LUCAS ALAMÁN AND THE HISTORIANS

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Grael Brian Gannon

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

Major Department:
History, Philosophy and Religious Studies

May 2010

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

ALAMÁN AND THE HISTORIANS

By

Grael Brian Gannon

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this ***disquisition*** complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

North Dakota State University Libraries Addendum

To protect the privacy of individuals associated with the document, signatures have been removed from the digital version of this document.

ABSTRACT

Gannon, Grael Brian, M.A., Department of History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies, College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, North Dakota State University, May 2010. Lucas Alamán and the Historians. Major Professor: Dr. Jim Norris.

This study considers the life, thought, and work of Lucas Alamán, Mexican statesman and historian of the early nineteenth century, as seen by historians from his time to the present with reference to his political attitudes, his political activities, and the political philosophy revealed in his historical writings, with note also of his economic and cultural concerns. Other Mexican thinkers and leaders of the period wanted to cast off the Spanish past, whereas Alamán believed that the Mexican future should be built on that past. Considered by some the greatest mind of the era, even his enemies acknowledged his brilliance and erudition, but they considered him to be an unreconstructed reactionary. Most historians, however, have noted that, in such fields as education and economics, Alamán was years ahead of his time, that in many areas he was creative and innovative. It is the thesis of this paper that, in the consensus of the historians, Alamán was shaped by the enlightened and progressive, yet authoritarian regimes of the last Bourbon kings of Spain; that his ultimate commitment was a patriotic loyalty to Mexico, which nation he believed best served by law and order and peace under the exclusive and paternalistic control of an authoritarian central government. The historical evidence, as a whole, is compatible with the thesis.

FRONTISPIECE

The time is out of joint, O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right!
William Shakespeare (*Hamlet* 1:5)

I am a dry leaf that the wind of adversity
has snatched away.
Lucas Alamán (cf. *Job* 13:25)

Lucas Alamán
c. 1820

Lucas Alamán
c. 1850

PREFACE

This paper is a study of the historiography which deals with the life and work of the Mexican statesman and historian, Lucas Alamán (1792-1853). Many years ago in Mexico City I purchased Alamán's principal work, the five volume *Historia de Méjico.* I had read about the fame of this opus, probably the most noted history of Mexico, but thought at the time that I would probably never get around to reading the vast book and just picked it up on a lark. To date it remains to be read, as the present effort is not directly concerned with Alamán's work, but with how he has been viewed by others.

During my first year of graduate study in history at North Dakota State University I decided to specialize in Latin American history, with special attention to Mexico and to do a thesis on Alamán as he interested me—and there was my five volume *Historia* to tickle the imagination. Though my historical interests are very broad, I had lived in Mexico City, had visited the country many times since, had some knowledge of Spanish, had collected a large library on Latin America and Mexico in particular, and, finally, my adviser at North Dakota State University, Professor Jim Norris, is a Latin American specialist. The stars seemed to be in conjunction.

In the summer of 2008 I searched for Alamán materials in Mexico City bookstores where I found a few invaluable sources. I then spent some hours at the Benson Library at the University of Texas at Austin, the world's greatest Latin American study collection. There I was able to photocopy a number of fairly recent Mexican essays which do not appear in academic library catalogues in the United States.

Alamán was a very important national figure during the first generation of Mexican independence from Spain. His *Obras Completas* comprise the five volume *Historia*, three volumes of *Disertaciones*, and four volumes of miscellaneous papers. The thirteenth and final volume is an onamastic index to the *Obras Completas*.

The survey of historical commentaries on Alamán in this master's thesis consists of a broad sampling of brief references and more substantial treatments, but makes no pretense of being exhaustive. Still, it is my hope to have utilized sufficient material to offer a reasonably complete picture of how the man has been seen. Those works of which Alamán is the principal subject, or in which there is a major discussion of him, are almost entirely by Mexican and American authors. There do not seem to be any works in the published book trade, either scholarly or popular, on Alamán in English, but there are a number of American masters theses and doctoral dissertations which deal with him. These, of course, are based very largely on Mexican sources, and are valuable for their content, but especially as a bibliographical directory to primary materials and published works in Spanish. There are a small number of important published studies by Mexican presses and some of these have been used here.

Alamán was a classical scholar, polyglot, scientist, mining engineer, diplomat, entrepreneur, hacendado, legislator, government administrator, political philosopher, conservative party leader, devout Catholic, hispanophile, family man, and historian. Any appraisal of him could appropriately address any of these aspects or some combination of them. The major commentaries do deal with many of them, though the major interest is in Alamán's experiences as leader of government, political

propagandist, and historian. This paper will concern itself primarily with these things.

Materials have come from my own library, from the collections of the libraries of North Dakota State University, Minnesota State University Moorhead, and Concordia College, as well as inter-library loan, especially of theses and dissertations, through the helpful service of North Dakota State University.

I have discovered surprisingly few journal articles of direct relevance. Of importance is Robert A. Potash's "Historiography of Mexico Since 1821" (1960), a historiographical goldmine covering the whole span of Mexican historical writing, almost all by Mexican historians, but I have not been able to find a continuation to cover the past half century, which has been a period of greatly increased activity. There is also Luis Martin's "Lucas Alamán Pioneer of Mexican Historiography: An Interpretive Essay" (1975), a perceptive overall critique of Alamán as historian. E. Bradford Burns on "Ideology in Nineteenth-Century Latin American Historiography" (1978), presents a scorching indictment of almost all nineteenth-century history from Latin American writers, as elitist and Europeanist.

American theses and dissertations include, in order of appearance: "The Dawn of manufacturing Industry in Mexico, 1821-1855," by David D. Burks (1952); "British Mining Ventures in Early National Mexico," by Newton R. Gilmore (1956); "Lucas Alamán: His Place in Mexican History," by George Penix Taylor (1963); "Lucas Alamán and Mexican Foreign Affairs," by Carl Dale Donathan (1967); "Proposals for Monarchy in Mexico, 1823-1860," by Frank Joseph Sanders (1967); "Lucas Alamán as Entrepreneur," by William Anton Vrame (1967); "Lucas Alamán: Domestic Activities 1823-1835, by Stanley Cooper Green (1970); "The Role of Lucas

Alamán in Mexican United States Relations, 1824-1853," by Quinton Curtis Lamar (1971); "Against the Tide: Lucas Alamán and the Hispanic Past," by Jane Ellen Dysart (1972); "Lucas Alamán and Mexican Reality, 1823-1853," by Stanley Pollin (1972); Lucas Alamán, Mexican Conservatism and the United States: A History of Attitudes and Policy, 1823-1853," by Jeanne Gabrielle Pascal Gargiullo (1992); and "Devotion or Dissatisfaction: Lucas Alamán and the Catholic Church," by Michael Efren Peyron (2003). There are copies of all of these in my permanent collection and all of them have been consulted, though most of them not directly cited.

Substantive Mexican treatments include: Juan Bautista Alamán, "Apuntes para la biografia del exmo. sr. d. Lucas Alamán" (1845); José M. Bassoco, *Biografía necrológica del exmo. señor Don Lucas Alamán* (1853); the standard modern biography, José C. Valadés, *Estadista e Historiador* (1938); Jorge Gurría, *Las ideas monarquistas de don Lucas Alamán* (1951); Moisés González Navarro, *El pensamiento politico de Lucas Alamán* (1952) and "Tradición y modernidad en Lucas Alamán" (1993); Luis Villoro, *El proceso ideológico de la Revolución de Independencia* (1953, 1967); Luis Martin, "Lucas Alamán Pioneer of Mexican Historiography: An Interpretive Essay" (1975); Andrés Lira, *Espejo de discordias: La sociedad Mexicana vista por Lorenzo de Zavala, José María Mora y Lucas Alamán* (1984) and *Lucas Alamán: selección y prólogo* (1997); Arturo Arnáiz y Freg, "Prologo" in Lucas Alamán, *Semblanzas e ideario* (1989); Lourdes Quintanilla, *El nacionalismo de Lucas Alamán* (1991) and "A la memoria de Lucas Alamán (1993); Rosa Alicia Pérez Luque, "Esbozo biográfico de Lucas Alamán" (1993); Patricia Galeana, "Lucas Alamán: Iberoamericanista" (1993); Luis Rionda Arreguín, "Mora y

Alamán: Enjuiciador de la Revolución de Independencia" (1993); Elisa Guadalupe Cuevas Landero, *La paradoja nación revolución en el pensamiento politico de Lucas Alamán* (1995); and Salvador Méndez Reyes, *El hispanoamericanismo de Lucas Alamán (1823-1853)* (1996).

These materials are almost all available only in Spanish. I have translated some of them *in toto* and substantial parts of others. Those translations not my own are brief quotations cited in works published in English. I have utilized some of the above essays and books extensively and briefly taken note of the others. In the case of more than one work by the same author on the same topic, I have mainly relied on the later publication because of the exigencies of limited time for research. Some of the most useful pieces appeared as lectures published from a symposium on Alamán, and all the above items dated 1993 are from that symposium, to be found in the latter part of chapter four. This event was convened by the University of Guanajuato on the occasion of the bicentenary of the birth of Alamán. All other works considered will be cited as they appear, in whichever chapter.

Translation from another language is always an exercise involving a certain tension between literalness and idiomatic semantic equivalence. No translations are perfect; I can only hope that mine convey what was intended in the original.

There is also the question whether to translate into English all foreign titles mentioned in the text, also whether to translate Spanish words or phrases frequently left in the original in English publications, e.g., "criollo" (Spanish) or "creole" (English, from French). Since this is an academic paper, I have chosen to keep the Spanish. I have opted to omit the accent in "México" except where it appears in

formal citations. In older Spanish, México was frequently spelled "Méjico," as the letter "x" had become obsolete in Spanish. Lucas Alamán's *Historia* used the "Méjico" form. Some modern citations of his work quote the title in that form; others transliterate it to "México." This paper follows whichever form appears in the work cited. As time passed, Mexican nationalism chose to emphasize the "x" spelling, supposedly as doing honor to the ancient Indian past, which is amusing since the "x" simply comes from Spanish of the time of the Conquest. Either that, or the "x"s were just leftovers from the earlier time. Thus many traditional Indian place names in Mexico retain the "x." When Cervantes wrote *Don Quixote* the "x" was sounded "sh." Some traditional uses of "x" in Mexican place names continue that sound, as in the tribe "Mexica" (Aztecs), pronounced "may-shee-kah," but most have migrated to a heavily aspirated "h" sound, identical with the modern Spanish "j," as in "Juan" or "Juárez," or the city of Xalapa instead of the earlier more common Jalapa (as in Jalapeños), or the city of Oaxaca, hence the modern interchangeability of "x" and "j," but sometimes the "x" is "s" as in Xochimilco or Taxco. To complicate things a bit further, the "x" is sometimes sounded as in English: "ks."

There are occasional anomalies of usage. Anastasio Bustamante's first name is rendered Anastacio in some publications. The last part of the name of Antonio López de Santa Anna is always written "Anna" today, but at one time could also appear as "Ana."

Another problem is the custom in the Spanish-speaking world of using a double last name. For men, the first of the two is his father's family name, while the second is the mother's maiden name; thus, if men are to be referred to by only one

name, it should be the first of the two last names. For women, the first of the two is the woman's maiden name and the second is her married (husband's) name, so if one name is to be used, it should be the last one. In more formal usage, the man's last names will have a "y" (and) in between; women's last names will have a "de" (of) between them; but today those are not usually seen. (The "de" is occasionally found in men's names as well, with a different purpose: probably indicating noble or quasi-noble status.) Mexicans themselves are not always consistent. E.g., Alamán's contemporary and friend, General Mier y Terán often turns up as Mier in the souces, but occasionally as Terán. A more famous case is Antonio López de Santa Anna. He is properly López, but is universally known as Santa Anna (pronounced Sahn-tahnah). It is not always easy to decide which is the correct name for citational purposes. Usually one is safe with men by picking the first of the two last names. If a woman's marital status is unknown, I have decided to cite both last names, except, of course, when there is only one, e.g., Lourdes Quintanilla.

Bourbon France created the office of *intendant*, a regional administrator responsible to the crown. The cousins of the French Bourbon kings, the Spanish Bourbon (Borbón) kings, imitated this plan with the similar office of *intendente.* Perhaps because of the variant third vowel, the English language allows either *intendant* or *intendent*, and books about Spanish America may use either form. Either usage is acceptable, but since this paper is about Spanish America, I have decided to use the form *intendent*, an English form closer to the Spanish. I am sure I have not been entirely consistent as to using Spanish terms instead of their English equivalent, as with "Bourbon," which is the French form, also used in English, as against the Spanish "Borbón."

There follows a general introduction and a biographical chapter. The substance of the paper is found in the following two chapters, the first surveying a number of brief references to Alamán down the years, followed by a chapter considering the more substantive discussions of him. There is a conclusion, endnotes, and bibliography.

This treatise has only scratched the surface of what the cited authors have to say about Alamán, and yet the text may be seen as overburdened with extended passages from them. But the task has been to capture the flavors of the different viewpoints, so statements have been included which embody the essence of the authors' views. There is a lot of repetition as, understandably, historians covering the same subject will tend to say similar things. Even the repetition has something to say to the reader as to the weight of themes across the years. The only real organizing principle is a chronological sequence—usually when the works first appeared.

In writing a historical essay, there will appear some inadequacies that one can understand and correct, some which don't feel right, but which one doesn't know quite how to amend, and still other problems of which the writer is blissfully unaware. I do not expect my adviser, Professor Jim Norris, to do my work for me and fix all my fumbles, but I think I can say that his advice and critical supervision have helped this to be at least better than it otherwise might have been! My thanks to him and also to the other members of my committee, friends and mentors, Professor David Danbom and Professor Mark Harvey from the history department, and Professor Carlos Hawley from the Spanish department. I have also reveled in the three fine academic libraries of North Dakota State University in Fargo, Minnesota

State University, Moorhead, and Concordia College, also just across the river in Moorhead. Interlibrary loan through the North Dakota State University Library has been absolutely indispensable. My thanks to all.

CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION

This paper is an exploration of the Mexican statesman and historian Lucas Alamán as he appears in the light of history. More specifically, it is a study of how historians have viewed him. Alamán was a very controversial figure in his own time. Many acknowledged his outstanding abilities, but considered him a malignant influence—a highly gifted but extremely reactionary statesman and historian. It is the thesis of this paper that he was very much a product of the benevolent despotism of the Spanish Enlightenment in which he was born and came of age. This spirit was open to progressive thought and action in a number of areas, but under the authority of an all-powerful central government. Like the Spanish Bourbon kings, he was a reformer, but, also like them, a reformer from the top down. The political chaos that reigned in Mexico in the decades following independence from Spain, reinforced his authoritarian tendency. Though his ideas and attitudes evolved somewhat over the years in response to current needs and realities, his fixed goal was the progress, prosperity, and happiness of the Mexican nation. The corollary for him was a conviction that these things could only be achieved on a base of law and order and peace. This paper contends that both the older and the more recent historians have recognized these features in his life and thought and work.

It is a historical truism that contemporaries are generally too close to events to possess sufficient perspective, that a more balanced and accurate judgment comes only with the perspective of time. Though many contemporary observations may indeed be perceptive, the passage of time is necessary to vindicate these as against other

contemporary views seemingly equally plausible at the time. Thus one of the points to be kept in mind is the degree of distance in time from the subject.

A further consideration is evaluating the presuppositions and prejudices of the historians. First, who are they? Most of them are from Mexico or the United States. There is an occasional British or non-Mexican Hispanic source. Defining a "historian" is not so simple. Earlier historians were more likely to be aristocratic public men, and that is true on the Mexican side even more recently. But today there is a greater tendency for historians to be full-time professional academics. Still, not all observers are professionals. Ralph Roeder, the author of a valued biography of Benito Juárez, and who is quoted here on Alamán, was a journalist, as was the principal modern biographer of Alamán, José C. Valadés. The present essay takes the view that history is where one finds it, though the great majority of sources utilized here are indeed historians, whether of the gentlemanly or academic type.

Mexican historians have the greatest existential involvement: it is their own history. At every time frame it may be pertinent to ask what the Mexican historian's own personal convictions may be as to what should be the best course for the Mexican nation, past, present, and future. This may color how he or she views Alamán, which is not to disparage the authentic insight of the personally involved.

The American historians are in the nice position of nearby outsiders, close enough for awareness, even empathy, but sufficiently removed to encourage a degree of objectivity. As Charles A. Hale puts it, "it may be the detached foreigner who is best able to bring fresh understanding to a sensitive historical topic like Mexican liberalism." Such are not, however, completely free of national involvement. Mexico

has inevitably been a factor in American history. The relationship has often been adversarial, and though Mexico has suffered more from such encounters than the United States, cultural myopia is by no means limited to the Mexican side. It will be seen that earlier American historians are more susceptible to a spirit of naïve nationalism, while more recent scholars have tended to exercise greater objectivity. If they are sometimes critical, it is generally out of concern for what they conceive to be the best interests of Mexico, views often not to be distinguished from those of modern Mexican historians. But we must remember that the very process of coming to a subject with an interest in it brings the inevitability of some bias.[1]

A third differential concerns the degree of depth of any given historical work. Some references to Lucas Alamán are brief notes within larger general histories. Others are lengthier studies which focus on him or upon a narrower historical topic in which he played an important role. Though accuracy may be possible in small summary judgments, it can be more difficult to achieve and is often violated. Evangelical writer and lecturer Edith Schaeffer once commented that, in explaining something to a small child, one may have to simplify, but should take care not to falsify. [Heard by the writer in a tour address.] Or as historian Herbert Butterfield has it:

> The difficulty of the general historian is that he has to abridge and that he must do it without altering the meaning and the peculiar message of history. The danger in any survey of the past is lest we argue in a circle and impute lessons to history which history has never taught and historical research has never discovered—lessons which are really inferences from the particular organization that we have given to our knowledge. . . .the most fallacious thing in the world is to organize our historical knowledge upon an assumption without realizing what we are doing and then to make inferences from that organization and claim that these are the voice of history.[2]

Where do the larger studies come from? As already noted, the published books, monographs, and essays are almost entirely Mexican. There does not seem to be a single major published monograph or trade book on Lucas Alamán in English. There is, however, a respectable body of American masters' theses and doctoral dissertations, already listed in the Preface, which give extensive coverage of the subject, themselves of course largely dependant on Mexican sources.

If those who know a little about Mexican history were asked to name the most significant political figures of nineteenth century Mexico, they might list Miguel Hidalgo, José María Morelos, Agustín de Iturbide, Antonio López de Santa Anna, Benito Juárez, Maximilian von Habsburg, and Porfirio Díaz. Not Lucas Alamán, but he surely deserves to be numbered among them. During the first half century of Mexican independence he was the effective ideological and administrative leader of three Mexican governments, and a frequent adviser to others. In addition, his five volume history of Mexico is generally considered the preeminent classic among historical writings on Mexico and, especially, of the period of the War of Independence.

These historical and political writings rank him among the greatest Mexican men of letters, which include Justo Sierra in the nineteenth century, José Vasconcelos, Octavio Paz, and Carlos Fuentes in the twentieth century. Of these, Sierra and Vasconcelos are on record about Alamán, Sierra critical but not dismissive; Vasconcelos with great praise. It is characteristic of leading Mexican literary figures to also have roles in government and public life, a function they have not attained by independent political action, but by patronage from "strong men" and political parties. Of all these, Alamán has played the most substantive political role.

He was adored by some, hated by others. Yet even his most implacable enemies regarded his intellect and his administrative competence with nothing short of awe. He was also considered to be of the highest personal character, and active in government only out of the desire to serve Mexico and his vision of what course Mexico should take, though here too lies controversy. While his personal integrity is widely admitted, some considered him to be ruthless in the pursuit of what he conceived to be the national good.

He understood the machinations of political life quite well, but his temperament did not permit him to be politic in his actions. He made little effort to curry favor, and was impatient with lesser minds—which meant almost everybody. His no nonsense approach to government inevitably brought him into conflict, often acrimonious, with any number of other leaders and members of ruling elites.

In the opening words of his 1970 doctoral dissertation, Stanley C. Green described Alamán as "the most imaginative and skillful man of his times." He expressed amazement that one man could have done so much, and that he could have provided such creative solutions to various problems. "That these often proved abortive was usually owing to the political vicissitudes of the era or the immensity of the problems rather than because of errors in his thinking."[3]

Green has well represented Alamán's immense talent as political thinker and administrator, but his rejection of error on the part of Alamán appears to be excessive. It is the consensus of many historians that Alamán's attempt to industrialize Mexico was a flawed vision. He was correct in seeing that modern industrialization was the key to future national power for those nations that could achieve it, but he erred in

supposing that Mexico was positioned to pursue that path. It was probably the clearest and perhaps the only indisputable major error of his career. A later statesman and historian, Justo Sierra, accurately stated the problem:

> Thus, he attempted to create, by fiscal legislation, a carefully protected industry in a country where the primary materials for it were not to be found. He tried to convert the Mexican Republic into a manufacturing country when there were no means of communication, no combustibles and no iron—not even any consumers.

The same point is made by Eduardo Galeano, who observed that Alamán "did not realize that industrial development was condemned in advance to remain up in the air, without bases of support, in that land of countless latifundios and general poverty."[4]

Alamán was increasingly conservative, but no fanatic. Widely traveled in Europe, he greatly admired Britain, and, at least in his earlier years, favored laissez faire and free trade economics. Later he was more of an economic nationalist or mercantilist, but was a firm advocate of modern technology and broadly based modern education. Though he strongly supported the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico, both from personal belief and from his view of it as an essential pillar of Hispanic civilization, he privately suggested that he would support freedom of religion were it not for the consequent rage of the common people. He rejected the Inquisition and superstitious popular religion.[5]

He was highly educated in the classics and in the natural sciences and engineering. As a believer in the organic nature of society, he had common ground with Edmund Burke, whom he admired and followed. As visionary economist and skilled administrator he could be compared with Alexander Hamilton. As a skeptical conservative statesman he resembled John Adams; as a tough and clear-sighted

diplomat, John Quincy Adams. But perhaps the closest analogue among American statesmen would be John C. Calhoun. Both were brilliant thinkers and writers who were also active at the levers of political power. Richard N. Current says of Calhoun, "He wrote and spoke as a politician and advocate, not as a disinterested scholar or philosopher, though there was much of the scholar and the philosopher in him." The very same could be said of Alamán. Both were the outstanding spokesmen for lost causes. The growing peril in which those causes found themselves was reflected in the somber qualities of both men's later thought, though both died before the denouement.[6]

There is something rather tragic about Alamán. His terms in office lasted only two or three years, the last one only a matter of weeks, terminated by his death. His governments were constantly being swept away by fresh military rebellions and coups d'état. The birth travail of Mexican independence had been longer and more destructive than that of any other Latin American country, and the aftermath was a series of weak, bankrupt governments bedeviled by a congeries of semi-autonomous warlord caudillos. Mexico had been the economic jewel in the Spanish crown, but the prolonged struggle had devastated its economy. The mining industry, in particular, which had been the single greatest driver of the Mexican economic engine, was ruined and could only be restored with new machinery, a lot of money, a lot of time—and a sustained period of peace and order in the land.

He was so able that, had he had the opportunity, Alamán probably could have made Mexico a great and prosperous nation. He never got the chance. One of the most serious problems was that a substantial segment of Mexican leadership was based in the outlying regions or states, and these people naturally guarded their local

prerogatives jealously with the result that effective national government from the center was virtually impossible. One of Alamán's abiding goals was to achieve effective centrist sovereignty, but he was pulling not only against the *amour propre* of the outlying governors, state legislatures, and regional caudillos, but also against the newly fashionable liberalism springing from the Enlightenment, John Locke, Adam Smith, and the American and French revolutions, all of which emphasized the rights of individual men (or at least some men) as against the state. It should be noted that the classical liberalism rising from the Enlightenment and the increasing importance of capitalism was not the same thing as is meant by the use of the term liberalism today.

The emphasis on atomistic individualism favored as little government as possible, and what there was should be as close to the citizen as possible, hence the preference for state governments as against central power. The same tension is seen in the first years of the independent United States, and was, indeed, magnified as time passed until the issue was largely settled on the battlefields of the American Civil War.

A note here about terminology. Both in the United States and in Mexico, the terms "federal" and "federalism" were much in use. But they meant different things. The Mexican student beginning to study United States history or the United States student beginning to study Mexican history can be forgiven some confusion. The words "federal" or "federalism" refer to a form of government in which some of the national sovereignty rests in the central government and some rests in the regional units, provinces, or "states."

The latter term, "state," is also confusing as it originally meant an autonomous sovereign people, what today is often called a "nation-state." The thirteen original

American states were independent nation-states. When they relinquished their total autonomy to enter into the new nation, the nomenclature remained unchanged so that what had become provinces of a larger entity were still known as states.

Though the word "federal" refers to the divided sovereignty between the center and the regions, because the change in the United States was toward greater centrality, the term federal came to be used primarily in reference to the central government. In Mexico, because the movement was from the unified Spanish government of New Spain toward greater autonomy for the provinces, the term federal is associated in the early years of Mexican independence with power to the provinces, named, again confusingly, states, in imitation of the United States. In the later nineteenth century and in the twentieth century, the Mexican practice evolved to mirror the federalist terminology of its northern neighbor, as seen in Mexican references to "federales"—federal or central government troops.

Alamán's philosophical position on government remained basically unchanged across the years, but the practical application of that philosophy evolved in response to changing realities. The United States in its first years of independence had no political parties; so it was in Mexico. But, just as with the republic to the north, Mexican political leaders soon began to coalesce into opposing factions.

It is in describing what separated these factions that we must begin to take care not to fall into misleading generalizations. It will be well to delineate the major philosophical themes guiding the course of nations during this period. Europe was emerging from an essentially feudal order based on agrarian-military aristocracies and a veritably tribal and mystical national unity expressed through theoretically

unchanging social, political, and economic institutions, increasingly based on a unifying monarchy and an all-embracing church.

A steady growth in commerce and technology through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the Enlightenment brought forth developments in science and technology that eventually threatened this established order, together with challenges from a new emphasis on the dignity and rights of man as against traditional hierarchical and collective institutions. The recently consolidated national monarchies answered these changes partly by tightening their grip and partly by adopting those of the Enlightenment ideas that seemed compatible with the authoritarian state, as in the Enlightened despotisms of Russia, Prussia, Austria, France, Spain, and Portugal.[7]

These states represented something of a half-way house on the way to the emergent bourgeois republics. The monarchies retained much of the traditional corporate elites, such as the nobility, the church, and the army, but these were, in many cases, streamlined, reduced in power, and made more directly subservient to the crown.

Though the modernizations of the enlightened despots usually gave their obsolescent societies a temporary reprieve, it was no more than that. The nineteenth century was to be framed by the relentless march of bourgeois liberal republicanism. The new liberals wanted republics governed by an aristocratic elite of wealth and education, in which property was private and freely marketable, that is, subject to the financial will of individual free entrepreneurs.

These people were opposed to constitutional and legal systems which allowed vast amounts of the national wealth to become tied up in "eternal" self-perpetuating corporations or communes. This meant hostility to laws of entail and primogeniture

which protected noble endowments far into the future, and, especially, to the ability of the church continuously to receive property which was then never again available to the marketplace except temporarily in the form of commercial loans. It also meant opposition to traditional Indian communities consisting of inalienable property for group use. There was also opposition to large standing armies and to special privileges for the officer class, though the military was a special case, partly because it was difficult to tame, and partly because it was often available to the liberal cause.

The condensed, abbreviated conception of Lucas Alamán is that he was a gifted reactionary who opposed the new liberal age and all it stood for. As we shall see, this is a false picture. In reality he was very much a product and exemplar of the period of enlightened despotism under which he spent his early formative years. In many ways he was creative, progressive, and pragmatic. He is to be differentiated from the Peruvian Bartolomé Herrera, the true representative of the older Spanish conservatism. Alamán was a Burkean conservative, a supporter of many elements of the new age, not opposed to change, but sensible of the need to build on the past, not sever from it. It must be noted that there were important differences. Burke was a parliament man, not an autocrat. He was also often an advocate for the underdog.

Alamán's thought was inspired by Burke, but also by such figures of the Spanish Enlightenment as Charles III, Benito Jerónimo Feijóo, Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, and Juan Antonio de Riaño. The last was the Bourbon intendent of Guanajuato, a splendid representative of all that was best in the Spanish Enlightenment, and the mentor and inspiration of the young Lucas Alamán. In his

subsequent six year sojourn of Europe, Alamán spent much time in the company of many of the leading thinkers of the age.[8]

After the Mexican War of 1846-1848 and the ensuing American despoliation of half the national patrimony, Mexicans finally began to get realistic about a more rational approach to government. In the years after Alamán's death, and after the bizarre interval of Mexico's Second Empire, the liberals triumphed. But, even as they did, they were themselves beginning to have second thoughts about their long commitment to decentralized federalism.

It was the liberal Benito Juárez who marked the beginning of a strong central regime in Mexico City and this was thoroughly consolidated by his liberal successor, Porfirio Díaz at the end of the century; both committed to strong government to provide order and peace as the necessary foundation for progress. This later nineteenth century version of liberalism was reshaped by Comte's positivism and neo-Darwinist social theory during the long Díaz years into a curiously authoritarian and repressive capitalist society. The ghost of Alamán may have had some cause for laughter.

Both Alamán's conservatives and the opposing liberals were committed to aristocratic rule. Neither side was democratic. Alamán was favorable to the liberal enthusiasm for the growth of commercial enterprise, and was even influenced to free trade, though experience led him back to protectionism for the sake of that very domestic enterprise, much as with Clay's American system in the United States in the tradition of Hamilton.

Where they differed was over the liberal conviction that individual enterprise was fatally hindered by the fact that a vast portion of the Mexican economy was tied up

in self-perpetuating collective or corporate entities, primarily the Catholic Church and the Indian communes. The special privileges and the burden on society of the military was another serious difficulty, though the liberals tended to be much less adamant about reducing that power because, as already noted, the military was accustomed to using force to defend its position, and because the liberals themselves resorted to military support.

The earlier liberals of Alamán's time were deeply convinced that Spanish civilization had become decadent and dysfunctional, seriously out of step with the times. In their haste to deny the mother culture, many of them hit on the idea of an artificial resurrection of pre-Columbian Indian themes, motifs, and symbols. This was rather ironic since almost all of the liberal leaders were of pure or dominant Spanish descent, and felt just as much caste superiority over the Indians and mestizos as did the most aristocratic conservatives.

Alamán, to the contrary, saw that the Mexico of early independence was very much the product of Hispanic civilization, and that the only sensible way forward was to build on that foundation. Change, yes, certainly, but no radical breaks with the past. He understood human society much as did Burke, the sense of a nation having an organic character which builds and grows over time and cannot be rudely cut off from its past without serious cultural pathology.[9]

It had been a tendency of European political economy in the nineteenth century, and American political economy right to the present, to hold Lockean liberalism sacred and to conceive it as the only really valid way to structure a society. This type of devotion to Enlightenment and nineteenth century liberal thought has also been

dominant, more often than not, in all of the Latin American republics ever since independence. But there have been a few countervailing voices. Perhaps especially in recent decades have some thinkers begun to wonder if the Spanish heritage was not the better path after all. One of the most eminent of these was the Mexican José Vasconcelos. Especially in his later years he found a great affinity to Lucas Alamán. Part of Alamán's enduring greatness is that his vision was not simply a temporary aberration, a blip on the screen of history, but the articulation of a major alternative cultural worldview which did not die with him.[10]

CHAPTER TWO. CURRICULUM VITAE

Lucas Ignacio José Joaquín Pedro de Alcantara Juan Bautista Francisco de Paula Alamán was born on October 18, 1792, in the reign of His Most Catholic Majesty, Charles IV, in the rich city of Guanajuato, New Spain, to Don Juan Vicente Alamán and his wife, Doña María Ignacia Escalada who had been the widow of Don Gabriel Arechederreta. Her son by that marriage, Juan Bautista Arechederreta, Lucas's half brother, was to become one of the leading clergymen in New Spain. She had married Don Juan Vicente in 1780 and they had two daughters, one of whom died, and a son, Lucas.[11]

Lucas was educated at home by tutors, then at the School of Belén under Father José de San Jerónimo, and in Latin with Francisco Cornelio Diosdado. At age 13 he completed his Latin studies with honors, then proceeded to the Colegio de Purísima Concepción where he studied mathematics under Don Rafael Dávalos. The family wealth derived mainly from silver mines and Lucas was early introduced by his father into the skills of mine operation. Guanajuato has been called the second city of New Spain at that time and was replete with the appurtenances of high culture, including a number of good libraries. Many social evenings were held at the mansion of the Intendent, Don Juan Antonio de Riaño y Barcena, a great patron of the arts and culture. Young Lucas was a constant visitor and was blessed by the guidance and deep friendship of Riaño, who was one of the finest ornaments of the late Bourbon colonial administration.[12]

At age 15 Lucas was sent to visit his sister and her husband who was the governor of the province of Nuevo Santander (present day Tamaulipas in northeast Mexico). A year later, in 1808, his father died and Lucas returned to Guanajuato. The business was turned over to an overseer and mother and son moved to Mexico City to continue his education in September, 1808, shortly after the deposition of Viceroy Iturrigaray. His successor, Viceroy Garibay asked the family for a donation toward saving Spain and rescuing the king from the French. A substantial contribution was made.[13]

In Mexico City Lucas studied painting, French, and other subjects. There he first met Agustín de Iturbide, the army officer who, 13 years later, would engineer the final break with Spain and the establishment of Mexican independence with himself as emperor. But deteriorating business required the Alamáns to return to Guanajuato where Lucas helped run the mine, continued with his painting, and took up the guitar. He perfected his French with Señora Riaño who was of that nationality. Other time was consumed in extensive reading, including books forbidden on the Index.[14]

In January, 1810, Lucas attended a post-Christmas party at the Riaño mansion. Other guests included the acting bishop of Valladolid (now Morelia), Manuel Abad y Queipo and his friend (whom he was to excommunicate in the light of events soon to follow), the priest of the nearby town of Dolores, Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla.[15]

Hidalgo was a curious intellectual of pure Spanish descent, conservative theologically, but very liberal in every other way, working for the uplift of the poor Indians, and pursuing a very worldly personal life style. Subsequent to the upheavals in Spain with the takeover by Napoleon and virtual kidnapping of the royal family, many

of the Mexican Spanish were in turmoil as to what response to make. Some sided with the exiled king, some with the Spanish junta that was resisting the French, others favored outright independence from Spain. Father Hidalgo became involved in a conspiracy to raise a rebellion, against the Spanish administration in New Spain, ostensibly in the name of the king. The conspirators were not ready to make their move, but they learned that the plot had been discovered by the authorities, so Hidalgo decided to launch the insurgency immediately by ringing the bells of his Dolores church just before dawn on September 16, 1810, the date to which Mexico has traditionally ascribed the dawn of its independence—a tradition hotly contested by Lucas Alamán in the years to come.

On September 28, 1810, Hidalgo's ragged army of Indians stormed into Guanajuato. Many of the Spanish families were brought by Intendent Riaño into the Alhondiga, a massive granary where he thought to defend them until help could arrive. Unhappily, Riaño was shot dead in the fighting and, soon after, the rebels were able to blow in the great door. They then poured in and massacred almost all of the Spanish occupants. There was rioting and looting all over the city. Lucas and his mother were not in the Alhondiga, but their house was attacked. Lucas himself was captured and in danger of execution, but some of the Alamán servants cried out that he was not a Spaniard but a native Mexican. Lucas was able to reach Father Hidalgo who recognized him and gave protection to the Alamáns and their house.

Alamán was to write of the terrible experience himself in later years, and many believe that this day of murderous anarchy made him a lifelong conservative and implacable foe of public disorder and violence. Shortly afterward the city was retaken

by Spanish general Félix María Calleja, an extremely capable, but very cruel officer: he proceeded to execute large numbers of those he deemed Hidalgo supporters.[16]

Lucas and his mother departed once more for Mexico City, under the protection of a military escort, on December 9, 1810. He resumed his studies: chemistry and mineralogy at the Real Seminario de Minería, also English and French under Manuel del Valle. In September, 1811, he was denounced to the Inquisition for possession of forbidden books—Robertson's *History of America*, Surville's *Emilie*, and Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield.* The charge was soon dropped, probably through intercession from his half-brother, Don Juan Bautista de Arechederreta, who was the rector of two colleges and archdeacon of the Metropolitan Cathedral of Mexico.

Lucas Alamán, though a life-long devout Catholic and defender of the church, despised the Inquisition, perhaps dating from this incident. But whatever the origin of this distaste, it is entirely characteristic of him: conservative, defender of church and tradition, yet intellectually curious and eager to investigate all manner of new ideas. This seeming tension, or at least complexity, is a key to understanding Alamán, and warns us against too facile a characterization of him.[17]

He published his first writing in 1812, an article defending the Copernican view of the relation of earth and the other planets to the sun, an early example of his intellectual honesty and refusal to echo obscurantist religious views. He began the study, in French, of botany and physics with the works of René Just Hauy, Antoine Lavoisier, and Mathurin Jacques Brisson. He graduated from the School of Mines with honors in September, 1813. He was almost 21 years old, and he persuaded his mother to let him travel to Europe to complete his education, which meant not only formal

study, but the Grand Tour, and introductions to all manner of distinguished personages in the way customary for bright, wealthy, well-connected young men of that day. Customary, but surely few ever availed themselves so tirelessly of every opportunity thus presented.[18]

He sailed from Veracruz, January 2, 1814, in the company of Dr. Victorino de las Fuentes, priest of Irapuato. With a stop at Havana, they arrived at Cádiz on May 30. For the next few years he traveled, lived, and studied in the principal countries of western Europe, constantly visiting famous sites, great works of art, and distinguished people, though showing little concern for politics or government. He had arrived in Spain soon after the restoration of Ferdinand VII, but was less interested in the currently debilitated condition of the country than in the glorious Spanish past.[19]

During his travels he met Napoleon, Baron Alexander von Humboldt, Viscount François René Chateaubriand, Madame de Staël, Benjamin Constant, the Duc de Montmorency, and Prince Stanislao Poniatowski. He also made the acquaintance of the scholars and scientists Jean Baptiste Biot, Louis Jacques Thernard, René Just Hauy, Cardinal Gonzalvi, Cardinal Dionisio Bardajú, Leopold de Buch, Alvaro Agustín de Liano, and Agustin Fyramus de Gandolle. While in Paris, Alamán continued his scientific studies with some of the above. Many of these people became his close friends. In Europe he also met up with, and financially assisted the brilliant, eccentric Mexican, Fray Servando Teresa de Mier, who became his traveling companion for a time, as were the Mexican Fagoaga brothers, Don Francisco and Don José.[20]

In 1815 Alamán spent time in England and that economically progressive, socially stable nation, governed by a fairly enlightened aristocracy, became his ideal,

not as to specifics, but as to type. He envisioned for Mexico a nation of the same character, but in the form of historic Hispanic traditions. He visited Oxford University and Scotland. In 1816 he traveled to Bologna in Italy, to Switzerland, Germany, and Holland. On the continent he studied mines in Germany and learned the new improved sulphuric acid method of gold separation, which he intended to implement in Mexico. During his European sojourn he also studied Greek and German.[21]

Early in 1819 he received word that his family had suffered serious financial losses and he had to return. He first visited his father's birthplace in Navarre, and had his portrait painted for an important collection being assembled for Mexico by Francisco Fagoaga. He traveled to Paris, embarked at Le Havre with the Fagoagas on the French ship *L'Amitie* and stood again on Mexican soil on February 27, 1820, after an absence of six years.

On his return to Mexico City with plans for a business career, he found that the liberal Spanish Constitution of 1812 had been restored by a military revolt against reactionary King Ferdinand VII. Spain was calling for representatives from the empire to sit with the homeland members of the Cortes, and Alamán was promptly chosen to represent Guanajuato. Thus his unanticipated career as a public man began. He was then 28 years old. Before leaving for Spain in 1821 he contracted for marriage with Doña Narcisa Castrillo, daughter of a prominent Guanajuato couple. The wedding took place at his return from Spain on July 31, 1823.[22]

Alamán's principal modern biographer, José E. Valadés has described Doña Narcisa, who was partly of Indigenous descent, rather acidly:

> obese, without any appearance of intelligence, having all the characteristics of the typical Mexican matron of the middle of the nineteenth century . . . By type and character Doña Narcisa was completely opposite in nature to Don Lucas.

Nevertheless, the Alamán marriage was apparently very happy. He was proud of his children. There were seven, one dying in infancy. His eldest son, Gil, became a distinguished ecclesiastic, and Alamán was greatly moved on attendance at his first mass. The second son, Juan Bautista, received a law degree and passed the bar examination. He was later to produce the first biography, albeit brief, of his father, which was later included as a preface to the posthumous republication of Alamán's *Historia de Méjico.* Doña Narcisa, however different from her husband, was unfailingly loyal to him during years of persecution and was constantly at his side as he lay dying in 1853. His last wishes to the two eldest sons were to be faithful to their religion, care lovingly for their mother, and maintain the unity of the family.[23]

Alamán had taken a very prominent part in the Cortes and was the secretary and spokesman for the American delegates. This had been a period of great turmoil both in Spain and America. Many were seeking new and different kinds of government, though there was little agreement on what it should be. Alamán and most of the Americans wanted to see the American empire changed into self-governing bodies under the headship of the king of Spain, or possibly a Spanish prince. On the other hand, they also requested greater weight in the representation in the Cortes. Neither goal was achieved, but the American representatives gained some valuable parliamentary practice, which partially refutes the widespread view that the Mexican political class had had no legislative experience prior to independence. At the close of the Cortes sessions, he went to Paris and renewed old friendships, including the Duc de

Montmorency and Baron Alexander von Humboldt, and first made the acquaintance of the Marquis de Lafayette. He also organized a Mexican mining company in France, then England, where sufficient capital was available. He returned to Mexico to become the managing director of the company until 1830. The results of this enterprise were somewhat problematic and Alamán considered it a failure. It had, however, pumped a lot of much needed capital into Mexico. Along the way, Alamán had also gotten Spain to remove the heavy taxes on Mexican silver.[24]

Events had been moving very rapidly back in Mexico while the Americans were at the Cortes sessions. After several years in which the insurgency had seemed under control, indeed, almost dead, there was a sudden change. A leading military officer, Agustín de Iturbide, who had been a stalwart supporter for the royal government, seems to have decided that his personal interests would be best served by going over to the other side. Like many of the Mexican criollos, Iturbide had no sympathy for the poor classes. One reason independence was so long coming is that Hidalgo's insurrection had terrified the propertied classes into sticking with Spain. Iturbide's task was to organize an independence movement which did not threaten the Mexican establishment. He was commanding royalist troops against the few remaining insurgents in the South, primarily Vicente Guerrero and Félix Fernández, who called himself Guadalupe Victoria. But Iturbide secretly communicated with them, resulting in a proposal.

The Plan of Iguala was a program for a conservative independence based on three points: first, Mexico would be an independent monarchy ruled by Ferdinand VII of Spain or some other European prince; second, the Roman Catholic Church was to

retain all its privileges; and third, the *peninsulares* (native Spaniards) and the *criollos* (Mexican born persons of pure, or allegedly pure Spanish descent) were to be treated as equal in all respects. The Iguala program was thus known as the *Tres Garantías* (the Three Guarantees) and the joined military forces of the rebels was known as the Trigarante Army. For a time the outcome hung in the balance, but then large numbers of royalists, conservatives, and liberals began to throw their support to the Plan of Iguala. City after city declared for independence.

When the newly appointed Spanish viceroy, Juan O'Donojú, landed in Veracruz, almost the entire country was in rebel hands and he and his party were besieged in the port city. He saw the reality of the situation and met with Iturbide to negotiate a transfer of power. At that point, Iturbide changed the Plan of Iguala, so that the new kingship would not have to be limited to European princes. He was maneuvering to be available for the position himself.

O'Donojú had surrendered the Spanish sovereignty of Mexico, but the king and the government in Madrid remained firmly opposed. The new Mexican Congress met in February, 1822, and could not find a Spanish or other European prince to reign over the new state. Some began to urge movement to a republic. Iturbide took advantage of the confusion to organize a "spontaneous" popular outcry for him to assume the throne. He "reluctantly" acquiesced and was crowned Agustín I, Emperor of Mexico, in the Metropolitan Cathedral on July 21, 1822. There was widespread but ill-founded popular delirium. The country was bankrupt and Iturbide proved to be incompetent. He soon dissolved Congress and ruled as dictator, but rebellion was growing all over the country. When military units began defecting, he realized the game was up and

abdicated in February, 1823, leaving for European exile after ten months in office. (He later returned, was captured and executed.)

A new Congress assembled in November under the leadership of Miguel Ramós Arizpe, who drew up a republican constitution modeled largely on that of the United States. The state legislatures elected Guadalupe Victoria president and Nicolás Bravo vice president. As in the republic to the north, political factions had not yet coalesced. There were still royalists who yearned for a Spanish prince or some kind of crowned head. The great majority were probably now republicans, though most undoubtedly had too much naïve faith in what a republic could achieve—or what any kind of government could achieve under the prevailing conditions. Mexico had been devastated by the years of struggle for independence. Silver mining had been the principal engine of the economy, but the mines were largely inoperable. The military cost more money than the state could take in, but woe to any who would try to reduce it. No one had sufficient power to enforce tough decisions. Those who tried were invariably overthrown by successors equally ineffective.

Gradually the republican majority divided into the *puros* and the *moderados.* The puros were doctrinaire liberals who wanted rapid change to a modern bourgeois, individualist, republic based on readily transferable private property and capital, with a corresponding reduction in the economic power of the church which had locked up a vast proportion of the national wealth. The moderados had much the same goals, but were prepared to go more slowly and compromise with other factions as necessary.

The conservatives at the right end of the spectrum also presented variations. Some conservatives were liberal at certain points. Alamán seems to have been of this

group. Progressive and open to new ideas on the practical level, not unaware of some of the emerging requisites for a successful economy, willing to work within a republican framework, aware that some aspects of the influence and operation of the church were inimical to national development, Alamán was hardly the feudal dinosaur that some dismissive characterizations would have him. The extreme conservatives were blind to the need for change. He was not of that ilk.

It is also important to remember that the Mexican political culture was in flux. Many views changed over time on all sides. Alamán clearly became more conservative with the passage of time and the widespread continuance of disorder and malfeasance. It is understandable that he, like many other Mexicans, began to yearn for a strong man to impose the peace and order necessary for any hope of progress. This is always the danger which accompanies prolonged national disorder. A chaotic France was ready to embrace Napoleon. A ravaged Germany was prepared to follow Hitler.[25]

But the liberals changed too, and in the same direction. They were quietly abandoning their shibboleth of decentralized power. Though kings and emperors were anathema, they too began looking for a strong man. As Alamán lay dying, one was emerging: Benito Juárez, a strong leader who manipulated power, but tried to remain within a framework of vigorous constitutionalism. Strong man liberalism reached its apotheosis in the long rule of Porfirio Díaz, who understood that there could be no progress without peace and order. Alamán had come on the stage too soon, and he had clung to cultural symbols and institutions that were too far out of fashion. Just as it was said in the United States that "only Nixon could go to China," so, in Mexico, only a "liberal" could establish a viable dictatorship.

But much of this had yet to play itself out. We must constantly remind ourselves that Mexico's leaders were navigating unknown seas, and it took time and experience to learn some hard lessons. And the opposing factions had many things in common. With very few exceptions the puros, the moderados, and the conservatives were all agreed that a republic meant rule by a small elite class of the wealthy and the educated. The idea was that wealth made them prudent and education made them knowledgeable. As T. R. Fehrenbach puts it: "It is too simple to call the camps *continuistas* and *reformistas* . . . because the *continuistas* or traditionalists were constantly forced to try reforms in order to make a nation, while the most radical of the reformers frequently behaved in highly traditional authoritarian ways."[26]

Some of them wanted to see this base greatly expanded with time and opportunity. In this too, Alamán was hardly a reactionary. He was devoted to the expansion of education, and he also advocated the establishment of local savings banks to encourage the working poor to start savings accounts that would give them some economic leverage. This would also build capital for investment.[27]

As Alamán was arriving back in Mexico, the fall of Iturbide was in progress. During the interregnum, the Congress created an executive committee to supervise the government until more permanent arrangements could be implemented, the *Supremo Poder Ejecutivo.* This group immediately called upon Alamán to assume the most important post in the cabinet: minister of exterior relations (foreign affairs), and interior relations (many things, but in essence conducting the relationship between the central government and the states). The biography by his son, Juan Bautista Alamán says:

> The celebrity which Alamán had acquired in the Spanish Cortes, his talent and vast knowledge when hardly thirty years old, could do no less than call the attention of the new government, which named him Minister of Relations and Minister of the Interior on April 12 of the same year, 1823.[28]

During this his first term of national office, Alamán undertook many tasks, among them the founding of the Museum of Antiquities and the Museum of Natural History, also the General Archives of the Nation, as well as patronage of the San Carlos art center. Also during this period he rescued the equestrian statue of Charles IV from destruction by removing it from the great central plaza to the inner patio of the Royal and Pontifical University. This large bronze by the Spanish artist and architect, Manuel Tolsá, is considered the finest surviving equestrian statue in the western hemisphere. It was also at this time that Alamán retrieved the remains of the Conqueror Hernán Cortés from their sepulcher in the Metropolitan Cathedral ahead of an anti-Spanish mob bent on their destruction.[29]

From his post at the Ministry of Exterior Relations, he was able to secure recognition for the new Republic from the United Sates and Great Britain. He also negotiated a treaty with Colombia. Alamán shared many concepts and ideals with the great South American liberator, Simón Bolívar, including the vision for a vast union or at least confederation of much of former Spanish America. At that time, Colombia was still in the phase of "Gran Colombia" as created by Bolívar, incorporating the present states of Ecuador, Colombia, Venezuela, and Panama. Mexico's previous incarnation as New Spain had extended all the way to the Colombian border, and though the Central American region had since gone its own way, Colombia was a nearby and natural ally for Mexico.[30]

Alamán sought to implement international Spanish American congresses, and he worked on a plan for Mexico to join Colombia in an effort to capture Cuba from Spain in order to prevent Spain from using it as a staging area for an attempt at reconquest, and also to prevent the United States from absorbing it.[31]

Suffering some criticism, Alamán resigned his post on November 5, 1823, but all the employees of his department petitioned the government to refuse to accept the resignation. The Supremo Poder Ejecutivo did, in fact, refuse the resignation and gave Alamán satisfaction on some points of honor. There was further trouble, apparently related to a rebellion by General José María Lobato, which occasioned his renewed resignation in January, 1824. Most of the cabinet had also resigned and the Supremo Poder Ejecutivo was in disarray for various reasons. The government induced Alamán to return to his post on May 13, 1824, where he remained until September 27, 1825, when President Victoria was induced by a political cabal associated with the York Rite Masons, to remove him.[32]

Alamán determined to wash his hands of politics and give his full attention to business, in large part as managing director of the British financed Compañia Unida de Minas through which he introduced the sulphuric acid process of metal separation. He was active in this role for the next five years, but results were disappointing. The revival of silver mining was burdened with a wide variety of problems.[33]

By 1830 Alamán had come to the belief that the exploitation of natural resources was not a sufficient foundation for long-range prosperity, which would depend, rather, on the development of a vigorous industrial sector. He then became the chief Mexican prophet of industrialization, both in theory and in practice. He

established the Banco de Avío, a government assisted central bank to serve as a fountain of industrial credit, much like Hamilton's Bank of the United States. He not only helped others to establish factories, but set up some of his own for the manufacture of cotton textiles in Orizaba and Celaya. He also acquired several haciendas and spent considerable time and effort trying to enhance their productivity.[34]

His efforts were farsighted and intelligent, yet did not sufficiently appreciate the lack of conditions in Mexico for the launch of industrialization. The failure of Alamán's factories and haciendas in particular was due to international trade conditions and insufficient capital. He had imported the most advanced machinery available, but the projects could not be sustained.[35]

Also, in order to protect Mexican cotton producers from cheaper foreign imports, there was tariff protection. But the Mexican industry could not produce enough for the factories, which resulted in a significant rise in the price of cotton to the factories. In part due to the need to overcome this, Alamán's company had to borrow money at ruinous rates, which resulted in bankruptcy, though there were better results for some other Mexican textile companies, which saw long-term benefits from his industrial promotions.[36]

Alamán became the American representative and trustee of the estates of the Duke of Terranova y Monteleone. This person was the European heir to the vast patrimony of the Conqueror, Hernán Cortés. It is not clear what compensation Alamán derived from this position, but it was undoubtedly considerable, and was probably his main resource for maintaining an affluent life style throughout his mature years. His service to the Duke was certainly invaluable: on more than one occasion his political

and forensic skill enabled him to ward off attempts of the Mexican Congress to confiscate and nationalize these properties.[37]

As an important part of this charge, Alamán carefully supervised the Hospital de Jesús, a charitable institution founded in the sixteenth century by Cortés. As already noted, an angry anti-Spanish mob was bent on tearing Cortés's remains out of their sepulcher in the Metropolitan Cathedral and destroying them. Alamán spirited them away and had them buried in the wall of the hospital's chapel, which would be his own burial place in due season. The disposition of the Cortés remains was kept secret until descendants of Alamán revealed the location in 1937. The bodies of both men are there to this day in the chapel of the old hospital.[38]

Alamán's political enemies at one point ordered an investigation of the hospital and its operation, but, that being done, they had to admit that it was not only well-maintained and well-run, but that it exceeded all the other municipal hospitals in those respects. Though bitter against the United States for its taking of Texas, then the whole Spanish northwest as a result of the Mexican-American War of 1846-1848, and the ensuing American military occupation of Mexico City, he nevertheless highly commended the American officers both for protecting the hospital and for entering it to admire the portrait of Cortés. He actually felt a pang of remorse at their eventual departure on account of the peace, law, and order that had prevailed in the city during the occupation.[39]

The presidential administration of Guadalupe Victoria was followed in 1828 by the election of Manuel Gómez Pedraza, an experienced man of letters, military officer, and outstanding orator. But he was the leader of the moderados and that was not good

enough for the puros, so they created such serious disturbances that Gómez Pedraza resigned in disgust so that the losing candidate in the presidential election could take the office. This was General Vicente Guerrero, another hero of the independence wars. He was a somewhat colorful, loveable, uneducated, activist, mixed-race person. His government soon fell into disarray and was eventually opposed by the armed resistance of the forces of his conservative vice president, Anastasio Bustamante.

In 1829, during the confusion following the collapse of the Guerrero administration, the government was put into the hands of a sort of presidential triumvirate made up of Pedro Vélez, Luis Quintanar, and Lucas Alamán, of which Alamán was the effective leader. General Anastasio Bustamante was installed as president on January 1, 1830, and called on Alamán to resume his former charge of exterior and interior relations.[40]

Bustamante was an honest conservative of limited ability who sought to implement the projects initiated by Alamán. There were serious efforts to rationalize the government budget, and to restore law and order across the land. This was largely successful, and Mexico had its first real opportunity since independence to catch its breath and pursue a peaceful economic development. But the price for this was a very harsh, repressive, and humorless administration. Bustamante, as a conservative law and order man, was in his element, but it was really Alamán who was driving events, and he deserves the principal credit and blame for the results.[41]

He was able to reestablish the foreign credit of Mexico and encouraged the development of industry and agriculture. Unlike the liberals, who were initially great admirers of the United States, Alamán early foresaw the perils of American

expansionism and tried to organize a more substantial settlement of Texas by Mexicans or Europeans as a bulwark against the northern juggernaut. He eloquently articulated this concern in a written initiative to the Congress which was adopted on April 6, 1830. Pursuant to the same goal, he negotiated a treaty with the United States whereby the latter recognized the same boundaries established with Spain under the Adams-Onís Treaty of 1819.

Alamán organized the first rational drainage system to cope with the floods that perennially threatened the capital, restructured and modernized the various branches and institutions of higher education, and set about the proper funding of hospitals and jails. He reorganized the finances of the California missions. It was during this administration that he proposed and congress established the Bank of Avío, previously mentioned, in 1831, and he was active in all manner of economic stimulation, including iron works, textile factories, a bakery, paper factories, and looms for stockings. He saw that quality sheep and goats were imported from France and cattle from Peru. He saw to the planting of mulberry trees and the beginning of a silkworm industry, as well as advances in ceramic production. He also founded a literary journal and procured the first theater for Mexico City.[42]

But there was widespread dissatisfaction across the land. The suppression of the radical liberals was "grossly intemperate." What turned out to be the ultimate outrage was the execution of Vicente Guerrero. Ex-President Guerrero was back in his southern home ground fomenting rebellion against the government. He was lured aboard an Italian ship, the captain of which had previously arranged to hand him over to his enemies for fifty thousand dollars. He was quickly tried for treason, convicted, and

executed on January 14, 1831. In all the troubled half century after independence, the execution of prominent political rebels was quite rare, his sad fate being shared only with the former emperor, Iturbide. As one of the great heroes of the wars for independence, his execution shocked the nation. Alamán got the lion's share of the blame for it. Apparently the fate of Guerrero was indeed deliberated in the cabinet. What seems to be the only account comes from General José María Tornel. He testified that while two in the cabinet had voted for execution, two others, including Alamán, had voted for exile, and that President Bustamante had cast the deciding vote for execution. After independence, exile had been a common Mexican penalty for political losers, from which they frequently rebounded to later political success. An exile for Guerrero would hardly have caused a ripple, but his execution aroused a storm.[43]

General Santa Anna organized the overthrow of the increasingly unpopular Bustamante government in 1832, and was himself elected president in 1833 by a huge margin. His vice president was Valentín Gómez-Farías an intellectual of rigidly liberal views, one of the puros. The ideological brain behind Gómez-Farías was Dr. José María Luis Mora, a distinguished thinker and writer. Santa Anna provided the muscle, Mora the ideas, and Gómez-Farías the execution.[44]

The new liberal administration was just as rigidly single-minded to the left as the Bustamante-Alamán administration had been to the right. Among other things, a fanatical campaign was launched against former cabinet members, and against Alamán in particular. Various illegal means were employed to proceed against him, and, in fear for his life, he went into hiding, spending a year concealed in convents. Toward the latter part of that hiatus, Guanajuato elected him a delegate to Congress, but he

remained in seclusion until the Supreme Court of Justice dismissed all the charges against him in 1835.[45]

Alamán turned again to his business concerns. In 1836 he was asked by the interim president of the republic, José Justo Corro, to undertake a diplomatic mission to France to conclude the ratification of a treaty drawn up in 1832. He did so, but he would not submit to French intransigence, so he came back home without success. On his return he continued in the rather unsuccessful attempt to build his own factories and farms previously noted. The bankruptcy of some of these enterprises destroyed most of his personal wealth in 1839.[46]

The Constitution was replaced in 1836 by something called the *Siete Leyes* (Seven Laws). This provided a *Consejo de Gobierno,* a sort of executive committee something like the former Supremo Poder Ejecutivo. Alamán was appointed vice president of this council in 1837. In 1840 he was commissioned to reform the customs system. In 1842 interim president, Nicolás Bravo, appointed him to direct the Office of Industry, which he did until relieved following a political coup in 1846. His enemies carefully investigated his work in that office to find something to charge him with, but had to confess that they only found "solid evidence of his excellent conduct of it." [47]

In 1844 Alamán began publishing his *Disertaciones sobre la historia de la República Mexicana, desde la Conquista hasta la Independencia.* He was elected President of the *Ayuntamiento* (the town council or municipal government) of Mexico City in 1849, which he managed with honesty and efficiency. That same year he began publishing the first of the five volumes of the *Historia de Méjico.* After finishing his term as President of the Mexico City Ayuntamiento, he was elected deputy to Congress

from the state of Jalisco in 1850, which charge he filled until the end of the congressional term in 1851.[48]

During his active public life, Alamán was the single most prominent historical writer in Mexico, but he was not without important competition. Other major figures were Carlos María de Bustamante, José María Luis Mora, and Lorenzo de Zavala. These three were all liberals.

Bustamante was "the first to publish an integrated work of the independence movement of 1810." This was issued in segments from 1821 to 1827, then published in five volumes, later greatly revised and augmented and reissued in 1843-1846 under the title, *Cuadro histórico de la Revolución Mexicana.* Scholar Lemoine Villicaña describes the work as a maddening hodge podge of materials of varying quality, so confused as to present "a dizzying task, above all for hurried and lost readers." Zavala described it as "full of falsehoods, inadmissible fables, inexactitudes without end, anodyne anecdotes, and all wrapped in a vulgar and detestable style." The book nevertheless remains an enormous mine of information about the independence period and continues to be one of the most important primary documents of that era.[49]

Mora was a very different mentality. He was probably the only Mexican intellectual in a class with Alamán. He was the ideological thinker behind the liberal Gómez Farías government (1833-1834), according to Hale, "the major liberal theorist of the pre-Reforma period of the 1850s." And, "Not only was he the most significant liberal spokesman of his generation but his thought epitomizes the structure and the predominant orientation of Mexican liberalism." After that administration ended, he went to live in Paris. There he later published his two most important works, *México y*

sus revoluciones (1836) and *Obras sueltas* (1838). Though Mora agreed with much of Bustamante, his disciplined and discerning mind was greatly annoyed by the sloppiness of Bustamante's scholarship and writing.[50]

Mora had a great deal in common with Alamán. They were both aristocratic criollos, both deplored the excesses of the years of revolutionary warfare, both admired and honored the achievements of the Spanish Conquest, and both opposed the grosser manifestations of Mexican Catholicism. But they differed sharply over how to deal with the church. Mora considered the vast property of the church to be the chief impediment to the ability of Mexico successfully to enter the new age, while Alamán wanted the religious institution to remain essentially unchanged as the great psychic root and unifying core of Mexican culture.

The Yucatecan Lorenzo de Zavala (1788-1836) was another leader of great intellectual gifts. He is sometimes described as the least ideologically self-deluded and most realistic of all the leading Mexican politicians, but considered somewhat dishonest. Zavala authored *Ensayo histórico sobre las revoluciones de México desde 1808 hasta 1830* (1831) and *Viaje a los Estados Unidos del Norte de América* (1834). He was the Mexican ambassador to France, but resigned in disgust when Santa Anna took over the government. He came to Texas and advised the people there to defy Santa Anna. He threw his lot in with the seceders and became the first vice president of the Republic of Texas, but then died shortly thereafter. He is included, as an important point of comparison, in Andrés Lira's *Espejo de discordias: La sociedad Mexicana vista por Lorenzo Zavala, José María Mora y Lucas Alamán* (1984).[51]

These four were the giants of Mexican historical writing in the first generation of Mexican independence from Spain. Of the four only Alamán "did not allow an anti-Spanish bias to vitiate his historical scholarship, but he was no less partisan than his ideological foes."[52]

Alamán was devoted to the advancement of science and culture. In addition to the cultural, archival, and historical institutions previously noted, he laid plans for a complete overhaul and modernization of both elementary and higher education. He established a Philharmonic Society. He contributed scientific instruments he imported from Europe to the College of La Purísima Concepción in Guanajuato. A partial list of memberships follows. He was a corresponding member of the Society for Elementary Instruction of Paris, member of the Royal Institute of the Sciences in Bavaria, member of the board of directors of the Academies of Language and of the History of Mexico, associate of the Institute of Geography and Statistics, honorary academic of the Royal Academy of Madrid and of the Fine Arts of San Carlos of Mexico, associate of the Pontifical Roman Academy of Archaeology.[53]

A rare personal glimpse of Alamán comes to us through a touching story from Guillermo Prieto, militant liberal, government minister, aide to Juárez, and the most noted Mexican poet of the century:

> While searching for a place to stay [during the attack of the American army on Mexico City in 1848], they [he and his family] were invited into a rich-looking house, where they occupied a comfortable apartment. When Prieto discovered he had taken lodging in a part of the Alamán house, he was mortified because of the deep political prejudices he held against him. He had, he says, published all sorts of insults against Alamán and, in his imagination, pictured him as a "Rodin, gloomy, bloodthirsty, and the fright of the very devil himself." At first Prieto avoided his host and refused his invitation to walk with him in his garden, but within fifteen days, he found himself seeking him to hear his charming accounts of his travels, his profound dissertations on Latin and

> Spanish literature, and his treasures of historical anecdotes of France and Spain." He describes the Alamán home as an enchanted house in which a profound silence reigned at all times. The atmosphere of respectful servants in their dark coats, and ancient maids in aprons, the sound of the chapel bell calling the family to Mass and the Rosary—all left a lasting impression on Prieto. He observes that "within the family of Alamán, all was virtue, regularity, decency, and order."[54]

Alamán remained out of public life in 1852, but another overthrow of government brought General Santa Anna to the presidency at the beginning of 1853 with the sponsorship of the conservatives. Alamán was to have his old posts back and to be the chief force of the government. In poor health, he reluctantly accepted. In a letter to Santa Anna, he carefully laid out the direction the new administration should take. It could have been Alamán's greatest opportunity to craft a good government for Mexico with Santa Anna having sufficient power to maintain national stability while constructive measures were put into place. But alas, Alamán's weakened body failed him and he died on June 2, 1853. Not long before, he had brought out the fifth and final volume of the monumental *Historia de Méjico.* It is not possible to know what would have happened if Alamán had lived and were able to exert his influence and direction. Without him, Santa Anna behaved badly and the country soon tired of him. He was ousted by the liberal uprising of Ayutla in 1855 and returned to foreign exile, never to hold power in Mexico again.[55]

Looking back over the course of independent Mexico thus far, it would seem that one government after another was overthrown by self-interested militarists. Yet, even in this unsavory stew, there was a semblance of rational structure.

> Finally, once a caudillo was in power, it was to the university men that he must turn to carry on the actual work of government, as well as to defend it in the press. Thus, the caudillos and civilian politicians were linked in a symbiotic relationship marked by mutual suspicion and mutual dependence. The military

> men often needed the intellectual and administrative skills of the educated civilians. The character of the relationship between caudillos and intellectual politicians varied a good deal, of course, depending on the relative social position and economic means of both. A wealthy and respected Lucas Alamán might well lecture in a schoolmasterly manner even so powerful a caudillo as General Santa Anna;[56]

What is analyzed here is actually a legitimate descendant of a very old Spanish tradition whereby government was conducted by an amalgam of "sword men" and "gown men." Knights, crusaders, military adventurers on the one hand; friars, priests, professors, lawyers, and accountants on the other. As in nineteenth-century Mexico, the two groups distrusted, even despised each other, but they needed each other.

Barbara Tenenbaum presents an opposing view: that the civilian leaders were not really all that important. She critiques an essay by Michael Costeloe, "*Hombres de bien* in the Age of Santa Anna," which is a condensed version of his larger work, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846.* Hombres de bien *in the Age of Santa Anna* (1993). *Hombres de bien* is a term of art which, in nineteenth-century Mexico, referred to upper middle-class public spirited men of affairs. Tenenbaum points out that there is confusion in Costeloe's determination of who should be included in this group. This is a valid criticism and it applies to Costeloe's book as well as to his essay in this collection. But she has another point to make:

> Finally, Costeloe gives the *hombres de bien* a significance far out of proportion to their real importance. . . . . his singling out of the *hombres de bien*, and those in Mexico City at that, makes it appear that they were critical to the politics of the time. But a study of Mexican history from Independence to reform indicates otherwise. Take for example, Santa Anna's treatment of Lucas Alamán in 1853 when he paid lip service to a dying man until six weeks later he implemented policies totally at variance with what the *hombres de bien* wanted. . . .They rarely hold actual power such as José de Gálvez did, rather they act as servitors to *los que mandan*.[57]

Tenenbaum does a good service in reminding us scholars and intellectuals that scholars and intellectuals sometimes yield to the temptation to give each other greater prominence as movers and shakers than is really the case. This over-emphasis is a sort of sub-category of the great person approach to history. Those who do all the talking are granted a disproportionate position in historical causation. Tenenbaum's warning is a salutary caution to all of us. On the other hand, it can be argued that she goes too far. The caudillos and the bureaucrats needed each other. The generals provided the muscle and the thinkers ran the administrations, as noted above.

This polarity ignores the realm of workers, artisans, manufacturers, and traders, which says a lot to explain how Spain fell increasingly behind the other European powers. Until recently this pattern has been duplicated in Spanish America where young men aspiring to a place in society ordinarily trained for the military or for the law, never for engineering.

Michael C. Meyer and William Beezley offer a further caution against Tenenbaum:

> Bustamante assmed the presidency at the end of 1829 and immediately Appointed the conservative politician Lucas Alamán to the most powerful post in his cabinet. Like previous and future military presidents. Bustamante depended upon a group of civilian leaders to develop policy, to grapple with the shortage of funds needed to operate the central government, and to search for means to repay Mexico's foreign debt.[58]

While appreciating Tenenbaum's warning, her dismissal of Alamán's relationship with Santa Anna seems speculative at best. First, Alamán's letter to Santa Anna is a detailed major manifesto. Second, Santa Anna accepted it without complaint and was apparently prepared to work with it. Third, Alamán was the person who, if

anyone, had the force of intellect and the force of character to keep Santa Anna to the mark. Alamán was not overridden by Santa Anna; rather, he died before he had the opportunity to show what he could do. It can be argued that Santa Anna had shown some signs of greater maturity and seriousness over the years, and it is at least conceivable that he might have appreciated Alamán's administrative skills, and that the two could have worked together constructively. Santa Anna indeed fell back into his inane ways, but that was after Alamán's death. Who can say what might have happened had Alamán been in continuing health? Once again we see that generalizations are dangerous, especially generalizations about hypothetical futures. The death of important people in mid-career and in critical times always raises unsatisfiable questions as to what might have been.

Alamán could not stay for what might have been his greatest opportunity, and yet there is a sense that the overall tide of history was running against him. Had he lived he might have witnessed and participated in the ultimate demise of the conservative cause. If so, the tragic sense of his last decades might have become agonizing. In hindsight, perhaps his departure at that point was really a mercy for him.[59]

Mexico was about to come under the sway of a new generation of young liberals, who were both more radical and more pragmatic. Their program was to destroy the political and economic power of the church, and to submit the army to civilian control. There was a new radical constitution, the Constitution of 1857. The conservatives reacted bitterly and the two factions fought the "War of the Reform" from 1858 to 1861. The conservatives lost and then played their final desperate card:

bringing in the foreign prince that had so often been discussed in the years since independence. It was to be Archduke Maximilian von Habsburg, younger brother of Austrian emperor Francis Joseph, who accepted the Mexican throne under the protection of French bayonets. Eventually the French army was forced to withdraw and the Mexican conservative forces were unable to avoid total defeat, followed by the restoration of the Republic and the execution of Emperor Maximilian. The Franco-Austrian intervention totally discredited what was left of the conservatives. The liberals had triumphed and largely had their way with Mexico under the strong regimes of Benito Juárez and Porfirio Díaz through the first decade of the twentieth century.

Alamán became largely forgotten, but his name and his activities are sprinkled profusely throughout any history of the first decades of independence. He had articulated a philosophy of culture and government which was to stimulate reflection over the years. It is the primary purpose of this paper to track that influence, how it was received and how it was understood from his own lifetime to the present day.

CHAPTER THREE. ALAMÁN IN GENERAL HISTORY

There are a number of (usually) single volume histories of Mexico which can give only limited attention to Alamán. Emphasis here is on passages in these histories which characterize the man or his thought and work in the mind of the historian.

We begin with mentions in the journal and correspondence of Edward Thornton Tayloe, a Harvard educated, wealthy Virginia planter who assisted the first American ambassador to Mexico, Joel Poinsett, as private secretary from 1825 to 1828. In a letter to his brother, Benjamin Ogle Tayloe, from Mexico City on August 15, 1825, he wrote:

> The government of Mexico, I regret to say, is a feeble one. . . . The Secretary of State, Lucas Alamán, is a traveled and ought to be, & perhaps is, an intelligent man—but as a statesman, I venture to say (perhaps I am presumptuous to judge) that he has, in the world, many superiors—I admire neither his style nor sentiments nor reasoning.[60]

Tayloe seems to have all the assurance of the newly arrived. His rather dismissive description of Alamán may have derived from the fact that Alamán was the Mexican leader most suspicious of the United States, and that Tayloe's superior, Joel Poinsett, was notably free-wheeling and improperly interfering in Mexican internal politics. Poinsett surely disliked Alamán, who stood up to this interference. This was one of many such situations in which Alamán struggled to preserve the integrity of Mexico and an indicator of his patriotism.

The next references to be considered are in *Life in Mexico*, a memoir by Frances Calderón de la Barca. Sra. Calderón was born Scottish, but lived many years in the United States where she became acquainted with the Spanish ambassador, Don Ángel Calderón de la Barca. They married in 1838 and the following year arrived in

Mexico City where Don Ángel was the new Spanish ambassador. The couple lived there until removing to Spain in 1853. *Life in Mexico* is based on a great number of voluminous letters written by Frances—"Fanny." In "Letter the Thirty-Fifth," she discusses the immense tribulations endured by Don Esteban Antuñano, a capitalist and friend of Lucas Alamán who was determined to establish a cotton textile factory.

> In this he spent so much of his capital, that he was obliged to have recourse to the Bank of *Avio* for assistance. The bank (*avio* meaning pecuniary assistance, or advance of funds) was established by Don Lucas Alamán and intended as an encouragement to industry. But industry is not of the nature of a hothouse plant, to be forced by artificial means; and these grants of funds have but created monopolies, and consequently added to the general poverty.[61]

The last sentence above indicates a shrewd recognition of what was perhaps Alamán's greatest mistake: trying to industrialize on inadequate and unfavorable foundations. Her more direct statement about Alamán is found in "Letter the Thirty-Seventh." In this letter she sets out to give small vignettes of many of the leading Mexican public figures, among them Alamán.

> And it is very much the case in Mexico at present, that the most distinguished men are those who live most retired; those who have played their part in the arena of public life, have seen the inutility of their efforts in favour of their country, and have now retreated into the bosom of their families, where they endeavour to forget public evils in domestic retirement and literary occupation.
>
> Amongst these may be reckoned Don Lucas Alamán, who passed many years in Europe, and in 1820 was deputy to the Spanish Cortes. Shortly after his return he became minister of foreign relations, which high office he has filled during various seasons of difficulty.[62]

George Lockhart Rives produced *The United States and Mexico, 1821-1848* in 1913. The first of the two volumes includes a detailed discussion of events leading up to the controversy over Texas. The narration of these affairs appears to be factually sound, though an anti-Mexican bias can be seen:

> Lúcas Ignacio Alaman [sic], the new Secretary of Foreign Relations, was the person through whom the attention of the Mexican public was really and seriously called to Texas affairs; and it was in consequence of his recommendations that the era of easy indifference was succeeded by a period of attempted regulation and repression, which ultimately brought about disaster.[63]

Rives transcribes the report which Alamán presented to the Mexican Congress to apprise them of the incipient danger of American expansionism. Copies of confidential as well as public Mexican government papers were conveyed to the American Van Buren administration by the American ambassador, Anthony Butler. Rives describes the content of one of these documents, Alamán's report to the Mexican Congress: "The tone of this report was more than unfriendly to the United States. It was grossly insulting." Rives seems to have taken umbrage at Mexico's determination to defend its territory, for which he considered Alamán primarily to blame.[64]

An even more anti-Mexican view was expounded by Charles Edward Chapman in *Republican Hispanic America: A History* (1937):

> George Canning, famous British prime minister of the 1820s, made cordial relations with Mexico the key to his Western Hemisphere policy, joining it with a virtual opposition to the United States in Caribbean, and indeed North American affairs. In Mexico, he and his agents were successful in obtaining the support of the most powerful faction in the government, including not only President Victoria, but also, and more important, the minister of foreign relation, Lucas Alamán.
>
> Lucas Alamán, a man who never became president, but who was "the power behind the throne," was to be an almost greater fatality to Mexico than even the caudillos of the evil Santa Anna stamp. A man of intellect and a noteworthy historian, he was also a Conservative statesman, pro-monarchist and anti-republican, and pro England and anti-United States. . . . Indeed, Alamán was also responsible, in large degree, for the eventual war of Mexico with the United States. He felt that a foreign conflict would inculcate Mexican patriotism and help solve domestic ills. It was a terrible mistake for Mexico. And as between the United States and Mexico, it has made sincerely good relations almost impossible, because Mexico has absorbed the Alamán ideal.[65]

This is a truly astonishing statement from a serious American historian as late as 1937, and may be indicative that American chauvinism was still credible on the academic scene that recently. Not only does Chapman display blatant prejudice; he falsifies history. Alamán was well aware of the peril involved in war with the United States and worked to avoid it. He had advocated vigorous measures to improve the Mexican hold on Texas, but without success. After Texas had declared independence and routed Santa Anna at San Jacinto, Alamán is on record advocating Mexican recognition of independent Texas as a measure for staving off worse things to come.[66]

Chapman goes on to discuss events during the Mexican Revolution. He argues that Pershing's failure to capture Pancho Villa was due to restrictions placed on his activities by President Wilson so as not to offend Mexican opinion or risk a clash with the Carranza government. This view, at least so far as it attributes Pershing's failure to restrictions placed on him by his own government, seems to be a unique one among historians. But Chapman goes even farther, dragging in the long-dead Alamán!

> The action of Carranza at this time was typical of him. Always generously supported by the Wilson government, he never lost an opportunity to "bite the hand that fed him." . . . . To be sure, no leader could long retain his grip on the Mexican people who suffered from the stigma of the backing of the United States. The shade of Lucas Alamán was much too deep for that.[67]

Why is Chapman so outraged that a Mexican president should be worried about appearing to please the United States? And to credit Alamán with singlehandedly creating a national animosity to the United States is a mind-boggling overload of the great man view of history.

In 1938, only a year after Chapman's work saw light, came the first edition of Henry Bamford Parkes's standard *A History of Mexico.* One year, and yet what a

difference. Parkes was dedicated to a higher level of objectivity. He speaks generally of the statesmen of the first decade of the Mexican Republic:

> Meanwhile the conservatives were rallying in defence of creole and clerical privilege. The ablest and the most honorable of them was Lucas Alamán, a mining engineer who was also the author of a classic history of Mexico and one of the most learned scholars in the country. . . .he was. . . a very subtle and a very strong willed politician. Favoring a foreign monarchy, but willing to accept a military dictatorship as the least undesirable alternative. . .[68]

Parkes later comments on Alamán's final effort to serve the nation by joining with General Santa Anna in 1853:

> He [Santa Anna] did not, however, wholly disappoint his conservative supporters. Alamán, who became the head of his cabinet, had presented him with a series of warnings and an elaborate program; and. . .Santa Anna. . .was willing to adopt such parts of the program as were compatible with his own aggrandizement . . .

Parkes concludes: "The death of Alamán in June, 1853, deprived the conservatives of their ablest statesman," and Santa Anna once again went astray and was soon overthrown, never again to hold power.[69]

Lesley Byrd Simpson brought out the first edition of *Many Mexicos* in 1941. It includes some comments on Alamán, describing him as "a Creole aristocrat who had somehow escaped the sloth which too frequently paralyzed the members of his class." Alamán visited England in 1815 and, "in England's industry, her conservative and (relatively) responsible aristocracy, her opulence, and, above all, in her orderliness, he discovered the qualities which his own country needed." Simpson sees Alamán as finding in English institutions the pattern for his own country. "Order became Alamán's God. . ." In his philosophy, "he was a benevolent despot of the eighteenth century born out of time." Simpson here underscores one of the prime elements of the thesis of this paper, that Alamán was very much a product of the eighteenth century

Spanish Bourbon enlightened despotism. Simpson is also relevant on the subject of Alamán's patriotism, another key pillar of this thesis: "He had a clear vision of the growing might of the United States and opposed Manifest Destiny at every turn."[70]

Simpson again speaks to Alamán's passion for order: "Santa Anna, now sixty, was brought back from Venezuela and . . . . The dying Alamán, worshipping order to the last, consented, on his own terms, to head the government of the man he despised and needed."[71]

E. Bradford Burns attacked the whole elitist conception of history which dominated nineteenth century Latin American historians with very few exceptions. This concern appeared in his article, "Ideology in Nineteenth-Century Latin American Historiography." This viewpoint was expressed earlier in a comment about Alamán's European bias in Burns's book, *The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (1950): "One of the major historical controversies occurred in Mexico and pitted the Conservatives, brilliantly represented by Lucas Alamán, against the Liberals . . .represented by José María Luis Mora. Alamán asserted that Hernán Cortés founded the Mexican nation and that the long colonial period had benefited Mexico." Burns adds that: "in overlooking—indeed, denigrating—the Indian heritage he was well within the trends of nineteenth-century historiography."[72]

Victor Alba in *The Mexicans: The Making of a Nation* (1967), speaks of "historians and political thinkers of great stature—Alamán, Zavala, and Mora, to mention a few." He continues: "The second man of distinction was Lucas Alamán (1792-1853), a businessman, a conservative politician, and a historian of insight, who devoted his life to the encouragement of industry and to organizing credit banking—

two activities that were revolutionary in the Mexico of his day." Alba provides testimony as to the enlightened and progressive side of Alamán:

> On the whole his policies were progressive, although they were not couched in the liberal rhetoric. He favored the distribution of land to rural workers and founded a credit bank to give loans to the new owners and to people who wished to start new industries. Alamán believed that property is the guarantee of public morality; and he also established a savings bank for workers to enable them to acquire the wherewithal to become owners.

As a representative of Spanish Bourbon enlightenment policies, he thus had concern to help the people, but again as a Bourbon figure, "he distrusted revolution because the violence it entailed ultimately weakened all authority. He favored a revolution from above, however, a protective or tutelary revolution."[73]

In 1969 Samuel Flagg Bemis published his highly regarded work, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy.* It is perhaps a sign of the obscurity into which Alamán has fallen, at least in the United States, when Bemis refers to Alamán as "Luis Alemán," thus mistaking the first name and misspelling the second![74]

Eduardo Galeano has already been noted in a comment on Alamán's failure at industrialization. In the *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of Pillage of a Continent* (1973), Galeano mounts a passionate diatribe against exploitation of Latin America by the United States and powerful European nations. Though Galeano belongs to the left-liberal community he speaks favorably of Alamán as a stalwart for the autonomy of Mexican economic activity: "In a plea to the government in 1843 Mexican politician Lucas Alamán gave a somber warning and insisted on the need to defend national industry by banning or imposing heavy duties on foreign imports." He considered Alamán both prescient and progressive about the importance of

industrialization for national prosperity in the coming age, but his vision could not be implemented because Mexico could not yet provide the "critical mass" for a successful industrial revolution.[75]

T. R. Fehrenbach is notable for the profound insights that are woven throughout his historical writings. This is no less true for *Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico* (1973). He is sensible of one of Mexico's greatest problems: the dependence on simplistic myths and stereotypes which deter a correct understanding of the national past and present.

> In the dominant Mexican view, all who worked for racial or social equality and for economic reforms, whether failures, great men, or bandits, have become national heros [sic]. Those who stood for tradition, even if patriots and nation-builders, are tarred with villainy. A few such villains, like Lucas Alamán and Lorenzo de Zavala, are grudgingly respected, because they dealt with facts.[76]

Fehrenbach describes Alamán as the youthful witness of the Guanajuato massacre "who was to grow up to become the greatest conservative spokesman of independent Mexico. . ." He speaks highly of Alamán but considers that "his vision of rational conservatism mixed with material progress was blasted at the outset by three stubborn facts: the problems of Mexican society were too explosive for positive gradualism; the past was too unbearable to too many; and there was no expertise, energy, or leadership in Alamán's own class."[77]

Though Alamán had an excessively benevolent view of the Mexican colonial past, he was not seduced by the opposing picture which has become part of the Mexican national myth: "The Mexican historians, such as Alamán, Zavala, and Bulnes, who whatever their politics tried to show facts as facts no matter how much this

destroyed the Mexican self-image, were hated by many liberals precisely for this reason . . ."[78]

The history of Mexico most widely used as a textbook for university courses in the United States is *The Course of Mexican History* by Michael C. Meyer and William L. Sherman, which has gone through many editions. They have this to say of Alamán:

> Of all the great Mexican historians of the post-Independence years only one—Lucas Alamán . . .did not allow an anti-Spanish bias to vitiate his historical scholarship, but he was no less partisan than his ideological foes. . . . The Wars for Independence, according to Alamán, had to be viewed in two stages. The early stage, that of Father Hidalgo, he censured as insane attack on property and civilization itself. But the conservative conclusion of the Independence movement by Iturbide could be rationalized.[79]

In 1988 Jonathan Kandell published *La Capital: The Biography of Mexico City*. He notes that Alamán, in his *Historia de Méjico*, made the claim that the people of Spain were lazy and unenterprising, as also were the criollos, the Mexican born Spanish. He gives praise only to the Spanish who came directly from Spain to better their lives in Mexico, these *peninsulares* were referred to, contemptuously by the Mexicans, as *gachupines* ("wearers of spurs" according to one source). It was this body of Spanish nationals who were mostly forced to leave Mexico in the years after independence, a very serious loss of human and financial capital.[80]

Ramón Eduardo Ruiz in his *Triumphs and Tragedy: A History of the Mexican People* (1992), noted that the conservative Alamán and the liberal Mora both lamented the death of Morelos. Alamán saw Morelos as a superb planner, a noble character, and on the whole, a constructive force, even though the enemy. Alamán was often capable of great objectivity. During the Victoria administration, Alamán advised getting loans

from the Europeans, especially the English, as this would draw those countries into an interest in Mexico and thus serve as a bulwark against aggressive moves from the United States. In this we see another instance of his dedicated Mexican nationalism.[81]

Ruiz says that: "Alamán was a man of ideas, more and more conservative ones. . . . . In the mold of Burke, he saw property as the basis of society; without security for its owners, no society could exist. . . . Yet he accepted the Enlightenment myth of progress, thinking it was possible to improve mankind through education."[82]

Ruiz notes that "Even conservatives such as Lucas Alamán urged Congress to grant campesinos the right to reclaim lands taken from them by hacendados." Though he comments that nothing came of it.[83]

He reflects on the aftermath of the Mexican-American War: "The loss of half of Mexico had unveiled the magnitude of criollo incompetence. Unless Mexicans shook themselves free of the political turpitude, their country would disappear from the face of the earth, devoured by the giant next door." A result of this danger would be the rise of a new generation of more determined political leaders who would embody the triumph of liberalism while gradually taking up some of Alamán's ideas.[84]

Jorge G. Castañeda in *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War* (1993) provides an interesting quote from Mexico's present-day dominant man of letters, Carlos Fuentes:

> I think since Lucas Alamán . . .we have had a series of distinguished thinkers of the right in Latin America . . . .They are the ones that have had real influence in Latin America. . . .There has been a current of thought of the right that has informed and influenced life in Latin America much more than the left. The left-wing intellectual has always been an exception.[85]

Castañeda was a young leftist, who on maturing, took part in the conservative Vicente Fox administration for a time. Fuentes, a brilliant and complex thinker, has also been largely leftist in his own views. His comment is rather surprising and may overstate the historic role of rightist thinkers. (A footnote in Castañeda's book gives examples of eminent Latin American rightists for those interested.)

In *Mexico, Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996* (1997), Enrique Krauze attests to the great importance of the thought of Edmund Burke for Alamán. Krauze is surely wrong when he calls the *Reflections on the Revolution in France* Alamán's "first intellectual inspiration," but the importance of Burke for Alamán is not exaggerated.[86]

This concludes a rapid journey through the observations of nineteen Mexicans and Americans on Alamán and related topics which are to be found as brief elements in works of broad, general scope. What remains is to explore works that deal with the subject at greater length.

CHAPTER FOUR. ALAMÁN IN DETAIL

Fay Robinson published *Mexico and Her Chieftains* in 1847 during Alamán's final years. Her account is especially valuable as it is obviously the work of one who had access to contemporaries of Alamán and the various viewpoints and rumors then current concerning him. In the light of other researches, her account seems not entirely reliable, but it is an important primary source, and much of it strikes an authentic note.

She notes the harshness of Alamán's treatment of those he deemed guilty of treason, including at least possible responsibility for the assassinations or executions of a *corregidor* (a magistrate and chief administrative officer in a provincial jurisdiction) named Quesada, a senator from Jalapa, the brother of Governor Codallos of the State of Mexico, the brother of former President Guadalupe Victoria, and, most notoriously, former President Vicente Guerrero. Some of these allegations are mere shadows in the pages of history, and at least some of them are highly dubious. Alamán was definitely involved in the events surrounding the end of Guerrero, but, as previously noted, according to General Tornel's account, Alamán was one of two in the cabinet who had voted for exile, not execution.

But Robinson may have accurately caught the public temper of those years as to Alamán. And that opinion was not all negative. She continues: "The Mexican people had. . . already conceived a presentiment that ere long a firm hand would hold in check the evil passions which then under the impetus of the absence of government, incident to the revolution, had devastated their country." She described Alamán as "possessed, in fact, of great determination, of a moral energy capable of anything, and of ceaseless

perseverance." While Alamán was the power behind the Bustamante presidency, he managed to restore law and order and to get the national budget in the black for the first and only time decades before and after.[87]

Robinson notes that "Alaman was a member of the general cortes of the Spanish empire in 1820; and has never been in favor of the restoration of the Spanish system. He has, however, always been opposed to democratic tendencies; and has been one of the bitterest enemies of the United States in Mexico."[88]

This last is further testimony to his fierce Mexican nationalism. It is not altogether clear which "Spanish system" Robinson refers to. The problem concerns something at the heart of any analysis of Alamán. Was he a republican or a monarchist? Did he want to restore the Spanish system in Mexico or not? Part of the problem is that Alamán clearly revered the Spanish administration of the last Bourbon kings before the French Revolution, but he gladly participated in the interregnum Spanish Cortes in order to gain greater autonomy for New Spain, a sort of "dominion" status. Yet he found the Cortes dangerously liberal. Part of his willingness to support independence was to keep Mexico conservative and Hispanic. This is further complicated by the fact that the liberal Spanish parliamentarians and the reactionary Spanish king, Ferdinand VII, kept bobbing up and down alternately. The truth most likely is that Alamán wanted to build on the best of the Spanish heritage, but within an autonomous Mexican context. Once again we see the signs of progressive cultural conservatism and Mexican patriotism as suggested in the thesis of this paper.

The next historical work to be considered is also by an American. Hubert Howe Bancroft was a somewhat expansive, but capable American historian, who was a sort

of one man historical industry, composing a great number of volumes on American and Mexican history, and running his own publishing company. His five volume history of Mexico came out in the years 1883-1888. In volume four he offers a fine print footnote which runs for parts of four pages. It begins with these words: "The most important work on the war of independence is that of Lucas Alaman [sic], entitled *Historia de Méjico desde los primeros movimientos que prepararon su Independencia en el año 1808 hasta la época presente.*"[89]

> Alaman had watched the progress of the revolution, had personally known Hidalgo and other later leaders, and was therefore able to judge of the value of the histories presented. The blind hero-worship of the Mexican accounts, and the bitter tirades of the Spanish versions, had equally disgusted him. . . . His main authority for the period from 1814 to 1820, when he was travelling in Europe, is Dr. Arechederreta's minute diary of events with comments. He moreover claims to have made the general archives his chief source, and to have kept before him all extant books, newspapers, and manuscripts obtainable. The very careful and not scanty notes bear him out herein, and his exactness and conscientiousness are shown by the notes in the appendices, wherein he is constantly correcting statements not in accord with later researches or with reliable information from friends, critics, and even opponents. Alaman's long public career, after 1821, when he figured as deputy to the córtes [sic], has afforded him ample opportunity to gather material and knowledge for his work and has developed the ability so evident in its pages.[90]

In volume five, dealing with the actual sequence of events during the first decades of independent Mexico, Bancroft further observes: "Of an aristocratic family, reared amidst the exclusiveness of the colonial régime, he had imbibed ideas wholly antagonistic to the great majority, by which and for which the independence had been achieved. And travel only tended to confirm the ancestral predilection for the old-world glories of Spain."[91]

In 1900, the Mexican statesman and man of letters, Justo Sierra, previously noted, was beginning to put forth his political history of the Mexican people from pre-

Columbian times to his own day, the twilight years of the Díaz dictatorship. Sierra was one of the liberals who was at heart a constitutionalist and a democrat, who yet persuaded himself that Mexico first needed a period of peace, order, and progress—the slogan of the Díaz administration. The liberals had finally triumphed over the conservatives who had shot their bolt in trying to install a European prince to rule Mexico. At last the liberals could afford to speak of the vanished conservatives more dispassionately, especially since they were, in fact, appropriating some of their principles, especially those of Lucas Alamán: a strong, centralized, authoritarian government, peace, law and order, and the aggressive stimulation of agriculture, industry, education, and the arts and sciences.

Sierra's book went through several permutations, concluding with an edition edited and introduced in 1948 by the distinguished Mexican historian Edmundo O'Gorman. This was translated into English by Charles Ramsdell and published by the University of Texas in 1969 as *The Political Evolution of the Mexican People.* Sierra has a great deal to say about Alamán throughout many pages of his work. Alamán had been the great enemy of the liberals, and Sierra does not hesitate to criticize his vision. Nevertheless, Sierra's words are not lacking in objectivity, wisdom, even appreciation:

> Alamán, who had been outstanding among the advocates of independence at the Cortes of Madrid, had acquired, on returning to his country, the conviction that the colonial regime was still the one to be preferred. And while he had no illusions that the regime could ever be brought back, he dedicated his brilliant mind and vast store of knowledge to a proposition that may be formulated thus: What Mexico needs is to revert to the Spanish system, although not as a dependency of Spain, and to depart from it only when absolutely necessary, and even then with caution.[92]

We have already seen that Sierra had correctly put his finger on Alamán's misapprehension about the suitability of Mexican industrialization. But, returning to

the theme of Alamán's patriotism, he says: "Alamán, in keeping with his life-long principles, authored decrees prohibiting colonization by Americans along the northern frontiers (a most imprudent act of hostility, which our neighbors could not forgive)."[93]

Sierra's criticism of Alamán's policy with regard to the northern frontier is puzzling. Why should a Mexican statesman's attempt to safeguard its borderland be improper? Alamán's point was that, without strong measures, the northern regions of Mexico would inevitably be lost to the United States. He was absolutely correct in this fear. Whether the measures he advocated would have prevented the American takeover cannot be known, since no one but Alamán (and General Mier) had the will to try to implement them. Without such efforts, Alamán knew the game was lost and he was proved right. Since the United States was bound to usurp those lands anyway, what was lost by taking a strong position in the Mexican government? It seems incredible that Sierra should speak of the United States not being able to "forgive" a Mexican statesman for defending Mexican sovereignty. It almost makes Sierra appear a lackey for the colossus to the North.

Though Sierra has further comments to come concerning Alamán, his valedictory really comes later on pages 251 and 252 in a well articulated statement which brings the judgment of history upon Alamán not altogether unfairly:

> A man of great intelligence, but whose political ideas were based on a fundamental error, of which they were the logical consequences. . . . The fundamental error of Alamán and of the party that he organized during the moderate administrations consisted in a belief in the goodness of the colonial regime, which had given the country peace, order, and prosperity. . . . he failed to understand that the purely mechanical peace and order of Spanish times ineluctably brought on the agitation and anarchy of Mexican times, precisely because the kind of education that we had received from the Spaniards was worthless as a preparation for a responsible life. To him, the changes in the times, the impossibility of restoring the mental and physical isolation which

was the essential condition for the success of the colonial regime meant nothing.[94]

Sierra wisely raises the factor of the relative isolation of colonial times in Mexico, which allowed even a rather weak Spanish state to maintain a reasonably tranquil American empire, both geopolitically and ideologically. On the other hand, Alamán was hardly unaware of the danger of pressure from foreign powers, the United States in particular. Whatever polity, economy, and society the Mexicans would have pursued, the danger would have been the same, and he was active in trying to face it. Mexico's failure to defend itself from North American pressure was due more to the breakdown of unity than to the failings of any particular ideology. Still, Sierra may be right in asserting that the Spanish inheritance was too antiquated and remote from the needs of the new day to be a viable alternative.

José Vasconcelos, lawyer, philosopher, educator, man of letters, and statesman, one of the most distinguished Mexican figures of the first third of the twentieth century, strongly opposed the positivism of Sierra and his colleagues, as well as the Díaz dictatorship which supported it. He backed the Madero revolution, and was one of the most prominent figures in the post-revolutionary government of the early 1920s. As time passed, he became more conservative, appreciated the Catholic faith and the Hispanic heritage. One who greatly impressed Vasconcelos was Lucas Alamán. He compared Alamán with the Americans Alexander Hamilton, John Quincy Adams, and Henry Clay, and noted that the Mexican future would have been so much brighter had Alamán been able to have a connected eight-year presidency of the nation.[95]

Awakened to the importance of Alamán by Vasconcelos, the journalist José E. Valadés wrote the first and, so far, only major biography of Alamán in 1938. Valadés

has been seen as a bit of a hagiographer, and not having shown great critical skill in the use of his materials, but credited with compiling many of those materials and bringing them to public attention through *Lucas Alamán: Estadista e Historiador.* Gradually, since that publication, a small stream of works have appeared on Alamán. American theses and dissertations appeared: two in the 1950s, four in the 1960s, four in the 1970s, one in 1992, and one in 2003.

With the next work of note we return to a book not dedicated to Alamán, but which has an important long section on him. This is the two volume *Juarez and His Mexico* (1947) by Ralph Roeder, another journalist, but his work is praised by Robert A. Potash in his authoritative "Historiography of Mexico since 1821" (1960). In a lengthy section in pages 86 -113, Roeder analyzes the character and vision of Alamán and includes an equally thorough discussion of Alamán's great historian opposite, liberal José María Luis Mora.

Roeder discusses Alamán in terms of undisguised contempt. He says that Alamán's political "debut was distinguished by the fact that it was followed by no career." That is serious hyperbole, and even to the extent that it is true, it is true about every other Mexican politician and statesman of the era. Roeder describes Alamán as resigned to pouting over his disappointments, and retreating in a kind of sulk to write his *Historia.* As against Father Hidalgo, "He preferred to date Independence from Iturbide, but when he scanned the years that followed it, his heart failed him. The grim and unrelenting progress of anarchy and impoverishment which they revealed was too much to stomach; and before attempting an account of those years he gave up and cursed the day on which his country was born."[96]

Perhaps the single most important modern work on Alamán saw the light in 1952. It was Moisés González Navarro's *El pensamiento político de Lucas Alamán.* A small part of this work has been translated for the present study, but greater attention has been given to his contribution to the 1993 symposium on Alamán in Guanajuato, which will be discussed in due course. In the introduction to *El pensamiento*, González Navarro observes that there is only "the most nebulous memory" of Alamán as imparted in the schools, and, further, that the truth about him is deformed by those who would regard him as the "object of dogmatic admiration" or the opposite. González Navarro warns against a simplistic reliance on "the filing systems of the routine political jargon."[97]

González Navarro emphasizes that one cannot understand Alamán without careful attention to his epoch. "His significance is tied to the elucidation and full understanding of the turbulent period in which he lived." What this means, more specifically, is that: "The characteristic of Alamán is to have lived with one foot in a historic stage which was declining and the other in one that was being born, without finishing understanding the one or the other." He was shaped "to live conformed intellectually and socially by the Colony and to work in the period of the destruction of his legacy." This conforms to the thesis of this paper that Alamán was largely the product of his late Spanish Bourbon enlightenment upbringing. González Navarro is saying that it is the discontinuity between his formative years and the new age in which he had to live and work which gave rise to the apparent ambiguity, even enigma, of his life.[98]

González Navarro concludes his essay by stressing another element of the present thesis, patriotism: "Through the sincerity of his patriotism, through the undeniable trials that tested him, through many valuable services that he lent to the country, the discussed historian and statesman merits an honored place in the history of Mexico."[99]

The prologue to Luis Villoro's *La Revolución de Independencia* comes in a work published in 1953, though the copy available for this paper is the reworked second edition of 1967 with the augmented title, *El proceso ideológico de la Revolución de Independencia.* Villoro organizes much of this work around such concepts as the past, the future, and utopianism. In "Chapter Eight: The Ill-Timed Revolution, part four, the Preterist Solution," he begins: "The historical conception of Alamán is not found exposited in a systematic way in his work; it is possible, nevertheless, to infer it if we question ourselves as to the type of historical attitude which makes it possible."[100]

He characterizes the Alamán approach as the *dynamic preterite.* Perhaps he means a "past on the move." Alamán sees Mexico as obviously the product of its past, the three century long Spanish past, and he regards the effort of so many criollo intellectuals, the liberals, as a sustained tirade against their own heritage. He is not opposed to change, but it should not be the result of an imposed ideology: "if the gardener tries to make a plant grow by force, he would only succeed in destroying it." The preterite attitude "locates the motor of historical development in social spontaneity," that is, allowing the society to forge its own realities and relationships as it goes along. It does not seem that Alamán used the term, "the invisible hand," dear to

Adam Smith and the British liberals, but he surely would have accepted it with alacrity, if Villoro is right. He says, "Alamán will have the tendency to reduce rational planning to the limits of a purely administrative function" in which "theoretical planning is reduced to the minimum possible."[101]

All this would appear to make Alamán a classical liberal in the British and American sense as opposed to the ideological Jacobinism of the French Revolution. It all sounds so Jeffersonian! Of course, the American case is singular: it was a continuation of long evolved British ways, with just a few significant ideological innovations, rhetoric to the contrary. After all, Britain itself had gradually been emasculating the relics of its feudal past, so the United States had not had so far to go in promulgating the new Jeffersonian age.

Mexico, on the contrary, had been firmly in the grip of a pervasive and, at best, paternalistic crown government, an equally pervasive comprehensive, corporative, and eternal church—as an entirely non-modern state within the state—and a vast congeries of separate Indian communes. Apparently it was this almost mediaeval structure that Alamán wished to meld with the liberal invisible hand of spontaneous social and economic development. This would be a strange sort of hermaphrodite, but not an irrational one: its combination of seemingly polar inspirations would be a conceivable social alternative. Alamán was greatly influenced by the argument for organic society articulated by Edmund Burke. The real difference between Alamán and Burke would be not as to the historical dynamic, but that Britain was already well on the way to a modern society as noted above. In any event, this kind of understanding of Alamán might go at least part way toward resolving the question of how to define him.

Villoro offers a sort of comparative study of the polarities of the Mexican post-independent society—on the one hand, on the other hand: "Alamán sees only one of the extremes of the dilemma, moreover he does not come to the point of understanding the other; the existence of oppressed classes that impede progress and maintain the subjection, a worse form of violence, and which alone ruptures the spontaneous evolution of society through the political break which can make it disappear."[102]

In other words, Villoro thinks Alamán saw what was wrong with the rationalistic liberals, but failed to see what was wrong with his side. That may be true, but surely the "oppressed classes" were not any better served by the aristocratic liberals. The best that could be said for them is that their program for the break-up of the old order might set in motion forces that would eventually lead to a society of greater equality. Villoro seems to believe that Mexico needed the insights of both sides of the debate, but that the chief liberal philosopher, Mora, was the better guide to the future

As a footnote to Villoro, Stanley Pollin makes the excellent point that Alamán was hardly waiting for organic evolution. Many of his projects involved the kind of strong direction from government that has really characterized most Mexican national governments to the present. (See also the coming comment from Charles Hale on this.) Villoro, who saw the conservatives as opposing governmentally imposed change seems to have missed this and may have gotten caught up in the rich apparatus of his theory.[103]

Another aspect of the quest for determining in what sense, if any, Alamán could be called a liberal is seen in the issue of free trade versus protection. How did

Alamán's enthusiastic efforts to support economic progress and especially industrialization fit into the liberal-conservative debate? Nineteenth century liberalism, worshipping at the shrine of Adam Smith and David Ricardo, stipulated free trade. The advantage of free trade for developing nations was that they could import the cheapest manufactured products available, and, in return, freely market their produce and other natural resources.

For the developing country such a program would please the consumer of manufactured goods, the merchants who sold them, and the farmers and miners—though the latter two were sometimes victimized by low world market prices for their production, over which they had little or no control. The only people who really wanted protective tariffs were the owners of factories, those who wanted to become owners of factories, and industrial workers.

The problem was that there were very few of these as compared with the other groups. Also, Mexico, as previously noted, and like most of the developing Latin American countries did not at that time have a significant domestic market for manufactured goods, only a tiny upper class and a very small middle class.

Thus, Alamán would seem not to fit the typical liberal picture. On the other hand, he possibly envisaged a future Mexico become fully competitive which could then trade freely in both the domestic and the international markets under a good liberal banner. The two leading proponents of industrialization in the Mexico of that period were Alamán and Esteban Antuñano. In 1961 an article on these men appeared in *Historia Mexicana* by Charles A. Hale. The English original is titled "Alamán,

Antuñano, and the Continuity of Mexican Liberalism." The concluding two paragraphs may shed some light on the rather fugitive definitions of Lucas Alamán:

> Our findings would seem to cast some doubt upon the idea of a continuity in Mexican liberalism from the nineteenth to the twentieth century, at least in the area of economic ideas. For either the notion of promoting economic independence through government encouragement of industry is not really "liberal" at all, or else Lucas Alamán was really somewhat of a "liberal"—at least in this one respect.

Hale points out that state direction of the economy was characteristic of the colonial period, and was characteristic of at least the later nineteenth-century liberals as well as such conservatives as Alamán, and that this same state involvement has been the rule in every Mexican administration from Díaz to Hale's time. (This continues to be true to a degree, though recent Mexican administrations, beginning with Salinas, have made substantial moves toward a free market economy.)[104]

Luis Martin gives a close critical look at the *Historia de Méjico in* "Lucas Alamán Pioneer of Mexican Historiography: An Interpretive Essay." He says: "Although the work is now more than a century old, it is still read, studied and discussed, and it continues to exercise a profound influence on Mexican historiography to this day." Martin gives Alamán very high marks for the intrinsic power of the volumes: "In writing his work, Lucas Alamán complies faithfully, to all the rules of historical writings." Also:

> The documentation used by Alamán is massive and complete. He has used official documents, *Informes*, *Residencias*, *Ordenanzas*, private letters, eye-witness accounts and diaries, acts of *cabildos* and *ayuntamientos*, pamphlets and newspapers of the period, political speeches, account books of miners and merchants.[105]

Martin notes that Alamán also utilized even the works of his opponents, including Carlos Bustamante's *Cuadro histórico de la revolución de la América*

mexicana. Martin says: "Bustamante wrote five volumes of a dull, almost unreadable compilation of facts and documents. Alamán puts flesh and blood to those bones, and, in the process. . . reaches conclusions that are the intellectual antipodes of Bustamante's "[106]

He goes on to elaborate on the incredible, accurate detail about such things as local topography and types of weaponry used in battle, all the while telling the story with the color and excitement, the narrative skill of a page turner. "Alamán is aware that he stands alone among the Mexican historians of his time, and this makes his arguments bolder and more violent. He marshals together history and religion, philosophy and international law to destroy beyond repair his adversaries' positions."[107]

Alamán was in strong agreement with Simón Bolívar, as Martin expresses it that: "Independence was the work of the creoles, whose rights were founded in the conquest, and in the conquest alone. Independent Mexico is the cultural and juridical heir of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, or it is nothing at all. Those who place the roots of the new republic in the theocratic Tenochtitlán do not know the ABC's of history." Martin also considers that Alamán's "masterful analysis" of economic factors, which, coming before the era of Karl Marx, was greatly ahead of its time. Martin finds Alamán's first-hand description of political institutions unique, as are his constant attention to social structures, races, classes, the church, and the international repercussions.[108]

Turning to the literary aspect of the work, he says that Alamán captures the reader's interest by "casting his figures with profiles that are sharply divergent" which

"injects into the chronological framework a dynamic tension, which readily holds the attention of the reader. . . .Alamán's style makes the Historia sparkle like a jewel." He adds, "Only the person who has ploughed through the heavy, pompous Spanish prose of the early 19th century, can properly justly appreciate the magic miracle of Alamán's style." And: "In his long descriptive sections, Alamán is a superb master of the Spanish language. . . . Persons become alive in his prose, and the land emerges from his pages as in a relief map."[109]

The final section of this essay is a critique of the overall historical weight of the *Historia.* Here the judgment is somewhat mixed. Martin points out that Alamán is not just writing a history, but setting forth a philosophy of history. He makes constant references to divine providence, while not overshadowing human responsibility. He observes that, in an important sense, Alamán is the subject of his own history, just as Velázquez, in *Las Meninas* was the painter, and part of the "painted."[110]

Martin thinks Alamán is wrong in finding the true foundation of Mexican independence in the Plan of Iguala led by Iturbide, and not in the revolt of Hidalgo. Martin says that the forces which shaped Mexico, "can be better symbolized by Hidalgo and Morelos than by Iturbide." But the other extreme is wrong too, so Alamán has at least told part of the story, and told it more memorably than anyone else, "a permanent landmark in Mexican historiography."[111]

In 1989 Arturo Arnáiz y Freg issued selections of Alamán writings under the title, *Semblanzas e ideario*, to which he prefaced a thoughtful and lengthy "Prólogo," which really constitutes a major essay on Alamán. Arnáiz y Freg says that Alamán was, "in his most sincere moments in a posture of evasion . . . .Alamán lived in exile

and dissimulation . . . .he suffered in a hostile atmosphere ," but that "even his adversaries viewed him with respect."[112]

Arnáiz y Freg notes Alamán's strong anglophilia, but this did not include passion for parliamentarianism or freedom of thought and expression. He calls Alamán a defender of economic liberalism, surely a misleading comment as that was a position from which Alamán early retreated.[113]

After his first, youthful experience of high office during the earliest years of independence under the brief empire of Iturbide and the first republican presidency of Guadalupe Victoria, he experienced numerous defeats and disappointments. He "came to consider active politics as enemy territory. Separated from public life, he judged it unworthy of his destiny . . . . He turned to react . . .as a spoiled child, to whom all change of situation brings fear. He converted himself, now without dissembling, into a devotee of immovability." In these words, Arnáiz y Freg echoes the pouting child analysis of Roeder, so at least two perceptive observers have advanced this view.[114]

Speaking of Alamán's historical writing, Arnáiz y Freg says: "It is true that, as a clear and at times brilliant expositor, he achieved entire chapters in which he remains serenely reflective and controls his passion; but in spite of his talent, he does not succeed in leaving out of his books an energetic polemic accent . . . .He worked profoundly in the libraries and the archives, but as always he brings preconceived ideas, only encountering that which he sought."[115]

Arnáiz y Freg respects Alamán, yet dissects him with a kind of clinical coldness tinged with a hint of malice. Perhaps his most serious complaint is that Alamán spoke respectfully of his opponents as long as they lived, but once dead, described them more

harshly. This, if true, is understandable, but petty. Yet he concludes his essay with gracious words: "He was not successful in going beyond what he held; but he achieved his salvation because his virtues as a patriot greatly exceeded his defects. He suffered deeply for causes beyond his will, and became accustomed to viewing life with the eyes of a fatalist. He didn't understand Mexico, but he knew how to love it."[116]

This brings us to one of the most significant contributions to Alamán studies in recent years, the *Ciclo de Conferencias* symposium on him which was convened on the occasion of the second centenary of Alamán's birth in 1792 by the University of Guanajuato in his birthplace. This brought together several leading scholars with some expertise in the Alamán era of Mexican history, including the man who may be regarded as the dean of modern Alamán studies dating from the publication in 1952 of *El pensamiento político de Lucas Alamán,* Moisés González Navarro. These symposium contributions were published in 1993.

The first presentation at the symposium was by Alicia Pérez Luque. Much of what she had to say has been incorporated in the biographical second chapter of this paper. She began the conclusion of her remarks with thoughts which echo the cautions of González Navarro in *El pensamiento*: "In order to understand Alamán with his mistakes and successes it is necessary to situate him in his time and in his setting."[117]

The second address at the symposium was by González Navarro: "Tradición y modernidad en Lucas Alamán." The title reveals in advance that the author will argue for a complex composition of the thought of Alamán. He notes that José Vasconcelos resurrected interest in the passion of Don Lucas for a state which believed in the race, the language, and the religious community. For all that he was a statesman "who was

not able to be classified as a man of the past . . . .the most progressive man in Mexico . . . . most obsessed by the proposition that Mexico might accelerate its march, industrialize itself, modernize its methods of agricultural and mineral exploitation, adopt the latest inventions of machinery and science, intensify popular education and raise the flag of culture."[118]

He was concerned to provide good jobs with the development of industry, and to help working people to have a more decent life, and "loan bureaus for the workers to form small capitals to lay foundations for the republican system . . ." He was intent on the reformation of education, and, though a devout Catholic, was impatient with the universities of the time of Fernando VI, in them "a thousand subtleties and useless abstractions were taught, confusing them with the fundamentals of dogma and law." "He accepted the value of the experimental sciences . . . It appeared to him that the teaching of these disciplines was of much greater importance than the repetition of the subtleties of decadent scholasticism."[119]

He was widely read in Enlightenment philosophy and accepted some of it, though seeing in it a tendency toward an atomized humanity organized strictly around the possession or absence of money. He was influenced by the progressive Spanish Enlightenment Bourbon thinkers Fray Benito Jerónimo Feijóo and Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos.[120]

Though Alamán was definitely a defender of his class, which he saw as the only group fit to lead the nation, he did not utterly ignore the great mass of the Indians. Among his educational suggestions was provision that "in the universities Americans would learn indigenous languages . . ." He also struggled to retain something of the

protection the Indians had had under the Spanish crown. González Navarro reminds us that Alamán's rejection of democracy was shared with the liberals, though he put forth some suggestions that virtue and wisdom could be considered along with enlightenment and property. Alamán has often been denominated an absolute monarchist, but he seems to have been pragmatic on that point. His comment in 1846 that he did not "believe absolutely either in a monarchy or in a republic, only in independence and liberty," has often been taken to be disingenuous concealment of a whole-hearted monarchism. Perhaps, but perhaps he meant it. He certainly worked under whatever system would let him serve.[121]

It is difficult to summarize or encapsulate González Navarro's presentation. He touches on many of the biographical points, but ties these to various brief but penetrating discussions of the great range of issues that surround the life and work of Alamán. He concludes by observing that Alamán's political tradition was largely eclipsed and lost, but that his economic and social insights "configured some of the elements of modern capitalism," that "economically modernity represented by Don Lucas and Mora resulted victorious." And one might well add that, even politically, much of the Alamán vision was vindicated under a different label in later nineteenth century liberalism. He concludes with Alamán the patriot: "Through the sincerity of his patriotism, through the undeniable trials that tested him, through many valuable services that he lent to the country, the discussed historian and statesman merits an honored place in the history of Mexico.[122]

After the González Navarro contribution to the symposium comes "A la memoria de Lucas Alamán," by Lourdes Quintanilla. She is another important Alamán

scholar. Her major work on him is *El nacionalismo de Lucas Alamán* (1991), The topic is relevant to the thesis of this paper, but we will limit the present exposition to her concise offering at the symposium.

This address takes on the rhetoric of sheer poetry. Her survey of the highlights of the life and work of Alamán has an elegiac tone. She begins:

> To the 19th century correspond the words of the 19th century and those of the end of the 20th century its new voice they await. The notables of the first years of independent Mexico lived in difficult times. United in the fight that divided them, the liberals and conservatives rest in peace. The judgments about them are excessive. In nothing do people favor a close, impartial, and serene reading of their texts. The Manichaean division is ruined, hardly sketched. Unfortunately, the world is more complex. Together they weave the tapestry of history. At a distance their shades are confused.[123]

At a later point she articulates the reason for the lingering disfavor of Alamán in the general or popular Mexican mind:

> Every cult of heroes involuntarily mythicizes. Any historical figure whatever carries with him the germ of the myth. In their giants, the people recognizes itself. In them they encounter their archetypes, their spiritual progenitors. Bustamante's version established itself once and for all as the inviolable foundation of modern Mexico, to be accepted as sacrosanct. Alamán didn't accept the myth. He is not forgiven.[124]

The Bustamante referred is, of course, not General Anastasio Bustamante, under whose presidency Alamán had perhaps his freest hand to govern, but Carlos María de Bustamante, whose tomes were characterized by Zavala as almost unreadable but which nevertheless constituted the lode from which most of the historic ore of the War of Independence was mined for the received history of modern Mexico. For all its glaring faults, it is Bustamante's *Cuadro* that captured the Mexican imagination, not Alamán's *Historia.* The balance of her address is a brief review of major themes of the latter. She then concludes:

> We live distinct imaginary times and its pulse is other. We go toward the end of the millennium between uncertainty and chance. Political reflection in a completely different world obliges to imagine other forms. The adventure continues in a planetary culture where societies are being invented and reinvented every day. The past has already passed. For Lucas Alamán: a mute prayer to his memory.[125]

Ernesto Lemoine Villicaña presents "Lucas Alamán: Enjuiciador de la Revolución de Independencia." The title elicits Alamán as "examiner." Lemoine Villicaña follows many of his colleagues with a certain amount of biographical summary, after which he concentrates on the essence of Alamán's task as seen through the historical writings. "Toward his forties Alamán had arrived at a conclusion: the evils of the country arose from the dysfunctional excesses of the liberal sector . . . and of the ideological base which supported it: the revolutionary movement of Father Hidalgo." It is then said that he decided to attack the problem by creating the conservative party and by publishing his histories.[126]

The historical works were, primarily, the *Disertaciones* and the *Historia.* The former was a series of vignettes of the colonial regime from the Conquest through the last Bourbon monarchs, with the theme that colonial New Spain lived by an essentially sound and beneficial system, needing only minor tweaking and tinkering. The overthrow of the system through revolution is portrayed as an utter disaster.[127]

Lemoine Villicaña agrees with others that Bustamante's *Cuadro* is a dreadful mess, and yet, a treasure store of vast content concerning the persons and events of the Independence. As for Alamán's bitter attacks on Hidalgo and the seemingly endless violence and disorder of that period, Lemoine Villicaña cites the response of the important liberal leader, Melchor Ocampo, who chides Alamán for becoming so fixated on the admitted excesses and atrocities of the War of Independence that he

loses his perspective and rejects the end achievement because of the shabby means by which it was consummated. Lemoine Villicaña ends very briefly with a hint that the best approach may be to read both Bustamante and Alamán, each of them providing a part of the truth.[128]

Patricia Galeana speaks of "Lucas Alamán: Iberoamericanista." She notes that Alamán "can receive the title of statesman, because his work transcended the object solely of retaining power, and he was preoccupied with creating institutions that would give stability to the Mexican state." She thus touches on two principal themes of the thesis: order and patriotism. She addresses one aspect of the difficulty of defining Alamán: "The young Alamán was moderately liberal, turning each time more conservative through the running of the years." She takes note of the apparent contradiction in both conservatives and liberals declaring against public institutions interfering in the normal, unregulated flow of events. The conservatives wanted the government to butt out—but only to the extent of leaving the built up Spanish institutional system in place. And yet Alamán favored significant government stimulus and assistance to nascent industry. As for the liberals, they were all for the untrammeled "invisible hand" and the sanctity of private property, but only after they would have been politically activist enough to dismantle the very institutions which the conservatives wanted left in place, especially the vast property of the church. This discussion agrees with the point made earlier in this paper by Stanley Pollin and Charles A. Hale that Alamán, as well as the liberals, was not simply an organic, evolutionary conservative, but a determined and progressive state interventionist whenever he deemed it desirable.[129]

Galeana reviews many of Alamán's strong positions vis-à-vis foreign affairs. He was foresighted in his fears of American expansionism and tried to develop a policy to make Texas viable as a continuing part of Mexico. After that proved impossible to achieve and Texas broke away, he advised quick recognition of Texan independence so that Mexico would not be drawn into further troubles from that open sore. Again his advice was neglected with the expected results. He strove to avoid war with the United States. Alamán, always the realist, knew the odds. When the war with the United States nevertheless came, he firmly prophesied that the tiny United States Army would prevail against all that Mexico could throw against it. Right again. While others ranted and posed and ended losing even more, Alamán sought to preserve the most possible for Mexico by cutting her losses.[130]

Alamán was also a farsighted statesmen in relations to the south. He helped his government permit the peaceful secession of the Central American provinces from Mexico, and gave great attention to the promotion of Latin American unity through promotion of the ideals of Simón Bolívar and through an offensive and defensive treaty with Gran Colombia. He carried on knowledgeable negotiations with the Vatican over the complex and difficult problems involved with the latter's relationship with the new republic. Though a devout Catholic, "it is clear that he opposed clericalism, understanding this as the utilization of the sacerdotal quality for activities remote from those of religion." Some may quibble over this description of his attitude to the church, but, however it is construed, at least we are made aware that the line between the liberals and the conservatives over the church may not have been quite as black and white as is often supposed.[131]

Galeana's view of Alamán is, on the whole, positive. She highlights his strengths and accomplishments. Her address to the symposium closes with this further accolade to the man's profound patriotism: "Lucas Alamán was not only a man of state with a great vision, a historian and a man of enterprise, but a defender of the matters that in his moment he tried to handle concerning the rights and the integrity of Mexico."[132]

This brings us to the final presentation at the symposium, "Mora y Alamán: Su Vision del mundo histórico," by Luis Rionda Arreguín. This is, as the title suggests, a comparative discussion of the writings of Alamán and Mora. Recall that of the three great historical authors of the first years of independence, Lucas Alamán, José María Luis Mora, Carlos María de Bustamante, and Lorenzo de Zavala, all were liberals except Alamán. Alamán and Zavala were the most clear-eyed and realistic, Bustamante was the worst scholar and writer, but the most influential over time in the national memory. Alamán and Mora call for comparison because of the essential elegance and dignity of each. They were the respective princes of conservatism and liberalism, the philosophers for each camp.

Important nineteenth century critics Don Antonio Peña y Peña, Don Joaquín García Icazbalzeta, and Don Julio Zárate all tag Alamán with being highly partisan in his *Historia.* So does José Vasconcelos, but he supports Alamán in that regard:

> In the final chapters of the fifth volume of Alamán's *Historia* we encounter the signs of all the evils of our situation and previews of disasters; without doubt it is for this that no one cites these pages but, to the contrary, poisons the soul of the youth with the lies, the mediocre judgments of so many others that pass for guides to the national thought."[133]

Alamán stubbornly claims to be completely impartial as historian. He does approach impartiality in his descriptive passages, stating facts accurately, not fearing to praise his enemies on occasion, nor to berate his allies. But, in his task as interpreter of the overall meaning, his bias is apparent. How could it really be otherwise? Alamán the dedicated protagonist of the Spanish tradition is a leading character in his own *Historia*, as Luis Martin earlier noted in his perceptive comparison of Alamán to Velazquez, the painter, but also the "painted." Mora was more modest, but then he was a theoretician only, while Alamán was both theoretician and practicing statesman. His history was not only an account of the actions of others, but a vindication of his own deep involvement in the unfolding of his nation's destiny. Alamán and Mora were actually agreed on many points. Both were criollo aristocrats. Both opposed democracy. Both favored importing Catholics into Texas to avert its alienation to the United States. Both decried the excesses and atrocities of revolutionaries such as Hidalgo. But a big difference was that Mora thought the ultimate gain worth the cost, much as Jefferson viewed the French Revolution; while Alamán was equally convinced that the crimes more than nullified any conceivable gain. Mora was a true son of the Enlightenment in his faith in virtually inevitable progress.[134]

Alamán was not altogether free of that infection, to wit his faith in a golden future provided by industrialization, but, as a conservative, he had a more skeptical understanding of the possibilities available to human nature. Furthermore, he was greatly guided by a sense of the overmastering power of divine providence in all

things, but, as with some of the Old Testament prophets, this did not necessarily bode good news.[135]

Both Alamán and Mora believed in the importance of change, but Alamán thought it should come through gradual evolution in response to particular needs as they would appear (with the qualifications already noted), while Mora had a more rationalistic approach. Ending his analysis with a degree of synthesis, Rionda Arreguín says that, when Alamán fell from power with Bustamante's government, Mora, as principal planner for the succeeding Gómez Fárias administration, actually carried forward several of Alamán's proposals especially in the area of educational reform. "The ideological currents of greatest influence in Mexican life of the first half of the nineteenth century, that contributed to forming a political culture in our country, are sustained in the thought of two theoreticians: Lucas Alamán and José María Luis Mora."[136]

The 1992 symposium saw publication in 1993. Since then there have appeared two major monographs in Mexico: *La paradoja nación revolución en el pensamiento politico de Lucas Alamán* by Elisa Guadalupe Cuevas Landero (1995); and *El hispanoamericanismo de Lucas Alamán (1823-1853)* by Salvador Méndez Reyes (1996). As in so many things related to this project, logistic considerations of time and space have made it necessary to bypass the Méndez Reyes book since it deals with a very specialized aspect of Alamán's thought and work. Instead, this survey of historiography on Lucas Alamán will conclude with attention to Cuevas Landero.

The first section of her book is taken up with a rather elaborate and detailed discussion of methodology. In this "presentación" she poses her thesis in the form of a

question: "whether. . . the alamanista thought really is opposed to the spirit of innovation of its epoch and to progress and change in his society." She seeks the answer to this question through an inspection of "the ambience that exists in Spain and New Spain when Lucas Alamán is born," also "The influence which the Enlightenment period exercises over his ideas," then "the post-independent polarization of Mexican society," and finally "His important political works: and "his plan for the nation."[137]

In the course of her extended monograph, Cuevas Landero notes that alamanista political thought "is complex because it is the result of an amalgam of different ideas." She particularly notes the influence of Hernán Cortés, the Catholic monarchs, the Bourbons, Intendent Riaño, the Enlightenment, Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, Edmund Burke, and English economic ideas.[138]

Cuevas Landero rehearses all the varied facets of the Alamán career and determines that he was notably progressive and creative. The influence of conservatism shows in his insistence on gradual and non-violent change, also in his unerring tendency toward a strong, central, and authoritarian government. This last is not necessary to a conservative stance, as we see with one of his mentors, Edmund Burke. But Alamán was formed under the enlightened despotism of the late Bourbons. In Spain, and to an even much greater extent in Mexico, there was no foundation for a broad-based community of yeoman farmers and middle bourgeoisie. In Mexico, a very small group of cultured, well educated people with enough property for leisure and leverage, floated atop a vast mass of Indians living inwardly in their traditional world, with a growing constituency of unsettled mestizos in between. In such a situation, all competent people have the temptation to do the job themselves well, rather than to

experience the frustration of trying to train the ignorant up to the level of doing it rather badly. Hence the irresistible conservative temptation toward benevolent despotism. Part of this was the simple need for unity, peace, and order as a basis for any sort of real progress.[139]

Cuevas Landero concedes that there was not infrequently inconsistency between what Alamán thought and proclaimed and what he actually did in practice, but observes that this was inevitable if he was to get anything done at all. In effect, he had to hold his nose and work with caudillos and other less than desirable colleagues. She concludes that:

> Beyond the political classification that is made today of our personage, there remains registered his labor as active entrepreneur, educator, historian, sociologist, and politician, that in the rupture—as with the innovators of the 18th century—he aspired to the recovery of the natural rationality of man and the cooperation of all the social sectors in order to make possible the progress and happiness of the Mexican.
>
> Lucas Alamán is an example of what a public man can do to modernize a nation without putting at risk its integrity, identity, and roots.[140]

CHAPTER FIVE. CONCLUSION

This paper began with the presentation of the thesis that Lucas Alamán was largely the product of his early formative years. He was the privileged and successful child of a family favored to enjoy and benefit from all the amenities available to such people in the upper class society of the late eighteenth century Spanish Bourbon empire. He quite naturally became the defender of his class, but was open to improved education and excitement about the wonders of developing natural science and industrial technology. He also developed a passion for greater governmental efficiency under centralized political power.

It was generally conceded by friend and foe alike that Alamán was immensely gifted, but this very fact may have made him even more hated in some quarters, where his high abilities rendered him the more dangerous in their eyes. Many referred to him as "black brains." Was he a conservative? Yes, but it's complicated. By the definitions of the time he had some liberal tendencies, but his thinking evolved in a more conservative direction over time. Then there is the matter of his creative, progressive, and activist side. In several different areas from economics to culture he led his nation.

Most of the historians and observers examined in this paper have served to confirm that he was a conservative authoritarian, but also a complexly progressive and innovative visionary. Though more gifted, he almost seems a reincarnation of Spain's capable Bourbon king, Charles III. Both wanted to improve the lives of their people, but both meant to do this from the top down and did not like to have their proposals

debated or altered. Both had a number of good ideas which, for various reasons, did not usually accomplish very much toward overall improvement.

It was in that benevolent despotism of the Spanish Enlightenment that Alamán had his center of gravity. At his most impressionable age, he imbibed this spirit under the cordial mentorship of the cultured and virtuous Intendent Riaño, and filled it out with his wide reading and European experiences.

As González Navarro observed, he was living with one foot in a world that was passing away and the other foot in a world that was being born. This fact of this transition helps to explain some difficulties of definition. Alamán shared some presuppositions with many of his opponents, especially in the earlier years. Stanley Pollin points out that the historians have tried to make a clear, simple description of Alamán, but in that endeavor quickly falsified the picture, either missing the radically different elements in his life and thought, or else recognizing the complexity and viewing him as schizoid. The truth is that Lucas Alamán was *sui generis*, and he cannot be adequately portrayed by means of easy generalizations.[141]

We learn that he was physically unimpressive. It appears that he would avoid political discussions in polite social situations, but enjoyed discoursing on everything else. He was probably somewhat lonely, partly because his manner may have been too dignified, not to say cold, to invite intimacy, partly because he likely enjoyed being alone a good deal with his books and his thoughts. He was possibly an introvert, psychologically timid, but intellectually and spiritually very strong. He undoubtedly gained immense comfort from being surrounded by his family. He fervently loved Mexico, his *patria.*

How should we rate Alamán as historian? The question, like the man, is a complicated one. On the simplest level, that of discerning and reporting the facts accurately, he was superb. His accounts are outstanding in their rich amplitude and encyclopaedic knowledge of such things as topography and weaponry. They are beautifully written. He called things as they were, without sparing his own side.

But beyond accurate description there comes the matter of judgment about the selection of material. What is left out can be as important as what is included, and the layman reader may not realize that he is being herded along in a certain direction by the historian's decisions about what to set before him. That raises the question as to the basis for this kind of selection, and where the danger of the Whig view of history rears its head. If one has strong convictions about something, it is fatally easy to see the past as a steady progression to that end and to trim the story accordingly. In this area, criticism of Alamán has some weight. From a modern vantage point, Alamán was a whig historian. It was very important to him that the telling of the story of Mexico should unfold in the service of an overarching moral. He saw it as a cautionary tale both for his contemporaries and for Mexicans of the future.

Prior to the question about the acceptability of Alamán's histories is the question whether it is methodologically permissible to write history as advocacy. Many people think it is, and such popularity as historical research has with the public is often related to this hope: that metaphysical and ethical transcendent truths can be distilled from history to the great benefit of humanity. It is very common in America today to hear iterations of philosopher George Santayana's assertion that "Those who cannot remember history are condemned to repeat it." The statement implies that knowledge

of history will teach us how to recognize the successes and failures in human experience, and to direct our actions accordingly. There is a long line of historically oriented philosophers from St. Augustine to Hegel, Marx, and Toynbee. It seems to be a part of human nature to ask the big questions and history is looked to as a principal vehicle for that search.[142]

Many of the historians mentioned in this paper criticized Alamán for a philosophy of history that was not fully accurate, or that it was wrongheaded, but none of them seems to have raised the question whether the teleological structuring of history is permissible in principle. If they criticized him, it was for doing it badly, not for doing it at all.

Modern professional historians have raised that question with a vengeance and tend to be very chary of making clear value judgments about the stuff of history. Herbert Butterfield in *The Whig Interpretation of History* has some very pointed things to say on this subject. He speaks of the temptation to read back into history some grand theme which is explained by those things which lead up to the present. In this approach it is always possible to select out of the myriad of facts, events, ideas, those that undergird the favored interpretation This is done by pruning away whatever doesn't fit, like the scientist who says, "Whatever my net won't catch isn't fish." Butterfield says:

> The historian like every other specialist is quick to over-step the bounds of his subject and elicit from history more than history can really give; and he is for ever tempted to bring his stories to a conclusiveness and his judgments to a finality that are not warranted by either the materials or the processes of his research. Behind all the fallacies of the whig historian there lies the passionate desire to come to a judgment of values, to make history answer questions and decide issues and to give the historian the last word in a controversy.[143]

He continues:

> True, it is not for the historian to exonerate; but neither is it for him to condemn. It greatly clears his mind if he can forgive all sins without denying that there are sins to forgive; but remembering that the problem of their sinfulness is not really a historical problem at all. And though it is certainly not in his competence to declare that moral responsibility does not exist, we may say that this responsibility lies altogether outside the particular world where the historian does historical thinking. He is faced with insuperable difficulties if he tries to stand with one foot in a world that is not his own.[144]

Surely many modern professional historians would say "amen!" And yet this leaves us with some uneasy feelings. It can be argued that one of man's noblest features is his desire to find ultimate value. Butterfield somewhere comments that, of course, a judge in a court of law must make value judgments because the cases before him must be resolved one way or the other. This would seem to leave at least an opening to the historian to make value judgments, but only by making a clear distinction between what historical research has demonstrated on the one hand, and the historian's larger vision as a moral human being on the other.

We constantly need to evaluate the ethical status of situations, but we must remember that history can give us only part of the information we need. It can help us to understand why and how something happened in terms of a meticulous investigation of its context in space and time, but not why in some transcendent sense. For one thing, the human story is an ever flowing stream, and our passions of the moment may be seen quite differently at a later date in retrospect—which is not to say that ultimate judgment is secure even then. We don't know enough to make a science of this, and we never will.

In this light, Alamán's determination to put the stamp of his own convictions on his historical scholarship has to be seen as dubious. On the other hand, the factual material he adduced, and the moral interpretations he placed on it can both serve us as

food for thought in the ongoing dialogue about truth and value and their application in the "real world."

Well educated and intellectual people are most often attuned to the new ideas of their age. They tend to take a certain pride in being among the first to take the measure of things to come and to act as heralds of the future. There is a certain psychic momentum that sometimes develops when new ideas achieve "critical mass." Those with keenly tuned intellectual antennae quickly adopt the new paradigms. They see themselves as independent thinkers, but they are really conforming to the new. Lucas Alamán didn't take the bait. He drew upon the wisdom of the ages, while candidly facing the importunities of the present—which is not to say that he did not have his own "tunnel vision." Like the "new thinkers," he saw what he wanted to see. We make mistakes in life for many reasons, but prominent among these is our inability to know the future. The modern witticism, "It seemed like a good idea at the time," speaks volumes about human folly.

The historians reviewed in this paper have had differing views of Lucas Alamán, but most of them stress that his deepest commitment was a patriotic dedication to the Mexican nation, and that he saw law and order and peace as the necessary preconditions for the national advance. Further, that he considered a strong, even authoritarian central government as the only realistic means for the creation of these preconditions. He had an organic view of society, that traditional institutions and customs should not be radically uprooted but transformed slowly and pragmatically, though this conviction was somewhat at variance with a countervailing influence in his thinking that came from an Enlightenment emphasis on science and rational direct

action which led him to many progressive and innovative actions. The study of his life and thought continues to fascinate. It is a garden of many delights.

These findings are consistent with the thesis of this paper that Alamán was largely a product of the cultural influences he imbibed around the end of the eighteenth century, and that he was a conservative patriot who stressed order and authority, qualified by important elements of progressive thought and action.

NOTES

1. Charles A. Hale. *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821-1853* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 6. Hereafter cited as Hale, *Mora*; Eduardo Galeano. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent* (New York: Monthly Review Press, rev. ed., 1997), 182.

2. Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1931, 1973), 24-25.

3. Stanley C. Green, "Lucas Alamán: Domestic Activities 1823-1835" (PhD diss., Texas Christian University, 1970), 7

4. Justo Sierra, *The Political Evolution of the Mexican People.* trans. Charles Ramsdell (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969), 188.

5. Hale, *Mora*, 263-265; José C. Valadés, *Alamán: estadista e historiador* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1938), 51. Hereafter cited as Valadés; George Penix Taylor, "Lucas Alamán: His Place in Mexican History" (master's thesis, Georgetown University, 1963), 12-13. Hereafter cited as Taylor.

6. Richard N. Current, *John C. Calhoun* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1963),

7. Elisa Guadalupe Cuevas Landero, *La Paradoja Nación Revolución en el Pensamiento Político de Lucas Alamán* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995), 256. Hereafter cited as Cuevas Landero.

8. Lesley Byrd Simpson, *Many Mexicos* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941, 1952), 188. Hereafter cited as Simpson; Taylor, 6.

9. Cuevas Landero, 14, 19, 252, 257.

10. Moisés González Navarro, "Tradición y Modernidad en Lucas Alamán," in *Lucas Alamán, Historiador y Político: Ciclo de Conferencias* (Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993), 20 Hereafter cited as González Navarro, "Tradición."; Luis Rionda Arreguín, "Mora y Alamán: Su Visión del Mundo Historico," in *Lucas Alamán, Historiador y Político: Ciclo de Conferencias* (Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993), 83. Hereafter cited as Rionda. *Ciclo de Conferencias* is hereafter cited as *Ciclo.*

11. Juan Bautista Alamán, "Apuntes para la Biografía del Exmo. Sr. D. Lucas Alamán," in *Historia de Méjico* by Lucas Alamán, 3rd ed. vol. 1 (Méjico: Editorial Jus, 1972), ix. Hereafter cited as J. B. Alamán. *Historia* is hereafter cited as Lucas Alamán, *Historia.*

12. J. B. Alamán, x-xi; Simpson, 188; Rosa Alicia Pérez Luque, "Esbozo Biográfico de Lucas Alamán," in *Ciclo*, 13. Hereafter cited as Pérez Luque; Taylor, 5-6.

13. Valadés, 28.

14. Taylor, 28; Valadés, 29; Lillian Estelle Fisher, *The Background of the Revolution for Mexican Independence* (Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1934), 74; Taylor, 8.

15. Lucas Alamán, *Historia*, 1:354; Pérez Luque, 13.

16. Valadés, 33; Simpson, 189; T. R. Fehrenbach, *Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 324.

17. Valadés, 51; Taylor, 12-13.

18. J. B. Alamán, xi, xiv.

19. Taylor, 14.

20. Valadés, 66-67; Taylor15-16; Cuevas Landero, 19; J. B. Alamán, xii; Taylor 16.

21. J. B. Alamán, xii-xiii; Taylor, 16-19.

22. J. B. Alamán, xiv; Ibid., xxi.

23. Valadés, 91, trans. George P. Taylor; Ibid, 483-486; Ibid., 538.

24. J. B. Alamán, xv; Pérez Luque, 14; Ernesto Lemoine Villicaña, "Lucas Alamán: Enjuiciador de la Revolución de Independencia," *Ciclo*, 52. Hereafter cited as Lemoine; Nettie Lee Benson, ed., *Mexico and the Spanish Cortes* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966); Taylor, 22; J. B. Alamán, xv.

25. Patricia Galeana, "Lucas Alamán: Iberoamericanista," *Ciclo*, 66.

26. Fehrenbach, 360.

27. González Navarro, "Tradición," 27, 38.

28. J. B. Alamán, xviii.

29. J. B. Alamán, xviii; Pérez Luque, 17.

30. Pérez Luque, 15; Ibid., 15; Ibid.

31. Moisés González Navarro, *El pensamiento politico de Lucas Alamán* (México: El Colegio de México, 1952), 132-133. Hereafter cited as González Navarro, *Pensamiento*; Cuevas Landero, 257-259.

32. J. B. Alamán, xix.

33. Ibid., xx; Pérez Luque, 5.

34. J. B. Alamán, xxiii; Pérez Luque, 16; González Navarro, "Tradición," 22; Lourdes Quintanilla, "A la memoria de Lucas Alaman," *Ciclo*, 75; Pérez Luque, 15.

35. Taylor, 24-25.

36. Charles A. Hale, "Alamán, Antuñano, and the Continuity of Mexican Liberalism." English original manuscript, 5. Later in Spanish translation in *Historia Mexicana* 42 (Fall, 1961), 228.

37. J. B. Alamán, xx; Pérez Luque, 15; Taylor, 29.

38. Henry Bamford Parkes, *A History of Mexico* (Boston: Houghton Miflin, 3rd ed., 1969), 191. Hereafter cited as Parkes.

39. J. B. Alamán, xxi, xxix; Ibid, xxix; González Navarro, "Tradición," 38; Enrique Krauze, *Mexico, Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996.* trans. Hank Heifetz (New York: HarperCollins, 1997), 145. Hereafter cited as Krauze; Jan Bazant, "Mexico from Independence to 1867," *The Cambridge History of Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), vol. 3, 449.

40. J. B. Alamán, xii; Ibid., xxi.

41. Stanley C. Green, *The Mexican Republic: The First Decade 1823-1232* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987), 189.

42. J. B. Alamán, xxii.

43. Michael C. Meyer and William L. Sherman, *The Course of Mexican History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed., 1987), 322. Hereafter cited as Meyer and Sherman; Ibid.; Taylor, 77.

44. González Navarro, "Tradición," 31; Rionda, 84; Quintanilla, 46.

45, J. B. Alamán, xxv; Pérez Luque, 15.

46. J. B. Alamán, xxvi; Ibid., xxvi-xxvi.

47. Taylor, 80.

48. J. B. Alamán, xxviii; González Navarro, "Tradición," 34; Pérez Luque, 16; J. B. Alamán, xxx; Pérez Luque, 16; J. B. Alamán, xxix; González Navarro, "Tradición," 34; Pérez Luque, 16.

49. Lemoine, 56; Ibid., 58; Ibid.

50. Hale, *Mora*, 7; Ibid., 8.

51. Parkes, 192; Andrés Lira, ed., *Espejo de discordias: La sociedad mexicana vista por Lorenzo de Zavala, José María Luis Mora y Lucas Alamán* (México: Secretaria de Educación Pública, 1984).

52. Meyer and Sherman, 368.

53. Pérez Luque, 17.

54. Guillermo Prieto, *Memorias de mis tiempos 1840 a 1853.* 2 vols. (México: Libreria de la Vda. De C. Bouret, 1906), vol. 2, 233-235, in Taylor, 150-151.

55. J. B. Alamán, xxxii; Ibid., xxxiv; Simpson, 226.

56. Jan Bazant, "Mexico from Independence to 1867," *The Cambridge History of Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), vol. 3, 381.

57. Barbara Tenenbaum, "The Emperor Goes to the Tailor," *Mexico in the Age of Democratic Revolutions, 1750-1850,* ed. Jaime E. Rodríguez O. (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994), 300-301.

58. For a complete copy of Alamán's letter to Santa Anna see Appendix A in Taylor, 160-164.

59. For a complete copy of Alamán's letter to Santa Anna see Appendix A in Taylor, 160-164.

60. C. Harvey Gardner, ed., *Mexico 1825-1828: The Journal and Correspondence of Edward Thornton Tayloe* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959), 72.

61. Frances Calderón de la Barca, *Life in Mexico* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1927), 335.

62. Ibid., 349.

63. George Lockhart Rives, *The United States and Mexico 1821-1848* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), vol. 1, 192.

64. Ibid., 246.

65. Charles Edward Chapman, *Republican Hispanic America: A History* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), 218-219.

66. Jonathan Kandell, *La Capital: The Biography of Mexico City* (New :York: Random House, 1988), 143.

67. Chapman, 236.

68. Parkes, 192.

69. Ibid., 225-226.

70. Simpson, 205.

71. Ibid., 225.

72. E. Bradford Burns, *The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950), 44.

73. Victor Alba, *The Mexicans: The Making of a Nation* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967), 50] Ibid., 51; Ibid., 54-55; Ibid., 81.

74. Samuel Flagg Bemis, *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), 562.

75. Eduardo Galeano, *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973, 1997), 37.

76. Fehrenbach, 306.

77. Ibid., 323; Ibid., 354.

78. Ibid., 355.

79. Meyer and Sherman, 368.

80. Kandell, 172.

81. Ramón Eduardo Ruiz, *Triumphs and Tragedy: A History of the Mexican People* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1992), 161.

82. Ibid., 183.

83. Ibid., 190; Ibid., 191-183; Ibid., 208.

84. Ibid., 218.

85. Jorge G. Castañeda, *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War* (New York: Knopf/Random House, 1993), 183.

86. Krauze, 16; Ibid., 108-109, 117, 121-123, 129.

87. Fay Robinson, "Lucas Alamán y Escalada (1792-1853)," *Mexico and Her Chieftains*, in *Sons of Dewitt Colony Texas*, tamu.edu/ccbn/dewitt/alamanbio1.htm.

88. Ibid.

89. Hubert Howe Bancroft, *History of Mexico* (New York: The Bancroft Company, 1883-1888), vol. 4, 821.

90. Ibid., 822.

91. Ibid., vol. 5, 635-636.

92. Justo Sierra, *The Political Evolution of the Mexican People.* trans. Charles Ramsdell (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969), 188.

93. Ibid., 200.

94. Ibid., 251-252.

95. José Vasconcelos, *Breve Historia de México* (México: Editorial Continental, 1956), 315-316.

96. Ralph Roeder, *Juárez and His Mexico* (New York: Viking Press, 1947), vol. 1, 86.

97. González Navarro, *Pensamiento*, 9-10.

98. Ibid., 117.

99. Ibid., 118.

100. Luis Villoro, *El proceso ideológico de la Revolución de Independencia* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1967), 234.

101. Ibid., 236; Ibid., 237; Ibid.; Ibid., 238; Ibid., 239.

102. Ibid.

103. Stanley Pollin, "Lucas Alamán and Mexican Reality, 1823-1832 (PhD diss,, University of Calgary, 1972), 106. Hereafter cited as Pollin.

104. Hale, "Alamán, Antuñano," 19-20.

105. Luis Martin, "Lucas Alamán Pioneer of Mexican Historiography: An Interpretive Essay," *Américas* 32:2 (October, 1975), 239-256; Ibid., 240: Ibid.; Ibid.

106. Ibid., 242.

107. Ibid., 244.

108. Ibid., 247.

109 Ibid., 248; Ibid.; Ibid., 249.

110. Ibid., 253.

111. Ibid., 256.

112. Arturo Arnáiz y Freg, *Lucas Alamán: Semblanzas e Ideario* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1989), viii-x.

113. Ibid., xiii.

114. Ibid., xviii.

115. Ibid., xxi-xxii.

116. Ibid., xxx.

117. Pérez Luque, 17.

118. González Navarro, "Tradición," 19-20.

119. Ibid., 23; Ibid.; Ibid., 25; Ibid.

120. Ibid., 26; González Navarro, "Tradición," 26; Cuevas Landero, 14, 19, 252, 257; Rafael Aguayo Spencer, *Obras de D. Lucas Alamán XIII: Indice General Onomástico* (México: Editorial Jus, 1948), 94, 136.

121. González Navarro, “Tradición,” 27; Ibid., 29, 38; Ibid., 32; Ibid.

122. Ibid., 38.

123. Quintanilla, 41.

124. Ibid., 44-45.

125. Ibid., 49.

126. Lemoine, 54; Ibid.

127. Ibid., 63.

128. Ibid.

129. Galeana, 65; Ibid., 66; Ibid., 68.

130. Ibid., 71.

131. Ibid., 73-75; Ibid., 75; Ibid.

132. Ibid., 76.

133. Rionda, 83.

134. Ibid., 81.; Ibid.., 94-95, 97.

135. Ibid., 88.

136. Ibid., 98-99.

137. Cuevas Landero, 11.

138. Ibid., 11-12; Ibid., 14-15.

139. Ibid., 258-259.

140. Ibid., 261.

141. Pollin, 1-5.

142. George Santayana, *The Life of Reason*, 1:12, 284.

143. Butterfield, 51.

144. Ibid., 85-86.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aguayo Spencer, Rafael, ed. *Obras de D. Lucas Alamán.* 13 vols. México: Editorial Jus, 1948.

Alamán, Juan Bautista. "Apuntes para la Biografía del Exmo. Sr. D. Lucas Alamán." In *Historia de Méjico.* 3rd ed. 5 vols. Méjico: Editorial Jus, 1972.

Alamán, Lucas. *Historia de Méjico.* 3rd ed. 5 vols. Méjico: Editorial Jus, 1972.

Alba, Victor. *The Mexicans: The Making of a Nation.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Arnáiz y Freg, Arturo. *Lucas Alamán: Semblanzas e ideario.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1989.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. *History of Mexico.* 5 vols. New York: The Bancroft Company, 1883-1888.

Bazant, Jan. "Mexico from Independence to 1867." In *The Cambridge History of Latin America.* vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Bemis, Samuel Flagg. *John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Benson, Nettie Lee, ed. *Mexico and the Spanish Cortes: Eight Essays.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.

Burks, David D. "The Dawn of Manufacturing in Mexico." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1952.

Burns, E. Bradford. "Ideology in Nineteenth-Century Latin American Historiography." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 58:3 (August, 1978), 409-431.

_____. *The Poverty of Progress: Latin America in the Nineteenth Century.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1980.

Butterfield, Herbert. *The Whig Interpretation of History.* Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1931, 1973.

Calderón de la Barca, Frances. *Life in Mexico.* London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1927.

Castañeda, Jorge G. *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War.* New York: Knopf/Random House, 1993.

Chapman, Charles Edward. *Republican Hispanic America: A History.* New York: Macmillan, 1937.

Costeloe, Michael P. *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846: Hombres de Bien in the Age of Santa Anna.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Cuevas Landero, Elisa Guadalupe. *La paradoja nación revolución en el pensamiento potítico de Lucas Alamán.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995.

Current, Richard N. *John C. Calhoun.* New York: Washington Square Press, 1963.

Donathan, Carl D. "Lucas Alamán and Mexican Foreign Affairs, 1821-1833." PhD diss., Duke University, 1968.

Dysart, Jane Ellen. "Against the Tide: Lucas Alamán and the Hispanic Past." PhD diss., Texas Christian University, 1972.

Fehrenbach, T. R. *Fire and Blood: A History of Mexico.* New York: Macmillan, 1973.

Galeana, Patricia. "Lucas Alamán: Iberoamericanista." In *Lucas Alamán, historiador y político.* Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993.

Galeano, Eduardo. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent.* Translated by Cedric Belfrage. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1973, 1997.

Gardner, C. Harvey, ed. *Mexico 1825-1828: The Journal and Correspondence of Edward Thornton Tayloe.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.

Gargiullo, Jeanne Gabrielle. "Lucas Alamán, Mexican Conservatism and the United States: A History of Attitudes and Policy, 1823-1853." PhD diss., Fordham University, 1992.

Gilmore, Newton R. "British Mining Ventures in Early National Mexico." PhD diss., University of California, 1956.

González Navarro, Moisés. *El pensamiento político de Lucas Alamán.* México: El Colegio de México, 1952.

_____. "Tradición y Modernidad en Lucas Alamán." In *Lucas Alamán, Historiador y político: Ciclo de conferencias.* Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993.

Green, Stanley C. "Lucas Alamán: Domestic Activities, 1823-1853." PhD diss., Texas Christian University, 1970

______. *The Mexican Republic: The First Decade 1823-1832.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987.

Hale, Charles A. *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora, 1821-1853.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Kandell, Jonathan. *La Capital: The Biography of Mexico City.* New York: Random House, 1988.

Krauze, Enrique. *Mexico, Biography of Power: A History of Modern Mexico, 1810-1996.* Translated by Hank Heifetz. New York: HarperCollins, 1997.

Lamar, Quinton Curtis. "The Role of Lucas Alamán in Mexican United States Relations." PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 1971.

Lira, Andrés. *Espejo de discordias: La sociedad mexicana vista por Lorenzo de Zavala, José María Luis Mora y Lucas Alamán.* México: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1984.

Meyer, Michael C., and William Beezley, eds. *The Oxford History of Mexico.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Meyer, Michael C., and William L. Sherman. *The Course of Mexican History.* 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Parkes, Henry Bamford. *A History of Mexico.* 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Miflin, 1969.

Pérez Luque, Rosa Alicia. "Esbozo biográfico de Lucas Alamán." In *Lucas Alamán, historiador y político: Ciclo de conferencias.* Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993.

Peyron, Michael Efren. "Devotion or Dissatisfaction?: Lucas Alamán and the Catholic Church." Master's thesis, University of California Santa Barbara, 2003.

Pollin, Stanley. "Lucas Alamán and Mexican Reality, 1823-1832." PhD diss., University of Calgary, 1972.

Prieto, Guillermo. *Memorias de mis tiempos 1840 a 1853.* 2 vols. México: Librería de la Vda. De C. Bouret, 1906.

Quintanilla, Lourdes. "A la memoria de Lucas Alamán." In *Lucas Alamán, historiador y político: Ciclo de conferencias.* Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993.

______. *El nacionalismo de Lucas Alamán.* Guanajuato: Gobierno del Estado de Guanajuato, 1991.

Raat, W. Dirk, ed. *Mexico from Independence to Revolution, 1810-1910.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.

Rionda Arreguín, Luis. "Mora y Alamán: Su visión del mundo historico." In *Lucas Alamán, historiador y político: Ciclo de conferencias.* Guanajuato: Universidad de Guanajuato, 1993.

Rives, George Lockhart. *The United States and Mexico 1821-1848.* 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

Robinson, Fay. *Mexico and Her Chieftains,* 1847. In *Sons of Dewitt Colony, Texas.*

Roeder, Ralph. *Juárez and His Mexico.* 2 vols. New York: Viking Press, 1947.

Ruiz, Ramón Eduardo. *Triumphs and Tragedy: A History of the Mexican People.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1992.

Sanders, Frank J. "Proposals for Monarchy in Mexico, 1823-1860." PhD diss., University of Arizona, 1967.

Santayana, George. *The Life of Reason.* 1:12:284, 1905. Cited in *Respectfully Quoted: A Dictionary of Quotations*, Suzy Platt, ed. New York: Dorset Press, 1992. 245.

Sierra, Justo. *The Political Evolution of the Mexican People.* Translated by Charles Ramsdell. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969.

Simpson, Lesley Byrd. *Many Mexicos.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1941, 1952.

Taylor, George Penix. "Lucas Alamán: His Place in Mexican History." Master's thesis, Georgetown University, 1963.

Tenenbaum, Barbara. "The Emperor Goes to the Tailor." In *Mexico in the Age of Democratic Revolutions 1750-1850.* Edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1994.

Valadés, José C. *Alamán: estadista e historiador.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1938.

Vasconcelos, José. *Breve historia de México.* México: Editorial Continental, 1956.

Villoro, Luis. *El proceso ideológico de la Revolución de Independencia.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1967.

Vrame, William Anton. "Lucas Alamán as Entrepreneur." Master of science thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1967.