



www.senado2010.gob.mx

www.juridicas.unam.mx

TOPICS IN MEXICAN HISTORIOGRAPHY, 1750-1810; THE BOURBON REFORMS, THE ENLIGHTENMENT, AND THE BACKGROUND OF REVOLUTION

PEGGY K. KORN

All historians work backward from today. The more perceptive recognize that they do so. Therefore, rather than attempt an all-inclusive examination of subsequent writing and publishing of the history of Mexico in the eighteenth century, let us limit discussion to the historiography of a set of priorities, to themes of great interest to present-day historians. In so doing, we are after all but acknowledging that often what we now consider shortcomings of past histories are but interpretations predicated upon premises and concerns of ages other than ours.

Can a general statement be made concerning what historians of today most want to know about the eighteenth century? The collective impact of recent work does allow, as we shall see, the formulation of a tentative listing of queries subdivided as follows. We want to know, first of all, what was life in Mexico like in the eighteenth century? And what sort of changes took place in the latter decades of that rather general time span, and in the first decade of the 19th century to distinguish it from the preceding centuries of Spanish domination. Secondly, we seek to discover the extent to which the changes realized do or do not provide a continuum or continuing process culminating in revolution. Finally, we wish to assess the nature and magnitude of external influences on internal conditions and developments in Mexico in this period and especially to evaluate how these impulses from without may have contributed to a climate propitious to revolution, or even to actively fostering independence from Spain.

These, then, are our questions. We can not fault other historians in other times for asking different ones. We trust scholars of the future will smile kindly, and not too condescendingly, upon us and our sense of what is important. Recognizing that questions put to a body of historical material come to serve as boundaries imposed on the answers, we should note some of the more outstanding queries and responses of the past before considering in detail the work of today.

1830 TO 1910: GENERAL HISTORIES

An historian's attitude toward *the* big event in Mexican history between the Conquest and the Revolution of the twentieth Century, the Revolution of 1810, often determined, consciously or unconsciously, how accounts of the eighteenth century were to be written. Indeed, from the immediate post-revolutionary period henceforth it often determined whether or not one should bother to consider the eighteenth century at all.

In general, historians writing in the nineteenth century either put down the unrest from 1810 to 1821 as a struggle between gachupines and creoles, or between Spain and its American dependencies, or between liberty and despotism, or even between Spanish law and order, on one hand, and the Mexican tendency to anarchy and chaos on the other. Whatever was said of the eighteenth century most often either remained lumped with the history of the two preceding centuries or was brought in as a curtain-raiser to revolution. And so it often is still. Such handling was simply more obvious at a time when most accounts of the eighteenth century appeared in general histories of Mexico or, most frequently, of all Spanish America.

Here we should note an apparent exception which turns out to be a case in point: the multi-volumed, indeed magisterial, work of H. H. Bancroft, *Mexico* (6 v. San Francisco, 1883-1888). It was *the* Mexican history written in the United States of America before the 1920s and, if recently neglected, still not superseded. Bancroft's sanguine and enthusiastic spirit permeates a mini-library compiled with the aid of obviously diligent assistants. A vociferous liberal in the great, late tradition of the nineteenth century, Bancroft applauded the end of the Spanish regime in America; he observed that, by 1823, "America and Europe are pretty well separated politically, never again, thank God, to be united".¹

And how was Spanish dominion brought low?

Looking well into the causes of the Spanish American revolt, we find there the full catalogue of wrongs and injustice common to political subordinates of this nature and in addition some of the blackest crimes within the power of tyranny to encompass. What were such matters as duties per cent, free coming and going, sumptuary regulations, or even local laws and legislation beside intellectual slavery, the enforcement of superstition, the subordination of soul, the degradation of both the mental and spiritual in man.²

¹ v. 4, p. 7.

² *ibid.*, p. 13.

In short, Bancroft assumed that nothing of historical importance went on in the stagnant atmosphere of oppressed Mexico. Accordingly, his volume on the eighteenth century is a narrative account largely of political and institutional developments, and as such it is still of great value to historians today. His sources include diaries of the period and other treasures, many of them, unfortunately, since ignored.³

Bancroft provides a stellar example of the nineteenth century vantage point. He could not see any activity in progress in the viceroyalty of New Spain except that set in motion by, or in regard to, Spain.

Independence was the favorite theme of nineteenth century historians. Most of them accepted political liberty as a concomitant of progress. There was a widespread belief in the fashionable assumption that "when the fruit is ripe, it will drop". In conformity with this school of thought, the desire for independence was indicative of a general American maturity. Little or no consideration was given to the ripening process. No need, then, to set down the history of the eighteenth century, a task by implication analagous to recounting the daily adventures of a pear hanging on a bough.⁴

In short, to most European and Anglo-American historians, Mexico in the eighteenth century was beside the point. They concentrated, when they wrote of Mexico, on the independence movement. Hidalgo and Morelos simply *happened*, thrust forward by destiny (shades of Napoleón!). When specific cause for revolution was ascribed, it was laid, as by Bancroft, to the individious policics and ill health, indeed

³ Among them, in a series published in Mexico in 1854 by *Diario Oficial*, José Manuel de Castro Santa-Ana, *Diario de sucesos notables [1752-1758]*, (3 v., *Documentos para la historia de Méjico*, ser. I. iv-vi). The same series, v. vii, contains José Gómez, *Diario curioso de México [1776-1798]*.

⁴ Dominique de Pradt, *Des colonies et de la revolution actuelle de L'Amerique* (2 v., Paris, 1817), for example, saw all revolutionary activity in America as a chain reaction proceeding from that announcing United States maturity in 1776. For other aspects of de Pradt's ideas and their influence, see Arthur P. Whitaker, *The United States and the Independence of Latin America* (Johns Hopkins Univ., 1941). Also writing in the glow of the revolutionary period was the British charge d'affaires in Mexico, H. G. Ward, *Mexico in 1827* (2 v., London, 1828). De Pradt defined maturity in terms of population and natural resources. Mexico began as inferior to the metropolis, he stated, but had come to equal and would soon overtake it. Cf. William Davis Robinson, *Memoirs of the Mexican Revolution* (2 v., London, 1821), who wrote that Alexander von Humboldt "has flattered the Spanish government" in regard to the extent of reform in Mexico, that injustice and oppression were the sum total of Mexican history until 1808.

Spanish historians in the 1800s, of course, had their own cause for concern with Mexican independence. See Melchor Almagro Fernández, *La emancipación de América y su Reflejo en la Conciencia Española* (Madrid, Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1944) and Luis Felipe Muro Arias, "La Independencia Americana vista por Historiadores Españoles del siglo xix", in *Estudios de Historiografía Americana* (colegio de México, 1948), pp. 207-388.

prostration, of mother Spain. In this sense, Mexican independence was described as a reaction *against* Spain rather than as a movement for national liberty.

It was when Mexicans looked to their own past that the writing of their eighteenth century history proper can be said to have begun. In the two decades after achieving independence, liberals and conservatives began to think back, if selectively, to a time when their land, politically oppressed or not, was at least more prosperous. So José María Luis Mora, even though avidly anti-clerical, in his *Obras sueltas* (Paris, 1837), included some of the writings of Manuel Abad y Queipo, Archbishop-Elect of Michoacán at the inception of revolution in 1810, for, said Mora, "they contain knowledge fundamental to the understanding of questions relating to the public credit of the Mexican Republic". So Carlos María de Bustamante, declaring history to be the surest guide to legislation, published the annalistic history by Andrés Cavo of, in the main, the *ayuntamiento* of Mexico City, under the inflated title of *Los tres siglos de Méjico* (México, 1836). Bustamante more than doubled its volume and added immeasurable to its scholarly worth by the supplement for the years 1767-1821 he appended. So Lucas Alamán in works published 1844-1849 looked back longingly to the general order and stability maintained by the viceregal system of government.⁵ To Alamán, to employ a rather anachronistic and international analogy, New Spain approximated Camelot.

Alamán, generally considered the most informative of Mexican historians writing about the eighteenth century, presented the early Bourbon regime as a triumph of enlightened rule. Spain and New Spain, according to his conservative, flourished until the serpent bearing the apple—that is, France profering the Family Pact—brought war and ruin. A weak and exceedingly ill-advised king, Charles IV, then gave the *coup de grace*. Not decay of Spanish institutions but the effect of external meddling and one weak king lost the empire. He related, as if subsidiary and completely dependent on manipulation from abroad, something of what transpired within Mexico. Changes in economy and administration introduced in the regime of Charles III brought salutary reforms conducive to economic prosperity and, as he mentioned in passing, "aumento de la Ilustración". He attributed to Bourbon reforms not only Enlightenment, but also the growth of Mexican *conciencia de sí* or self-awareness. His interest in his fellow-

⁵ *Disertaciones sobre la historia de la república mexicana desde la época de la conquista* (3 v., México, 1844-1849). Volume three includes a history of Spain in which he praises the constitution of the Habsburgs. *Historia de Méjico desde los primeros movimientos que prepararon su independencia en el año de 1808 hasta la época presente* (5 v., México, 1849). Volume one includes a summary of the outstanding institutions and events of the late eighteenth century.

creoles was subsidiary to his estimation of the importance of the Spaniards who governed; he relegated the role of Mexicans to that of passive subjects of Spain, if harboring a traditional antagonism to gachupines. There was, he implied, some reaction in Mexico to Spanish policies and to other external influences on the country, but he was not terribly concerned with any of it until 1808, when reaction to the overthrow of the viceroy by Spaniards somehow produced a "creole party" who initiated a revolution. Where these men came from, who they were, what they had been doing before 1808, and the content of their discontents were all outside the sphere of his inquiry. Alamán's goal was to present New Spain as a model of institutionalized stability, with change carefully imposed and regulated by government. In this sense, he looks at the Revolution of 1810 much as Edmund Burke surveyed contemporary affairs in France in 1790.

Alamán saw widespread creole disaffection from the old orders spring full-blown from the Spanish deposition of the viceroy, José de Iturrigaray, in 1808. Bustamante, his more liberal contemporary, recorded the presence of a good deal of positive activity of all sorts among the Mexicans and indicated something of the social complexities of the late eighteenth century. Unfortunately, he never tells us enough. What he intimates, however, is tantalizing. He mentions, for example, enlightened viceroys and educated creoles sharing many economic and social concerns. To him Spanish involvement in war with England from 1796 on was not, as Alamán implied, simply a presage of greater disaster to come, but an event allowing some Mexicans to bolster the country's internal economy. Is Bustamante's account of the sporadic and arbitrary governmental harassment he suffered while editing the *Diario de México* indicative of how the Spanish regime hampered and discouraged enterprising Mexicans from engaging in legitimate activity of all sorts? If all too sketchily, Bustamante nevertheless contributes much information on the nature of adverse Mexican reaction to a number of what have been subsequently termed "the Bourbon reforms", from the popular displeasure at the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 to the outcry raised against the attempt by the government to alienate the real property of hospitals, poor houses, and other religious institutions by the Consolidation Act of 1804. It's a pity that neither Bustamante nor Alamán left us reminiscences of their formative years.

Two trends predominate in the writing of Mexican history from the next generation born after the revolution, to 1910. First of all, Mexican historians were less interested in solving immediate national problems and more concerned with the eighteenth century as a part of the national heritage. Secondly, this interim span was a period of tug-of-war, and occasionally synthesis, between historical writing as *belles lettres* and as a science.

Synthesis is most apparent in the work of Joaquín García Icazbalceta. Both meticulous research and what used to be referred to as a felicitous style mark the series of biographical sketches and commentaries on historians born in eighteenth century Mexico which he contributed to the *Diccionario Universal de Historia y Geografía* (10 v. México, 1853-56). He commented pungently on Cavo's annals "anotadas año por año con lamentable prolijidad", on Bustamante's supplement to them, as not very good but the best thing Bustamante wrote, on Alamán, as a writer infinitely superior to Bustamante. Highest praise to all writers about America he reserved for Alexander von Humboldt. He included notes on the Spaniards, Manuel Abad y Queipo and the enlightened viceroy, Revillagigedo the Younger, who "always knew how to reconcile the good of the country [Mexico] with the benefit of the metropolis".⁶ García Icazbalceta, a pivotal figure in Mexican historiography, noted the contributions of both creoles and enlightened Spaniards to Mexican culture. Although primarily interested in the first Spanish century in Mexico, his lifelong devotion to recovering colonial documents and primary sources gave impetus to publication and republication of much eighteenth century material, as well as to greater reliance on it by other historians.⁷

⁶ Vol. 8-10 were an Apéndice edited by Manuel Orozco y Berra. Selections from it reappeared in Joaquín García Icazbalceta, *Opúsculos y biografías*, edited by Julio Jiménez Rueda (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, [hereafter UNAM], 1942). Also see Manuel Guillermo Martínez, *Don Joaquín García Icazbalceta; his place in Mexican historiography* (Catholic Univ. of America, 1947). García Icazbalceta's works have been collected in *Obras* (10 v, México, 1896-1899).

⁷ García Icazbalceta published in *Renacimiento*, 2 (1894), a letter Humboldt wrote to José de Iturrigaray on March 28, 1803. His collections of sixteenth century documents are well known. He also edited *Opúsculos inéditos latinos y castellanos del P. Francisco Javier Alegre* (México, 1889) and published the *Noticias de México* (México, 1880), a manuscript left by the Mexican bookseller, Francisco Sedano (1742?-1812).

Eighteenth century Mexican documents, manuscripts, and histories were selected for publication in accord with the interests of historians writing at the time. In the first half of the century, even during the revolutionary years, works of "economic" import appeared or reappeared. Notable among them were:

1813: *Colección de los escritos más importantes que en diferentes épocas dirigió al gobierno Don Manuel Abad y Queipo* (México, 1813).

1816-1821: José Mariano Beristáin de Souza, *Biblioteca hispanoamericana septentrional...*, an attempt to complete the *Biblioteca mexicana* begun by Juan Eguíara y Eguren (1755).

1820: Juan Antonio Ahumada, *Representación político-legal a la majestad del Sr. D. Felipe V en favor de los empleos políticos, de guerra y eclesiásticos*, originally published in Madrid in 1725.

1831: José Antonio Alzate y Ramírez, *Gacetas de Literatura de México* (4 v, Puebla).

1831: *Instrucción reservada que el conde de Revilla Gigedo dio a su sucesor en el mando, Marqués de Branciforte*.

Manuel Orozco y Berra, the title of whose *Historia de la dominación española en México* (4 v., México, 1906) indicates he wrote from the point of view of what Spain did, in his volume iv, "El Poder Real,

1831: Hipólito Villarreal, *México por dentro y fuera bajo el gobierno de los virreyes. O sea Enfermedades Políticas que padece la capital de la Nueva España en casi todos los cuerpos de que se compone* (1788).

1845-1853: Fabián de Fonseca y Carlos de Urrutia, *Historia general de la real hacienda* (6 v.).

(From the 1850s on, García Icazbalceta's influence is in evidence, culminating around the turn of the century with the publication of a number of outstanding collections of documents, and beginning in 1854 with the publication, mentioned above (note 3) of *Documentos para la historia de Méjico*. From this time on, too, material by or relating to the expelled Mexican Jesuits appeared. It is discussed on p. 35).

1853-1857: Manuel Orozco y Berra, comp., *Documentos para la historia de México* (4 series). See above, note 3.

1856: Matias de la Mota Padilla (1688-1776), *Historia de Nueva Galicia*.

1867-73: *Instrucciones que los virreyes de Nueva España dejaron a sus sucesores* (2 v). Later printings of individual instructions include:

1960: Norman F. Martin, ed., *Instrucciones del Marquez de Croix que deja a su sucesor, Antonio María Bucareli*.

1960: Ernesto de la Torre, ed., *Instrucción reservada que dio don Miguel José de Azanza a su sucesor don Félix Berenguer de Marqueña* (1800).

1965: Norman F. Martin, ed., *Instrucción reservada del Obispo- virrey Ortega Montañés al Conde de Moctezuma*.

1966: Conde de Revilla Gigedo, *Informe sobre las Misiones (1793) e Instrucción Reservada al Marqués de Branciforte (1794)*, edited by José Bravo Ugarte.

1867: José de Gálvez (Marqués de Sonora), *Informe general que instruyó y entregó... al Virrey, D. Antonio Bucarely y Ursúa... 31 diciembre, 1771*.

1869: Alexander von Humboldt, "Tablas geográfico-políticas del reino de la Nueva España (en el año de 1803) presentadas al señor virrey del mismo reino en enero de 1804", in *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística*, 2ª época, I.

1869: Fernando Navarro y Noriega, "Memoria sobre la población del Reino de Nueva España" (1814), *ibid.*, pp. 281-291.

1877-1882: Juan E. Hernández y Dávalos, ed., *Colección de Documentos para la historia de la guerra de independencia de México de 1808-1821* (6 v).

1905-1911: Genaro García and Carlos Pcreyra, eds., *Documentos inéditos o muy raros para la historia de México* (36 v), includes vol. 10: *Tumultos y rebeliones acaecidos en México*; vol. 11: *El clero de México y la Guerra de Independencia*; and vol. 15: *El clero de México durante la Dominación Española*.

1910: Genaro García, ed., *Documentos históricos mexicanos* (7 v) vol. 1, 2 and 7 include documents for the years, 1807-1810.

1930: *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación*, 1, included the text of the *Carta Reservada* of Revillagigedo of August 31, 1793. Subsequent editions contain innumerable documents in eighteenth century history.

1933-1936: Luis Chávez Orozco, ed., *Documentos para la historia económica de México* (11 v).

1939-1942: Francisco del Paso y Troncoso, ed., *Epistolario de Nueva España, 1505-1818* (16 v), vol. 13 includes eighteenth century materials.

1939-1945: Silvio Zavala and Mario Castelo, eds., *Fuentes para la Historia del Trabajo en Nueva España* (8 v), vol. 8:1575-1805.

1701-1789", acknowledged his reliance on a number of primary materials, as do the contributors to the first full-scale Mexican history, edited by Vicente Riva Palacios, *México a través de los siglos* (5 v. México, 1889[?]).⁸ Its authors expressed their indebtedness to the scholarship of García Icazbalceta.

As Edmundo O'Gorman has observed, they achieved the synthesis of the Indian and Spanish pasts in conceiving of their project as properly concerned with the historical evolution of the Mexican people and in assuming that "people" to be a corporate body, an organism formed in the bosom of the viceroyalty and evolving through time and space. Within the weighty compendium born of this broad and lofty vision, however, the pages on the eighteenth century reflect a potpourri of old attitudes. While emphasizing Mexican reaction to European wars and to the American and French revolutions, they were largely devoted to charting material progress (although here Riva Palacio erred in so important a matter as avering that no change occurred in the production of agriculture and mining from the 1600s to 1810). It is a history of events (individuals are unimportant), on one level, and of the Mexican spirit on another. Determinism, in this case sired by positivism, prevails. Mind and body naturally progress toward liberty; there is no need to examine how they interact. At its end, the nineteenth century remained a treasure trove of eighteenth century history yet to be written.

1949: Francisco González de Cossío, ed., *Gacetas de México*.

1953: Xavier Tavera Alfaro, "Documentos para la historia de periodismo mexicano (siglo xviii)", en homenaje a Silvio Zavala, *Estudios históricos americanos* (Colegio de México), pp. 317-344.

1963: — *El Nacionalismo en la prensa mexicana del siglo xviii*.

1960: Juan Vicente de Güemes de Padilla, Conde de Revillagigedo, *El Comercio Exterior y su influjo en la Economía de la Nueva España (1793)*, This is vol. 4 in the *Colección de documentos para la historia del comercio exterior de México* edited by Luis Chávez Orozco.

1962: Francisco Eduardo Tresguerras, *Ocios literarios*. Edited by Francisco de la Maza.

Note should be made here of Tadeo Ortiz de Ayala, *México considerado como nación independiente y libre...* (Burdeos, 1832), by the creole tutor of the sons of Iturrigaray who, in chap. 5, included a bibliography of Mexican authors and artists of the colonial period; of Nicolás León monumental *Bibliografía mexicana del siglo xviii* (5 v, México, 1902-1908); of the popular biographies in *Hombres Ilustres Mexicanos* (México, 1873-1874), edited by Eduardo Gallo E., and of the most balanced of nineteenth-century works on our period, Carlos Pereyra, *Historia de América Española* (7 v, Madrid, 1876), vol. 3: *México*.

⁸ Eighteenth century history is found in vol. 2: *El Virreinato*, by Riva Palacio, and the first decade of the nineteenth century in vol. 3, *La Guerra de Independencia*, by Julio Zárate.

GENERAL HISTORIES SINCE 1920

General histories written in the twentieth century by non-Mexicans, despite information accumulating in specialized studies, have brought too little change, for the most part, in approach to eighteenth century Mexican history. Spanish activity in Mexico is all. Internal events appear only as reactions. Notable exceptions, of course, are works emanating from East Germany and Russia. From the United States, Mexican histories by Ernest Gruening (*Mexico and its Heritage*, New York and London, 1928), Lesley B. Simpson (*Many Mexicos*, Univ. of California, 1952), Henry B. Parkes, (*A History of Mexico*, Boston, 1950), and most recently, Charles C. Cumberland (*Mexico. The Struggle for Modernity*, New York, 1968) illustrate this trend.

The earliest, Gruening, followed in the tradition of Bancroft, discerning no change in the (unenlightened) policies of Spanish government throughout the viceregal period. Simpson confined his discussion of the eighteenth century to a brief mention of "the Bourbon revolution" bringing progress to New Spain. Parkes placed the entire century in a chapter on the growth of liberalism, mentioned some of "the precursors of revolution", by which he meant the scattered and sporadic local uprisings (whose inclusion may well be a contributing factor to why this history was translated into Russian), then went confidently on to the events of 1810. Cumberland, who by 1968 should have known better, lumped the viceregal period, as so often done of yore, and ignored as much as possible (more, in fact), the more recent materials available concerning the history of the eighteenth century.

Here special mention must be made of Lillian Estelle Fisher's *The Background of the Revolution for Mexican Independence* (Boston, 1934). Closest to an attempt at a general history of the late colonial period by a non-Mexican, it is full of information badly assembled, less a goldmine than a grab-bag. For all of that, the book is a response to scholarly enquiry.

The approach to the late eighteenth century taken by M. S. Alperovich in *Voina za Nezavisimost Meksiki* (Moscow, 1964) should stimulate other historians to attempt syntheses of our period. He begins by attacking the proclivity of "conservative and reactionary bourgeois historians" to rehabilitate Spanish colonialism, mentioning in particular the writings of Cecil Jane, Salvador de Madariaga, Richard Konetzke, and Pierre Chaunu, all of whom he claims see the independence movement as a conservative reaction of creole aristocrats to the liberal reforms of the Bourbon government. Alperovich, instead, explains the revolution as a bourgeois one in which large groups of colonial

society participated. He seeks its origins in the late eighteenth century and finds them, not surprisingly, stemming from economic conditions.⁹

He interprets the policy of Charles III not as one of determined reform but as the result of indecision and inconsequence. The government could neither prevent increase in industry, agriculture, and trade nor could it create the conditions necessary to resolve the attendant economic problems. He finds that Mexicans, long thrust upon their own resources, had developed a revolutionary ideology subsequently stimulated by events in Anglo-America and in France. Alperovich reverses the older cause-and-effect relationship historians such as Simpson posited between the Bourbon reforms and the Mexican independence movement. Citing as evidence the more than 100 risings in the colonial period, he assumes that all of them embodied a desire for political emancipation from Spain. The Bourbon reforms he then interprets as introduced in reaction to this growth of a widespread emancipation movement *before* 1760.

Fault may be found with his conceptual framework, particularly with his assumption that all local disturbances had political content, but is perhaps as well to write history from a relatively inflexible ideological point of view, obvious to all, as from a firm, but mistaken, conviction that one is objective and possesses no preconceptions whatsoever.

POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC HISTORY

Specialists in political history, especially in the United States, have tended to cluster around a study of what although largely instituted in the reign of one Bourbon, Charles III, and in some aspects retrogressive — have come to be known as the Bourbon reforms.¹⁰ In 1913

⁹ As *Historia de la Independencia de México (1810-1824)*, it was translated by Adolfo Sánchez Vázquez (México, 1967). Also see Manfred Kossok, "Revolution and Bourgeoisie in Latinamerika. Zum Charakter der Lateinamerikanischen unabhängigkeitbewegung, 1810-1826", *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, Jahrgang, 9 (1961), Sonderheft, pp. 123-143; M. Kossok and Walter Markov, "Konspekt über das spanische Kolonialsystem", *Wissen Zeit, Gesellschafts*, 5:2 (1955-1956), pp. 121-268; and their "Las indias non [sic] eran colonias? Hintergründe einer Kolonialapologetik", in *Lateinamerika zwischen Emanzipation und Imperialismus, 1810-1960* (Berlin, Akademie-Verlag 1961), pp. 1-34. From Spain, Jaime Vicéns Vives, ed., *Historia social y económica de España y América* (5 v, Barcelona, 1957-1959), vol. 4, pt. 1 on Mexico. And now being published in London, Peter Calvert, *México*.

¹⁰ Excellent discussion of Bourbon economic policies in Spanish America and an indication of their effects are supplied by J. H. Parry, in *The Spanish Seaborne Empire* (New York, 1966), and R. A. Humphreys, "Economic Aspects of the Fall of the Spanish American Empire", *Revista de Historia de América*, 30 (1950), pp.

Donald E. Smith, assuming "There was no great change in government in the late eighteenth century", unhesitatingly based his institutional history of *The Viceroy in New Spain* (Univ. of California), largely on a study of viceregal administration there in the time of Charles III. Three years later, Herbert I. Priestley in his study of *José de Gálvez, Visitor-General of New Spain, 1765-1771* (Univ. of California), described economic reforms that were not, he stated, fundamental changes in the operation of fiscal machinery but only an enforcement of the existing system, since of "Paramount interest to Spain" was "the productive wealth of New Spain". Reforms introduced due to the visit of Gálvez centralized administration of revenues, enforced monopoly regulations, effectively warred against smuggling, and fostered Spanish manufacture and commerce. However, Priestley added, they also succeeded in making New Spain take up more of the burden of empire, and made local and general government more pervasive and more pervasively Spanish.

A decade later, Lillian E. Fisher surveyed obvious innovation in her study of the *The Intendant System in America* (Univ. of California, 1929), introduced in New Spain in 1787, to promote and administer the reform program on a regional level. Fisher described what was clearly viewed as change by contemporaries who judged the success of the system in large part in accord with their opinions about whether change itself was good or bad. Together with more recent assessments, her work points to the system achieving some reform in finance, civil administration, military matters, and in indian affairs. At the same time, the system provoked an adverse Mexican reaction, by intervening in municipal government and local life, which in some instances overshadowed what it achieved in its stated purposes of bureaucratic organization and revenue increase.¹¹ In a recently completed disserta-

450-456. For contemporary awareness of the new spurt of Spanish energy in New Spain, see William Robertson, *History of América* (2 v, London, 1777), book 8. *Historia Mexicana*, 17; 3 (1968), in memory of José Miranda is dedicated to general but informative articles on eighteenth-century economic history.

¹¹ A summary of Fisher's findings appeared as "The Intendant System in Spanish America", *Hispanic American Historical Review* (hereafter HAHR), 8 (1928), pp. 3-13. See also Luis Navarro García, *Intendencias en Indias* (Seville, 1959), and for documents concerning the system, Gisela Marazzani de Pérez Enciso, *La Intendencia en España y América* (Caracas, 1966); Víctor A. Belaúnde, "Factors of the Colonial Period in South America working toward a New Regime", HAHR, 9 (1929), pp. 144-153, concluded that older divisive traditions, notably regionalism, "received new strength from the reforms of the Bourbons. These reforms were intended to strengthen and reaffirm the bonds between colonies and mother country, but the results were just the contrary". John Lynch, *Spanish Colonial Administration 1782-1810: The Intendant System in the Viceroyalty of the Rio de la Plata* (London, 1958), is the sort of study needed for New Spain. See also the essay on the intendency system in the forthcoming book by David Brading, *Three Essays on Bourbon México*.

tion, B. R. Hamnett suggests some of the longer-range effects of the Mexican interaction and reaction in "The Intendant System and the Landed Interest in Mexico: the Origins of Independence, 1768-1808" (Cambridge Univ. 1968).

Studies of this system (which put the principles of enlightened despotism to work regionally) were followed by reconsiderations of the nature of the office of viceroy in this period of greatest (Spanish) Bourbon aspiration. Dissertations by James M. Manfredini and Edwin H. Carpenter, both completed in 1949, stress the benign, indeed beneficent aspects of the administration of the viceroy who epitomized the spirit of the program, Juan Francisco de Güemes y Horcasitas, el Conde de Revillagigedo.¹² Manfredini noted Revillagigedo's interest in encouraging agriculture, mining, public health and social welfare in general, primary, technical and professional education, and freer trade. In the capital, Revillagigedo pursued an exceedingly enlightened policy. He cleaned and lit the streets, forbid bathing and other personal functions in public fountains, admonished the populace to clothe itself, waged war on drunkenness, regulated the food supply, and encouraged clean hospitals, roadbuilding, libraries, and schools, including those of architecture and mining, and periodicals disseminating useful knowledge.

It was, as you recall, García Icazbalceta who long ago recognized the fine balance Revillagigedo sought, and momentarily achieved, in the harnessing of Mexican prosperity to the needs of the *real hacienda*, in other words, that the dual nature of the reforms he imposed or attempted—he admitted there were some problems he could not solve—clearly reflected the combination of enlightened principles with autocratic aims and methods. All were designed, ultimately, to increase the national wealth of Spain.

How the Crown, fearing England, especially after the occupation of Havana in 1762, innovated initially in dispatching an army to New Spain is recounted by María del Carmen Velásquez in *El estado de guerra de Nueva España, 1760-1808* (Colegio de México, 1950). She and Lyle N. McAlister, studying *The Fuero Militar in New Spain, 1764-1800* (Univ. of Florida, 1957), relate how a new semi-autonomous corporation, the army, was imposed, buttressed by a Mexican militia,

¹² See also J. Ignacio Rubio Mañé, "Síntesis histórica de la vida del II Conde de Revillagigedo, virrey de Nueva España", *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, 6 (Seville, 1949), pp. 451-496; Lillian E. Fisher, *The Viceregal Administration in the Spanish American Colonies* (Univ. of California, 1926); Gaston Desdévies du Dezert, "Vice-Rois et Capitaine Généraux de Indes Espagnoles a la fin du XVIII e siècle", *Revue Historique*, 125 (1917), pp. 225-264; Bernard E. Bobb, *The Viceroyalty of Antonio María Bucareli in New Spain, 1771-1779* (Univ. of Texas, 1962), and Isidoro Vázquez de Acuña, "El capitán General don Matías de Gálvez", *Revista de Historia Militar* (Madrid), 10 (1966).

and served to stimulate further changes in royal policy and in internal arrangements. Dra. Velásquez concentrated on the latter, describing *Bourbon reforms within a larger historical context*. She approached Mexico as the subject of change rather than as its object, and stressed the non-benign aspects of reform.

In studies of the mining reforms, in particular, scholars first sought to understand how Spanish policies related to economic change and to delineate how measures introduced under royal aegis best illustrated the sometimes happy confluence of the two faces of reform, the beneficial and the acquisitive. Arturo Arnáiz y Freg, Walter Howe, Clement Motten, and Arthur P. Whitaker have written of how the Crown sponsored schools, legislation, and scientific endeavors to promote the output of the Mexican silver mines, in the process benefiting Mexicans, Spaniards, and government, and resulting in increasing Mexican economic prosperity and intellectual stimulation. These studies, pursued in the 1930s for the most part, prepared the way for more intensive and extensive works on the Enlightenment in Mexico. David A. Brading, in a book now being published, *Three Essays on Bourbon Mexico, a study of the Guanajuato silver mining industry in the main*, continues on to a consideration of these measures within a broader, social context.¹³

Most indicative of the autocratic nature of Bourbon reform were its manifestations in pursuit of a policy ground in regalism. They are surveyed in general by Alberto de la Hera and in particular by Magnus Mörner who considers regalism to be a prime factor in the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767.¹⁴ How the Bourbons transformed traditional

¹³ Arturo Arnáiz y Freg, *Andrés Manuel del Río* (México, 1936); his "Don Fausto de Elhuyar y Zubice", *Revista de Historia de América*, 6 (1939), pp. 75-96; and his "Don Andrés del Río, descubridor del Eritronio (Vanadio)", *ibid.*, 25 (1948), pp. 27-68; Arthur P. Whitaker, "The Elhuyar Mining Missions and the Enlightenment", *HAHR*, 31 (1951), pp. 558-585; Walter Howe, *The Mining Guild of New Spain and its Tribunal General, 1770-1821* (Harvard Univ., 1949); Clement G. Motten, *Mexican Silver and the Enlightenment* (Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1950); David A. Brading, "la minería de la plata en el siglo XVIII: el caso Bolaños", *HM*, 18 (1969), pp. 314-33; and Germán Somolinos d'Ardois, "Historia de la ciencia", *HM*, 15 (1966), pp. 275-287 for bibliography.

¹⁴ Alberto de la Hera, *El regalismo borbónico en su proyección indiana* (Madrid, 1963); also Gaston Desdésus du Dezert, "L'Église espagnole des Indes au fin du XVIII^e siècle", *Revue Hispanique*, 39 (1917), pp. 112-292; Vicente Rodríguez Casado, "Notas sobre las relaciones de la Iglesia y el Estado en las Indias en el Reinado de Carlos III", *Revista de Indias*, 11 (1951), pp. 97 ff; Mario Góngora, "Estudios sobre el galicanismo y la Ilustración católica en América española", *Revista Chilena de Historia y Geografía*, 125 (1957), pp. 96-151; Richard Konetzke, "Staat und Gesellschaft in Hispanoamerika am Vorabend der Unabhängigkeit", *Saeculum*, 12 (1961); Magnus Mörner, "The Expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain and Spanish America in 1767 in the light of Eighteenth Century Regalism", a paper read at the 79th Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, Dec. 29, 1964.

policy in imposing direct state control over most aspects of Mexican religious life and institutions is described by N. M. Farriss in *Crown and Clergy in Colonial Mexico, 1579-1821. The Crisis of Ecclesiastical Privilege* (London, 1968). Here regalistic policies are explained as one aspect of the broader program designed to ensure the subservience of all traditionally autonomous and semi-autonomous corporations and organizations to the control of the state.

Meanwhile, Eduardo Arcila Farías, recognizing the essentially economic cast of the reform program, provided a model for interpreting the myriad relationships of governmental policies and practices with internal Mexican change and economic development. In his *El Siglo Ilustrado en América: reformas económicas del siglo XVIII* (Caracas, 1955), he concluded that these governmental policies augmented agriculture and mining production and commerce, modified conditions of work, and even distribution of capital, and abetted economic growth in general. While industry lagged, official mercantilist policy discouraging colonial industry was leniently applied and the making of such goods as cheap cotton cloth, not in competition with Spanish manufacture, boomed.¹⁵

For what is largely a report of regalistic attitudes of the period, notably of José de Cálvez: Raúl Flores Guerrero, "El imperialismo jesuita en Nueva España", *HM*, 4 (1954), pp. 159-173; and for a related discussion on the Inquisition as a political instrument see the differing views of Lewis A. Tambs, "The Inquisition in Eighteenth Century Mexico", *The Americas*, 22 (1965), pp. 167-181, and Richard E. Greenleaf, "The Mexican Inquisition and the Enlightenment, 1763-1805", *New Mexico Historical Review*, July 1966, pp. 181-196; also see his "North American Protestants and the Mexican Inquisition, 1765-1820", *A Journal of Church and State*, 8 (1966), pp. 186-99.

¹⁵ Cf. Alperovich. A number of books and, especially, articles have appeared on Mexican economic conditions. Among them are the following: the great number of studies published and pursued by Luis Chávez Orozco, from his *Historia económica y social de México* (México, 1938), to his "Orígenes de la política de seguridad social", *HM*, 16 (1966), pp. 155-183; and his collections of documents (see above, note 7); Earl J. Hamilton, "Monetary Problems in Spain and Spanish America, 1751-1800", *Journal of Economic History*, 4 (1944), pp. 21-48; the research of Jesús Silva Herzog, including his edition of *Relaciones estadísticas de Nueva España de principios del siglo XIX* (México, 1944), and the unpublished manuscript by Clark W. Reynolds, "The Per Capita Income of New Spain before Independence and after the Revolution" (1967), and also the issue of *HM* cited above (note 10).

Documents concerning royal regulations of working conditions were collected by Silvio Zavala and Mario Castelo (see above, note 7). Aspects of embryonic industry appear in M. Carrera Stampa, *Los gremios mexicanos. La organización gremial de Nueva España* (México, 1954); his "El Obraje novohispano", in *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la Historia*, 20 (1961) pp. 148-171; and Richard Greenleaf, "The Obraje in the late Mexican Colony", *The Americas*, 23 (1967), pp. 227-50. Mining conditions appear in D. A. Brading (see above, p. 17 and note 13) and Luis Chávez Orozco, *Conflicto de trabajo con los mineros de Real del Monte, año de 1766* (México, 1960).

An increasing number of works pertaining to trade and commerce include

Recently, several historians have gone beyond the reforms introduced under Charles III to investigate aspects of the economic policies invoked under his successor, Charles IV. Romeo Flores Caballero in "Las representaciones de 1805", (*Historia mexicana* (hereafter *HM*) 17, (1968), pp. 469-473) and in "La consolidación de vales reales en la economía, la sociedad y la política novohispanas", (*HM*, 18, (1969), pp. 334-378) discussed the issuing of *reales vales* from 1780 on, the royal need for funds to amortize them leading to the *real cédula de consolidación de vales reales* of December 26, 1804, the attempt to enforce the decree in New Spain and the economic, social, and political responses. He concluded that the act affected all sectors of society, was a factor in making Spain appear inept and extortionist; government, previously a unifying force, now assumed the role of a divisive social factor. In this sense, Manuel Abad y Queipo might well blame revolution on the bad government of Charles IV.

Flores Caballero indicated that he had consulted a number of *representaciones* written in response to the *cédula* of 1804 and that they will soon be published in the *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación* by Masae Sugawara H. Sugawara has studied the impact of the *vales reales*, as among "Los antecedentes coloniales de la deuda pública de

Robert S. Smith's articles, "Shipping in the Port of Veracruz, 1790-1821", *HAHR*, 23 (1943), pp. 5-20; "The Institution of the Consulado in New Spain", *HAHR*, 24 (1944), pp. 61-83; "The Puebla Consulado", *Revista de Historia de América*, 21 (1946), pp. 19-28; "The Wealth of Nations in Spain and Hispanic America", *Journal of Political Economy*, 65 (1957), pp. 104-125; and with Irving A. Leonard, "A proposed library for the Merchant Guild of Veracruz", *HAHR*, 24 (1944), pp. 84-102; José Flores Ramírez, *El Real Consulado de Guadalajara* (Guadalajara, 1952); Luis Chávez Orozco, ed., vol. 1: *El comercio de España y sus Indias* in *Colección de documentos para la historia del comercio exterior . . .* (see above, note 7); Sergio Villalobos R., "El comercio extranjero a fines de la Dominación Española", *Journal of Inter-American Studies*, 4 (1962), pp. 517-542; Stanley J. Stein, "Merchants and Monarchs: Interest Groups in Policy-making in Eighteenth Century Spain and New Spain", a paper read at the 79th Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, Dec. 30, 1964; Jesús Silva Herzog, "El comercio de México durante la época colonial", *Cuadernos Americanos*, 153: 4 (jul-ag. 1967), pp. 127-153; and the collections of documents, Secretaría de Educación Pública, *El Comercio de Nueva España* (México, 1945) and Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior, *El contrabando y el comercio exterior en la Nueva España* (México, 1967).

One of the most fruitful—and this with no unintended—economic areas studied to date, since it was the principal industry of the period, hasta been agriculture. See Luis Chávez Orozco, *La crisis agrícola novo-hispana de 1784-1785* (México, 1953), and his *Documentos sobre las alhóndigas y pósitos de Nueva España* (11 v, México, 1955-1959); François Chevalier, "Survivances seigneuriales et présages de la Révolution agraire dans le Nord du Mexique fin du XVIII e XIX siècles", *Revue Historique*, 222 (Jul-Sept. 1959), pp. 1-18; Delfina E. López Sarrelangue, *Una villa mexicana en el siglo XVIII* (UNAM, 1969); and the important book by Enrique Florescano, *Precios de maíz y crisis agrícolas en México, 1708-1810* (El Colegio de México, 1969) mentioned below, p. 193.

México".¹⁶ In his introduction to Part I: "España: Los Vales Reales, orígenes y desarrollo de 1780 a 1804", Sugawara contends that *all* Spanish policies represented only an inept reaction to forces pressing upon Spain from without, did not contribute to prosperity in the empire, and were of no help in solving the economic problems of Mexico. He implicitly refutes the thesis of Arcila Farías and seconds that of Alperovich.

Sugawara relates royal measures to wider Western economic history at one end and to Mexican development at the other. Here again a Marxist-Leninist orientation points up the present need for more works of tentative synthesis embracing the Bourbon reforms in New Spain and their relationship to Western history in our period as a whole.

Earlier assessments, seemingly at least half-forgotten now, of the origins of the reform program, too, sought to place the extended visit made by Gálvez within the sphere of European international affairs. Notable among them are the articles concerning French and British interest in Spanish American, and particularly Mexican, trade. Vera Lee Brown, Arthur S. Aiton, and Allan Christelow found French intrigue behind the decision to reform and the ultimate choice of José de Gálvez to implement the policy.¹⁷ It is high time the Gálvez mission

¹⁶ BAGN, 8 (1967), pp. 129-402. And see the excellent survey by Brian R. Hamnett, "The Appropriation of Mexican Church Wealth by the Spanish Bourbon Government, the 'Consolidación de Vales Reales', 1805-1809", *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 1 (1969), pp. 85-113.

¹⁷ Vera Lee Brown, "Anglo-Spanish Relations in America in the closing years of the Colonial Era", *HAHR*, 5 (1922), pp. 327-483; Arthur S. Aiton, "Spanish Colonial Reorganization under the Family Compact", *HAHR*, 12 (1932), pp. 269-280; Allan Christelow, "French Interest in the Spanish Empire during the Ministry of the Duc de Choiseul (1759-1771)", *HAHR*, 21 (1941), pp. 515-537, and Dorothy B. Goebel, "British Trade to the Spanish Colonies, 1796-1823", *AHR*, 43 (1938), pp. 288-320. For ongoing foreign influence in Mexico: John Rydjord, *Foreign Interest in the Independence of New Spain* (Duke Univ., 1935); for French influence; Rafael Heliodoro Valle, "Algunos franceses en México", *Filosofía y Letras*, 2 (1943), pp. 153-159; Jacques Houdaille, "Frenchmen and Francophiles in New Spain from 1760 to 1810", *The Americas*, 13 (1956), pp. 1-30; and his "Gaëtan Souchet D'Alvimart, the Alleged Envoy of Napoleón to México, 1807-1809", *ibid.*, 13 (1959), pp. 109-132; Jesús Reyes Heróles, "Rousseau y el liberalismo mexicano", *Cuadernos Americanos*, 21 (1962), pp. 159-185; Jefferson R. Spell, *Rousseau in the Spanish World before 1833* (Univ. of Texas, 1938) and his more specific "Rousseau in Spanish America", *HAHR*, 15 (1935), pp. 260-267; and, most recent, Richard E. Greenleaf, "The Mexican Inquisition and the Masonic Movement, 1751-1820", *New Mexico Historical Review* (1969), 42, pp. 93-117. For British influence and relations: William Kaufmann, *British Policy and the Independence of Latin America, 1804-1828* (Yale Univ., 1951); the introduction by Sir Charles K. Webster to *Britain and the Independence of Latin America* (Oxford Univ., 1944); and John Lynch, "British Policy and Spanish America, 1783-1808", *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 1 (1969), pp. 1-30. The classic study of French policy is W. S. Robertson, *Franca and Latin American Independence* (Johns Hopkins

be connected to the whys of reform, to the ongoing problems of the borderlands, where, after all, he spent three years, and to the subsequent history of official policies and appointments, notably those of Matías and son, Bernardo, as viceroys, and Teodoro de Croix as Captain General of the Provincias Internas. Had *afrancesados* or true French agents captured the government of New Spain?

The works of Richard Herr, Jean Sarrailh, and Luis Sánchez Agesta supply the necessary Spanish background to policies carried out in Mexico.¹⁸ They indicate a complexity of purpose lay behind the multi-

Univ., 1939), and of the United States, Arthur P. Whitaker, *The United States and the Independence of Latin America, 1800-1830* (see above, note 4).

Lilian E. Fisher wrote a brief article on "Teodoro de Croix", *HAHR*, 9 (1929), pp. 488-504; see Alfred B. Thomas, ed. and tr., *Teodoro de Croix and the Northern Frontier of New Spain, 1776-1783* (Univ. of Okla., 1941), and Roberto Moreno y de los Arcos, "Teodoro de Croix. Su actuación en América" (unpublished thesis, UNAM, 1967). For José de Gálvez: Priestley; the 1771 *Informe* (see above, note 7), Luis Navarro García, *Don José de Gálvez y la comandancia general de las provincias internas del norte de Nueva España* (Seville, 1964). For his nephew, Donald E. Worcester, ed., *Bernardo de Gálvez's Instructions for Governing the Interior Provinces of New Spain (1786)* (Berkeley, 1951); Guillermo Porras Muñoz, "Bernardo de Gálvez", in homenaje a D. Antonio Ballesteros Beretta, *Miscelánea Americanista*, III (Madrid, 1952), pp. 575-620. On Bernardo's father-in-law, Ramón Ezquerria, "Un patricio colonial: Gilberto de Saint-Maxent, teniente gobernador de Luisiana", *ibid.*, I (Madrid, 1951), pp. 429-502. Also see J. Ignacio Rubio Mañé, "Política del virrey Flores en la Comandancia General de las Provincias Internas, 1787-1789", *BAGN*, 24 (1953), pp. 213-257; Bernard E. Bobb, "Bucareli and the Interior Provinces", *HAHR*, 34 (1954), pp. 20-36; For the classic statement: Herbert E. Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands* (Yale Univ., 1921). A. P. Nasatir is currently engaged in research concerning the frontiers of Spanish Louisiana and particularly the Anglo-Spanish frontier on the Upper Mississippi, 1796-1804. Also for Louisiana: Jack D. L. Holmes, *Gayoso: the Life of a Spanish Governor in the Mississippi Valley, 1789-1799* (Baton Rouge, 1965); and V. Vital-Hawell, "La actividad del cónsul de España y de los emisarios franceses en Nueva Orleans de 1808 a 1809", *Revista de Indias* (jul-dic. 1963), and John P. Moore, "Antonio de Ulloa. A Profile of the first Spanish Governor of Louisiana", *Louisiana History*, 8: 3 (1967), pp. 189-218; Arthur P. Whitaker, "Antonio de Ulloa", *HAHR*, 15 (1935), pp. 155-194. Other important works on the frontiers include Isabel Eguiloz de Prado, *Los indios del nordeste de Méjico en el siglo XVIII* (Seville, 1965); Michael E. Thurman, *The Naval Department of San Blas, New Spain's Bastion for Alta California* (Glendale, Calif., 1967); Max L. Moorhead, *The Apache Frontier. Jacobo Ugarte and Spanish-Indian Relations in Northern New Spain, 1769-1791* (Univ. of Oklahoma, 1968); and Mark Simmons, *Spanish Government in New Mexico* (New Mexico, 1968). Also see the older works: Bolton, R. W. Manning, "The Nootka Sound Controversy", *American Historical Association Annual Report* (1904), pp. 279-478; and V. Alessio Robles, "Las condiciones sociales en el norte de la Nueva España", in *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la Historia*, 4: 2, (1945).

¹⁸ Luis Sánchez Agesta, *El pensamiento político del despotismo ilustrado* (Madrid, 1953); Jean Sarrailh, *L'Espagne éclairée de la seconde moitié du XVIIIème siècle* (Paris, 1954); Richard Herr, *The Eighteenth Century Revolution in Spain* (Princeton Univ., 1958). There is also quite a bit of periodical literature, and some books, on specific personages involved in and aspects of royal policy, including

faceted program, that under Charles III the royal policy in New Spain sprang from the desire to swell the *Real Hacienda*, from an increasing fear of England and, finally, as Richard Konetzke has documented, from the deeply-felt need "to make the colonies love the nation".¹⁹ Much light would be shed on reform and its ramifications in Mexico by comparative study with contemporary policy and activity in Spain. A brief survey, "La Reorganización Imperial en Hispanoamérica, 1760-1810", *Iberomanskt*, (Stockholm), 4:1, (1969), pp. 1-36, by Magnus Mörner, is our most recent and most balanced account, short but beautifully organized.

Study to date, then, finds the predominating (Western) view is that Bourbon reforms, enlightened and autocratic, initiated largely under Charles III as an attempt at increased assertion of control, acted as catalysts but not originators of Mexican economic prosperity, as stimulants to social, cultural, and intellectual change, demographic change and increase and, finally, as we shall see, to the development of a new revolutionary state of mind. The reforms belong, in proper historical perspective, among the factors abetting change that would at length prove conducive to movement toward independence. And it must be remembered, as Earl J. Hamilton, R. A. Humphreys, Stanley J. Stein, and Masae Sugawara remind us, that both reform and prosperity were responses to an increasing European demand for products and markets.²⁰

Political and economic history, then, largely centered on Spanish activity (or lack of it) under Charles III, has yielded some underst-

Ricardo Krebs Wilckens, *El pensamiento histórico, político y económico del Conde de Campomanes* (Santiago de Chile, 1960); José Loredo Aparicio, ed. and comp., *Jovellanos* (México, 1946); José María Ots Capdequi, "Sobre la política económica y el régimen fiscal del Estado español en América al tiempo de la independencia", in homenaje a don Ramón Carande, (2 v, Madrid, 1963), II, pp. 331-345; John H. R. Polt, "Jovellanos and his English Sources", *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new series, 54 (1964); José Cepada Adán, "La política americana vista por un cortesano de Carlos III", *Anuario de Estudios Americanos*, 21 (1964), pp. 437-487; Marcelo Bitar Letayf, "El conde de Campomanes y el comercio español con Indias", *Cuadernos Hispanoamericanos*, 205 (1967), pp. 91-97; and José Antonio Gómez Marín, "La reforma agraria y la mentalidad ilustrada", *ibid.*, 229 (1969), pp. 151-160.

¹⁹ Richard Konetzke, "La condición legal de los criollos y las causas de independencia", *Estudios Americanos*, 2 (1950), pp. 31-54. He cites the fiscales, Campomanes and Floridablanca, of the royal council (el Consejo Extraordinario) in a session of March 5, 1768 (p. 45).

²⁰ Earl J. Hamilton, *op. cit.* (note 15); also his "Money and Economic Recovery in Spain under the First Bourbon, 1701-1746", *Journal of Modern History*, 15 (1943), pp. 192-206, and *War and Prices in Spain, 1651-1800* (Harvard Univ., 1947); R. A. Humphreys, *op. cit.* (note 10); Stanley J. Stein, *op. cit.* (note 15) and, with Barbara H. Stein, *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America: Perspectives on Economic Dependence* (Oxford Univ., 1969).

anding of what went on in Mexico in the later eighteenth century. Until recently, however, while infusing the period with shape and motion, such accounts gave little indication of internal vitality. In effect, they continued to leave an impression of material progress, abetted or hampered by Spanish policy, or both, depending on the year, paralleling the emergence of a Mexican spirit. Thus Justo Sierra, for example, in his ebullient essay, *Evolución Política del pueblo mexicano* (México, 1900-1902), still tended to describe Mexico in the eighteenth century as an organism becoming conscious of its personality. With equal, if not greater, zest, José Vasconcelos, in his *Breve historia de México* (México, 1937) stated that New Spain under Spain had been the most cultured and enlightened of colonies until the advent of Charles III, who "interrumpe el desarrollo nativo y crea problemas y situaciones nefastos". Vasconcelos returned, nearly full circle, to the outlook of Alamán and, oddly enough, looked forward at the same time to the argument of Alperovich. Such delightfully impressionistic characterizations of the eighteenth century as those of Sierra and Vasconcelos were to be made obsolete in the writing of the history of the 1700s, by the imminent wedding of the material and the spiritual.

CULTURAL AND INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

Since 1940 an increasing number of historians, especially in Mexico itself, have come to consider of primary historical importance not political and general institutional arrangements so much as the predominating suppositions or commonly-held assumptions supporting such institutions in a given time and place. Especially do they seek to ascertain the goals and values common to a society or the more dominant segments of it; they assume politics and institutions in general to compose a superstructure reared upon and supported by them. Political and even economic history are seen as outcroppings jutting from the subsoil of ideology.

According to this view, the intellectual preoccupations of an era, are determinants of culture, responsible for setting social values, concerns, and goals.

Whereas Marx posited an economic determinism derived — to vary a cliché — from upending the Hegelian concept of the dialectic— this school of historians appears closer in philosophy to the original Hegelian idea that non-material (indeed for Hegel, spiritual) forces to a large extent shape present history and direct its future course. To this school, then, political and economic determinism occupy the same causative level. Both, in turn, are more products than producers

of history. Instead, it is how a society views itself and its relationship to its environment in time and through time the point of view it maintains as its predominant philosophy—or philosophies—and the alterations these undergo, that are the most important determining factors in the history of a community or social entity. A concomitant notion, then, is that past history influences the making of present individual and collective decisions and thus also affects the future. In effect, this outlook has achieved a predominant position in the writing of Mexican history in the past 20 years and has been translated into an ongoing analysis of what earlier historians were content simply to personify as “the Mexican spirit”.

John Phelan, among others, has described how history and philosophy have joined forces in the common endeavor “to discover the national ethos of the Mexican culture”.²¹ Embracing cultural nationalism as a subdivision of universalism, a group of scholars has adopted a position intrinsically humanistic and, like humanists of the sixteenth—and eighteenth—centuries, they assert, in Phelan’s phrase, that “the historians’ task is to illustrate how the past conditions and determines the range of alternatives for the future”. This idea of man as a decision-maker may well be a subtle variation on an eighteenth-century comment on the great chain of being, Voltaire’s observation that “Every effect evidently has its cause . . . but every cause has not its effect . . . Everything is begotten, but everything does not

²¹ P. 309, John L. Phelan, “México y lo Mexicano”, *HAHR*, 36 (1956), pp. 309-318. Also see Samuel Ramos, “Las Tendencias Actuales de la Filosofía en México”, (also in English) in *Intellectual Trends in Latin America* (Austin, 1945), pp. 44-65; Bernabé Navarro, “La Historización de Nuestra Filosofía”, *Filosofía y Letras*, 18 (1949), pp. 263-280; Patrick Romanell, *The Making of the Mexican Mind* (Univ. of Nebraska, 1952); Hugo Díaz-Thomé, “El mexicano y su historia”, *HM*, 2 (1952), pp. 248-258; Julio Le Riverend, “Problemas de historiografía”, *HM*, 3 (1954), pp. 62-68; Luis González y González, “En torno de la integración de la realidad mexicana”, in homenaje a Silvio Zavala, *Estudios Históricos Americanos* (México, 1953), pp. 407-424; Luis Villoro, “The Historian’s Task: the Mexican Perspective”, in Archibald Lewis and Thomas F. McGann, eds., *The New World Looks at its History* (Univ. of Texas, 1963), pp. 173-182; Edmundo O’Gorman, “La Revolución Mexicana y la Historiografía”, in *Seis Estudios Históricos de Tema Mexicano* (Univ. Veracruzana, 1960), pp. 203-220; and his “Tres etapas de la historiografía mexicana”, *Anuario de Historia (UNAM)*, 2, (1962), pp. 11-19; Arturo Arnáiz y Freg, “Mexican Historical Writing”, in A. Curtis Wilgus, ed., *The Caribbean: Mexico Today* (Univ. of Florida, 1964), pp. 216-224; the more general essay by Arthur P. Whitaker, “The Enlightenment in Spanish America”, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 102: 6 (1958), pp. 555-559; and the outstanding collection of bibliographical essays published as *HM*, 15: 2-4 (1966), “Veinticinco años de investigación histórica en México”. For philosophers seeking *lo mexicano*: Antonio Caso, *México (Apuntamientos de cultura patria)* (UNAM, 1943); José Gaos, *En torno a la filosofía* (2 v, México, 1952); Silvio Zavala, *Aproximaciones a la historia de México* (México, 1953); and Francisco Larroyo, *La filosofía americana: su razón y sin razón de ser* (UNAM, 1958).

beget".²² For us it has meant a new interest in the eighteenth century not simply negatively as the time before the revolution but positively as a seedbed and transmission period of values and traditions specifically Mexican. Wigberto Jiménez Moreno distinguished this new tendency as

La de hincar el análisis sobre las ideas y los sentimientos, que son, junto con las primeras necesidades, los verdaderos motores de los hechos. Esto, unido a un examen más certero de los factores económicos y sociales, desplaza el centro de gravedad de nuestros estudios, trayéndolos de la historia política hacia la historia cultural, y de la mera narración de los sucesos, a la interpretación de lo que significan.²³

Renewed interest in the non-material aspects of history, in culture and intellectual activity, has brought the eighteenth century into great prominence. Pedro Henríquez-Ureña what seems long ago observed, "El siglo XVIII fue, dentro de los límites impuestos por el régimen político de la Colonia, acaso el siglo de mayor esplendor intelectual autóctono que ha tenido México".²⁴ More recently, our period has come into favor with a broader range of scholars who, whether concerned with the history of philosophy or the philosophy of history take a Collingwood-like stance and contribute to both fields simultaneously.²⁵ Precursors of this tendency in historical thought include not only historians of literature such as Henríquez-Ureña, Francisco Pimentel, José María Vigil, Luis G. Urbina, Julio Jiménez Rueda, Carlos González Peña and Alfonso Reyes, but also historians of art and architecture such as Manuel Toussaint, Manuel Romero de Terreros, and Francisco de la Maza, of philosophy such as Emeterio Valverde y Téllez, and of academic culture, notably John Tate Lanning.²⁶

²² From his *Philosophical Dictionary* in *The Works of Voltaire*, translated by T. Smollett (Paris, 1901).

²³ P. 455; Wigberto Jiménez Moreno, "50 Años de Historia Mexicana", *HM*, 1 (1952), pp. 449-455.

²⁴ Cited by B. Navarro, *op. cit.* (note 22), p. 268.

²⁵ See R. G. Collingwood, "Human Nature and Human History" (1936), in *The Idea of History* (New York, 1956), pp. 205-230.

²⁶ See Manuel Toussaint, *Arte colonial en México* (México, 1948); Pal Kelemen, *Baroque and Rococo in Latin America* (New York, 1951); George Kubler and M. Soria, *Art and Architecture in Spain and Portugal and their American Dominions, 1500-1800* (London, 1959); Pedro Henríquez Ureña, "Las traducciones y paráfrasis en la literatura mexicana de la época de independencia (1800-1821)", *Anales del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia y Etnología* (ser. 3), 5 (1913), pp. 51-64, 379-381; *Diccionario de Escritores Mexicanos* (UNAM, 1967); Emeterio Valverde y Téllez, *Bibliografía Filosófica Mexicana* (México, 1907), and his *Crítica Filosófica y Estudio Bibliográfico y Crítico de las Obras de Filosofía* (México, 1904); John Tate Lanning, *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies* (New York, 1940),

Bernabé Navarro has traced an upsurge of monographs approaching the Mexican past in this fashion and insinting on the cultural importance of the eighteenth century to 1940 when José Gaos began in a seminar at the Colegio de México to investigate the most important intellectual themes relating to Mexico, when *México y la Cultura*, including chapters by Silvio Zavala and Samuel Ramos appeared, when Antonio Caso published a trendsetting article on Juan Benito Díaz de Gamarra y Dávalos, the eighteenth century educator and eclectic, and when Gabriel Méndez Plancarte began his seminar on Mexican philosophy and history in the Seminario Tridentino. In 1941 Méndez Plancarte published his *Humanistas del siglo XVIII*; the following year *La historia de la filosofía en México* by Samuel Ramos appeared.²⁷

In that same year of 1942, a group of scholars in the United States, in a slim volume, *Latin America and the Enlightenment* edited by Arthur P. Whitaker, expressed recognition of the importance for all Spanish America of that great cultural trend of the eighteenth century, the Enlightenment. Seeking to allay for all time the notion that Spain kept Latin America enfolded in obscurantism and oppression, they discussed aspects of the official and unofficial introduction of enlightened ideas, particularly the emphasis on useful knowledge, from various European countries, and presented evidence of their dissemination throughout Latin America.

Monelisa Lina Pérez-Marchand, in *Dos etapas ideológicas del siglo XVIII en México a través de los papeles de la Inquisición* (Colegio de México, 1945) corroborated through a study of Inquisition records that enlightened notions had indeed spread throughout Mexico by the latter part of the eighteenth century. In the previous year, Mariano Picón-Salas beautifully resurveyed and depicted within his work on colonial culture, *De la Conquista a la Independencia* (México, 1944) the fabric of intellectual life in Mexico in the late viceregal period. These two books carried into the writing of history proper the thesis of Ramos that in the late eighteenth century in Mexico as in Europe a new philosophy, indeed ideology, came to challenge the older established one, and that some of the best minds in Mexico forsook the world view dominant since the Conquest to embrace the new truth.

Problems remained of definition, of origins, of when and how the

his earlier "La Real y Pontifical Universidad de México y los preliminares de la Independencia", *Universidad de México*, 2: 9 (1936), pp. 3-4; and, most recent, "Tradition and the Enlightenment in the Spanish Colonial Universities", *Journal of World History*, pt. 4 (1967); David Mayagoitia, *Ambiente Filosófico de la Nueva España* (México, 1946).

²⁷ Navarro, *op. cit.*

Enlightenment was introduced and developed in Mexico, and of how it affected subsequent history, notably the independence movements. Among the earliest of such monographic studies were those by Agustín Millares Carlo who recognized the importance of the writings of the Galician Benedictine monk, Benito Gerónimo Feijóo y Montenegro, and especially of his *Teatro crítico universal* (9 v. Madrid, 1739) in transporting the Enlightenment from France to Spain, in marrying French (and English) rationalism to religious orthodoxy, and so in producing an eclectic blend of Catholicism with the critical spirit.²⁸ Enlightened notions, wrapped in eclecticism, then travelled from Spain to Mexico, where they remained associated with Feijóo's name and with Catholicism.

A private printing of Victoria Junco's *Gamarra o el eclecticismo en México* (México, 1944) and an edition of a selection of Gamarra's writings, *Tratados* (UNAM, 1947) by José Gaos established that advocate of Feijóo's eclecticism as the principal introducer of modern or enlightened philosophy in Mexico. Bernabé Navarro subsequently summarized the contribution of Gamarra in a critical essay introducing his translation of Gamarra's *Elementos de filosofía moderna*, vol. 1 (UNAM, 1963).

Ramos had mentioned not only Gamarra's work but the contributions of certain young creole Jesuits to Mexican philosophy. Navarro, in *La introducción de la filosofía moderna en México* (Colegio de México, 1948) discussed the modern concepts embedded in some of the *cursus philosophicus* that denoted the content of courses in philosophy, taught in the Jesuit colegios, by individual members of the order. His work spanned the period between Feijóo and Gamarra, putting back enlightenment in México to at least mid-century and finding the "modern" outlook to have been an ongoing one within the country.

Monographs and articles published during the 1950s described numerous individual and social manifestations of enlightened concepts, thus drawing attention to the more popular modes of acceptance of the new currents of thought. Pablo González Casanova in the first issue of *Historia mexicana* (Colegio de México, 1951) commented on the appearance in the late 1700s of popular satire containing advanced "philosophical" notions, then expanded his findings into a book, *La literatura perseguida en la crisis de la colonia* (Colegio de México,

²⁸ Agustín Millares Carlo "Feijóo en América", *Cuadernos Americanos*, 3 (1944), pp. 139-160; his *Dos Discursos de Feijóo sobre América* (México, 1945), and his edition of Feijóo's *Teatro Crítico Universal* (Madrid, 1923-1925). Also Gaspard Delpy, *L'Espagne et l'esprit européen: l'oeuvre de Feijóo* (Paris, 1936), and for other eclectic importations: María del C. Rovira, *Eccléticos portugueses del siglo XVIII y algunas de sus influencias en América* (México, 1958).

1958). Henceforward *Historia mexicana* printed a number of outstanding contributions to eighteenth century history.

Juan Hernández Luna had earlier edited selections from the writings of José Antonio Alzate (México, 1945). Rafael Moreno now discussed Alzate as a prime propagandist for the new ideas concerning educational reform and in an article appearing a decade later, for the importance of the natural and physical sciences.²⁹ In the same period, Xavier Tavera Alfaro edited a number of the writings of this admirer of Gamarra and Mexican savant of encyclopedic interests.³⁰ As intellectual and cultural innovation were discerned, Jesús Reyes Heróles, in the first volume of *El liberalismo mexicano* (3 v, UNAM, 1957-1961) and Francisco López Cámara, in *La génesis de la conciencia liberal en México* (Colegio de México, 1954) reminded readers of a continuation of liberal ideas predating the Enlightenment by pointing to the liberalism, also described by Ramos and Méndez Plancarte, inherent in the Spanish and Mexican traditions of Christian humanism.

By the 1960s, in *Estudios de la historia de la filosofía en México* (UNAM, 1963), Rafael Moreno could contribute an essay summarizing much of this research. Bernabé Navarro had accumulated sufficient data to postulate, beyond the emergence of a modern philosophy, the appearance of a *Cultura mexicana moderna en el siglo XVIII* (UNAM, 1964). Mexican history had come a long way since the days when Riva Palacio and Justo Sierra wrote airily of a Mexican spirit progressing toward liberty.

Yet subsequent thought and study has not proved them wrong. Leopoldo Zea, in *América como conciencia* (México, 1951) had discerned during the course of the viceregal period the emergence of a particularly American self-awareness expressed by Mexican creoles. Earlier, Millares Carlo had noted the influence on creole attitudes of Feijóo's insistence on considering America as a geographical and cultural entity distinct from Spain. Millares Carlo also translated from Latin into Castilian an early manifestation of creole particularism or criollismo, the 1755 edition of the *Prólogos de la Biblioteca Mexicana* of Juan José de Eguiara y Eguren (México, 1944 rev.ed., Maracaibo, 1963). Juan Hernández Luna then characterized Eguiara y Eguren as "El iniciador de la historia de las ideas en México" (*Filosofía*

²⁹ Rafael Moreno, "Alzate, Educador ilustrado", *HM*, 2 (1953), pp. 389; and his "La concepción de ciencia en Alzate", *HM*, 13 (1964), pp. 346-378; also see his earlier, "José Antonio Alzate y la filosofía de la Ilustración", *Memorial y Revista de la Academia Nacional de Ciencias*, 57 (1952), pp. 55-84. For Bartolache: *Los exámenes universitarios del doctor José Ignacio Bartolache en 1772* appeared in print (México, 1948) illustrating reawakened interest in Alzate's enlightened contemporary.

³⁰ Xavier Tavera Alfaro, *op. cit.* (note 7).

y *Letras*, 25 [1953], pp. 65-80), while Bernabé Navarro pointed out how the *Biblioteca* came to be written to defend "La cultura mexicana frente a Europa", (*HM*, 3 (1954), pp. 547-561). Articulate *criollismo*, they concluded, emerged as a reaction to European slurs and gachupin pretensions and as a growing creole pride in the Mexican *patria*.

Luis González y González (1948) explained how the interaction of this sentiment of *conciencia de sí* with enlightened notions stimulated the growth and hardening among a number of articulate Mexicans of a sense of national identity.³¹ The patriotic and anti-gachupin outlook latent in *criollismo* gained form and direction from the enlightened emphasis on national sovereignty and, above all, from the prime characteristic of the movement, the spirit of optimism. Literate creoles, González y González stated, shared a feeling of nationalistic optimism. In the work of Eguiara y Eguren, Alzate, the creole Jesuits, and other articulate Mexicans he discerned a chain or, better, a net of inter-related concepts and attitudes forming an intellectual continuum from the ideas of enlightened creoles to thoughts of national autonomy. José Miranda, in *Las ideas y las instituciones políticas mexicanas* (México, 1952) described the (largely latent) political content of this continuum.

A central point to González y González was the impetus the visit (sponsored by Charles IV) and writings of Alexander von Humboldt gave to creole optimism. This too was a theme developed by José Miranda in *Humboldt y México* (UNAM, 1962). Miranda succinctly summarized how enlightened trends preceded Humboldt to Mexico, how he served as a catalyst to certain notions; especially did he fan a creole spirit of self-help and aid through inculcating in Mexicans a pride in their national resources and an inflated confidence in the potential of their country.³²

³¹ Luis González y González, "El optimismo nacionalista como factor de la independencia de México", in *Estudios de historiografía americana* (Colegio de México, 1948), pp. 155-215; John L. Phelan, "Neo-Aztecism in the Eighteenth Century and the Genesis of Mexican Nationalism", in Stanley Diamond, ed., *Culture in History. Essays in honor of Paul Radin* (Columbia Univ., 1960). See also F. López Cámara and X. Tavera Alfaro, *op. cit.*; Francisco Larroyo, "El movimiento de independencia. Las influencias educativas", *Excelsior* (Mexico City), May 10, 1953; Rafael Moreno, "La creación de la nacionalidad mexicana", *HM*, 12 (1963), pp. 531-551; and Jorge Alberto Manrique, "El pesimismo como factor de la independencia de México", in *Escritos en homenaje a Edmundo O'Gorman, Conciencia y Autenticidad Históricas* (UNAM, 1968), pp. 177-196.

³² See also Carlos Pereyra, *Humboldt en América* (Madrid, 1917); Juan A. Ortega y Medina, *Humboldt desde México* (UNAM, 1960), Marianne O de Bopp, *et al*, *Ensayos sobre Humboldt* (UNAM, 1962); Catalina Sierra, *El nacimiento de México* (UNAM, 1960), analyzes some of the consequences of this over-optimism. Most recent: Manfred Kossok, "Alejandro de Humboldt y el lugar histórico de la revolución de independencia latinoamericana", in *Festschrift für Alexander von*

Commitment to, indeed outsized faith in, material progress exemplified an increasing secularization of thought. Yet this does not mean that a secular culture evolved, but only a *more* secular mood. Throughout the eighteenth century, too, churchmen remained a dominant factor in cultural and intellectual life. When proponents of modern philosophy confronted supporters of traditional orthodoxy, as Pablo González Casanova has shown in *El misonéismo y la modernidad cristiana en el siglo XVIII* (Colegio de México, 1948) they most often did so from within the Church.

For the most part, as Farriss and others have pointed out, modernism in religion was espoused by certain members of the lower clergy and particularly of the Franciscan, Jesuit and Mercedarian orders.³³ On the other hand, among this sort of churchmen were also to be found what may have been the overwhelming majority of *misonéistas*. Certainly the moderns, what ever their number, proved to be a vociferous minority, as has so often been the case with the Party of the Future. Scholarly fascination with the Jesuits, especially, has shed light on the content of this modern or enlightened movement, on Bourbon regalism, on popular reaction to Bourbon innovation, and on the climate of opinion, both elitist and popular, found in Mexico throughout our period.

Ramos found modernism first apparent among a small group of young creole Jesuits who considered "the teachings of scholasticism not in accord real life". Méndez Plancarte observed a new modern spirit, united with a revitalized humanism, in their desire to

Humboldt (Berlin, 1969), pp. 27-52, wherein Humboldt is discussed as championing the social and political emancipation of colonial peoples.

Also see, for the continuation of Eguiara y Eguren's work, A. Millares Carlo, "Don José Mariano Beristáin de Souza y su *Biblioteca Hispanoamericana Septentrional*", *Inter-American Review of Bibliography*, 16 (1966), pp. 20-57; and Beristáin, *op. cit.* (note 7).

³³ Farriss, *op. cit.* See also Manuel Jiménez Fernández, *El concilio IV Provincial Mejicano* (Seville, 1939); Mariano Cuevas, S. J., *Historia de la Iglesia en México* (5 v, El Paso, Texas, 1928); José Bravo Ugarte, "El clero y la independencia . . .", *Abside*, 5 (1941), pp. 612-630; *ibid.*, 7 (1943), pp. 406-409; Félix Alvarez Brun, "La ilustración, la expulsión de los jesuitas, y la independencia de América", *Cuadernos Americanos*, 17 (1958), pp. 148-167; Karl Schmitt, "The Clergy and the Enlightenment in Latin America: an analysis", *The Americas*, 15 (1959), pp. 381-391; and his "The Clergy and the Independence of New Spain", *HAHR*, 34 (1954), pp. 289-312; Elías Martínez, "Los franciscanos y la independencia de México", *Abside*, 24 (1960), pp. 129-166; and Michael P. Costeloe, *Church Wealth in Mexico* (Cambridge Univ., 1968). For an outstanding exception, an enlightened bishop (elect) critical of many royal policies: Lillian E. Fisher, *Champion of Reform: Manuel Abad y Queipo* (New York, 1955) and Secretaría de Educación Pública, *Estudios de Abad y Queipo* (México, 1947). For one disaffected Franciscan; Ernesto de la Torre Villar, "Fray Vicente de Santa María y su Relación histórica", in *Escritos en homenaje a Edmundo O'Gorman, Conciencia y Autenticidad Históricas* (UNAM, 1968), pp. 365-398.

reform education, and instill Mexicans with useful knowledge and thus to promote material and social progress.

Here was discerned an indigenous variety of the Enlightenment apparent before the then commonly-accepted date of its introduction, the 1760s. Enlightenment, then, did not originate in Mexico as a byproduct of the reforming tendencies of the ministers and officials of Charles III. In editing selections concerning the reforming Jesuits written by their contemporaries, Juan Luis Manciro and Manuel Fabri, Bernabé Navarro in *Vidas de mexicanos ilustres del siglo XVIII* (UNAM, 1956), by extracting concrete examples of their early activities, indicated how Rafael Campoy, Agustín Pablo Castro, Javier Clavijero, Diego José Abad, and Francisco Javier Alegre sought to return to the classics in literature, the writings of the church fathers and great schoolmen in theology, and to replace disputation and scholastic method in philosophy with the tenets of rationalism and critical analysis. All exhibited encyclopedic interests. Members of the group explored languages, the natural and exact sciences, history, and archaeology, Campoy formulated a plan to increase the population of his native region of Sinaloa. They had an enlightened faith in the ability of Mexicans through use of individual reason, if well-educated, to change and better life on earth. Gerard Decorme, in *La Obra de los jesuitas mexicanos durante la época colonial* (2 v, México, 1941) and Delfina Esmeralda López Sarrelangue, in *Los colegios jesuitas de la Nueva España* (México, 1941), noted that Francisco Ceballos, the enlightened Provincial of the Order in Mexico, had planned to institute a reform of method and curriculum in Jesuit colegios on the eve of expulsion.

Scholarly interest in the expulsion itself has established the existence and given some indication of the nature of popular disaffection in 1767. Accounts by Orozco y Berra and Priestley relying on the report of José de Gálvez (1771), documents published by José Toribio Medina, Mariano Cuevas and Beatriz Ramírez Camacho, an article by Richard Koneczke, as well as other sources, describe popular reaction to the royal order as widespread, proceeding from initial shock to subsequent expression ranging from resigned amazement to over rebellion.³⁴ Mexicans witnessed the rigorous manner of expulsion,

³⁴ See José Mariano Dávila y Arrillaga, *Continuación de la Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España* . . . (2 v, Puebla, 1889). Orozco y Berra, *Domina- ción* . . . *op. cit.*, and Priestley, *op. cit.* José Toribio Medina, *Noticias Bio-Bibliog- ráficas de los Jesuitas expulsos de América en 1767* (Santiago de Chile, 1914); Mariano Cuevas, S. J., ed., *Tesoros Documentales de México, siglo xviii. Priego Zelis, Clavijero* (México, 1944); Beatriz Ramírez Camacho, "Breve relación sobre la expulsión de los jesuitas de Nueva España", *BAGN*, 7 (1966), pp. 875-890; Alberto Pradeau y Avilés, *La expulsión de los Jesuitas de las provincias de Sonora, Ostimuri*

the secrecy, speed, and severity with which the government shipped out even the old and the infirm. Many Mexicans of all segments of society expressed a sense of loyalty to schoolmasters, local priests, friends, relatives and even, in some regions, to the Jesuits as representatives of royal government. For all these reasons the expulsion became an ongoing symbol of all grievances against the Spanish authorities. In addition, events attendant upon the banishment signified adverse reaction to the Bourbon reform program in general and attested to the basically conservative nature of the Mexican populace.

Certainly from the late eighteenth century to today, publication of works written by Jesuits in exile is indicative of (and contributes to) ongoing interest in the problem of Jesuit influence in Mexico. Bustamante edited and published not only Cavo's history but also an edition of the *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España* of Francisco Javier Alegre (México, 1841-1842). García Icazbalceta translated the life of Alegre by Fabri from Latin into Castilian. In 1871 a list of expelled Jesuits compiled by Rafael de Zelis was printed. José Mariano Dávila y Arrillaga wrote a *Continuación de la Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en Nueva España del P. Francisco Javier Alegre* (2 v, Puebla, 1888-1889). Rafael Landívar's *Rusticatio Mexicana* has been translated into Castilian and had several Mexican editions. Most outstanding, and most widely known and read, is of course the *Storia Antica de Messico* (Cesena, 1780-81) of Clavijero.³⁵

These writings demonstrate how earlier tendencies became intensified and channelled in exile into protestations of Mexican patriotism and national identity. Maneiro and Fabri list the works and interest of this group while in Italy. All appear to have been devotees of the

y Sinaloa en 1767 (México, 1959); Konetzke, *op. cit.* (note 19), and Peggy K. Korn, "Contributions of the Jesuits to Mexican Nationalism", (unpublished ms.).

³⁵ The most scholarly translation of Francisco Javier Alegre is *Historia de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús de Nueva España* (4 v, Rome, 1959-1960), edited by Ernest J. Burrus, S. J. and Félix Zubillaga, S. J. García Icazbalceta's translation of Manuel Fabri's life of Alegre from Latin to Castilian appears in his *Obras*, vol. 4, pp. 180-184. Spanish translations of Rafael Landívar's *Rusticatio Mexicana*, one by Federico Escobedo and another by Ignacio Loureda, were first published in México in 1924. Reputedly best is the prose version by Octaviano Valdés, *Por los Campos de México* (México, 1941). Also see Jorge A. Ruedas de la Serna, "Un poema desconocido del P. José Julián Parreño, Jesuita expulso en 1767", *BAGN*, 7 (1966), pp. 863-874; Ignacio Osario R., "Diego José Abad, bibliografía", *Boletín de la Biblioteca Nacional*, 14 (1963), pp. 71-97; Justino Fernández, "Pedro José Márquez en el recuerdo y en la crítica", *Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas* (UNAM), 8 (1963), pp. 5-20. For early bibliography of Clavijero see Luis González Obregón, *El Abate Francisco Javier Clavijero. Noticias bio-bibliográficas* (México, 1927); Rubén García, *Bio-Bibliografía del Historiador Francisco Javier Clavijero* (México, 1931).

Mexican Virgen de Guadalupe. Extensive scholarly interest in Clavijero, in particular, corroborates the importance of these Jesuits. Antonelli Gerbi, José Miranda, Julio le Riverend Brusone, and Víctor Rico González present Clavijero as a somewhat enlightened creole intent on defending his Mexican *patria* and its ancient cultures against European detractors. Luis Villoro and Charles E. Ronan, S.J., write of him as a great *indigenista*. John Phelan placed the Jesuit among those authors who extolled the ancient indigenous civilizations as the classical antiquity of the Mexican creoles. Gloria Grajales included excerpts from Clavijero's writings in her study of *Nacionalismo incipiente en los historiadores coloniales* (UNAM, 1961). His work is an example, then, of an aristocratic and enlightened criollismo embracing a sense of Mexican cultural nationalism at odds with the Spanish tradition.³⁶

These Jesuit exiles maintained ties with New Spain; their writings had an immediate impact within the country. Maneiro and Fabri note that creole corporations supported Jesuit literary activities. Cavo wrote his history at the behest of the ayuntamiento of Mexico City. The rector and university claustro underwrote distribution of Clavijero's history to distinguished persons in the capital. Alzate eulogized it, as did the viceroy, Bernardo de Gálvez. Gamarra wrote a Latin prologue to the poem *Musa Americana* by Abad, published anonymously in Madrid in 1769. Clavijero's history and Landivar's poem were said to be in the library of Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla. With good reason Navarro emphasized the role played by these Jesuits in introducing and continuing a revolution in the climate of opinion.

Ramos, Pérez Marchand, and González Casanova are among those who have indicated that, paradoxically enough, the intellectual premises predicated by the moderns received impetus thereafter in part as a result of the removal of their proponents. In teaching and preaching, they note, the Jesuits had long been a moderating force reconciling old and new, if seeking to modify yet intent upon upholding traditional values and institutions. After them, is the implication, the

³⁶ Antonello Gerbi, *Viejas Polémicas sobre el Nuevo Mundo* (3^a ed., Lima, 1943), and his *Disputas del nuevo mundo* (México, 1949); José Miranda, "Clavijero en la Ilustración mexicana", *Cuadernos Americanos*, 5 (1946), pp. 180-196; Julio Le Riverend Brusone, "La Historia Antigua de México del Padre Francisco Javier Clavijero", in *Estudios de Historiografía de la Nueva España* (Colegio de México, 1945), pp. 293-321; Víctor Rico González, *Historiadores Mexicanos del Siglo XVIII* (UNAM, 1949); Luis Villoro, *Los grandes momentos del indigenismo en México* (Mexico, 1950); and his "La naturaleza americana en Clavijero", *La Palabra y el Hombre* (Oct.-Dic. 1963), pp. 543-550; Charles Edward Ronan, S. J., "Francisco Javier [Mariano] Clavijero (1731-1787)", in the forthcoming vol. 12 of *The Handbook of Middle American Indians*; Phelan, "Neo-Aztecism", *op. cit.* (note 31); Francisco de la Maza, *El Guadalupanismo mexicano* (Mexico, 1953).

intellectual climate tended to polarize. *Post hoc ergo propter hoc*? Or was the steady hand gone from the ideological tiller in New Spain? This corpus of studies gives evidence that *misonéistas* and proponents of secular education found less and less meeting ground. In education the Jesuits were committed to maintain the Thomistic balance between temporal and spiritual; the expulsion left education to less adroit *maestros*. Gamarra although avowedly orthodox in his writings was exceedingly clumsy, or at least insufficiently adept, if such was his purpose, at propounding a philosophy reconciling temporal progress with the traditional static worldview perpetuated in scholastic thought. A secular and anti-authoritarian spirit infused the periodicals edited by Alzate and the doctor of medicine and mathematician, José Ignacio Bartolache. Alzate and Bartolache were Jesuit-educated, as were most of the creoles who attended school. Alzate was a priest. In Mexico City Revillagigedo, in accord with enlightened economic and social policies, encouraged periodicals and the teaching of useful knowledge. Intendants and enlightened clerics did the same thing in regional centers. Alamán wrote of Jesuit colegios now, under government sponsorship, become secular institutions instilling in creole students all sorts of "useful" information and little respect for tradition. Did the government zealously hack away at its own ideological underpinnings?

Further, was the Bourbon administration in good part responsible after all for the introduction of enlightened notions? Campoy, Castro, Alegre and Clavijero read copies of Feijóo, and other eclectics, belonging to their *peninsulare* fathers, all of whom held administrative positions in the government. We should investigate the *fathers* of these Jesuit fathers.

The young moderns, then, were forerunners of relatively aristocratic and extremely (in relation to total population) small groups of creole devotees of enlightenment, in centers throughout Mexico, who considered it important, and fashionable, to be in the intellectual vanguard. They found in enlightened ideology an alternative to the traditional doctrines still dominant in Mexico. Modernism was *not* so widespread as it was in France, for example, but it was there. And among the overwhelming majority of those who were enlightened, intellectual revolution preceded hope for economic and social advancement. Notions of independence from Spain, as opposed to freedom from Spanish governors, often came late among the moderns and in many cases probably not at all. Here we need to look further into the social milieu and political attitudes of such upstanding enlightened creole supporters of the Establishment as Gamboa, León y Gama, and Velázquez de León, men Humboldt lauded as superior in scientific acumen to the now much better known Alzate. What

of that acquaintance of Humboldt, the enlightened loyalist, José Mariano Beristáin de Souza? Miguel Ramos Arizpe, too, informs us of how enlightened creoles could as late as 1812 cling to the dream of autonomy within the empire.

A rapid survey, then, finds these few enlightened Jesuits belonging to an intellectual and professional creole elite, in influence out of all proportion to their numbers. It indicates further that to speak of the Enlightenment in Mexico is to mean a limited phenomenon, a gloss overlaying a very different popular culture. The importance of ideas, the degree to which they determine events, however, does not necessarily correlate proportionately with their common acceptance. Moreover, it is becoming ever clearer that one enlightened principle, the zest for innovation, provides the strongest link between Enlightenment and revolution. Other enlightened concepts succeeded in turning creole thought to active civil responsibility, to common cause with fellow-inhabitants of Mexico, but it was the shattering of the moral tie to Spain by the denial of the value of eternal sameness in the temporal sphere that allowed enlightened creole leaders of the movement for independence to justify their defection and conservatives to rebel in an attempt to restore the old order. Perhaps Sir Lewis Namier was right; that after all, "new ideas are not so potent as broken habits".³⁷

And, as Luis Villoro recently said, the history of ideas "sólo puede tener sentido si las ideas se estudian como expresiones e instrumentos utilizados por hombres concretos en determinadas situaciones reales".³⁸ One of our most important tasks now is to connect ideas with their individual proponents and to scrutinize these individuals in relation to their social milieu. What better individual figure to begin with than Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, whose formative years span our period, and who so greatly affected the course of Mexican history.

Numerous biographies and genealogical studies tell us Hidalgo was born to a creole family of middling economic and social position, and that he first studied at the Jesuit colegio at Valladolid (now Morelia) for a few months before the expulsion.³⁹ Was his first formal

³⁷ Sir Lewis Namier, *Vanished Supremacies* (New York, 1963), p. 23.

³⁸ Luis Villoro, "Historia de las Ideas", *HM*, 15 (1966), p. 166.

³⁹ José de la Fuente, *Arbol genealógico de la familia Hidalgo y Costilla* (México, 1910), and his *Hidalgo Íntimo* (México, 1910); also in that centenary year of the revolution, Genaro García, in *Documentos históricos mexicanos*, *op. cit.* (note 7), included documents concerning Hidalgo and related to him; William S. Robertson, "Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla", in *The Rise of the Spanish American Republics as told in the lives of their Liberators* (New York and London, 1912); Luis Castillo Ledón, *Hidalgo* (2 v, México, 1948); Jesús Amaya, *El padre Hidalgo y los suyos* (México, 1952); Jesús Rodríguez Frausto, "Los gentilicios de Hidalgo", *Excelsior*, May 10, 1953; and his *Hidalgo no era guanajuatense* (Mexico, 1953); selections from the

education provided in accord with a curriculum reformed by Clavijero? He next attended the Colegio de San Nicolás (now the University of Morelia), a school with a long humanistic tradition dating back to Vasco de Quiroga.⁴⁰ Pérez-Marchand noted that in the colegio and the town interest in modern books and ideas was fully evident. Was Valladolid a rather typical provincial center or did it and the surrounding region harbor an unusual number of *afrancesados* and *inquietos*?

There is no evidence that Hidalgo received anything but a traditional education, if perhaps he later thought it less filled with scholastic trivia than that he underwent at the university.⁴¹ Yet he partook of an intellectual atmosphere apparently tending to radicalization. As a teacher of theology (and later as rector), at San Nicolás in the years 1783-1792, his notions of proper education appear part of a general trend toward a more secular-minded approach to *all* branches of knowledge. While the modern-minded Jesuits never tampered with revealed truth, in his "Disertación sobre el Verdadero Método de estudiar la teología escolástica" (1784), Hidalgo did.⁴² This document has been noted by among others, José de la Fuente, Luis Castillo Ledón, and Samuel Ramos. It has been analyzed by Gabriel Méndez Plancarte, Juan Hernández Luna, and Rafael Moreno.⁴³ It

Cuadro Histórico de la Revolución Mexicana of Carlos María de Bustamante, published as *Hidalgo* (Mexico, 1953); Agustín Cué Cánovas, *Hidalgo* (Mexico, 1953); Jesús Romero Flores, *Don Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla* (México, 1953); Hugh M. Hamill, Jr., *The Hidalgo Revolt* (Univ. of Florida, 1966); and two theses: María de los Angeles Hernández Díaz, "Biografía de Don Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla" (Instituto Federal de Capacitación del Magisterio. Escuela Normal Oral), and Luz María López Licona, "Biografía de don Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla", at the same institution; both are dated 1967. Also see Rafael Heliodoro Valle, "Bibliografía sobre Don Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla", *Boletín de la Biblioteca Nacional*, 10 (1959); and *adenda* by Emilia Romero de Valle, *ibid.*, 11: 1 (1960); the historiographical study, Juan Hernández Luna, *Imágenes Históricas de Hidalgo* (UNAM, 1953), and Peggy K. Korn, "The Beginnings of Mexican Nationalism: the Growth of an Ideology, 1521-1810" (unpublished dissertation, 1965).

⁴⁰ Salvador Reyes Hurtado, "Hidalgo en San Nicolás", *Letras Nicolaitas* (Morelia), 4 (1953); Enrique Arreguín Vélez, ed., *Hidalgo en el colegio de San Nicolás. Documentos Inéditos* (Morelia, Univ. Michoacana, 1956); Julián Bonavit, *Historia del colegio de San Nicolás* (Univ. Michoacana, 1958); Pablo G. Macías, *Hidalgo, reformador y maestro* (UNAM, 1959); and the general biographies listed above.

⁴¹ See Nicolás Rangel, "Estudios Universitarios de los principales caudillos de la independencia. Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, 1753-1811", *BAGN*, 1 (1930).

⁴² The *Disertación* was originally written in both Spanish and Latin. The Spanish version only is known and is in the Museo de Morelia. The text, with the original orthography, appeared in *Anales del Museo Michoacano*, 1 (1939), pp. 58-74; and in modern form as an appendix to Bonavit, *op. cit.*, pp. 413-435, as well as in Gabriel Méndez Plancarte, *Hidalgo. Reformador intelectual* (Mexico, 1945). Also see Rafael Heliodoro Valle, *op. cit.*, *BBN*, 10: 2, p. 42.

⁴³ La Fuente, *op. cit.*; Luis Castillo Ledón, "Una disertación de Hidalgo", *Re-*

reveals Hidalgo to have been a quick-witted young academician who prided himself on his present mindedness. He belongs among those who sought independence from the past, first in education, later, as a parish priest, through economic and social reform and, finally, abruptly through rebellion.⁴⁴

What were the roots of his disaffection? Was he in debt to a Spaniard? Why was he sent from San Nicolás to the outlying parish of Colima? Did he feel advancement in the Church impossible for a creole? As a landed proprietor to what extent was he affected by the *Consolidación* decree of 1804? What was the nature of his relationship with Abad y Queipo? Were his workshops at San Felipe and Dolores a trend of the times, having official impetus and sanction as did analogous enterprises, according to Herr, in Spain? How did he react to the events of 1808? When did he begin to plot against the Spaniards and did he seek independence, autonomy, or only creole predominance?

At the other end of the spectrum, information is sparse concerning the people who responded to the *Grito*. And in order to obtain it, we need to know much more of social conditions and changes than we do now. All the political and economic studies cited earlier serve as a beginning. Silvio Zavala, Luis Villoro, Hugh Hamill, and M. S. Alperovich have written overviews of the immediate background of revolution.⁴⁵ We have documents on social history compiled by Richard Konetzke and Luis Chávez Orozco, demographic studies including a re-edition of the 1814 *Memoria sobre la población del reino de Nueva España*, edited by Fernando Navarro y Noriega (México, 1954) and of the Spanish version of Humboldt's *Ensayo . . .* by Juan A. Ortega y Medina, as well as comments on them by Victoria Lerner

vista Mexicana de Estudios Históricos, 1 (1927), pp. 180-184; Ramos, *Historia*, *op. cit.*; C. Méndez Plancarte, *Hidalgo*, *op. cit.*; Juan Hernández Luna, "El mundo intelectual de Hidalgo", *HM*, 3 (1953), pp. 157-177, appeared in the bicentennial year of Hidalgo's birth; Rafael Moreno, "La teología ilustrada de Hidalgo", *HM*, 5 (1956), pp. 321-336. For Hidalgo's intellectual proclivities before 1810 also see *Filosofía y Letras*, 47-48 (1952) and *HM*, 3:2 (1953), issues devoted to Hidalgo; Jesús Reyes Heróles, "Continuidad del liberalismo mexicano", *Cuadernos Americanos*, 13 (1954), pp. 169-202; Agustín Rivera, *Hidalgo el joven teólogo* (Guadalajara, 1954); Alfonso García Ruiz, *Ideario de Hidalgo* (México, 1955); Edmundo O'Gorman, "Hidalgo en la Historia", *Memoria de la Academia Mexicana de la Historia*, 23 (1964), pp. 221-247; and Luis Villoro, *El proceso ideológico de la revolución de independencia* (UNAM, 1967), the revised edition of his *La Revolución de Independencia* (UNAM, 1953).

⁴⁴ See the documents relevant to Inquisition records concerning Hidalgo and those of his *causa* in Hernández y Dávalos, *op. cit.* (note 7), and other documents concerning those years published in various issues of BAGN.

⁴⁵ Silvio Zavala, "México. La Revolución. La Independencia", in Ricardo Levene, ed., *Historia de América* (13 v, Buenos Aires, 1940-1941), vol. 7 and 11; Luis Villoro, *op. cit.* (note 43) and Hamill, *op. cit.* (note 39).

and related articles by Sherburne F. Cook and Donald B. Cooper.⁴⁶ Lyle N. McAlister has posited a model of "Social Structure and Social Change in New Spain", (*HAHR*, 43 (1963), pp. 349-370), and Angel Palerm Vich assessed the emergence of an embryonic middle class in "Factores históricos de la clase media en México" (in Miguel Othón de Mendizábal, *et al.*, *Las clases sociales de México*, pp. 63-84). Luis González Obregón early depicted the social milieu of the year of revolution in *La vida de México en 1810* (México, 1943). Sergio Morales Rodríguez noted changes in social customs and beliefs under Bourbon rule. Luis Navarro García has described rural society, while some important social sectors have received individual attention from Charles Gibson (Indians), Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán (Negroes), and Romeo R. Flores Caballero (Spaniards).⁴⁷

Of tremendous value is Eric Wolf's "The Bajío in the Eighteenth Century; an analysis of cultural integration". (*Publications of the Middle American Research Institute of Tulane University*, 17, 1955) and the essay by Eusebio Dávalos Hurtado, "La morfología social de Nueva España, móvil de su independencia" (in *Estudios antropológicos en homenaje al Dr. Manuel Gamio*, México, 1956, pp. 593-603). We historians would do well to emulate the conceptual framework, lucidity, and style of these social anthropologists. We would also learn much by concerning ourselves with more of the more local and regional history of the late colonial period.

Most exciting because they indicate a trend toward synthesis of the more formal subdivisions of history into a conceptual whole, are a number of recent theses and dissertations and some works in progress

⁴⁶ Richard Konetzke, *Colección de Documentos para la Historia de la Formación social de Hispanoamérica, 1493-1810* (3 v, Madrid, 1962); Chávez Orozco, *Documentos*, *op. cit.* (note 15); Victoria Lerner, "Consideraciones sobre la población de la Nueva España (1793-1810) según Humboldt y Navarro y Noniega", *HM*, 17 (1968), pp. 327-348; Sherburne F. Cook, "The Population of Mexico in 1793", *Human Biology*, 14 (1942), pp. 499-515; and his "The Smallpox Epidemic of 1797 in Mexico", *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 7 (1939), pp. 937-969; also Donald B. Cooper, *Epidemic Disease in Mexico City, 1761-1813: An administrative, social, and medical study* (Univ. of Texas, 1965).

⁴⁷ Sergio Morales Rodríguez, "Costumbres y creencias en la Nueva España", in *Estudios históricos americanos*, *op. cit.*, pp. 425-476; Luis Navarro García, "La sociedad rural de México en el siglo XVIII", *Anales de Universidad Hispalense*, 1 (1963); also see V. Alessio Robles, "Las condiciones sociales en el norte de la Nueva España", in *Memorias de la Academia Mexicana de la Historia*, 4 (1945); Charles Gibson, "The Transformation of the Indian Community in New Spain, 1500-1810", *Journal of World History*, 2: 3 (1955), and his *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule* (Stanford Univ., 1964); also see Delfina E. López Sarrelangue, "Población indígena de la Nueva España en el siglo XVIII", *HM*, 12 (1963), pp. 516-530; Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, *La población negra de México, 1519-1610* (México, 1946); and Romeo Flores Caballero, *Los españoles en la vida política y social de México, 1804-1838*, soon to be published by El Colegio de México.

and in press. Among them are Isabel González Sánchez, "Situación social de los indios y de las castas en las fincas rurales, en vísperas de la Independencia" (tesis, UNAM, 1963), the book by David Brading and the dissertation and article by Brian R. Hamnett, mentioned earlier, the other studies, underway, on the *Consolidación* decree of 1804 by Masae Sugawara and Flores Caballero, current research by Norman F. Martin, S.J., on the unemployed (los vagabundos), the dissertation by Virginia Guedea, "Criollos y peninsulares en 1808" (Universidad Iberoamericana, México, 1964), and the dissertations in progress: "Le Rôle des 'Illustrados' et des liberaux creoles et espagnols dans le mouvement d'indépendance au Mexique", (Thèse Lettres, 3^o cycle, Univ. de Paris, Institut des Hautes Études de l'Amérique Latine), and Doris Ladd Speck, "The Aristocracy of Mexico at Independence: an Introduction" (Ph. D. dissertation, Stanford Univ.). The social and economic consequences for our period of the study by Enrique Florescano of *Precios del maíz y crisis agrícolas en México (1708-1810)* (Colegio de México, 1969), are enormous. The Mexican revolution of 1810, like the French, of 1789, was preceded by a Great Hunger.

Here then we have the start of the investigation of the complexities of society and social change. We need to know much more. How much of the creole population could in truth claim *limpieza de sangre*? How did the distribution of wealth change throughout the century? Certainly it can no longer be assumed that gachupines held all the wealth, nor that all creoles were anti-Spanish, nor that those who were chose to rebel only because Spain hindered their economic wellbeing and advancement. What sorts of influence on Mexican pocketbooks and premises had England and the United States after 1797? Finally, who were the Mexicans who joined Hidalgo? No longer can we dismiss them as Indian hordes or as "peasants" only, nor can we characterize the rebellion of 1810 as a people's revolt for political independence.

The current state of historiography now allows several possible hypotheses about the eighteenth century which help to answer our initial questions. Overriding is the conviction that Mexican history must be studied as part of a wider Western culture; autonomous developments can not otherwise be understood. We know, thanks especially to intense investigation of cultural history centered on the introduction and development in Mexico of the Enlightenment or *modernismo*, that European currents of thought circulated and kindred attitudes were adapted to a number of varying needs and aspirations. It is also clear that the new Bourbon regime in Spain allowed freer ingress of outside cultural influences in general, just as it authorized, or its functionaries in Mexico overlooked, increasing foreign trade and con-

traband. Further, in many ways the government abetted such innovation, notably through sending in a new Spanish bureaucracy inculcated with enlightened notions borrowed largely from France, of fomenting material progress through governmental activity. A remaining problem is just when these minions of enlightened despotism began to exert such a leavening influence.

Political innovation converged with rising population and economic prosperity to bring social change, increase to some extent social mobility, and concomitantly to give impetus to questioning of assumptions supporting the traditional social arrangements. A new breed of creole, or a significant increase in an old sort, educated in a profession, became increasingly aggressive in demands for social and political preeminence in Mexico. At the same time, hacendados and mineowners maintaining a traditional ethos of criollismo enjoyed prosperity, then watched it dribbling away as the government of Charles IV, appearing inept in comparison to that of his predecessor and enmeshed in wars with France and Britain, exerted ever more pressure on Mexican resources. Increasingly, they found more profitable markets for their wares in England and through the United States.

Meanwhile, a populace periodically plagued by famine and subsequent epidemics, taxed ever more efficiently, was increasingly disoriented by political and economic reform. Larger sectors earned money income or simply wandered, broken away from traditional communities, especially in the Bajío. Mexicans rose sporadically in various locales to protest innovation because it was innovation and because it weighed heavily on their daily lives and, perhaps in the case of the expulsion of the Jesuits, also because it put in jeopardy what was more important than life to at least some, their immortal souls.

In the crisis of 1808, elements of enlightened creole professionals, notably members of the ayuntamiento of Mexico City, joined by a few of the creole aristocrats, sought unsuccessfully to achieve their economic and social aspirations through political means.⁴⁸ Adherents

⁴⁸ See José Miranda, *Las Ideas*, *op. cit.*; Manuel Giménez Fernández, *Las doctrinas populistas en la independencia de Hispano-América* (Seville, 1947); Villoro, *El proceso* and *La Revolución*, *op. cit.*, Juan López Cancelada, *Conducta del Excelentísimo Señor Don José Iturrigaray* (Cadiz, 1812); and his *La Verdad Sabida y Buena Fe Guardada* (Cadiz, 1811); the rejoinder by Fray Servando Teresa de Mier (José Guerra), *Historia de la Revolución de la Nueva España* (2 v, London, 1813); Genaro García, *El plan de independencia de la Nueva España en 1808* (México, 1903); William E. Robertson, "The Juntas of 1808 and the Spanish Colonies", *English Historical Review*, 31 (1916), pp. 573-585; A. F. Zimmerman, "Spain and its Colonies, 1808-1820", *HAHR*, 11 (1931), pp. 439-463; Enrique Lafuente Ferrari, *El virrey Iturrigaray y los orígenes de la Independencia de México* (Madrid, 1941); Frances M. Foland, "Pugnas políticas en el México de 1808", *HM*, 5 (1955), pp. 30-41; also, on the mysterious Talamantes: Luis González Obregón, "Fray Melchor de Talamantes", in *Ensayos históricos y biográficos* (México, 1937);

of this group in the next two years mobilized popular discontent to gain numbers to their creole cause. In 1810, brief unity was achieved. Led by an enlightened creole, Miguel Hidalgo, and by more conservative elements of the militia, a throng in hope of redress of present and specific grievances and of opportunity for plunder, joined these creoles in what Hidalgo called for, and what Anastasio Zerecero, among others, has referred to, as "an explosion of national sentiment".

Eighteenth century studies to date have enabled us to form the desired continuum to 1810, and to provide with a vital, and anatomically complex, body the Mexican spirit. By our next meeting may we know much more not simply of the mental processes, but also about the blood and guts of that body, Mexican society, in all its diversity.

Genaro García, *Documentos* (1910) *op. cit.*, vol. 7; and Emila Romero de Valle, "Fray Melchor de Talamantes", *HM*, 11 (1961), pp. 28-56; and her "Bibliografía de Fray Melchor Talamantes", *ibid.*, pp. 443-486. For earlier disaffection, Nicolás Rangel, *Los precursores ideológicos de la Guerra de Independencia, 1789-1794* (México, 1929).