. Historians are increasingly alone in the quest to chronicle and interpret past interplay between nations.

This work focuses on the literature, published within the last decade, concerning Mexico's twentieth century international relations, exclusive of the realm of Mexican-United States diplomacy. The paucity of materials in the field permits the handling of a broad range of topics that fall within our general scope. By no means is this work comprehensive. Nor is it confined exclusively to the work of young scholars, as originally suggested by those who established the framework for the paper. The imposition of such restrictions would preclude its writing. No picaresque attempts will be made to differentiate between diplomatic history, foreign policy, or international relations. The works under discussion will primarily be those of a specialized nature which deal with all the aforementioned topics. The major emphasis will be upon scholarly monographs, although a few articles which have appeared in English will be examined.<sup>1</sup> The writer has at times been compelled to analyze Mexican international relations, but for the most part indicates existing gaps and areas for potential development, and raises questions for future scholarship to answer.

<sup>1</sup> To do likewise for Spanish language articles would be impossible within the confines of this paper.

In addition to works on Mexican-United States relations, this paper will also exclude the many excellent legal treatises, particularly on international law, which have been published recently in Mexico, as well as literature on foreign economic relations and development. The last decade has also produced an abundance of journal articles and monographs dealing with France in Mexico, adding information to major secondary works on diplomacy prior to the intervention,<sup>2</sup> the French in Mexico,<sup>3</sup> and the aftermath,<sup>4</sup> none of which fall within the purview of this paper. Also omitted is the early Diaz era and a few significant volumes dealing with relations with Guatemala,<sup>5</sup> Central America, France, Great Britain, Spain and the Vatican<sup>6</sup> during that period.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

Virtually no literature, either monographic or in article form, by a citizen of the United States has appeared on the making and conduct of Mexican foreign policy. Frank Brandenburg's "Foreign Policy And International Affairs", which appeared as a chapter in his *The Making*

<sup>2</sup> See, Carl H. Bock, *Prelude to Tragedy. The Negotiation and Breakdown of the Tripartite Convention of London, October 31, 1861*. Philadelphia Univ. of Penna. Press, 1966. Jose Fuentes Mares, *Juarez y la intervención*. Mexico, Editorial Jus, 1962.

<sup>3</sup> See, Jack A. Dabbs, *The French Army in Mexico, 1861-1867*. The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1963. Arturo Arnáiz y Freg & Claude Bataillon (eds), *La intervención francesa y el imperio de Maximiliano. Cien años después, 1862-1962*. México, Asociación Mexicana de Historiadores e Instituto Francés de América Latina, 1965. Lilia Díaz (trans. & ed.), *Versión francesa de México. Informes diplomáticos*, vol. II, 1858-1862, vol. III, 1862-1864, vol. IV, 1864-1867. México, El Colegio de México, 1964-1967.

<sup>4</sup> See, Lucía De Robina (ed.), *Reconciliación de México y Francia, 1870-1880*. México: Publicaciones de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1963.

<sup>5</sup> See, Ministerio de Educación Pública de Guatemala, *Memoria sobre la cuestión de límites entre Guatemala y México. Presentada al Señor Ministro de Relaciones Exteriores por el Jefe de la Comisión Guatemalteca, 1900, & Límites entre Guatemala y México. I: La cuestión de límites entre México y Guatemala, 1875. II: Cuestiones entre Guatemala y México, 1895*. Guatemala, Centro Editorial, 1964. Daniel Cosío Villegas, *El Porfiriato. La vida política exterior*. Parte 1, vol. V. of *Historia moderna de México*. México, Editorial Hermes, 1960.

<sup>6</sup> See, Daniel Cosío Villegas, *El Porfiriato. La vida política exterior*. Parte 2. (Vol. VI. of *Historia moderna de México*) México, Editorial Hermes, 1963. José Bravo Ugarte, *Historia de México*, t. III, *Relaciones internacionales territorio, sociedad y cultura*. México, Editorial Jus, 1959. Javier Malagón Barcelo, Enriqueta López Lira & José María Miquel I. Vergés, *Relaciones diplomáticas hispano-mexicanas, 1839-1898*. Serie I, *Despachos Generales*, IV, (1846-1848). México, El Colegio de México, 1968.

*Of Modern Mexico*,<sup>7</sup> merits attention. More than half of this unusual treatment is devoted to foreign policy and its formulation, with stress on economic factors. Brandenburg contends that the basic guiding principles of Mexican policy often prove paradoxical. He cites collective security, juridical equality of nations, national sovereignty, national self-determination, non-intervention, pacific settlement of international disputes, protection of basic human rights, regionalism, and universalism as the cardinal principles which often, because of delicate inter-relationships, cause conflicts.<sup>8</sup> For example, how does Mexico maintain diplomatic relations with Cuba and not offend the Organization of American States or its respective members? Brandenburg poses many such questions and presents insights into a multitude of unexplored facets of Mexican foreign policy.

Mexican foreign policy has been unique in that the nation has generally had no ideological, political, or territorial interests beyond her own borders. Her primary quests have been peace and independence, and she has tried to avoid international entanglements. However, the nationalistic nature of the 1917 Constitution, which guides Mexican foreign policy, has caused problems with other nations. Article twenty-seven of that document contains the basic international goals of the Revolution, those being agrarian reform, and the recovery of natural resources from foreign ownership. In "Revolution And Foreign Policy: Mexico's Experience", Jorge Castañeda emphasizes that, prior to the Revolution, expropriation was traditionally valid in international law only in the maintenance of public order.<sup>9</sup> Castañeda points out that Mexican style expropriation, with compensations not being paid immediately, but rather when best suited to the economic stability of the expropriator, has established a hemispheric trend<sup>10</sup> which has touched off numerous international quarrels. He mentions basic principles of equality of rights between nationals and aliens, non-responsibility of a state for damages suffered during civil strife, and the concept of non-recognition of territorial conquest, which have been violated during the Revolution as Mexico has assumed obligations for acts committed by Revolutionary forces, and has expressed a moral commitment to compensate.<sup>11</sup>

In "The Foreign Policy of Mexico",<sup>12</sup> Francisco Cuevas Cancino presents an excellent historical analysis of his nation's international

<sup>7</sup> Frank R. Brandenburg, *The Making of Modern Mexico*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 320.

<sup>9</sup> Jorge Castañeda, "Revolution And Foreign Policy: Mexico's Experience", *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 78 (Sept., 1963), 391-417.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 398.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 394.

<sup>12</sup> Francisco Cuevas Cancino, "The Foreign Policy of Mexico", *Foreign Policies In A World Of Change*. New York, Harper & Row, 1963.

behavior. He indicates the adaptation of an individualistic foreign policy to the nation's historical configurations, an area that needs further elucidation. From his cursory treatment of the subject one sees that an interpretative history of the changes in the course of Mexican foreign policy throughout the phases of the Revolution is feasible. A work that deemphasizes the narrative approach in favor of analysis is in order. Cancino states Mexico depends on a spiritual interpretation of history, and displays a contempt for the materialistic shaping of diplomacy.<sup>18</sup> Exposure to Cancino's work leaves many questions unanswered or half explained. Why has Mexico's foreign policy always been cautious and even defensive within Latin America? Why has Mexico not been more active in post-World War II international affairs? After all, is not Mexico confronted with the problems of diplomatic recognition, or even the threat of war? The preliminary works by Brandenburg, Cancino and Castañeda constitute a challenge to further scholarship in the foreign policy domain.

#### INTERVENTION

A basic component of Mexico's foreign policy has been an overwhelming desire to preserve her independence. This, coupled with numerous tragic experiences with foreign powers, has made her sensitive to intervention of any type. Mexican literature consistently mentions the Argentine legalist Carlos Calvo who stated in 1863 that sovereignty is inviolable and precludes resident aliens from requesting their own governments to intervene on their behalf. Mexico has followed the precepts of Luis Maria Drago, of Argentina, who reiterated Calvo's ideas in 1902 by asserting that public debts cannot be cause for armed intervention or occupation of territory of an American state. The doctrine of non-intervention emanates from Mexico's basic belief in the state's right to guide its own destiny. It even extends to the right of recognition as exemplified by the well known derogation of the Mexican policies of Woodrow Wilson as moral imperialism.

Both at Montevideo in 1933 and Buenos Aires in 1936, Mexico strove vociferously for hemispheric acceptance of non-intervention, and the belief that states determine their own forms of internal government and protect human rights themselves. Mexico rejected the doctrines of Uruguayan Foreign Minister Rodriguez Larreta who, in 1945, proposed collective action by hemispheric republics to safeguard endangered human rights. Paradoxically, in 1960 at the San Jose Conference, Mexico opposed all types of intervention and simultaneously supported the idea that the inter-American system was incompatible

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid*, p. 652.

with totalitarianism. Is the belief that international Communism is inimical to OAS principles reconcilable with a strict non-intervention policy? How does one explain Mexico's position in light of her often professed belief that defense against foreign ideology is a matter of domestic rather than international jurisdiction? Numerous similar conundrums currently exist, involving intervention, which have yet to be investigated and analyzed by non-Mexican historians.

The Mexican point of view has been presented sagaciously by Isidro Fabela in *Intervención*,<sup>14</sup> which deals with the legalistic aspects of non-intervention. His book probes Mexico's position at various Pan American Conferences and strongly reenforces the policy of absolute non-intervention. This piece of scholarship is justifiably anti-United States, and opens many avenues of historical scrutiny. For example, one might elaborate upon the theme that the Revolutionary commitment to non-intervention has precluded Mexico from becoming a hemispheric leader in the sense of exercising hegemony over lesser Latin American nations. Is it not feasible to examine more fully the concept of leadership by abstention and genuine national sovereignty?

Numerous inconsistencies remain to be explained. Can Mexico pursue an independent international position and successfully defend the values of Western Civilization? If one is truly independent do values need to be defended? How can Mexico subscribe to the belief in non-intervention and the rights of nations to form their own destiny and yet have aided the Spanish Republican government against Franco? Why does Mexico at times refute the idea of coexistence within the context of self-determination among peoples? Is the concept of non-intervention reconcilable with the defense of democracy, or is the defense of democracy, beyond national boundaries, of itself non-democratic? The answers to these and other questions have not as yet been explored by historians and experts in international relations.

#### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

International law has been the cornerstone of Mexican foreign policy because the Spanish concept of a community of states which follow similar juridical principles has endured from colonial times. Throughout the twentieth century Mexico has subscribed to the ideas of international cooperation. Yet the literature discussing the subject is sparse.

When the League of Nations was founded in 1919, Mexico was one of four countries, excluding the Central Powers, which was not invited to join. When Mexico finally joined the League in 1931 she repudiated

<sup>14</sup> Isidro Fabela, *Intervención*. México, Escuela Nacional de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales, UNAM, México, 1959.

the Monroe Doctrine, subsequently favored China in the Manchuria matter, opposed Italy in the case of Ethiopia, protested against the Anschluss and the German occupation of the Sudetenland, and supported the Republic of Spain. All of these policies, along with others pertaining to Mexico's participation in the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of International Justice, need contemporary critical investigation and appraisal.

In the United Nations, Mexico has constantly supported the rights of all governments, regardless of size. Certainly within the confines of this body room exists for ample investigation. As of now Jorge Castañeda's *México y el orden internacional*,<sup>15</sup> which was subsequently published as *Mexico and the United Nations*,<sup>16</sup> remains the lone recent volume on the subject. This work, which evolved from the labors of a study group at *El Colegio de México*, presents a chauvinistic view of Mexican foreign relations and policies towards other nations. At this juncture a revised and less partisan edition is in order, one which stresses Mexico's action in the UN *per se*, rather than general policies with the member states. It should include Mexico's reaction to an organization where some members are more equal than others, as well as answers to the following questions. How has Mexico, as a nation with a lengthy colonial past, enunciated her displeasure towards twentieth century colonialism? How does she define colonialism in the ideological context? What has she done to diminish the power of the Security Council, aside from proposing that it be increased in size? In light of her non-interventionist principles how has Mexico reacted to the collective security measures which have necessitated military action on the part of the UN? Why has Mexico generally refused to recognize her potential leadership position among Latin American nations? Is it attributable to her strict adherence to the precepts of national sovereignty? If Mexican sensitivity to imperialism has impeded her leadership capabilities in international organizations, why has she taken the lead in advocating Latin America as a denuclearized zone?

Are professors in the United States disinterested in such matters? Only John Faust and Charles Stansifer in "Mexican Foreign Policy in the United Nations: the Advocacy of Moderation in an Era of Revolution",<sup>17</sup> have explored the situation. They alone, in rudimentary fashion, have chronicled some of the Mexican votes in the UN. They point out that Mexico has generally supported the Russian concept

<sup>15</sup> Jorge Castañeda, *México y el orden internacional*. México, El Colegio de México, 1956.

<sup>16</sup> Jorge Castañeda, *Mexico and the United Nations*. New York, Manhattan Publishing Co., 1958.

<sup>17</sup> John R. Faust & Charles L. Stansifer, "Mexican Foreign Policy in the United Nations: the Advocacy of Moderation in an Era of Revolution", *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 44 (Sept., 1963), 121-129.

of universal membership for all ideologies, and yet has condemned Soviet intervention in Hungary. Paradoxically, Mexico has supported the admission of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Rumania, while simultaneously refusing to seat China. Additional scholarship on many of these points will undoubtedly produce valuable insights into Latin American policy in general, as well as enhance comprehension of Mexican policy.

Since the Chapultepec Conference of 1945, Mexico has pursued a more Pan Americanistic attitude than the United States in both the UN and the OAS. A need exists for thorough studies of Mexico's policies in the Inter-American system. An abundance of research materials, many of which are a matter of public record, have gone unscathed. For example, in the realm of collective security alone, sufficient data exists to form the nucleus of a multivolume series.

#### THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Because of her prominent position in Spain's colonial empire, after independence it was believed that Mexico would exercise hegemony over Latin American affairs. But only during the tenure of Alamán, Gorostiza, Ramos Arizpe, Azcárate and Herrera did México manage her foreign policy on the assumption that she was a great power.<sup>18</sup> Subsequently Mexico fell prey to increased instability and her pretensions towards Latin American leadership diminished. During the twentieth century the nation has not resorted to "bloc" influences for fear that to do so might be intervention. Mexico's profound belief in sovereignty has weakened her in terms of hemispheric power. Despite the lack of an assertive regional policy, the Mexican Revolution has enabled the nation to lead primarily by setting an example for international morality.

How far this moral example has extended in the foreign policy sphere has never been studied. One wonders, to what extent the Latin American nations have endeavored to emulate Mexico's Revolutionary foreign policy. By remaining true to the precepts of peace, not maintaining a large standing army, and keeping military expenditures to a minimum, Mexico has not shared common objectives with many of the nations of the region. Nevertheless, Mexico has been in agreement with most hemispheric states with regard to the need for international economic cooperation. Even in this area of accord, little literature exists, outside of publications produced under the auspices of the UN, the OAS, the Inter-American Development Bank and their respective affiliates.

<sup>18</sup> Cancino, *op. cit.*, p. 643.

The major works dealing with Mexico in hemispheric affairs dwell primarily on relations with the United States. If anything, the proximity of Mexico to the United States and preoccupation with mutual diplomacy should have awakened academic interest as to the other Latin American reactions to Mexican foreign policy. Why have there been no extensive studies on the attitudes of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, the Caribbean, or Central American countries towards Mexico? Have not Bolivia, Cuba, and Guatemala been interested in the foreign policy of the Mexican Revolution? Is it unrealistic to expect commentaries from other Latin American nations on Mexican international relations, when so few works exist on their own foreign policies?

One recently published piece of Mexican literature was Alonso Aguilar's *El Panamericanismo de la Doctrina Monroe a la Doctrina Johnson*.<sup>19</sup> This indictment of Pan Americanism emphasizes an inept OAS controlled by the United States. He touches upon the portents of the Tricontinental Conference of Havana and the possibility of Latin American orientation away from the United States, and links with Africa and Asia. In espousing Latin American withdrawal from the OAS, Aguilar reiterates the anti-Komunismo theories of the Guatemalan scholar-statesman, Juan José Arévalo.<sup>20</sup> Although it is a general work, not primarily designed for scholarly consumption, the book reflects one Mexican viewpoint and might serve as a model for a more specific study of Mexico's hemispheric relations.

If one were confined to works like that of Alonso Aguilar, he might soon come to believe that the United States has a monopoly on hemispheric imperialism and that Mexico has remained unsoiled. However an examination of *border relations with Guatemala* would reveal that Mexico too has at times been hypocritical. The story of Mexico's annexation of Chiapas and Soconuzco should be analyzed, as should her involvement with Great Britain concerning the proposed transfer of British Honduras to Guatemala. These long-standing problems ought to be studied in depth in order to add to our growing fund of knowledge about Mexican diplomacy.

Recently there has been an upsurge of Mexican interest in Cuba and *vice versa*. The events of the Cuban revolution of Fidel Castro cannot yet be considered with proper historical perspective. Twenty years hence scholars will want to analyze the early moral support given Castro by the *cardenistas*. Analogies will be drawn between the Mexican and Cuban revolutions, and the current deluge of polemics will be sifted through carefully for historical relevance. Works like

<sup>19</sup> Alonso Aguilar, *El Panamericanismo de la Doctrina Monroe a la Doctrina Johnson*. México, Cuadernos Americanos, 1965.

<sup>20</sup> Juan José Arévalo, *Anti-Komunismo en América Latina*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Palestra, 1959.



Isidro Fabela's *El caso de Cuba*,<sup>21</sup> will be given more credence. Perhaps by the 1980's a comparative study of Castro's endeavors to export Cuba's revolution and Mexico's lack of messianism will prove rewarding. However, a more immediate need is to address the basic question of why Mexico has not consciously exported her Revolution.

Daniel Cosío Villegas' *Cuestiones internacionales de México, una bibliografía*,<sup>22</sup> provides an excellent backlog of materials on hemispheric affairs, many with emphasis on Mexico. Each subdivision of this work could be expanded into an historical volume or even a bibliography of its own. Literally dozens of areas within hemispheric relations remain untouched. New works dealing with Mexican diplomacy with virtually every Latin American nation remain to be written, and ancient scholarship needs revision in light of new data. At this point, would it be audacious to suggest that Mexico's relations with Canada provide virgin territory for the scholar?

#### THE EARLY REVOLUTION

After the unimaginative foreign policy of the Díaz years one would hope to find that the Revolution rekindled a literary interest in Mexican international relations. The preponderance of scholarship dealing with the early years of the Revolutions is based upon the México-United States theme. Young scholars from north of the Río Grande remain content to explore the intricacies of their own nations' involvement with the various Revolutionary governments. However, in the past decade Europeans have expanded their horizons, and some heretofore neglected archival collections have been used to produce cogent works which examine Mexican foreign policy from different perspectives.

From behind the Iron Curtain came Friedrich Katz's *Deutschland, Díaz un die mexikanische Revolution. Die deutsche Politik im Mexiko 1870-1920*,<sup>23</sup> a Marxist oriented diplomatic history of German-Mexican relations. Based primarily on German Mission reports from Mexico, this interesting work details European imperialist rivalries and increases the knowledge about the World War I era and the German struggle to enlist the aid of Mexico in the battle against the United States.

<sup>21</sup> Isidro Fabela, *El caso de Cuba*. México, Cuadernos Americanos, 1960.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel Cosío Villegas, *Cuestiones internacionales de México, una bibliografía*. México, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1966.

<sup>23</sup> Friedrich Katz, *Deutschland, Díaz un die mexikanische Revolution. Die deutsche Politik im Mexiko 1870-1920*. Berlin, VEB Deutsche Verlag de Wissenschaften. Schriftenreihe des Institutes für allgemeine Geschichte und der Humboldt-Universität, 1964.

From this volume one discovers a vast store of untapped materials on Mexico in the German Central Archives. A similar treatment of the inter-war years and the World War II period should now be prepared.

Two articles from the United States have recently appeared to supplement the Katz volumen. Warren Schiff's "German Military Penetration into Mexico During the Late Díaz Period",<sup>24</sup> illustrates the influence of the German military over that of France in Mexico prior to World War I. It points out Germany's failure to institutionalize her gains, thus enabling United States' influence to remain dominant. This article begins to penetrate the German Foreign Ministry Archives for materials relevant to Mexico. "The Mexican-German Conspiracy of 1915",<sup>25</sup> by Michael Meyer also accentuates German interest in Mexico from the Díaz era. Meyer's piece, which deals with the abortive Mexican-German Cabal of 1915, breaks new ground concerning numerous facets of German-Mexican relations which should be explored. Too little has been written about Mexico's World War I policy, especially with reference to Germany. Even Bárbara Tuchman's *The Zimmerman Telegram*,<sup>26</sup> which deals with a well-known aspect of World War I diplomacy, is primarily based upon sources available in the United States. More pervasive research into German archives should be conducted and the results published.

In conjunction with the Katz volumen *Meksikanskaia revoliutsiia 1910-1917, gg. i. politika SShA*,<sup>27</sup> by the Russians Alperovich and Rudenko, should be read. Another example of Marxian historical analysis, this Soviet view of the Revolution places particular emphasis on United States diplomacy towards Mexico. It also makes one wonder if the Russians have fallen into the pattern of viewing Mexico only in the light of the United States. Or is it the ideological conflict between Communism and capitalism which compels this trend?

Helping the United States save face, the late Alfred Tischendorf authored *Great Britain and Mexico in the Era of Porfirio Díaz*.<sup>28</sup> Tischendorf began to penetrate into Anglo-Mexican diplomacy, a task which was taken up by British political scientist Peter Calvert in *The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1914: The Diplomacy of Anglo Ame-*

<sup>24</sup> Warren Schiff, "German Military Penetration into Mexico During the Late Díaz Period", *Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. 39 (Nov., 1959), 568-579.

<sup>25</sup> Michael C. Meyer, "The Mexican-German Conspiracy of 1915", *The Americas*, vol. 23 (July, 1966), 76-89.

<sup>26</sup> Barbara W. Tuchman, *The Zimmerman Telegram*. New York, Dell Publishing Co., 1958.

<sup>27</sup> M. Al'Perovich & B. Rudenko, *Meksikanskaia revoliutsiia, 1910-1917 gg. i. politika SShA*. Moscow, 1958.

<sup>28</sup> Alfred Tischendorf, *Great Britain and Mexico in the Era of Porfirio Díaz*. Durham, Duke Univ. Press, 1961.

*rican Conflict*.<sup>29</sup> Although the latter work deals with the diplomacy of the United States, it is cited here for its explorations of British diplomacy during the early years of the Revolution. A clear picture unfolds of British finances being used to counteract American diplomatic and political pressures in Mexico, and British dollar diplomacy is contrasted with the Yankee version. The writer concludes that Great Britain did not emulate the United States by pursuing moralistic foreign policy in Mexico. He leaves the impression of British order versus United States chaos in foreign policy. As a study in contrasting styles of diplomacy, Calvert's work is an ideal model for future histories.

Upon turning attention to Mexican titles, one is initially attracted to *Historia diplomática de la Revolución mexicana, 1912-1917*,<sup>30</sup> by Isidro Fabela the ex-Constitutionalist Foreign Minister. Unfortunately the title is somewhat misleading, as both volumes deal essentially with diplomacy between Mexico and the United States. However, Volume II does contain a section dealing with Mexico's neutrality during World War I. Another work by the same person, *Documentos históricos de la Revolución*,<sup>31</sup> contains numerous useful selections pertaining to the early Revolution as excerpted from the Foreign Relations Archives in Mexico City. An additional deceptive title *La política internacional de la Revolución*,<sup>32</sup> by Aarón Sáenz, turns out to deal primarily with United States-Mexican relations during the Obregón years. However, it makes one aware that a similar treatment for relations with the rest of the world is lacking.

#### THE LATER REVOLUTION

In a statement to the press on September 30, 1930, Mexican Foreign Minister Genaro Estrada issued *La doctrina mexicana* which stipulated that automatic recognition of a government should be accorded, but that when so granted by México it does not imply judgment. From the issuance of this maxim it became an integral part of Mexican Revolutionary foreign policy and a topic of conversation in diplomatic circles throughout the hemisphere. In June of 1964 the Estrada Doctrine was refined by the Mexican government when it stated that the nation would henceforth maintain and with-

<sup>29</sup> Peter Calvert, *The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1914: The Diplomacy of Anglo-American Conflict*. London, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968.

<sup>30</sup> Isidro Fabela, *Historia diplomática de la Revolución Mexicana, 1912-1917*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, vol. I, 1958, vol. II, 1959.

<sup>31</sup> Isidro Fabela, *Documentos históricos de la Revolución*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1964.

<sup>32</sup> Aarón Sáenz, *La política internacional de la Revolución*. México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1961.

draw diplomatic agents when it considered it advisable, without judging the right of any nation to accept, preserve, or change its government or authorities. In other words, Mexico would no longer "recognize" governments, but rather just establish diplomatic relations. In light of Mexico's Revolutionary experience, the fact that this doctrine has endured for over three decades and its more recent ramifications, up-to-date monographic literature about it is conspicuous by its absence.

The foreign policy and international relations of the Cárdenas years is of Revolutionary salience. Although the *cardenistas* have not been a political group in the conventional sense, they have had a profound affect upon the course of Mexican history. The Russian author Shul'govskii in his work<sup>33</sup> dealing with the anti-imperialism of the Cárdenas Administration, touches upon the liberation of the Mexican people during the 1930's. His analysis of Mexico's emerging socialism provides diverse insights into the nations' role in foreign affairs as the Revolution matured. There remains a need to develop the international aspects of *cardenismo*. For example, considerable Mexican diplomacy ensued following the oil expropriations of 1938. In *México y Estados Unidos en el conflicto petrolero*,<sup>34</sup> Lorenzo Meyer hints at the complexities of Anglo-Mexican diplomacy over the petroleum crisis, but the major focus of his study is United States-Mexican relations. Nevertheless, Mayer's well documented work clears the path for future investigations.

Economists have often attributed the success of the industrial phase of the Mexican Revolution to World War II. Although it is exceedingly difficult to disassociate Mexican foreign policy from relations with the United States with whom she was inextricably bound during the conflict, little monographic literature has been written strictly on Mexico's role in the war. The academic world is currently inundated with literature concerning the diplomacy of the Allied-Axis struggle. Archival collections encompassing the early war years are now accessible, sets of valuable documents have been cataloged and even published. Materials pertaining to the international policies of the later Revolution are beginning to be made available in Mexico by the *Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores*,<sup>35</sup> as well as

<sup>33</sup> A. Shul'govskii, *Meksika na krutom povorote svoe i istorii: osvoboditel'naia i antiimperialisticheskaia bor'ba meksidanskogo naroda v 30-e gody i problema vybora puti sotsial'nogo razvitiia*. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo Prosvieshenie, 1967.

<sup>34</sup> Lorenzo Meyer, *México y Estados Unidos en el conflicto petrolero, 1917-1942*. México, El Colegio de México, 1968.

<sup>35</sup> For example, see, México: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. *Labor internacional de la Revolución Constitucionalista de México: libro rojo*. México, Ediciones de la Comisión Nacional para la Celebración del Sesquicentenario de la Proclamación de la Independencia Nacional y del Cincuentenario de la Revolución Mexicana, 1960.

abroad, and hopefully an energetic group of embryonic scholars will seize upon them.

#### INTERNATIONAL IDEOLOGY

With the advent of the Cold War the production of literature pertaining to international ideology, particularly of the leftist variety, increased in Mexico. While leftism in Mexico attracted considerable attention in Mexican academic circles, in the United States it was generally ignored in print. Perhaps this is attributable to the mentality which pervaded the United States during the McCarthy scare which may have subconsciously frightened academicians in subsequent years.

In *La batalla ideológica en México*,<sup>36</sup> Alberto Bremauntz delves into the history of ideas and illustrates the importance of Marxism-Leninism to Mexico's development. He derogates the United States, the Roman Catholic Church and capitalism as inimical to the Revolution which he visions being completed only through socialism. Like Juan José Arévalo, he inveighs against anti-Komunismo which he claims is detrimental to development. His brief examination of the international aspects of the ideological struggle in Mexico proves enlightening. Like Aguilar and Arévalo he is highly critical of the Latin American military regimes which are sustained by their constant quest to eradicate Communism and buttressed in their endeavors by the State Department.

From the United States and the pen of Karl Schmitt came *Communism in Mexico: A Study in Political Frustration*,<sup>37</sup> which distinguishes between the multifarious Marxist groups in Mexico. Although primarily oriented to internal politics, a chapter on international Communism does discourse on recent relations. This chapter could be expanded into a book, beginning with the early struggles to ignite the fires of international Marxist ideology in Mexico and terminating with the impact of Castroism upon the nation. Schmitt's work is a welcome addition to the literature in the field, but obviously much remains to be done in this highly controversial area. Perhaps a "New Left" historian, if such a person exists among Mexicanists in the United States, might author a work on Communism in Mexico. Also, a history of Communism's affect upon Mexican foreign policy by an American would be thought provoking.

Prior to the emergence of Castro, the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City served as a focal point for dissemination of Communist materials

<sup>36</sup> Alberto Bremauntz, *La batalla ideológica en México*. México, Ediciones Jurídico Sociales, 1962.

<sup>37</sup> Karl M. Schmitt, *Communism in Mexico: A Study in Political Frustration*. Austin, Univ. of Texas Press, 1965.

for Central America, and the Russians have long expressed an interest in the Mexican Revolution. Rodrigo García Treviño, a former socialist leader of the *Confederación de Trabajadores de México*, in *La ingerencia rusa en México*,<sup>38</sup> has written an introductory history of the Mexican Communist Party from its inception under Russia's Michael Borodin, Japan's Sen Katayama, and India's N. M. Roy. He deals effectively with the Communism of the 1930's and the impact of the Comintern upon Mexico. The writer even examines the diplomacy of international Communism's alignment with England and the United States against Nazism.

Despite disunity among Marxists in Mexico, for many years the late Vicente Lombardo Toledano was a major link to international Communism. For purposes of meeting the minimum electoral requirements Lombardo's *Partido Popular Socialista* supplanted the Communist Party. His Marxist-Leninist writings were prolific and said by many to have an affect upon the course of the Mexican Revolution. The writings are analyzed by Gerardo Unzueta in *Lombardo Toledano y el marxismo leninismo*.<sup>39</sup> In his own volume *¿Moscú o Pekín? La vía mexicana hacia el socialismo*,<sup>40</sup> the leader of the PPS dealt with world problems as he made a doctrinaire analysis of the future of Mexican socialism. Even a scholar in the United States has endeavored to capture the message Lombardo struggled so long to convey. In *Mexican Marxist: Vicente Lombardo Toledano*,<sup>41</sup> published prior to the labor chief's death, Robert Millon offered a biography of the leader of the international Communist movement in Mexico. Significantly, the author deals with the attitudes of Lombardo with respect to international affairs.

In explaining why Mexico's Communist Party has made no headway, journalist José Revueltas, in *Un proletariado sin cabeza*,<sup>42</sup> offers a disillusioned version of Communism in Mexico. Although he has not lost his faith in the Communist doctrines, he proposes that the Mexican Communist Party as early as 1929 failed to organize itself as the conscience of the proletariat, a role that was assumed by the Official Party. Also of interest to the student of Mexican Communism is a work by the artist David Alfaro Siqueiros, *Mi respuesta. La*

<sup>38</sup> Rodrigo García Treviño, *La ingerencia rusa en México*. México, Editorial América, 1959.

<sup>39</sup> Gerardo Unzueta, *Lombardo Toledano y el marxismo-leninismo*. México, Fondo de Cultura Popular, 1966.

<sup>40</sup> Vicente Lombardo Toledano, *¿Moscú o Pekín? La vía mexicana hacia el socialismo*. México, Partido Popular Socialista, 1963.

<sup>41</sup> Robert Millon, *Mexican Marxist: Vicente Lombardo Toledano*. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1966.

<sup>42</sup> José Revueltas, *Un proletariado sin cabeza*. México, Ediciones de la Liga Leninista Espartaco, 1962.

*historia de una insidia. ¿Quiénes son los traidores a la patria?*<sup>43</sup> This collection of documents supplements the work of Revueltas. The writer criticizes the PRI for its failure to follow a true revolutionary path, and insists that the Communist Party is still capable of rectifying the situation.

Many north of the Río Grande have long believed that the Mexican left will never succeed as long as it espouses foreign ideology which is inimical to a basic tenet of the Revolution. Nevertheless the writings of Jesús Silva Herzog about a world dominated by the Soviet Union and the United States, have been well received in Mexico and Latin America. In *El mexicano y su morada y otros ensayos*,<sup>44</sup> he deals specifically with these themes. Similarly in *American Extremes*,<sup>45</sup> an updated version of *Extremos de América*,<sup>46</sup> the old master Daniel Cosío Villegas confronts the attractions of Communism for those suffering from economic inequality. Cosío differs from Silva Herzog, in that he asserts Communism sounds the death knell to national independence and personal freedom. In a more contemporary vein he treats the impact of Communism upon the world from Russia and Korea to Cuba and the Castro rebellion.

The study of international Communism has considerable appeal in Mexico, where many attribute the success of the Revolution to the borrowing of ideology without adherence to international conspiracies. The appeals of Communism have been apparent to United States historians of Mexican international relations, but lack of productivity in the area indicates disinterest in writing about what has been highly unpopular in their country.

Mexican international relations viewed in terms of the class struggle is an area open to scholarly objectivity, for a great deal of the work in the field has been biased. Notwithstanding the writings on international ideology, a strong anti-foreign sentiment in Mexico is discernable. Xenophobia is still ripe in the Mexican literature on international themes and this pertains to Russia as well as the United States. Marxism seems to be gathering acceptance, while anti-Stalinism remains in evidence. Opponents of the Marxian interpretation of history, such as Antonio Caso, are on the decline. In the final analysis, the study of Marxism in Mexico is still underdeveloped when compared to that of liberalism.

One's readings on Mexican international ideology might culminate

<sup>43</sup> David Alfaro Siqueiros, *Mi respuesta. La historia de una insidia. ¿Quiénes son los traidores a la patria?* México, Ediciones de Arte Público, 1960.

<sup>44</sup> Jesús Silva Herzog, *El mexicano y su morada y otros ensayos*. México, Ediciones Cuadernos Americanos, 1960.

<sup>45</sup> Daniel Cosío Villegas, *American Extremes*. Austin, Univ. of Texas Press, 1964.

<sup>46</sup> Daniel Cosío Villegas, *Extremos de América*. México, Tezontle, 1949.

with *Los signos de nuestro tiempo. Extrema izquierda y democracia integral*,<sup>47</sup> which includes brief papers analyzing the fair left and investigating the possibility of a third position in foreign policy. An historical work contrasting Mexican foreign policy with that of De Gaulle, Nasser, or Perón, might enhance the feasibility of this argument.

Because of the nature of the Mexican Revolution, World War II, and the impact of numerous Spanish Republican exiles upon Mexico's intelligentsia, literature concerning right wing ideology has been meager both quantitatively and qualitatively. During the past decade there has been more academic concern with Communism, and fascism, except for the Spanish variety, has been almost dormant in the literary sense. However, with the majority of the peoples of Latin America living under the aegis of militarism, at this time of writing, the scarcity of works involving Mexico's diplomacy with right wing governments is regrettable from the standpoint of utilizing history as a means of furthering comprehension of the present.

#### NEW DIRECTIONS

The above paragraphs have by no means uncovered all of the voids existing in the recent literature on Mexican international relations. In skimming through some of the areas in which monographs relevant to Mexico's twentieth century international policy have been produced during the past decade, the writer has no doubt been guilty of countless omissions. He has probably offended some of his Mexican *compañeros* by neglecting to mention their works of which he was unfamiliar. The difficulties of preparing this type of paper were many and varied. The shortcomings in collections of over 6,000,000 volumes in Northeastern Ohio, including the Cleveland Public Library's extensive Latin American section, make it evident that more viable and rapid means of exchanging information concerning Mexican scholarly publications have to be devised. To broaden the understanding of Mexico and capture the fancy of potential Mexicanists the immediate need for more translations of basic scholarly works from Spanish to English, and *vice versa*, must be filled.

In addition to the numerous literary deficiencies noted throughout the previous pages, many others exist. For instance, Mexican relations with nations of the Soviet Bloc have not been examined. Not only are there opportunities for scholars to penetrate the history of relations between Mexico and Russia, but diplomacy with Czechoslovakia and Poland, with whom ties have been established the longest,

<sup>47</sup> Victor Manzanilla Schaffer, *Los signos de nuestro tiempo. Extrema izquierda y democracia integral*. México, Editorial Libros de México, 1961.



should be studied. Mexican relations with France, Great Britain, and Spain during the twentieth century have not been covered in detail. Despite the existence of *México y el Vaticano*,<sup>48</sup> by the Jesuit Luis Medina Ascensio, considerable remains to be done in the field of Mexican—Church diplomacy. Non-Catholic insights into the subject might prove illuminating.

Works are needed which deal with the historical, rather than the legal side of Mexico's treaty commitments. In the realm of legal history a gap exists in literature on Mexico's territorial claims. For example, what have been the international consequences of Mexico's claims to waters extending nine miles beyond her coast as opposed to the generally accepted practice of claiming only three miles jurisdiction? Numerous alien vessels, which have intruded in Mexico's territorial waters, have been seized over the years, and a comprehensive examination of these events has yet to appear in print. Mexico has long been interested in international arbitration and the history of her relations in this field would make interesting reading. Occasionally a work appears like *México y el arbitraje internacional. El Fondo Piadoso de las Californias. La Isla de la Pasión. El Chamizal*,<sup>49</sup> by Antonio Gómez Robledo, which enhances the understanding of Mexican relations. His work corroborates the idea that Mexico's primary diplomatic objective has been the conservation of her territory, a topic alone deserving of an historical tome.

After perusing the volumes on Mexican international relations dealing with the twentieth century and published within the past ten years, the lack of diplomats' published memoirs, biographies, and autobiographies is also apparent. The most important figures in the formulation of Mexican foreign policy, Presidents and Foreign Ministers, have often been men of letters, and their papers should be compiled and published in a useful format.

Mexican historians might also consider using features found in scholarly books published in other countries. Lately, Mexican literature has been appearing with more footnotes, but far too many volumes still lack bibliographies and indices. Paradoxically, the bibliography, which is an integral part of scholarship, has recently emerged as a separate entity. No finer example can be found than *Revolución mexicana, 1910-1920*,<sup>50</sup> a prodigious guide to the contents of multi-volumes in the section on the Mexican Revolution of the Archives

<sup>48</sup> Luis Medina Ascensio, *México y el Vaticano*, vol. 1: *La Santa Sede y la Emancipación Mexicana*. México, Editorial Jus, 1965.

<sup>49</sup> Antonio Gómez Robledo, *México y el arbitraje internacional. El Fondo Piadoso de las Californias. La Isla de la Pasión. El Chamizal*. México, Editorial Porrúa, 1965.

<sup>50</sup> Berta Ulloa Ortiz, *Revolución Mexicana, 1910-1920*. México, Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1963.

of the Secretary of Foreign Relations, compiled by Berta Ulloa Ortiz. The format of this well indexed monumental work could be duplicated for material from other nations including the United States. Above all, let its contents now direct historians of Mexican international relations into new and more perspicacious endeavors.

In conjunction with *Revolución mexicana*, the external politics section of *Fuentes de la historia contemporánea de México*,<sup>51</sup> edited by Stanley Ross and associates, provides a solid foundation for those interested in pursuing the literature of Mexico's international relations up to 1940. Similar projects must be completed to catalog the existing literature published in the 1940-1960 era.

#### FINAL OBSERVATIONS

Over the past ten years the volume of historical studies concerning Mexico has grown rapidly. As Mexico has gained in international stature, the overall quality of her native historians has improved. Greater emphasis has been placed on international relations in Mexico, as reflected by the increased number of degrees granted in the field. Under the institutional leadership of *El Colegio de México*, which has engaged experienced scholars on worthwhile projects, young academicians of the future have been trained. Names like Daniel Cosío Villegas and Isidro Fabela are known throughout the hemisphere for their contributions on Mexican international relations, and younger scholars are beginning to be noticed. However, the name of a single historian from north of the Río Grande, who has distinguished himself in this field, outside of the area of Mexican-United States relations, fails to come to mind. The few United States scholars who have ventured into this area have generally been unimaginative and their work has yielded little in the way of new interpretations.

The Mexicans too have not been faultless. From the standpoint of proportionate number of works they have produced in the field, more interpretative histories should be forthcoming. These could easily emanate from the published document collections and bibliographies which have tended to dominate the international relations field in Mexico over the past decade. That is not to say that bibliographical and documentary work must be curtailed, but only to suggest that it is time to divert attention to the more analytical aspects of diplomatic history. For example, could not existentialist philosophy be applied to international relations? Might not the historian inquire into the essence

<sup>51</sup> Stanley R. Ross, *et al.*, *Fuentes de la historia contemporánea de México. Periódicos y revistas*, vol. 1. México, El Colegio de México, 1965.

of diplomatic reality? Is it not feasible that from this approach there might evolve a true interpretation of Revolutionary foreign policy? Even if such an effort proved futile from the standpoint of literary production, it could be a worthwhile mental exercise.

In an attempt to gain perspective, a cursory survey of the literature reviewed in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* for the years 1959 to 1968 was conducted and divulged some interesting statistics.<sup>52</sup> During that period thirty-six volumes on Mexican-United States relations were reviewed, with twenty-two originating in the United States and thirteen in Mexico.<sup>53</sup> In contrast, twenty-eight published volumes were reviewed in other areas of Mexican international relations. Of these only five came from the United States, and twenty from Mexico.<sup>54</sup> In light of the fact that in the overall production of historical monographs Mexicanists in the United States have generally kept pace with those in Mexico, obviously the field of Mexican international relations has, for the most part, been overlooked by United States historians. Only Great Britain, among the European countries, has recently made major advances in Mexican studies. Consequently, literature on Anglo-Mexican diplomacy is beginning to emerge.

In general, scholars in the United States have not involved themselves in the controversies evolving out of recent Mexican diplomacy with nations other than their own. Perhaps they have been unaware of the existence of numerous research possibilities. Maybe they have been too cognizant of the hazards of writing diplomatic history involving living individuals and institutions that are vulnerable to criticism. Nevertheless, historians of international relations must be courageous and engage in research and writing about the recent past.

Radical views of Mexican diplomacy and foreign policy have been verbalized in the United States, but have yet to appear in print. To increase the core of knowledge, the depth and scope of scholarship must be expanded. This can be accomplished by new and innovative interpretations of international diplomacy. It might now be opportune to ascertain whether or not orthodoxy in this historical pursuit is healthy, or conducive to intellectual sterility.

In the realm of thought the United States can invade Mexico without trepidation, as celebrative imperialism is non-existent. Academicians in the United States must delve more deeply into the field of Mexican international relations and atone for past derelictions, so that no longer can it be justifiably asked: *¿Dónde están los yanquis?*

<sup>52</sup> Bear in mind that the *HAHR* generally reviews all works published in the United States, but not in Mexico.

<sup>53</sup> Twenty-three volumes were produced in English, twelve in Spanish, and one in Russian.

<sup>54</sup> Four volumes were published in English, twenty-two in Spanish, and one each in German and Russian.