

© John Womack, Jr.

The Mexican Revolution--what it did, what it made possible, and what it did not do

To the memory of James Connolly, Michael Mallin,
Christopher Poole, and Constance Markievicz

Katz Center for Mexican Studies
University of Chicago

October 30, 2015

I thank the Katz Center for inviting me to give this lecture in honor of Friedrich Katz. It cannot be for any merit of mine. I stand in humility before all he accomplished, in his scholarly work and in life. He was among the great historians of modern Mexico, the greatest on the most powerful foreign circumstances and factors in force in modern Mexico, in a word, imperialism, the economic, geo-political, and cultural condition of modern Mexican history. No less remarkable, personally, he was among the most thoughtful, honest, and generous historians in this huge range of studies, maybe the kindest of all.

I do not intend here to review the entire Revolution, I mean all the nationally important social and political movements in Mexico from 1910 to 1920, much less to try to make it all comprehensible. I have only a specific point to make. But it is a critical point, which assumes some knowledge of the old regime and of the major Revolutionary movements, requires some analysis of certain of them, warrants a historical judgment on them, and opens questions both about the old regime and its opposition and about the regime after the Revolution, the struggles over its composition and aims. So it reprises an argument I left implicit in an essay published 30 years ago, where I concluded, "The 'revolution' had been in governance."¹ I cannot make my argument fully explicit here. But I do want to clarify its principal thesis. It is not a very new thesis; it does not differ much from the main conclusion Communist International

¹ John Womack, Jr., "The Mexican Revolution, 1910-1920," in Leslie Bethell, ed., *The Cambridge History of Latin America*, 11 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1984-95), 152-153.

agents in Mexico drew already in the 1920s.² I think all that is new about it may be only its emphasis on certain developments that during the Revolution could have happened but did not happen--and in the questions it therefore opens about the pre- and post-Revolutionary regimes. Most briefly, crudely, the thesis is that the Revolution as it actually happened did not come near endangering the development of capitalism in Mexico; at certain times in certain places, some movements could have gone anarcho-syndicalist or socialist, but other movements smashed them before they got purposely into the turn.³

Corollary: The important struggles for socialism that did happen in modern Mexico did not begin until after the Revolution, in the 1920s (and then, I would argue, primarily because of the Comintern). In other words the Mexican Revolution belongs almost all to a long nineteenth century, not to the short twentieth century (1914-1991).

Three simple introductory notices: (1) Not only do I not go into all the major Revolutionary movements, 1910-1920, I also do not regard the Revolution as prolonged after 1920, as if (historically) a great, but definite conjunction of efforts (say a war) included its consequences and sequels, which of course came later, in new conditions both external and internal, involving new functions and factors. (2) By the Revolution I mean not whatever people in Mexico did in that decade, or experienced then, but action they purposely took because they

² Edgar Woog, "Chiffres et Matériaux sur la Situation du Mexique: Rapport du camarade Stirner," December 18, 1927, Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennii Arkhiv Sotsialno-Politicheskoi Istorii (henceforth RGASPI), Collection 495-Section 108-Documents 67-69, pp. (as renumbered in the file) 5-8, 15, 24-25, 57, 126, 161-164, for a copy of which I thank Miles V. Rodriguez; Presidium, Communist International, "Mexic [sic] Resolution," April 18, 1928, RGASPI, 495-108-79, thanks to Miles V. Rodriguez; Trawin [Yakov Davidovich Drabkin, aka Sergei Ivanovich Gusev; Lazar Jeifets, Victor Jeifets, and Peter Huber, eds., *La Internacional Comunista y América Latina, 1919-1943: Diccionario Biográfico* (Moscow: Instituto de Latinoamérica de la Academia de las Ciencias, 2004), 146-147], "Zur Mexikanischen Frage (Thesen)," April 27, 1928, RGASPI, 495-108-79, for a copy of which I thank Miles V. Rodríguez; Stirner [Edgar Woog], "Rapport sur le Mexique," September 15, 1929, RGASPI, 495-108-96, pp. (as renumbered in the file) 76-90, thanks to Miles V. Rodriguez; A. Vol'skii [Stanislav S. Pestkovsky], *Istoriia meksikanskikh revoliutsii* (Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1928), 139-143, 173-174, 205-206; Diego Ortega [Stanislav S. Pestkovsky], *Agrarnyi vopros i krest'ianskoe dvizhenie v Meksike* (Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo, 1928), 63-76, 86-140; idem, "Grazhdanskaya voina v Meksike," *Mirovoye Khoziaistvo i Mirovaia Politika*, No. 7 (July 1929), 45-61; Lazar Jeifets and Victor Jeifets, "Quién diablos es Andréi [aka Vol'skii and Diego Ortega]? Stanislav Pestkovsky, Camarada Andréi: Una tentativa de investigación histórica," *Memoria: Boletín de CEMOS*, No. 121 (March 1999), 21-26; Viktor L. Kheifets [Jeifets], *Komintern i evoliutsia levovo dvizheniia Meksiki* (Saint-Peterburg: Nauk, 2006), 178-203.

³ On "conscious" and "purposive": Lars T. Lih, *Lenin* (London: Reaktion Books, 2011), 58.

considered it Revolutionary. (3) My interest is in purposeful class struggles, my analysis as if from a Comintern intelligence officer, say in 1928 (and anachronistic in my own words).

What then did the Revolution do?

(1) It broke the long-established imperialist deal on Mexico, the informal complex of arrangements among U.S., British, German, and French banks, corporations, and governments (improvised through the previous 50 years) that they would transact their business and push their policies in Mexico in civil terms, if not exactly peaceful, at least no wars or bellicose proxies there, unlike in Central America or the Caribbean. This break took place at the very beginning of the Revolution, in 1910, when Standard Oil, sore at the Mexican government's favoritism for Eagle Oil, backed the main conspiracy then to overthrow the government. As the Revolution continued under its first government, the break turned sharper, meaner, stronger, encouraging and aggravating the imperialist conflicts. These deepened into proxy belligerence in the contentious overthrow of the Revolutionary government in 1913, when Washington lost control of the coup to a London- and Berlin-backed general, whom it then backed Revolutionaries to overthrow until (given U.S. armed intervention at Veracruz) they succeeded in 1914. But Washington-New York gained nothing against London, or Berlin, or Mexico. Even if the Revolutionary armies on their victory had tried to restore the old imperialist deal, or negotiate a new such arrangement, as better for Mexico than imperialist proxy wars, they could not have done it, for the imperialist powers started their own, modern Thirty-Years-War in Europe in 1914, its first round lasting until the U.S. military engagement there in 1917 forced the Armistice of 1918. Revolutionaries in Mexico during the First World War used its imperialist conflicts to make wars against each other, which intensified U.S.-U.K and German use of them as proxies, provoked a second U.S. armed intervention in Mexico, prolonged the Revolutionary civil war,

and all thereby, void of any Revolutionary premeditation, much less plan for it, raised more broadly and hotter than ever Mexican anti-U.S. nationalism. By 1920 therefore, in the new, post-war imperialism, in circumstances of unprecedented U.S. economic, geo-political, and cultural predominance in the Western hemisphere, the Revolution had practically imposed on Mexico's official foreign relations the obligation of (at least) occasional displays of anti-imperialist, specifically "anti-American" nationalism.⁴

(2) The Revolution broke Mexico's old regime, wrecked its long-reigning national political hierarchies. From their solidly bourgeois, semi-colonial, private political circles, it forced open to the Mexican public, into Mexican civil society, and out among regular and irregular armed forces, for 10 years, the question of who might officially and really govern Mexico. (This long ago was my point on "governance.") The Porfirian regime had already gone into crisis years before 1910, above all because the army and high finance could not agree on very old President Díaz's succession. Spared armed contests over its crisis, it would probably have done no better than a presidential retirement and succession in 1911-12, to cover an ugly, deeply unstable compromise among imperialist, Mexican military, and Mexican financial factions. The Revolution's directors in 1910, as bourgeois as the regime they were to overthrow, U.S.-connected, Standard Oil-backed, were at best striving to establish in Mexico what they in their Liberal delusion imagined U.S. Whitemanistan democracy was, which (they reasoned) would resolve the immediate crisis and insure a future of bourgeois democratic order for

⁴ Vol'skii, *op. cit.*, 75-80, 141-156, 167-177, 194-198, 205-206; Ortega, *Agrarnyi vopros*, 30-42, 49-52, 77-79, 105-110, 113-117; José C. Valadés, *Historia general de la Revolución Mexicana*, 10 vols. (Mexico City: M. Quesada Brandi, 1963-67), VI, 298-299, 303-304, 306-309, 311, VII, 43, 145-153, 157-194; Friedrich Katz, *Deutschland, Diaz und die mexikanische Revolution: die deutsche Politik in Mexiko, 1870-1920* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1964); Robert F. Smith, *The United States and Revolutionary Nationalism in Mexico, 1916-1932* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1972), 23-228; Lorenzo Meyer, *Mexico and the United States in the Oil Controversy, 1917-1942* (Austin: University of Texas, 1977), 3-148; Emilio Zebadúa, *Banqueros y revolucionarios: la soberanía financiera de México* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1994), 137-155, 168-222. The new "Thirty Years War": Arno Mayer, *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken? The "Final Solution" in History* (New York: Pantheon, 1988), 19-20, 30-33.

Mexican capitalist progress. In fact about all they managed for the crisis was to cover an ugly, deeply unstable U.S.-U.K.-Mexican military-financial compromise, 1911-12. But their Revolution also raised much popular excitement at a broad prospect of justice, no new national program, only justice by renewed national respect for the old Liberal Constitution, in popular terms the correction of the countless particular judicial and political wrongs that previously disfavored, disappointed, despoiled, abused, or exploited citizens had suffered, not as classes, only as individuals, families, or communities.⁵ Even so, the excitement for justice was contagious, in all classes.⁶

⁵ Valadés, *op. cit.*, I, II; Alan Knight, *The Mexican Revolution*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986). I; Friedrich Katz, *De Díaz a Madero: orígenes y estallido de la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: Editorial Era, 2008). On the Liberal delusion: W.E.B. Dubois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1903); idem, *John Brown* (Philadelphia: G.W. Jacobs and Company, 1909); Domenico Losurdo, *Liberalism: a counter-history* (London: Verso, 2011).

⁶ E.g., Mariano Azuela, *Los de abajo: novela de la revolución mejicana* [1915] (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1930); Álvaro Obregón, *Ocho mil kilómetros en campaña* [1917], 3rd ed. (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1960), 4-32; Francisco Bulnes, *El verdadero Díaz y la revolución* ([1920] (Mexico City: Editora Nacional Edinal, 1960), 335-430; Gabriel Gávira, *Su actuación Político-Militar Revolucionaria*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Talleres Tipográficos de A. del Bosque, 1933), 5-69; José Vasconcelos, *Ulises criollo: La vida del autor escrita por él mismo*, 6th ed. (Mexico City: Ediciones Botas, 1936); Alberto J. Pani, *Apuntes autobiográficos*, 2 vols. (Mexico City: Manuel Porrúa, 1951), I, 17-166; Porfirio del Castillo, *Puebla y Tlaxcala en los Días de la Revolución* (Mexico City: Imprenta Zavala, 1953), 13-98; Michael C. Meyer, *Mexican Rebel: Pascual Orozco and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-1915* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1967), 9-93; James D. Cockcroft, *Intellectual Precursors of the Mexican Revolution, 1900-1913* (Austin: University of Texas, 1968); John Womack, Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), 3-158; Paul Friedrich, *Agrarian Revolt in a Mexican Village* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970), 43-68; Héctor Aguilar Camín, *La frontera nómada: Sonora y la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1977), 19-273; Ian Jacobs, *Ranchero Revolt: The Mexican Revolution in Guerrero* (Austin: University of Texas, 1982), 3-97; Ángeles Mendieta Alatorre, *Juana Belén Gutiérrez de Mendoza (1875-1942): Extraordinaria precursora de la Revolución Mexicana* (Cuernavaca: Impresores de Morelos, 1983), 15-26, 43-45, 47-57, 63-65, 83-103, 123-153; Douglas W. Richmond, *Venustiano Carranza's Nationalist Struggle, 1893-1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1983), 1-42; Gonzalo N. Santos, *Memorias*, 5th ed. (Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1984), 13-65; Ricardo Corzo Ramírez et al., *...nunca un desleal: Cándido Aguilar (1889-1960)* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1986), 13-37; David LaFrance, *The Mexican Revolution in Puebla, 1908-1913: The Maderista Movement and the Failure of Liberal Reform* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1989); Thomas Benjamin and Mark Wasserman, eds., *Provinces of the Revolution: Essays on Mexican Regional History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1990); David W. Walker, "Homegrown Revolution: The Hacienda Santa Catalina del Álamo y Anexas and Agrarian Protest in Eastern Durango, Mexico, 1897-1913," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, LXXII, 2 (May 1992), 239-273; Oscar Flores Torres, *Burguesía, militares y movimiento obrero en Monterrey, 1909-1923: Revolución y comuna empresarial* (Monterrey: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, 1993), 19-72; Ana Lau and Carmen Ramos, eds., *Mujeres y Revolución, 1900-1917* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1993), 25, 30-34, 177-208; William K. Meyers, *Forge of Progress, Crucible of Revolt: Origins of the Revolution in La Comarca Lagunera, 1880-1911* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1994); Alicia Villaneda, *Justicia y Libertad: Juana Belén Gutiérrez de Mendoza, 1875-1942* (Mexico City: Documentación y Estudios de Mujeres, 1994), 17-57; Mónica

Because the Revolution then had no social or political organization sufficient to make any compromise stick, much less satisfy bourgeois or popular hopes, much less do durable justice to bourgeois or popular complaints, its first government could not last long. Local Revolutionary chiefs denied justice quickly made new plans for themselves, some for their people, and in Northern and Southern provinces some revolted against the Revolutionary government. The imperialists, the generals, and the bankers all knew the new government could not last, and soon formed factions to plot as much against each other as against it, each faction to make the decisive coup for itself. The government's overthrow came from a nasty, contested mixture of several imperialist, military, financial, political, and popular movements and maneuvers.

The Revolution in 1913-14 had a Counter-Revolution against which to concentrate its various forces. And from their various bases and angles these forces--military, political, and diplomatic--mostly did all act against the Counter-Revolution, its government, and its army, the old regular army. They seized property, coerced loans, imposed their own taxes, enough eventually to organize substantial Revolutionary armies. It matters critically that these forces remained various, knotted into factions, did not seriously unite, or even make coalitions that lasted very long, militarily, politically, or diplomatically. Once the U.S. Navy took Veracruz to favor the Revolutionary coalition Washington regarded likeliest to favor U.S. interests, Carranza's coalition, organized militarily as the Constitutionalist Army, this force gained strength from some others joining it, much more strength from U.S.-condoned Veracruz oil

Blanco, *Revolución y contienda política en Guanajuato, 1908-1913* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1995); Friedrich Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1998), 14-189; Francie R. Chassen de López, *From Liberal to Revolutionary Oaxaca, The View from the South: Mexico, 1867-1911* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 2004), 351-537; Mario A. Aldana Rendón, *Manuel M. Diéguez y la revolución mexicana* (Zapopan: Colegio de Jalisco, 2006), 23-92; Ana Lau Jaiven, "Las mujeres también fueron a la Revolución," in Patricia Galeana, ed., *Impacto de la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 2010), 91-112.

revenue. So it gained enmity from two other major Revolutionary coalitions, militarily the Division of the North (the DN), commanded by Villa, and the Liberating Army of the South (the ELS), its chief Zapata. All three forces continued their campaigns against the Counter-Revolution, all stronger than before, more separate than before, each after at least a major part in the Counter-Revolution's defeat, which all three did have in its final defeat in mid-1914. Still richest, the Constitutionalist Army came first, to dissolve the old army and occupy Mexico City. The Carrancista coalition's attempt then to extend its authority over the other two impacted them, pressed them together in a joint attempt in 1914-15 to organize the Revolution's first national representation, a "Sovereign Convention," for a new constitution, for rules to realize the Revolution's "ideals.... of [democratic] social and political improvement...." In Revolutionary civil war in 1915-16, the Convention fell apart, the Villistas and Zapatistas re-separated, and the Constitutionalist Army won enough ground that Carranza's coalition credibly claimed national authority, received U.S. recognition, and, despite Villista, Zapatista, and some Counter-Revolutionary resistance, staged national elections for its own constitutional convention, to write the rules for a new, more powerfully assertive Liberal state.⁷ This convention went far beyond Carranza's expectations, far beyond old Mexican Liberalism, in February 1917 swearing to a constitution with sociologically mediated articles on productive property and hired labor

⁷ Valadés, *op. cit.*, III, IV, V, VI, 1-61; Luis F. Amaya C., *La Soberana Convención Revolucionaria, 1914-1916* (Mexico City: F. Trillas, 1966); Meyer, *Mexican Rebel*, 94-175; Womack, *Zapata*, 159-266; Richmond, *op. cit.*, 43-164; Linda B. Hall, *Álvaro Obregón: Power and Revolution in Mexico, 1911-1920* (College Station: Texas A & M University, 1981), 38-162; Alicia Hernández Chávez, "Militares y negocios en la Revolución Mexicana," *Historia mexicana*, XXXIV, 2 (October 1984), 181-212; idem, "El zapatismo: una gran coalición nacional popular democrática," in Javier Garciadiego, ed., *Zapatismo: origen e historia* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de las Revoluciones de México, 2009), 17-51; Knight, *op. cit.*, II, 1-469; Katz, *Villa*, 193-614; Aldana Rendón, *op. cit.*, 92-274; Francisco Pineda Gómez, *La revolución del sur, 1912-1914* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2005), 469-529; idem, *Ejército Libertador, 1915* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2013), 38-85, 132-151, 177-178, 201-216, 242-246, 250-255, 266-272, 288-291, 302-305, 317-321, 369-373, 379-382.

(remarkably like U.S. Progressive Party positions).⁸ Neither the new constitution nor the Carrancista coalition's election of its chief president pacified Villistas, Zapatistas, or Counter-

⁸ Felipe Tena Ramírez, *Leyes fundamentales de México, 1808-1967*, 3rd ed., rev. (Mexico City: Porrúa, 1967), 606-629, 745-881; H.N. Branch, "The Mexican Constitution of 1917 compared with the Constitution of 1857," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Supplement, LXXIII (May 1917), 1-116; Ignacio Marván Laborde, "Los constituyentes abogados en el Congreso de 1916-1917," *Anuario Mexicano de Historia del Derecho*, XXV (2013), 319-340; Duncan M. Kennedy, "Three Globalizations of Law and Legal Thought: 1850-2000," in David Trubek and Álvaro Santos, ed., *The New Law and Economic Development: A Critical Appraisal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2006), 19-46. Constitutionalist sociology and law re property: Andrés Molina Enríquez, *Los grandes problemas nacionales* [1909] (Mexico City: Editorial Era, 1978); idem, *Esbozo de los primeros diez años de la revolución agraria de México (1910-1920)*, 5 vols. (Mexico City: Talleres Gráficos del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia y Etnografía, 1933-37), V, 112-120, 143-162, 167-192; Luis Cabrera, "Compañía Agrícola, Industrial, Colonizadora, Limitada del Tlahualilo, S.A., contra el Gobierno Federal de la República Mexicana [1909]," in his *Obras completas*, 4 vols. (Mexico City: Ediciones Oasis, 1972-75), 347-361, 365-386, 394-395; idem, "La reconstitución de los ejidos de los pueblos como medio de suprimir la esclavitud del jornalero mexicano [1912]," *ibid.*, I, 137-165; Stanley F. Shadle, *Andrés Molina Enríquez, Mexican Land Reformer of the Mexican Revolutionary Era* (Tucson: University of Arizona, 1994), 21-75; Emilio H. Kourí, "Interpreting the Expropriation of Indian Pueblo Lands in Porfirian Mexico: The Unexamined Legacies of Andrés Molina Enríquez," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, LXXXII, 1 (February 2002), 90-104. The main antecedents the Constitutionalists mistook to justify their work on property, Article 27: "Fuero Juzgo [654/1241], in Estéban Pinel and Alberto Aguilera y Velasco., eds., *Colección de códigos y leyes de España: Primera sección, códigos antiguos*, 4 vols. (Madrid: Francisco Roig, R. Labajos, 1865-66), I, 52; Castile, Laws, "Aquí comienza la Primera Partida [1256 ff]," *Los códigos españoles, concordados y anotados*, 12 vols., 2nd ed. (Madrid: Antonio de San Martín, 1872), II-1, xiv, 327-328, 489-490; Robert I. Burns, ed., *Las Siete Partidas [1252-1284]*, 5 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2001-12), II, 273, 376-377; Frances G. Davenport, ed., *European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies*, 4 vols. (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1934), I, 9-26, 56-83, III, 223-231; Alfonso García Gallo, ed., *Cedulario indiano, recopilado por Diego de Encinas [1596]*, 4 vols. (Madrid: Cultura Hispánica, 1945), I, 58-60; Francisco Martínez Marina, *Ensayo histórico-crítico sobre la Antigua legislación y principales cuerpos legales de los reynos de León y Castilla, especialmente sobre el código de D. Alonso el Sabio, conocido con el nombre de las Siete Partidas* (Madrid: La Hija de D. Joaquín Ibarra, 1808), 43-44, 52-53, 57-61, 122-123, 137-140, 317-320; "Bienes..." in Joaquín Escriche, *Diccionario razonado de legislación y jurisprudencia* [1831], 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Bogotá: Editorial Témis, 1998), I, 712, 727-731; "Dominio..." *ibid.*, I, 1114-1115; "Donación..." *ibid.*, I, 1115-1133; "Enajenación..." *ibid.*, II, 55-59; "Estado," *ibid.*, II, 129-132; "Patrimonio..." *ibid.*, III, 395; "Propiedad," *ibid.*, III, 512-513; "Realengo," *ibid.*, III, 555; "República," *ibid.*, III, 601. Cf. Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1900); Adhèmar Esmein, "L'inaliénabilité du domaine de la Couronne devant les États Généraux du xvie siècle," in Paul Oertmann et al., *Festschrift Otto Gierke, zum siebzigsten Geburtstag, dargebracht von Schülern, Freunden und Verehren* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1911), 361-381; William W. Buckland, *A Text-Book of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1921), 107-111, 174-181, 183-191, 201-202, 206-213, 258-261, 275-277, 331-356, 504-512; Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "Inalienability: A Note on Canonical Practice and the English Coronation Oath in the Thirteenth Century," *Speculum*, XXIX, 3 (July 1954), 488-502; J.P. Canning, "The corporation in the political thought of the Italian jurists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries," *History of Political Thought*, I, 1 (1980), 9-32; Daniel Lee, "Private Law Models for Public Law Concepts: The Roman Law Theory of Dominion in the Monarchomach Doctrine of Popular Sovereignty," *Review of Politics*, LXX (2008), 370-399. The jurisprudence they mostly followed, but did not cite: Jacinto Pallares (d. 1904, no Revolutionary, or revolutionary), ed., *Legislación federal complementaria del derecho civil mexicano* (Mexico City: Ramón F. Riveroll, 1897); idem, *Curso complete de derecho mexicano, o exposición filosófica, histórica y doctrina de toda la legislación mexicana*, 2 vols. (Mexico City: I. Paz, 1901). U.S. Progressivism then ideologically interesting in Mexico: e.g., Lester F. Ward, *Dynamic Sociology; or Applied Social Science, as based upon Statical Sociology and the Less Complex Sciences*, 2 vols. (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1883); idem, *Applied Sociology: A Treatise on the Conscious Improvement of Society by Society* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1906); Richard T. Ely and George R. Wicker, *Elementary Principles of Economics, together with A Short Sketch of Economic History*

Revolutionaries. The Carrancistas themselves quickly split into new factions, each plotting its presidential succession in 1920. The one that succeeded, in a new coalition, for Obregón, did it only by rebellion, U.S.-favored and in league with surviving Zapatistas and some Counter-

(New York: Macmillan, 1904); Richard T. Ely, "La división del trabajo," *La Iberia*, August 27, 1910; idem, "Las organizaciones obreras," *ibid.*, September 6, 7, 8, 1910; "Lo que es el sistema en las organizaciones," *ibid.*, September 22, 1910; Roberto A. Esteva Ruiz, "El derecho público internacional en México," *Diario de Jurisprudencia*, September 11, 1911, 70; National Progressive Convention, *A Contract with the People: Platform of the Progressive Party, adopted at its First National Convention, Chicago, August 7, 1912* (New York: Progressive National Committee, 1912); Wesley N. Hohfeld, *Fundamental Legal Conceptions as applied in Judicial Reasoning* [1913], and *Other Legal Essays* (New Haven: Yale University, 1919), 23-64; "A New Frontier," *Mexican Herald*, March 24, 1914; "The Socialization of the Common Law: Professor Pound's Lowell Institute Lectures," *The Green Bag*, April 1914, 166-170; Roscoe Pound, *The Spirit of the Common Law* (Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1921); "Sociología económica," *El Correo Español*, May 18, 1914; "Reflexiones: la civilización y el progreso social" and "Nota editorial: Después del desastre, el meliorismo," *ibid.*, May 22, 1914; "Por mayoría ayer se aprobó el artículo trece," *Mexican Herald*, March 27, 1915; "Carranza Sends Commission to U.S. to Study the Laws Regulating the Oil Industry," *New York Call*, May 14, 1915; "Mexican Oil Wealth Great Lure to Wealthy Interventionists," *ibid.*, June 7, 1915; José Vázquez Schiaffino, "Memoria relativa al viaje efectuado a los Estados Unidos de América, por una parte del Personal de la Comisión Técnica del Petróleo [September 1915]," *Boletín del Petróleo*, II, 6 (December 1916), 505-534; "Sección editorial: Lo que Significa para México la Reección de Wilson," *El Pueblo*, November 12, 1916. Why the congeniality of (some) U.S. Progressivism and Mexican Constitutionalist reformism: Charles A. Hale, *The Transformation of Liberalism in Late Nineteenth-Century Mexico* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1989); Gillis J. Harp, *Positivist Republic: Auguste Comte and the Reconstruction of American Liberalism, 1865-1920* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 1995), 109-209; Barbara H. Fried, *The Progressive Assault on Laissez Faire: Robert Hale and the First Law and Economics Movement* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2001). Direct U.S. Progressive-Mexican Constitutionalist political connections, 1916: Crystal Eastman, *The Mexican-American League* (New York: n.p., 1916); "La Unión Americana contra el Militarismo Trabaja Activamente Para ver [sic] de Evitar Decorosamente la Guerra," *El Pueblo*, June 23, 1916; "Los Delegados Mexicanos y Norteamericanos se van directamente a Washington," *ibid.*, July 4, 1916; Atl to Luis R. Guzmán, AGN, G, 168-16, July 7, 1916; Atl to Jesús Acuña, *ibid.*, G, 168-16, June 27, 1916; "Brief Peace Notes," *Advocate of Peace*, August 1916, 244; American Federation of Labor, *Report of the Proceedings of the Thirty-Sixth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Baltimore, Md., November 13 to 25, 1916* (Washington: Law Reporter Printing, 1916), 55-64, 385-389; John Murray, "Behind the Drums of Revolution," *The Survey*, December 2, 1916, 241, 243; Rosendo Salazar and José G. Escobedo, *Las pugnas de la gleba, 1907-1922*, two parts in one (Mexico City: Editorial Avante, 1923), I, 193-200; Amos R. E. Pinchot, *History of the Progressive Party, 1912-1916* [1927-36] (New York: New York University, 1958), 7-71, 218-223; Lincoln Steffens, *The Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens*, 2 vols. in one (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1931), 715-740; Eugene M. Tobin, *Organize or Perish: America's Independent Progressives, 1913-1933* (New York: Greenwood, 1986), 9-10, 67-73; Nancy P. Pinchot, "Amos Pinchot: Rebel Prince," *Pennsylvania History*, LXVI, 2 (Spring 1999), 180-191. The best light now on Molina's confusion: Antonio Azuela, "El problema con las ideas que están detrás," in Emilio Kouri, ed., *En busca de Molina Enríquez: Cien años de "Los grandes problemas nacionales"* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2009), 79-125; and Alejandra Núñez Luna, "Las aportaciones del jurista sobre la propiedad de las aguas: Del rey a la nación," *ibid.*, 127-227. On Constitutionalism re labor in 1916-17: William Suarez-Potts, *The Making of Law: The Supreme Court and Labor Legislation in Mexico, 1875-1931* (Stanford: Stanford University, 2012), 110-180.

Revolutionaries.⁹ Though no one could tell it then, this was the Revolution's final settlement, after which economic, social, and political accounts would be new.

It had been a big, long Revolution, certainly a decade of great, hard, violent struggles for power. In mourning for maybe 250,000 killed in military action, probably as many more dead from war-borne diseases, plus another 400,000 lost in the global influenza of 1918-19, it had been awful for most Mexicans who had made it to 1920.¹⁰ In fact by the settlement then U.S. imperialism was stronger than ever in Mexico; armed forces directed (officially or not) by big, U.S.-befriending Mexican businessmen were still fighting each other to decide national elections for their own interests; and for all the Revolutionary speeches, decrees, and new constitutional articles since 1910, the only substantial reform that in 10 years a Revolutionary force had actually done for the dispossessed and exploited, in Zapatista country the ELS's restitution to villages of their old agrarian lands, the new, constitutionally legitimized National Army had with extreme prejudice undone. But even so, no less significant, the promises Revolutionaries had continually made, if only to out-promise their rivals, had continually revived bourgeois hopes of U.S.-free national independence, bourgeois hopes of U.S.-like democracy (Liberal or Progressive) for themselves, and popular hopes of justice for exploited classes.

All this Revolution, Revolutionizing, Revolutioneering, brought some remarkable changes in Mexican society. Examples: the flight of some families of the élite into exile in the

⁹ Valadés, *op. cit.*, VI, 62-392, VII, 1-92; Womack, *Zapata*, 266-370; Meyer, *Mexico and the United States*, 75-148; Richmond, *op. cit.*, 98-237; Alicia Hernández Chávez, "Militares y negocios en la Revolución Mexicana," *Historia mexicana*, XXXIV, 2 (October 1984), 181-212; idem, "El zapatismo: una gran coalición nacional popular democrática," in Javier Garciadiego, ed., *Zapatismo: origen e historia* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de las Revoluciones de México, 2009), 17-51; Knight, *op. cit.*, II, 469-516; Linda B. Hall, *Oil, Banks and Politics: The United States and Post-Revolutionary Mexico, 1917-1924* (Austin: University of Texas, 1995); Katz, *Villa*, 615-715.

¹⁰ Melvin Small and J. David Singer, *Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816-1980*, 2nd ed. (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982), 227, 238, 254, 278; Valadés, *op. cit.*, VII, 81-83, 108-109; Womack, "The Mexican Revolution," 138, 153.

United States or Europe; the flight of Catholic hierarchs into exile; the flight of many bourgeois families from the provinces to Mexico City; the migration of many proletarians to work in labor-short U.S. transportation, manufacturing industries, and agriculture, or in the new Mexican oil fields; the new, heavy burden on working women in migration without consanguine kin, or left behind alone to care for elders and children; many more men not white in authority and command (some of not only Indian, but also deep African DNA); the enrichment of some once petty-bourgeois Revolutionary generals and politicians (in many cases initially by hook or crook, plunder, but often later respectabilized by relatives and lawyers); the democratization of machismo, from a Revolutionary agrarian claim that *la tierra es de quien la trabaja*, to any male's presumption that *la mujer es de quien la manda*; most impressively, the composition of the new National Army. These deep, serious changes, some of them, social historians over the last 40 years have brought to light for us.

But these are revolutionary changes only in the most generic sense. Some historians have mistaken them for the Mexican Revolution as such. But these were not specifically Mexican Revolutionary changes; not specific to the Mexican Revolution. They are only the kind of changes that any mighty force would wreak, the changes, for example, any big techno-economic innovation, say steam power, long-distance electric transmission, petroleum-derived fuels, or any big high-calorie dietetic innovation (sugar cane, potatoes, corn), or any big medicinal invention (like against smallpox or yellow fever), or any series of big natural disasters, or plagues, or famine, would make happen; any big civil war will disband the defeated army, make the victors the new army. Any big, railroad-heavy war in Mexico then would have wrought all these changes, including the composition of a new national army.

What is at stake here is what made the Mexican Revolution the Mexican Revolution, what specified it, made it special, “the Mexican Revolution.” The key is the continually shifting, always doubly contradictory connection between bourgeois and popular forces in Mexico then, a connection of three class-driven forces in continually repeated collaborations and conflicts. As if in naturally repetitive bouts of cooperation and contention, in mutual obsession, powered on a loco *Wechselwirkung*, “wild alternating current,” this was actually class struggle in Mexico then, capitalists, proprietary workers, and proletarians in a double struggle, both together and against each other, in a continually imperialism-twisted dialectic in which no force subsumed the old kinetics, took control of the torque, gave the turn a new, definite direction, and rose to make a new Mexican history.¹¹

On struggles for power and resurgent hopes, convergent, divergent, reconciliatory, antagonistic, the Mexican Revolution moved for the most part for most of the decade as bourgeois forces moved popular forces, drawn from proprietary and proletarian workers. In many different situations, geographic, economic, and social, contemporaneous and successive, the connection was largely direct, mutually reinforcing, and effective, between the exploiting class’s Revolutionary force and the self-exploiting class’s Revolutionary force, and definitely top-heavy, that is, bourgeois leadership, proprietary followership. Even so, these followers, subordinates, literal, official subalterns, were socially strategic intermediaries, themselves leaders, who for their own reasons brought under a general command volunteers they had

¹¹ Cf. V.I. Lenin, “The ‘Disarmament’ Slogan [October 1916],” in his *Collected Works*, 45 vols. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1960-70), XXIII, 94-104; idem, “Lecture on the 1905 Revolution [March 1917],” *ibid.*, XXIII, 236-253; idem, “Letters from Afar: First Letter [March 1917],” *ibid.*, XXIII, 297-308; idem, “Das Militärprogramm der proletarischen Revolution,” *Jugend-Internationale*, No. 9 and 10 (September and October 1917), 4-6, 3-4, respectively; Leopold H. Haimson, *The Russian Marxists and the Origins of Bolshevism* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1955), 99-101; Georges Haupt, *L’historien et le mouvement sociale* (Paris: Maspero, 1980), 237-266; Stathis Kouvelakis, “Lenin as Reader of Hegel: Hypotheses for a Reading of Lenin’s Notebooks on Hegel’s *The Science of Logic*,” in Stanislav Budgen et al., eds., *Lenin Reloaded: Toward a Politics of Truth* (Durham: Duke University, 2007), 164-205; Étienne Balibar, “The Philosophical Moment in Politics,” *ibid.*, 207-221. On wild AC: Wayne Kilcollins, *Maintenance Fundamentals for Wind Technicians* (Clifton Park: Delmar, 2012), 7-8.

mobilized from among their proprietary and proletarian neighbors, urban, industrial, and rural.¹² This was Maderista Revolutionary power in motion, likewise, later, Carrancista Revolutionary power in motion, 1910-15. Then broke open the outstanding exception, the Revolutionary civil war, 1915-16, when the bourgeois-proprietary Revolution lost a critical part, when for their own power, so against bourgeois leadership, some strong subordinate chiefs, the chiefest Villa, allied the DN with the ELS, and threatened from inside the Revolution to turn it into a popular, populist “social revolution.” The Villista-Zapatista, DN-ELS popular alliance failed in 1915-16, the Revolution’s most important, most significant failure. But a new bourgeois-proprietary Revolutionary coalition, though dominant over old and new dissident Revolutionary factions and persistent Counter-Revolutionaries, never did regain the previous bourgeois hold on the Revolution’s leadership, 1916-20. The settlement of 1920 was therefore both final and spurious.

Because of the essential, mutually interferent, dialectical, mutually moving contradictions, between the Revolution’s great struggles for power, continually resurgent bourgeois hopes for bourgeois democracy, and incongruent popular hopes for justice, proprietary justice, proletarian justice, through the entire decade, the crisis of 1915-16 wants special reflection. To reflect thereon is not to deny the significance of other Revolutionary developments, conflicts, moments. It is rather to try to understand how in the whole dynamic conjuncture of the time, imperialism, world war, great Revolutions elsewhere (e.g., Turkey, China, Russia), the crisis of 1915-16 made the essential difference to the Mexican Revolution.

Reflective analysis of it takes special consideration of four Revolutionary exceptions, two major forces, two secondary movements. The two major exceptions, the Villista force and the

¹² “Subaltern,” in Harry T. Peck, ed., *New Websterian 1912 Dictionary*, rev. (New York: Syndicate Publishing Company, 1912), 801; “Subaltern,” in J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, eds., *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., 20 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), XVII, 13.

Zapatista force, both came originally from the Maderista Revolution. They were exceptional not only in their then amazing (to the bourgeoisie scandalous, disgusting) claim to independence, but much more in struggling as popular forces not for bourgeois purposes, but for proprietary and proletarian justice, preeminently rights to land, the Villistas ideally in individual equality, the Zapatistas ideally in communitarian solidarity. Though to understand their importance in the Revolution most historians have mostly studied their programs, it was how they did in the civil war that matters most in the Revolution's determination. The greater force of the two militarily, in mass, logistics, discipline, armament, mobility, range of operations, and duration in action, was Villa's Division of the North, probably the largest regular revolutionary army in the history of Latin America. Thanks to Katz, historians now know plenty about it, including, as he simply, brilliantly explained, the DN's central weakness, that to keep its columns together, maintain its revolutionary drive, it could not deliver on its agrarian reform.¹³ The lesser force, the Zapata-led Liberating Army of the South, was smaller, localized, much less mobile, but more coherent, consistent, intensive, intense, and subversive, always based in Morelos, thence not so much spread as replicated or adapted in neighboring provinces. Given its struggle with the sugar plantations in Morelos, the factories in the fields there, and the villages from which planters had taken land and drew labor, the very villages provisioning the ELS, its headquarters could do collective agrarian justice to some proprietary and proletarian workers, had every good reason to do it, and did it. Had these two exceptional forces cooperated in serious action in 1914-15, they probably could have broken the bourgeois-directed Carrancista force, giving the Sovereign Convention a little while to try to realize a Mexican national agrarian commonwealth. But precisely because of their different bases and organization, on which they went as far as they

¹³ Katz, *Villa*, 287-308, 358, 807. On Villa's agrarian contradiction: *ibid.*, 211, 236-238, 249, 403-414, 474-475, 541, 803, 808.

could in 1915, they could not cooperate for long on a national scale, politically or militarily, could not make a national power, and separately, serially, the Carrancista force wrecked them. The Obregón-commanded Constitutionalist Army of Operations destroyed the DN in 1915. The González-commanded Constitutionalist Army of the East destroyed the ELS in 1916. The Northern and Southern forces surviving in action (for years to come) in themselves could no longer endanger the new bourgeois-led regime of 1917.

That 1915-16 was when the Revolution took its critical turn, against a popular populist project, for a bourgeois progressivist project, is an old observation. It is right, in that the turn then was essential in making the Revolution what it turned out to be. But it is not right if it means the turn was no more than a matter of comparative politico-military capacities, for in this sense it would mean the turn was actually not critical, but inevitable, already in the class cards, so that the Revolution would inevitably end in the constitutional settlement of 1917. In fact it was the Revolution's critical turn, but in another, deeper sense, so that it took another four years to end in the final, spurious settlement of accounts in 1920. To understand what the really distinctive, definitive crisis was in 1915-16 takes analysis beyond the Villista, Zapatista, and Carrancista forces. And here the two other Revolutionary exceptions, secondary exceptions, demand consideration, because though secondary either of them in a revolutionary commitment in 1915-16 could have made a critical, historic difference.

Both of these exceptions were social movements inevitably deep in politics, one of certain Catholic laity, the other, quite different, a certain labor movement. The origins of both predated the Revolution. Their terrific, then incomprehensibly complex pre-Revolutionary histories, histories way too much, way too different, to treat here, involved so much contradiction that neither the Church nor the labor movement nationally could have taken these movements as

even nearly representative of them during the Revolution. The Church's clergy and laity took various attitudes (often in mutual discord) toward the different Revolutionary factions, most in accord in radical enmity with the Constitutionalist coalition, 1914-17. If only for this reason, not to go into others, doctrine, conscience, God's will, the already well organized social Catholics of Mexico City then, including the faithful who had church bells rung for the ELS on its occupation of the city, on Wednesday, November 25, 1914, and its regiments supplied for the parade into the city with the Guadalupe banner they carried, the Virgin Mary medallions they wore, could well in 1915 have organized a Partido Popular de México and a Zapatista underground there, to powerful effect, probably critical effect in 1916, of serious consequence long thereafter.¹⁴

¹⁴ Jorge Prieto Laurens, *Cincuenta años de política mexicana: Memorias políticas* (Mexico City: Editora Mexicana de Periódicos, Libros y Revistas, 1968), 10-30, 34, 37-41, 49-52; Jean Meyer, *La cristiada*, 3 vols. (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1973), II, 54-100; Manuel Ceballos Ramírez, *El catolicismo social: un tercero en discordia: Rerum Novarum, la "cuestión social" y la movilización de los católicos mexicanos (1891-1911)* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1991), 279-416; Javier Garciadiego Dantan, *Rudos contra científicos: La Universidad Nacional durante la Revolución mexicana* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1996), 60, 141, 204, 218, 229, 300, 327, 331-332, 337-338; Katz, *Villa*, 45-47, 51-52, 233-234, 236-237, 266-267, 404-409, 426-428, 446-448. The ELS's first entrance into the city: "Han entrado ya a la capital las tropas surianas," *Mexican Herald*, November 25, 1914; "Capital Quiet under Rule of the Zapatistas," *ibid.*, November 26, 1914; "Emiliano Zapata with His Staff Arrive in Capital," *ibid.*, November 28, 1914; Francisco Ramírez Plancarte, *La ciudad de México durante la revolución constitucionalista*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Ediciones Botas, 1941), 246-252; Gustavo Casasola, ed., *Historia gráfica de la Revolución Mexicana, 1900-1970*, 2nd ed., 10 vols. (Mexico City: Trillas, 1973), III, 928. The DN-ELS parade into the city, the ELS again Guadalupan: "60,000 Troops to Make Entry into Capital Today," *Mexican Herald*, December 6, 1914; "Troops from North and South Parade in Capital," *ibid.*, December 7, 1914; Ramírez Plancarte, *op. cit.*, 271-278; Casasola, *op. cit.*, III, 942; Christopher G. Cunningham, "The Casa del Obrero Mundial and the Mexican Revolution: Radical Ideology and the Role of the Urban Worker in Mexico City, 1912-1916," Dissertation, Ph.D. (University of Toronto: Department of History, 1978), 274, 447; Pineda Gómez, *La revolución*, 515. The individual likeliest most responsible for the Church's welcome of the ELS and its Guadalupan entry, Fr. Pedro Benavides Lira, then canon and treasurer of the Metropolitan Cathedral of the Archdiocese of Mexico City and secretary of the Holy Mitre there, in effect the archdiocesan vicar general, formerly parish priest at Tizayuca, Mex., Tlalpam, Santo Tomás la Palma, and San Pablo, all in the Federal District, and since 1896 a noted Guadalupan: "El cumplimiento Pascual en la Cárcel de Tlalpam," *El Tiempo*, June 19, 1895; "Instalación de la Junta Guadalupana," *Voz de México*, October 17, 1896; "Actualidades," *ibid.*, April 14, 1897, "La gran peregrinación obrera al Santuario de Ntra. Sra. de Guadalupe," *El Tiempo*, June 2, 1900; "Misiones," *ibid.*, May 6, 1902; "El colmo de la mala fe," *El País*, July 5, 1902; "Aviso Religioso," *Voz de México*, August 21, 1906; "Religioso," *El Tiempo*, October 21, 1906; "Más de cincuenta mil almas han presenciado la entrada del nuevo arzobispo de México," *El Tiempo*, February 12, 1909; "Cinco mil niños recibieron ayer la sagrada comunión," *El País*, February 20, 1909; "Las Bodas de Plata del señor Pbro. D. Modesto Basurto," *El Tiempo*, October 6, 1909; "Los nuevos Canónigos en la Catedral," *Correo Español*, February 11, 1910; "El señor Pbro. Aguilar celebra sus bodas de plata," *El Tiempo*, April 6, 1910; "Honras fúnebres por el eterno descanso del alma del señor Pbro. Don Modesto Basurto," *ibid.*, February 11, 1911; "Fue recibido con indescriptible entusiasmo la venerada imagen de Nuestra Señora de los Remedios, en Catedral," *El País*, April 19, 1912; "No se ha nombrado nuevo srio. de la Sagrada Mitra," *ibid.*, March 17, 1914; "Notes of the Passing Day,"

Much more important to all three major Revolutionary coalitions than was the other secondary exception, the labor movement. In this crisis it mattered little that in Mexico's national economic divisions of labor, still vastly rural, largely agricultural, only a small fraction were proletarians in urban services, mines, mills, factories, transportation, electrical power-plants, oil fields. What mattered was their industrially strategic power, how much specific power in production they had at their work to stop production in how many other departments of the national matrix of production, and so challenge (more or less) the existing order of national security (whatever there was of it). Of all this labor's various organizations nation-wide in 1914, in many different cities and towns, many different industries, many different political situations, in no national organization, unions in some fifteen militarily critical strategic places (strategic as ports or for their railroad shops) held industrially critical strategic power. Among them, no surprise, the most important was Mexico City, taking its suburbs too, the Distrito Federal. There in early 1915 under a quick Constitutionalist occupation, Obregón the post commander, unions suffered a critical schism. Many details highly reminiscent of the 1914 war-excited betrayals in European labor movements belong in a history of this schism in Mexican labor, but are not pertinent here. Analytically here let it suffice to summarize: Some unions accepted from Obregón an offer hard to refuse, Constitutionalist military service in their own "Red Battalions," their members' usual wages paid and veteran rights of return to their jobs on Constitutionalism's triumph over the Villista and Zapatista forces; other unions, politically independent, recently come together in a DF federation, would not hear the offer, and through 1915 defied successive DF post commanders by conducting, in the middle of the Revolutionary civil war, awful inflation, empty markets, and typhoid, four big strikes, for contractual recognition, wages, and

Mexican Herald, April 5, 1914; "El Canónigo Benavides Gob. de la Mitra," *ibid.*, March 17, 1915; "Está en Veracruz el Sr. Vicario Paredes," *ibid.*, March 22, 1915.

working conditions, which mostly they won.¹⁵ Of these independent unions industrially most strategic was the union at Mexico City Light and Power, the Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas (SME), organized in December 1914 under the ELS occupation of the capital, on a certain (secret) *entender* with Zapata, which it evidently maintained under Constitutionalist occupation after August 1915, and technically capable, as it proved more than once, of cutting motive power to mechanized transport, vital public services, and almost all modern industry in the DF.¹⁶ From

¹⁵ For good measure, by my count, seventeen, viz., Guaymas, Guadalajara, Juárez, Monterrey, Tampico, San Luis Potosí, Torreón, Aguascalientes, Irapuato, Celaya, Veracruz, Orizaba, Puebla, Apizaco, Rincón Antonio, Salina Cruz, and Mexico City: United States War Department, Office of the Chief of Staff, War College Division, General Staff, No. 21, *Monograph on Mexico* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1914), 97-121, 157-180; [George Marvin?] "What War with Mexico Means," *World's Work*, August 1916, 427-429; and *War Map of Mexico* (Garden City: World's Work, n.d. [1916]). The Red Battalions: Dr. Atl to Primer Jefe, March 1, 1915, Archivo Histórico de la Defensa Nacional (hereafter AHDN), XI/481.5/315/82; idem to Primer Jefe, May 17, 1915, *ibid.*, XI/481.5/316/89; idem to Primer Jefe, May 21, 1915, *ibid.*, XI/481.5/97/627; John Murray, "Labor Unionism Sweeping Mexico," *New York Call*, April 2, 1915; idem, "Mexico May Be First Socialist Republic..."; idem, "Murray in Trench As Bullets Sing," *ibid.*, May 2, 1915; idem, "Frown of American Guns in Harbor of Vera Cruz Prevented New Commune," *ibid.*, May 6, 1915; idem, "5,000 Persons in Orizaba, Mexico, Massed in Celebration of the Commune During Murray's Visit," *ibid.*, May 9, 1915; idem, "When Diaz Ruled Mexico it was slavery and death for workers. Under Carranza the workers strike and get the moral support of the Constitutionals," *ibid.*, May 19, 1915; idem, "When We Take a City, You Organize Workers, Carranza Tells Unions," *ibid.*, May 20, 1915, for copies of which last six documents I thank Jenny Kastner; idem, "Behind the Drums"; Eliseo López Rabela and Ismael E. Sonoqui, "Informe que rinde la comisión nombrada para investigar las cuentas del compañero Jesús Torres Polo, ex-tesorero de la Casa del Obrero Mundial," April 5, 1915, Archivo General de la Nación (hereafter AGN), Secretaría de Gobernación (hereafter G), 99-35; Comité Revolucionario de la Casa del Obrero Mundial de México to Eliseo Arredondo, June 10, 1915, AHDN, XI/481.5/316/240; Salazar and Escobedo, *op. cit.*, I, 92-113, 119-125, 137-142, 153-162; Ramírez Plancarte, *op. cit.*, 325, 355-362, 371-372; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 311-334, 341-365; Alicia Hernández Chávez, "Los Batallones Rojos y Obregón, un pacto inestable," ms., Simposio Denominado Gral. Emiliano Zapata Salazar y el Problema Campesino, November 30, 1979.

¹⁶ Indications of an SME-ELS understanding: Libros de Actas del Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas, I, December 14, 1914, February 6, February 13, April 13, April 16, April 21, June 2, August 11, August 13, 1915, II, November 17, November 20, November 24, December 1, December 2, December 6, December 18, December 21, December 22, December 29, 1915, January 8, February 19, March 1, 1916; L. Ochoa and E. Velasco to José Colado, December 22, 1914, AGN, Departamento de Trabajo (hereafter DT), 31/2/7/11; C.B. Vilchis, Informe confidencial, March 13, 1914 [sic, for 1915], AGN, G, 8-32; J. Guilbaldo Nava to Secretario de Gobernación, October 5, 1915, AGN, G, 177-89; "En las minas no se registraron daños," *Mexican Herald*, May 6, 1915; "Durante dos horas toda la ciudad careció de luz," *ibid.*, July 9, 1915; "Á última hora," *ibid.*, July 20, 1915; "El servicio de los eléctricos se normaliza," *ibid.*, July 21, 1915; "Tres poblaciones en poder del General Amado Azuara," *ibid.*, August 8, 1915; "Quedó arreglada la huelga gral. de electricistas" and "La huelga gral. paralizó ayer muchos servicios," *ibid.*, August 14, 1915; "Las concesiones a los electricistas," *ibid.*, August 21, 1915; "Se interrumpió el servicio de luz y fuerza," *ibid.*, September 15, 1915; "Luz y energía de las plantas de la capital," *ibid.*, September 16, 1915; "Fue recuperada Necaxa por el Gral. A. González" and "Se reanudaron los servicios de luz y agua," *ibid.*, September 29, 1915; "Los últimos triunfos de las armas constitucionalistas," *El Pueblo*, September 30, 1915; "Regocijo popular por los triunfos obtenidos en Torreón, Necaxa y Viesca," *ibid.*, October 2, 1915; "Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas," *ibid.*, December 15, 1915; "Un agitador trató de provocar una huelga entre los empleados de la Compañía de Tranvías," *ibid.*, March 29, 1916; Pablo González, "Parte oficial rendido por el General Pablo González, sobre los combates sostenidos contra fuerzas zapatistas, con motivo de la recuperación de la plaza de México, efectuada en el

July 31 to August 2, 1916, during the U.S. Punitive Expedition against Villa in Chihuahua, the SME struck power again, stopping the district's modern services and production, most offensively (if but briefly) at the National Army's Mexico City powder and ammunition factories. The Constitutionalist post command made the union quit the strike, significantly by orders, dire threats, displays of armed force, and arrests, no blood shed.¹⁷

mes de Julio de 1915 [July 12, 1915],” in Juan Barragán, *Historia del Ejército y de la Revolución Constitucionalista*, 2 vols. (Mexico City: Antigua Librería Robredo, 1946), II, 609; idem, “Parte oficial de las operaciones militares llevadas a cabo por el Cuerpo de Ejército de Oriente desde el 17 de Julio hasta la reocupación de la Ciudad de México, el 2 de agosto de 1915 [August 2, 1915],” *ibid.*, II, 611-617; idem, “Informe, que el General de División Pablo González, rinde al C. Venustiano Carranza, Primer Jefe del Ejército Constitucionalista y Encargado del Poder Ejecutivo de la Nación, sobre su gestión en la parte administrativa, como General en Jefe del Cuerpo de Ejército de Oriente y con motivo de la recuperación y ocupación de la Ciudad de México y poblaciones cercanas [December 1915],” in Pablo González [Jr.], *El centinela fiel del constitucionalismo* (Saltillo: Editorial Alfonso Reyes, 1971), 411-414, 426, 431, 433, 435-436; Graham Fulton to Secretario de Gobernación, July 8, 1916, AGN, G, 205-54; idem to Secretario de Gobernación, July 14, 1916, AGN, G, 205-53; idem to Secretario de Gobernación, July 26, AGN, G, 206-41; Subsecretario de Comunicaciones to Secretario de Guerra, July 28, 1916, *ibid.*; Fulton to Secretario de Gobernación, September 4, 1916, AGN, G, 221-64; Hernández Chávez, “Los Batallones Rojos,” 3-4, 12-15, nn 5, 22, 24, 25, 27; idem, “El zapatismo, 38-41; David G. LaFrance, “Lucas and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-1917, in Guy P.C. Thomson with David G. LaFrance, *Patriotism, Politics, and Popular Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Juan Francisco Lucas and the Puebla Sierra* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1999), 294-300.

¹⁷ Among abundant sources, e.g., Secretario de Justicia to Secretario de Gobernación, June 13, 1916, AGN, G, 157-53; Ignacio López Bancalari to Lugo, June 24 and July 11, 1916, AGN, Departamento de Trabajo (hereafter DT), 31/2/11/14; Director del Departamento de Trabajo to Gerente General de la Compañía Mexicana de Luz y Fuerza Motriz, June 27, 1916, *ibid.*; B.G. Hill to Subsecretario de Fomento, July 20, 1916, AGN, DT, 34/1/13/2; Graham Fulton to Secretario de Gobernación, July 26, 1916; Libro de Actas del Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas, II, July 26, October 16, 1916; “La Confederación de sindicatos exige para los trabajadores a partir del día de hoy, el pago de salarios a base de oro,” *El Pueblo*, July 22, 1916; “Sindicatos obreros,” *ibid.*, July 23, 1916; “Las clases laboriosas no deben divorciarse en su conducta económica, del gobierno de la revolución,” *ibid.*, July 25, 1916; “Obreros de la metrópoli: Volved sobre vuestros pasos,” “Los obreros de México no han tenido plena conciencia de su conducta legal,” and “Conceptos del ciudadano Primer Jefe que deben tener presentes los obreros,” *ibid.*, extra, August 1, 1916; “Ayer, a Medio Día, Fueron Reanudados los Servicios Públicos que se Encontraban en Suspense a Causa de la Huelga,” *ibid.*, August 3, 1916; “Á propósito de la huelga,” “El noventa por ciento de los obreros declarados en huelga se ha presentado ya a reanudar sus labores,” and “Se Fija la Jornada de Ocho Horas de Trabajo para los Obreros de los Ferrocarriles Constitucionalsitas,” *ibid.*, August 4, 1916; “La Opinión Pública y la Huelga” “Los Enemigos de la Patria Siempre Serán de los Obreros,” and “Está terminada la averiguación judicial contra los obreros huelguistas,” *ibid.*, August 5, 1916; “¿Huelga.....[sic] Política?,” “La “Última Huelga,” “Nombraron defensor los obreros detenidos,” and “Con motivo de la huelga,” *ibid.*, August 6, 1916; “Sobre el mismo tema,” “Una entrevista con los obreros de Puebla a propósito de la huelga,” “Terminó el proceso de Ernesto Velasco y Luis Harris,” and “Está Próximo el Consejo de Guerra de los Huelguistas,” *ibid.*, August 8, 1916; “Hoy se efectuará el consejo de guerra de los obreros huelguistas,” *ibid.*, August 10, 1916; “Fueron absueltos del delito de rebellion los obreros procesados,” *ibid.*, August 12, 1916; “Queja de Empleados Contra el Sindicato de Electricistas,” *ibid.*, August 15, 1916; “Los Obreros Huelguistas Comparecerán Nuevamente ante el Consejo de Guerra,” *ibid.*, August 16, 1916; “El Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas rechaza varios cargos que se le hacen,” *ibid.*, August 21, 1916; “Se efectuó el consejo de guerra de los obreros huelguistas,” *ibid.*, August 27, 1916; “Ayer Fueron Restablecidos los Servicios Públicos que Quedaron en Suspense al Estallar la Huelga” and “Durante el Movimiento Huelguista, La Fábrica Nacional de Armas no [sic] Interrumpió sus Labores,” *El Demócrata*, August 3, 1916; “Son muy graves las

Consider the difference it would have made in the Revolution if a Red Battalion had mutinied, turned to fight as a Zapatista battalion, some agitation for which did happen.¹⁸ Much more important: Consider if the Mexican Machinists Union's railroad local in the DF, or better the SME, or better yet both, jointly, had organized underground cells for anti-Constitutionalist resistance in the district, coordinated with ELS headquarters for decisive action, turned a district general economic strike into a political mass strike, demanding not only a new, popular national government, but nationalization of land, disabled the capital's Constitutionalist command, and opened the city for the ELS to retake it, Machinists-SME strike committee taking economic charge of the district, ELS headquarters decreeing nationalization of all land in Mexico, for locally elected committees of working farmers to entitle to the local justified, retribute to the

trascendencias de la huelga," *La Defensa*, extra, August 1, 1916; "Hoy, a las cinco de la tarde, se promulgará la Ley Marcial en vista de que los obreros no cejan en su actitud," *El Nacional*, August 1, 1916; "A las doce y media se reanudaron todos los servicios públicos, entre ellos, los tranvíos y eléctricos y el alumbrado," *ibid.*, August 2, 1916; "El Consejo de Guerra de los promotores de la última huelga se reunió hoy por la mañana," *ibid.*, August 11, 1916; "Ernesto H. Velasco fue sentenciado a sufrir la pena capital," *ibid.*, August 28, 1916; "Sección Telegráfica," *Periódico Oficial del Estado de Chihuahua*, August 5, 1916; R.G. Cox, "A 'Good' Government in Action," *Regeneración*, August 28, 1916; idem, "Benevolence on a Rampage," *ibid.*, September 16, 1916; idem, "The Real Carranza" and "Carranza Still at It," *Regeneración*, September 30, 1916; "Promedios de kilowatts-hora generados en la planta de Necaxa, en comparación con los acontecimientos políticos [February 1913-July 1922]," Archivo de la Compañía de Luz y Fuerza Motriz de México, for a copy of which document I thank Jonathan Schrag; Salazar and Escobedo, *op. cit.*, I, 184-187, 200-208; Rosendo Salazar, *Líderes y sindicatos* (Mexico City: T.C. Modelo, 1953), 55-61; Valadés, *op. cit.*, V, 364-381; Luis Araíza, *Historia del movimiento obrero mexicano*, 4 vols. (Mexico City: Editorial Cuauhtémoc, 1964-65), III, 138-177; Jacinto Huitrón, *Orígenes e historia del movimiento obrero en México* (Mexico City: Editores Mexicanos Unidos, 1974), 193-296; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 383-394; Berta Ulloa, *Historia de la Revolución Mexicana, 1914-1917* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1983), 271-324; John Lear, *Workers, Neighbors, and Citizens: The Revolution in Mexico City* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 2001), 320-340; Ariel Rodríguez Kuri, *Historia del desasosiego: La revolución en la ciudad de México, 1911-1922* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2010), 125-177.

¹⁸ Background and instigation: "Coyoacán: le será aplicado el artículo 33 a Eloy Armenta," *El Diario*, May 31, 1913; "Notes of the Passing Day," *Mexican Herald*, June 1, 1913; "Los que salen del país," *La Opinión*, June 2, 1913; "Se expulsarán a unos peligrosos socialistas," *El Imparcial*, June 3, 1913; "Los que salen del país," *El Correo Español*, June 7, 1913; "El mitín socialista," *Diario del Hogar*, September 7, 1914; "Notes of the Passing Day," *Mexican Herald*, October 31, 1914; "Arrest of Director of Workingmen's Society," *ibid.*, November 1, 1914; "Los sindicatos de Artes Gráficas y Sastres apoyan definitivamente la idea de la Casa del Obrero para ayudar a la Revolución," *El Pueblo*, March 8, 1915; "Regocijo popular por los triunfos... Expulsión de un agitador," *ibid.*, October 2, 1915; "El movimiento obrero en Guanajuato," *ibid.*, December 10, 1915; [C.D. López] "Sociedades y sindicatos," *ibid.*, February 15, 1919; "Informe del Sr. J. Guilebaldo [sic] Nava al Director General de Consulados, Rafael Múzquiz, acerca de la fundación y actividades de la Casa Obrera Mundial, por el Sr. Eloy Armenta [October 15, 1915], in Isidro Fabela, ed., *Documentos Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana*, 23 vols. in 10, plus index (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Editorial Jus, 1960-76), IV-1, 257-259; Oficial Mayor de Hacienda to Secretario de Gobernación, March 4, 1916, AGN, G, 5-67; and Lear, *op. cit.*, 275-276.

local dispossessed, and distribute to the local landless.¹⁹ Even if, most likely, this Mexico City Commune had failed, it would have made a terrific, historic difference in the Revolution and to popular memory of the Revolution. Assume it failed. Consider its effect anyway on the constitutional convention, scheduled for November 1916; and if the convention had met anyway and issued a bourgeois-proprietary constitution in 1917, consider the memory of the Commune of 1916 on the crisis of succession in 1920. The Paris Commune failed. So in April 1916 did Ireland's Easter Uprising. But they left mighty memories, vivid, indelible through the 20th century, of popular revolutionary force in action, in struggle, for the foundation of a national, democratic, socially concerned republic.²⁰ Like a minor, distant premonition of the great,

¹⁹ These kinds of strikes: Karl Kautsky, *Der Weg zur Macht: politische Betrachtungen über das hineinwachsen in die Revolution*, 2nd ed., rev. (Berlin: Vorwärts, 1910). Agrarian reform: cf. "Plan de Ayala [November 25, 1911]," in Josefina E. de Fabela, ed., *Documentos Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana* (1970), XXI, 35-40; "Ley Agraria [October 26, 1915]," *ibid.*, XXI, 246-253; and "Programa de reformas político-sociales de la Revolución aprobado por la Soberana Convención Revolucionaria [April 18, 1916]," in Luis F. Amaya C., *La Soberana Convención Revolucionaria, 1914-1916* (Mexico City: F. Trillas, 1966), 459-460; with V.I. Lenin, *To the Rural Poor* [1903], 2nd ed., rev. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1967); *idem*, *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907* [1907] (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954), 299-308; and D.A. Kolesnichenko, "Agrarnye proecty Trudovoi gruppy v I Gosudarstvennoi dume," *Istoricheskie zapiski*, No. 82 (1968), 40-88. The ELS public and underground in Mexico City, 1912-16: Ramírez Plancarte, *op. cit.*, 333-334, 368-372; Mendieta Alatorre, *op. cit.*, 27-39, 65; Pineda Gómez, *La revolución*, 32, 268-277, 292-293, 296-298, 518-522, 526-529; *idem*, *Ejército*, 105-110, 182-183, 187, 195-201, 204-205, 214, 276, 279-288, 359; and e.g., "Acúsanlas de enviar armas a los del Sur," *Mexican Herald*, October 6, 1915; "Notas de México... Fueron aprehendidas las hijas de Paulino Martínez," *El Pueblo*, October 8, 1915; "Aprehensión de espías zapatistas" and "Vendian parque a los zapatistas," *El Nacional*, July 8, 1916; "Fueron detenidos unos espías zapatistas," *ibid.*, July 28, 1916. Cf. the old anarcho-confusion urged in Mexico in 1915-16, e.g., Miguel Mendoza L. Schwerdtfeger, *!Tierra libre!* (Mexico City: Secretaría de Fomento, 1915); Ricardo Flores Magón, "La barricada y la trinchera," *Regeneración* (Los Angeles), November 20, 1915; *idem*, "La necesidad del momento," *ibid.*, January 8, 1916; *idem*, "¡Venganza!" *ibid.*, August 26, 1916; "Manifiesto al Pueblo Mexicano [Tlaltizapan, June 1916]," *ibid.*, November 26, 1916, all from Armando Bartra, ed., *Regeneración, 1900-1918: La corriente más radical de la Revolución de 1910 a través de su periódico de combate* (Mexico City: HADISE, 1972), respectively 451-452, 462-466, 485, 488-495; Comité Central, La Confederación del Trabajo de la Región Mexicana, "Declaración de Principios..., Pacto de Solidaridad [March 13-14, 1916]," in Salazar and Escobedo, *Las pugnas*, 179-180; "Programa de reformas [April 18, 1916]," *op. cit.*, 459-463; with V.I. Lenin, "Socialism and War: The Attitude of the R.S.D.L.P. towards the War [July-August 1915]," *Collected Works*, XXI, 295-338; *idem*, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination [January-February 1916]," *ibid.*, XXII, 143-156; *idem*, "The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up [July 1916]," *ibid.*, XXII, 353-358; *idem*, "The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution [September 1916]," *ibid.*, XXIII, 77-87; *idem*, "Letters from Afar: Fifth Letter, The Tasks Involved in the Building of the Revolutionary Proletarian State [March 26/April 8, 1917]," *ibid.*, XXIII, 340-342; *idem*, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution [April 4-5/17-18, 1917]," *ibid.*, XXIV, 19-26.

²⁰ Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France* [1871] (New York: International Publishers, 1940), 58-64, 81-82, 85-86; Edward S. Mason, *The Paris Commune: An Episode in the History of the Socialist Movement* (New York:

doomed Entente-U.S.-imposed Euro-Armistice of 1918-19, President Carranza's bourgeois-proprietary coalition of 1917-18 depended not only on the new National Army, but also on strategic militia and transport unions, which memory of the Commune would have made even more disloyal than they actually were in the crisis of 1920.

That a Mexico City Commune in 1916, even the potential there for constituting the core of a national democratic Mexican social republic, is too much to consider, unreasonable, out of the question, that it reeks of juvenile leftist fantasy, goes right toward my point. It is way too much to consider for any practical purpose. But it serves nevertheless for some good historical reflection and to make my point.

First, it raises interesting questions, leading questions, about the crisis of 1915-16: What would it have taken for this kind of revolutionary action to happen, radical revolutionary action? Never mind poor Ricardo Flores Magón then, or poor Juan Sarabia, or truly heroic Lázaro Gutiérrez de Lara.²¹ Never mind Mexico's Samuel Gompers, Luis N. Morones.²² Never mind the

Macmillan, 1930). Mexican news on the Irish rebellion: "Sangrientes Motines Tienen Lugar en la Ciudad de Dublin, Donde Gran Número de Civiles Sostiene Nutrido Tiroteo con las Fuerzas del Gobierno," "Las Calles de Dublin continúan siendo teatro de acontecimientos trágicos," "En la capital de Irlanda ondea el pabellón republicano," and "La Ciudad de Dublin Recobra su Perdida Calma," *El Pueblo*, April 26, April 28, April 29, and May 2, 1916. Cf. Thomas Darragh [Roddy Connolly?], "Revolutionary Ireland and Communism," *Communist International*, old ser., No. 10-11 (June-July 1920), columns 2281-2294. Memory, fidelity, and fortitude: V.I. Lenin, "Karl Marx: A Brief Biographical Sketch with an Exposition of Marxism [1913]," *Collected Works*, XXI, 78; Haupt, *op. cit.*, 45-76; George Jackson, "Interview," "P.S. On Discipline," and "On Withdrawal," *The Black Panther*, August 28, 1971, pp. 6-8, 13-17, 19; Priscilla Metscher, *Republicanism and Socialism in Ireland: A Study in the Relationship of Politics and Ideology from the United Irishmen to James Connolly*, 2nd ed. (Dublin: Connolly Books, for publication in May 2016); Finbar Cullen, "Commemorating the 1916 Rising: Taking stock," *Socialist Voice*, March 1916, <http://www.communistpartyofireland.ie/sv/07-rising>.

²¹ Lázaro Gutiérrez de Lara and Edgcomb Pinchon, *The Mexican People: Their Struggle for Freedom* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1914); John L. Donnelly et al., *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Convention of the Arizona State Federation of Labor, held at Clifton, Arizona, August 6 to 10, 1917* (Miami [Ariz.]: Convention City, 1918), 7-8, 11-13, 34, 36-38, 44-46, 48, 54-56, 58-59, 63-65; "Mexican Agitator Killed in Sonora," *Copper Era and Morenci Leader*, February 8, 1918; "Freed in Gun Plot, Held in Draft Case," *Los Angeles Herald*, February 16, 1918; "El leader socialista Gutiérrez de Lara, promotor de levantamientos entre los Yaquis, fue capturado y fusilado," *El Informador*, March 8, 1918; Gail H. Stimson, *The Rise of the Labor Movement in Los Angeles* (Berkeley: University of California, 1955), 226-233, 305-310, 321-323; Eugenio Martínez Núñez, *Juan Sarabia: Apóstol y mártir de la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1965); Cockcroft, *op. cit.*, 180, 202, 224; Huitrón, *op. cit.*, 74-75, 227; W. Dirk Raat, *Revoltosos: Mexico's Rebels in the*

quack Dr. Atl.²³ What about Antonio Villarreal (and his sisters), or Manuel Palafox, or Antonio Díaz Soto y Gama, or Jacinto Huitrón, or Celestino Gasca?²⁴ None of them or any others of their

United States, 1903-1923 (College Station: Texas A & M University, 1981), 17, 21, 25-27, 47-54, 58-59, 80-87, 106, 118-119, 121, 191, 193, 212; José C. Valadés, *El joven Ricardo Flores Magón* (Mexico City: Editora Extemporáneos, 1983); Juan L. Sariego Rodríguez, *Enclaves y Minerales en el Norte de México: Historia social de los mineros de Cananea y Santa Rosita, 1900-1970* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 1988), 132-134, 152, 159-160; Carlos Macías Richard, *Vida y temperamento: Plutarco Elías Calles, 1877-1920* (Hermosillo: Instituto Sonorense de Cultura, 1995), 231-232; Philip J. Mellinger, *Race and Labor in Western Copper: The Fight for Equality, 1896-1918* (Tucson: University of Arizona, 1995), 89, 142, 154-173, 197; F. Arturo Rosales, ed., *Testimonio: Documentary History of the Mexican-American Struggle for Civil Rights* (Houston: Arte Público, 2000), 217; Claudio Lomnitz, *The Return of Comrade Ricardo Flores Magón* (New York: Zone Books, 2014).

²² Araiza, *op. cit.*, III, 59-60, 108-111, 114, 131, 187-189, IV 12-55; José Ortiz Petricioli, *El compañero Morones: Biografía de un gran líder* (Mexico City: B. Costa-Amic, 1968).

²³ On Atl's references, their culture, and the impostor himself: André Arnyvelde [André Lévy], "La Courtisane," *L'Illustration théâtrale: Journal d'actualités dramatiques*, No. 41 (October 27, 1906), 1-40; idem, "Les Arts: Un grand peintre mexicain, Atl," *Gil Blas*, January 19, 1912; idem, "À propos d'un livre récent: l'oeuvre écrite dans la chambre close--Chez M. Marcel Proust," *Le Miroir*, December 21, 1913, summarized in partial tr. in Marcel Proust, *Swann's Way*, ed. Susanna Lee (New York: W.W. Norton, 2014), 409-411; Gaston Sorbets, "La Courtisane à la Comédie Française," *L'Illustration théâtrale*, No. 41 (October 27, 1906), ii, inside back cover; "Exposition Atl," *Gil Blas*, May 1, 1914; Jean Jaurès, "Au Mexique," *L'Humanité*, July 17, 1914; [Antonio] Fabra Ribas, "La démission du Général Huerta," *ibid.*, July 17, 1914; "Le Général Huerta donne les Raisons de sa Démission," *ibid.*, July 17, 1914; Marciano C. de Medina, "Los ferrocarrileros formarán una brigada," *El Pueblo*, December 25, 1914; Doctor Atl [Gerardo Murillo], "La Importancia de la Revolución Mexicana en el Conflicto Mundial," *ibid.*, December 31, 1914; "Hoy habrá mitín en la Plaza de Armas," *ibid.*, January 7, 1915; M. Fernández Cabrera, "Mi viaje a México: El doctor Atl," *ibid.*, January 8, 1915; Jorge Useta, "Al margen de los sucesos diarios," *ibid.*, January 9, 23, 1915; "Los últimos trabajos de la Confederación Revolucionaria," *ibid.*, January 19, 1915; "Notas personales y de sociedad," *ibid.*, January 20, 1915; "Notas obreras," *ibid.*, January 22, 1915; "Movimiento de pasajeros," *ibid.*, February 18, 1915; "Quedó en libertad el vicario capitular, señor canónigo Paredes," *ibid.*, February 25, 1915; "Informe que rindió el ingeniero Pani sobre los trabajos de la Junta Revolucionaria de Auxilios," *ibid.*, March 11, 1915; "Manifestación en memoria de los mártires de Río Blanco," *ibid.*, March 13, 1915; John Murray, "John Murray Finds Soul of Mexican Revolution; Tells of Labor's Hopes," *New York Call*, March 31, 1915; idem, "Mexico May Be First Socialist Republic, Says John Murray, in Heart of Revolutionary Center," *ibid.*, April 4, 1915; Dr. Atl, "The Importance of the Mexican Revolution in the World's Conflict," *ibid.*, May 16, 1915, for the last three articles thanks to Jenny Kastner; idem, "La Prensa llamada 'Revolucionaria,'" *Acción Mundial*, May 16, 1916; "La Peticion de los obreros," *ibid.*, July 25, 1916; Gonzalo de la Parra, "Gerardo Murillo, alias Doctor Atl, no puede digerir sus fracasos," *El Nacional*, May 17, 1916; Salazar and Escobedo, *Las pugnas*, I, 203-304; Clement Greenberg, "Avant Garde and Kitsch [1939]," in his *Art and Culture: Critical Essays* (Boston: Beacon, 1965), 3-21; Paul Fort, *Mes mémoires: toute la vie d'un poète, 1872-1943* (Paris: Flammarion, 1944); Dr. Atl, *Gentes profanas en el convento* (Mexico City: Ediciones Botas, 1950), 67-74; Antonio Luna Arroyo, *El Dr. Atl: Paisajista puro* (Mexico City: Editorial Cultura, 1952), 15-42; Huitrón, *op. cit.*, 257-258, 275, 277, 296; Roger Shattuck, *The Banquet Years: The Origins of the Avant-Garde in France, 1885 to World War I* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1961), 7-29, 40-43, 186-222, 273-287; Paul Desanges, "Chronique d'une communauté militante: Les Forgerons, 1911-1920," *Le mouvement social*, No. 91 (April 1975), 35-43; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 282-299, 307, 309-315, 320-321, 354, 393; Arturo Casado Navarro, *Gerardo Murillo: El Dr. Atl* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1984), 13-32, 177-182; Debora L. Silverman, *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-Siècle France: Politics, Psychology, and Style* (Berkeley: University of California, 1989), 212-214, 226-228, 275, 284-314; Richard D. Sonn, *Anarchism & Cultural Politics in Fin-de-Siècle France* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1989), 26, 55-56, 76-78, 181-210; Daniel Wildenstein, *Monet, or the Triumph of Impressionism* (Cologne: Benedikt Taschen Verlag, 1999), 400. Cf. Robert Hunter, *Socialists at Work* (New York: Macmillan, 1908), 31-55, 71-75, 236-238; William Z. Foster, "Revolutionary Tactics," *The Agitator*, April 15, May 1, May 15, June 1, June 15, July 1, 1912; idem, "Syndicalism in France," *ibid.*, July 15, August 1, August 15, 1912; idem, *From Bryan to Stalin* (New York:

experience, courage, intelligence, or popular commitment, at their most “social,” went farther than 19th-century “social revolution,” good, old utopian anarchism (not even anarcho-syndicalism). None in 1915-16 much less later took a firm step or spoke a clear word for a decisive, definitive break with capitalism in Mexico, for a revolution, then, there, as yet of course both proletarian and proprietarian, but clearly, purposefully, definitely headed toward a new, 20th-century socialism.²⁵ How different would they have had to be, to envision it, organize for it, and try to make it? What would have made them that different?

International Publishers, 1937), 47-52; idem, *Pages from a Worker's Life* (New York: International Publishers, 1939), 286-293; idem, *History of the Three Internationals: The World Socialist and Communist Movements from 1848 to the Present* (New York: International Publishers, 1955), 157-249; Edward P. Johanningsmeier, *Forging American Communism: The Life of William Z. Foster* (Princeton: Princeton University, 2014), 42-46, 56-87; and V.I. Lenin, warning of “anarcho-syndicalists” acting “as shamefully [as] in France,” in his “The European War and International Socialism [September 1914],” *Collected Works*, XXI, 23.

²⁴ Fortunato Lozano, *Antonio I. Villarreal, Vida de un Gran Mexicano* (Monterrey: Imprenta Monterrey, 1959); Cockcroft, *op. cit.*, 83, 121-122, 125-133, 136, 147-153, 161-162, 175, 180-182, 192-203, 230; Huitrón, *op. cit.*, 194-196, 198, 210-213, 224, 227, 235-247, 254, 257, 259, 262, 264, 266, 268, 278, 282-283, 291, 293; Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 269-271, 317, 324, 369; Gloria Sánchez Azcona, *El general Antonio I. Villarreal, civilista de la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1980); Raat, *op. cit.*, 19, 21-22, 25-27, 32, 37-38, 46-55, 58-61, 79-87, 95, 104-106, 118-119, 125-126, 132-136, 145-147, 151-167, 191-193, 212; César Garza Guajardo, *El gobierno revolucionario de Antonio I. Villarreal, 1914* (Monterrey: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, 1988); Gloria Villegas Moreno, *Antonio Díaz Soto y Gama, intelectual revolucionario* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2010), 520-529, 536-542; Mexico, Secretaría de la Cámara de Senadores del Congreso de la Unión, 2a. Comisión de Guerra, XXXIV Legislatura, “Hoja de Servicios del General de Brigada Manuel Palafox Ybarrola,” November 24, 1931, 1485/70; Araiza, *op. cit.*, III, 21, 45, 65-66, 69, 72, 76-77, 100, 177, IV, 37-39, 42, 47-49, 95-98; Jeffrey K. Lucas, *The Rightward Drift of Mexico's Former Revolutionaries* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2010), 57-239; Elisa Servin, “Reclaiming Revolution in Light of the ‘Mexican Miracle’: Celestino Gasca and the Federacionistas Leales Insurrection of 1961,” *The Americas*, LXVI, 4 (April 2010), 527-557.

²⁵ Paul Zierold, “Die Revolution in Mexiko,” *Die Neue Zeit*, XXIX, 2 (1911), 396-402; idem [translator], “Suicides in the Army,” *International Socialist Review*, XV, 4 (October 1914), 254; “Progress in Mexico,” *ibid.*, XV, 8 (February 1915), 508; Jacinto Huitrón Chavero and Luis Méndez to Congreso Anarquista de Londres, July 8, 1914, in Huitrón, *op. cit.*, 242-246; idem, *ibid.*, 299-304; Linn A.E. Gale, “Mex [sic] Socialists Join Commune [sic] Party,” *Butte Daily Bulletin*, September 22, 1920; Andrei [Pestkovsky] to Dorogoi Druzhyha, December 8, 1924, RGASPI, 495-108-39, thanks to Miles V. Rodriguez; Vol'skii [Pestkovsky], *op. cit.*, 168-176, 187-206; Woog, “Chiffres et Matériaux,” 164-169, 212-220; Stirner [Woog], “Rapport Politique,” September 15, 1929, pp. (as renumbered) 76-90; Kheifets, *op. cit.*, 49-50, 112-121, 130-133, 139-162, 177-190, 338-358. Cf. Pineda Gómez, *La revolución*, 450; idem, *Ejército*, 261-288, 302-305, 316-321; and, for example, V. I. Lenin, “Letters on Tactics [April 1917],” *Collected Works*, XXIV, 44-51; idem, “From a Publicist's Diary [September 14 (1), 1917],” *ibid.*, XXV, 294-304; idem, “The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky [October-November 1918],” *ibid.*, XXVIII, 294-304, 311-315; Alexander V. Chayanov, *The Theory of Peasant Economy* [1924-28] (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1986), 1-28; Mancur Olson, *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1965); Eric R. Wolf, *Peasants* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1965), 77-95; Harold Wolpe, “Capitalism and Cheap Labour-Power in South Africa: From Segregation to Apartheid,”

These questions are interesting, because they bear on the history from which these men came, the history that formed them, and limited them. Reflection here raises necessary, compelling questions about that history, Mexico, 1870-1910. What was it about that history that prevented these men from growing not only a strong-hearted, righteous alienation from capitalism and its bourgeoisie, but a clear, critical intelligence on capitalism, so that they could quit fantasies of reforming it to fight for a revolution to go in fact deliberately beyond it, toward making the new socialism. That history was not short on popular heroes, courageous champions of popular justice. But it had nothing clear against capitalism, for post-capitalist socialism.²⁶ I would argue that the essential problems of that history then were both Liberalism, its duplicity, complacency, mendacity, hypocrisy, presumption, and Catholicism, for more than its craven adaptation to capitalism, its outright accommodation of capitalism and bourgeois pride.²⁷ That history instilled in the generation of men who made the Mexican Revolution some kind of radically misplaced duty to their fateful past, too much trust in it, some fatal trust in reform, some incapacity for alienation, to take the saving grace of alienation, to go or think past reform, so that they could not even see the new socialism, much less understand it, organize for it, fight for it.

Economy and Society, I, 4 (1972), 425-456; idem, "Introduction," in idem, *The Articulation of Modes of Production: Essays from Economy and Society* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), 1-45.

²⁶ Cf. James Connolly, *Labour in Irish History* (Dublin: Maunsel and Co., 1910); Priscilla Metscher, *James Connolly and the Reconquest of Ireland* (Minneapolis: MEP Publications, 2002); idem, "James Connolly and the Wider Class Politics of 1916," *Marxism-Leninism Today*, March 1916, <http://mltoday.com/article/2387>.

²⁷ Liberalism: Judith N. Shklar, *The Faces of Injustice* (New Haven: Yale University, 1990); Walter B. Michaels, *The Trouble with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality* (New York, Henry Holt, 2006); Carole Pateman and Charles W. Mills, *Contract & Domination* (Cambridge: Polity, 2007); Losurdo, *op. cit.*; Karen E. Fields and Barbara J. Fields, *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life* (London: Verso, 2012); Adolph Reed, Jr., "Marx, Race, and Neoliberalism," *New Labor Forum*, XXII, 1 (Winter 2013), 49-57. Catholicism: Jean-Michel-Alfred Vacant, *Études théologiques sur les constitutions du Concile du Vatican d'après les actes du Concile*, 2 vols. (Paris: Delhomme et Briguet, 1895), I, 134-145, 298-303, II, 256-262; Gerald A. McCool, *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century: The Quest for a Unitary Method* (New York: Seabury, 1977); Hans U. von Balthasar, *The Glory of the Lord: A Theological Aesthetics*, 7 vols. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1982), V, 21-29; Fergus Kerr, *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism* (Malden: Blackwell, 2002); idem, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neo-Scholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007).

So here is what the Mexican Revolution actually did that was most significant, what its most significant possibilities the dynamics of its decade, including its own struggles, opened, and the most significant possibilities were, and what the most significant possibilities were that it did not realize, even move toward realizing. It broke the old imperialist deal on Mexico, and it broke the old regime in Mexico. In the global dynamics of its decade, hugely The Great War, it opened immense revolutionary possibilities, wide-open clear ways to drive through capitalism in Mexico into the new modern phase of class struggle, purposefully toward socialism. It did not seriously enter these ways, this kind of struggle. It remained very largely in the long 19th century. It did not drive into the short, but tremendous 20th century.

John Womack, Jr.
Widener 46
Harvard University
October 28, 2015
Deo gratias