

© John Womack, Jr.

On The Revolution of the South, 1911-1920, Histories to Study:
What We Still Do Not Know of Them,
What It Would Be Worth Knowing

In memory of Stanley Francis Rother,
Okarche, Oklahoma, March 27, 1935-
Santiago Atitlán, Guatemala, July 28, 1981

Through the almost 50 years gone since my last serious research on *La Revolución del Sur*, the armed revolutionary struggle that from its base in Morelos made Emiliano Zapata its chief, 1911-1919, many new historical studies of the struggle have come into print from which I have learned much that has been wonderfully new to me. More than 50 studies I could cite in Spanish and English that deserve the close attention of all who want to understand this regionally based but nationally conscious and nationally crucial movement.¹ In particular respect for their

¹ María T. Álvarez Icaza Longoria, “El zapatismo rondando la capital,” in [Javier Garcíadiego, ed.,] *Zapatismo origen e historia* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de las Revoluciones de México, 2009), 369-388; Marco A. Anaya Perez, *Rebelión y revolución en Chalco-Amecameca, Estado de México, 1821-1921* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios de la Revolución Mexicana, 1997); idem, “La revolución zapatista en la region de los Volcanes (1910-1920),” in *Zapatismo*, 323-350; Jesús Ángeles Contreras, *Felipe Ángeles: Su vida y su obra* (Pachuca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo, 1996); Felipe A. Ávila Espinosa, *Los orígenes del zapatismo* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2001); Hector Ávila Sánchez, *Aspectos históricos de la formación de regiones en el estado de Mexico, desde sus orígenes hasta 1930* (Cuernavaca: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2002); Samuel Brunk, *Emiliano Zapata: Revolution & Betrayal in Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1995); Raymond Buve, *El movimiento revolucionario en Tlaxcala* (Tlaxcala: Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala, 1994); Patrick J. Carroll, *Blacks in Colonial Veracruz: Race, Ethnicity, and Regional Development* (Austin: University of Texas, 2001); Antonio Escobar Ohmstede, *De la costa a la sierra: Los pueblos indios de las huastecas (Mexico City: 1750-1900)* (Instituto Nacional Indigenista, 1998); idem, “La desamortización de tierras civiles corporativas en México: ¿una ley agraria, fiscal o ambas? Una aproximación a las tendencias en la historiografía,” *Mundo agrario* [Universidad de La Plata, Argentina], XIII, 25 (2nd sem., 2012), 1-33; Bernardo García Martínez, *El Marquesado del Valle: Tres siglos de régimen señorial en Nueva España* (Mexico City: Colegio del México, 1969); idem, *Los pueblos de la Sierra: El poder y el espacio entre los indios del norte de Puebla hasta 1700* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1987); idem, “Pueblos de indios, pueblos de castas: New Settlements and Traditional Corporate Organization in Eighteen-Century New Spain,” in Arij Ouweneel and Simon Miller, eds., *The Indian Community of Colonial Mexico: Fifteen Essays on Land Tenure, Corporate Organization, Ideology and Village Politics* (Amsterdam: Centro de Estudios y Documentación Latinoamericanos, 1990), 103-116; Adolfo Gilly, “¿Y de mis caballos, qué? (un incidente en la vida del general Felipe Ángeles,” in idem, ed., *Felipe Ángeles en la Revolución* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2008), 37-67; Catalina H. de Giménez, *Así cantaban la revolución* (Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1991); Francisco J. Gorostiza, *Los ferrocarriles en la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: Sliglo XXI, 2013); Guillermo Guajardo Soto, “‘Tierra y acero’: Máquinas y obreros bajo los zapatistas (1910-1915),” in Laura Espejel López, ed., *Estudios sobre el zapatismo* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 2000), 247-268; idem, *Trabajo y tecnología en los ferrocarriles de México: una visión histórica, 1850-1950* (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 2010); Paul Hart, *Bitter Harvest: The Social Transformation of Morelos, Mexico, and the Origins of the Zapatista Revolution, 1840-1910* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 2005); María T. Huerta, *Empresarios del azúcar en el siglo xix* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia 1993); idem, “Empresarios y ferrocarriles en Morelos, 1875-1900,” *Siglo XIX: Cuadernos de Historia*, V, 14 (January 1996); idem, “El perfil del empresario azucarero morelense del siglo xix,” *Antropología: Boletín Oficial del Instituto Nacional de Historia e Antropología*, No. 72 (2003), 73-78; Emilio

work I note here 13 authors whose extraordinarily valuable studies appeared after I finished mine, historians and anthropologists who in one way or another over the decades have taught me most about Revolutionary Morelos: Amith, Barrett, Crespo, Espejel López, Fisher, Hernández Chávez, Martin, Martínez, von Mentz, Moreno Fragnals, Pineda Gómez, Ravelo Lecuona, and brave, brilliant, admirable, *tan extrañado* Warman.² You will see as I go farther here how much

Kourí, *A Pueblo Divided: Business, Property, and Community in Papantla, Mexico* (Stanford: Stanford University, 2004); idem, "Introducción: Vida e impacto de un libro" and "Los pueblos y sus tierras en el México porfiriano: Un legado inexplorado de Andrés Molina Enríquez," in idem, ed., *En busca de Molina Enríquez: Cien años de "Los grandes problemas nacionales"* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2009), 9-32, 253-330; David LaFrance, *The Revolution in Mexico's Heartland: Politics, War, and State Building in Puebla, 1912-1920* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 2003); idem, "Arrugas y Verrugas: Los Zapatistas en Puebla, 1910-1920," in *Zapatismo*, 351-368; Valentín López González, *Los compañeros de Zapata* (Cuernavaca: Gobierno del Estado de Morelos, 1980); Sidney Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Viking, 1985); Mario Ramírez Rancano, *La revolución en los Volcanes: Domingo y Cirilo Arenas* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1995); Ariel Rodríguez Kuri, *Historia del desasosiego: La revolución en la ciudad de México, 1911-1922* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2010); Salvador Rueda Smithers, *El paraíso de la caña: Historia de una construcción imaginaria* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1998); Ernesto Sánchez Santiró, *Azúcar y poder: Estructura socioeconómica de las alcaldías mayores de Cuernavaca y Cuaautla de Amilpas, 1730-1821* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, 2001); idem, "El distrito de Cuernavaca en la primera mitad del siglo XIX: Cambio político, continuidad económica y control de los recursos naturales," in *Zapatismo*, 82-114; Beatriz Scharrer Tamm, *Azúcar y trabajo: Tecnología de los siglos XVII y XVIII en el actual estado de Morelos* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 1997); Jesús Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón de Zapata*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Comisión Federal de Electricidad, 1970); David Tavárez, "Legally Indian: Inquisitorial Readings of Indigenous Identity in New Spain," in Andrew B. Fisher and Matthew D. O'Hara, eds., *Imperial Subjects: Race and Identity in Colonial Latin America* (Durham: Duke University, 2009), 81-100; William B. Taylor, "Indian Pueblos of Central Jalisco on the Eve of Independence," *Bibliotheca Americana*, I, 3 (January 1983), 231-272; Irene A. Vasquez, "The *Longue Durée* of Africans in Mexico: The Historiography of Racialization, Acculturation, and Afro-Mexican Subjectivity," *Journal of African American History*, XCV, 2 (Spring 2010), 183-201; Gisela von Wobeser, *La hacienda azucarera en la época colonial* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1988).

² Jonathan D. Amith, *The Möbius Strip: A Spatial History of Colonial Society in Guerrero, Mexico* (Stanford: Stanford University, 2005); Ward J. Barrett, *The Sugar Hacienda of the Marqueses del Valle* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1970); Horacio [Gutiérrez] Crespo and Enrique Vega, *Tierra y propiedad en el fin del Porfiriato*, 3 vols. [Vol. I yet to appear] (Cuernavaca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, 1982); idem, "El azúcar en el mercado de la ciudad de México, 1885-1910," in idem, ed., *Morelos: Cinco siglos de historia regional* (Cuernavaca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, 1984), 165-222; idem et al. *Historia del azúcar en México*, 2 vols. (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1988-90); idem, "Los pueblos de Morelos: La comunidad agraria, la desamortización liberal en Morelos y una fuente para el estudio de la diferenciación social campesina," in Espejel López, *Estudios*, 57-120; Laura Espejel López, ed., *El Cuartel General Zapatista: Documentos del Fondo Emiliano Zapata del Archivo General de la Nación*, 2 vols. (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1995); idem, "El costo de la guerra: La Compañía Papelera San Rafael y el financiamiento zapatista," in idem, *Estudios*, 269-291; idem, "Las heridas de guerra del Ejército Libertador del Centro-Sur de la República Mexicana," in *Zapatismo*, 265-284; Andrew B. Fisher, "Negotiating Two Worlds: The Free-Black Experience in Guerrero's Tierra Caliente," in Ben Vinson III and Matthew Restall, eds., *Black Mexico: Race and Society from Colonial to Modern Times* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2009), 51-71; idem, "Creating and Contesting Community: Indians and Afromestizos in the Late-Colonial Tierra Caliente of Guerrero, Mexico," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, VII, 1 (Spring 2006); Alicia Hernández Chávez, "Pueblos y haciendas en el estado de Morelos (1535-1810)," Master's Thesis, Centro de Estudios Históricos, El Colegio de México, 1973; idem, *Anenecuilco: Memoria y vida de un pueblo* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1991); idem, *Breve historia de Morelos* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2002); idem, "El zapatismo: Una gran coalición nacional popular democrática," in *Zapatismo*, 19-52; Cheryl E. Martin, *Rural Society in Colonial Morelos* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1985); Brígida von Mentz, *Pueblos de indios, mulatos y mestizos, 1770-1870: Los campesinos y las transformaciones protoindustriales en el poniente de Morelos* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 1988); María E. Martínez, *Genealogical Fictions:*

through the last five decades, thanks to all these scores of scholars, I have learned about the Revolution, but also why I think historians, anthropologists, sociologists, and politologists have much more work to do, to explain how this revolution mattered in the Mexican Revolution at large, its possibilities, its limits, and its historical significance.

To approach my argument I need to clarify a few preliminary points about that now old book, *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (1969). First, as a student intent in 1963 on a doctoral dissertation, I planned initially to try to write a history of the (so-called but so-misnamed) “Zapatista army,” 1911-1920. From the little history I knew then of the French Revolutionary armies, hardly more than Richard Cobb’s *Armées Révolutionnaires*, I wanted to do a history like Cobb’s, a socio-military history of the *Ejército Libertador del Sur* (N.B., not *Liberal*, but *Libertador*).³ Unlike Cobb, in the first place a historian infinitely more learned, experienced, sophisticated, and sharp than I was then or would ever be, I had only a year for my research, and the only big, deep archive I could find (thanks eternal to Josefina Z. Vázquez) was the “Archivo de Magana,” at the UNAM, which contained almost nothing I would need for a Cobbian thesis, but lots of other kinds of records for me to work otherwise, on which I did all I could. I never had in mind only a biography or a micro-history. Thanks to the Cuban Revolutionaries and the Viet Cong, the frame I always had in mind was a socio-military history, inevitably of national, therefore international significance. I confess, I did not then see the inevitable implications clearly, but I did sense them, and as I wrote I learned more (though not nearly enough). It is the revolutionary military question, a risen class’s armed conquest of power, in all its connections, that still most interests me. For the title of my dissertation I chose “The Revolution in Morelos, 1910-1920,” plain and simple. On advice and reflection it was finally “Emiliano Zapata and the Revolution in Morelos, 1910-1920,” so listed in Harvard College Library catalogue. But I did not mean Zapata made the revolution there. I meant the revolution there made him its chief and the historical figure he became.

Second, the beginning of the preface in English, about “country people who did not want to move,” does not translate true in Spanish (for all the wonderful translation Francisco González Aramburu did otherwise, for which I am ever grateful) as “*no querían cambiar*.” It is better in the French translation, “*ne voulaient pas bouger*.” But best is the Italian translation, “*un popolo di contadini che fecero una rivoluzione perchè non volevano andarsene da dov'erano*.” These were people who did not want to leave home, leave their villages, their parishes, all the family, saints, property, claims, business, work, security, heritage, insurance, memories, faith, and hope

Limpieza de Sangre, Religion, and Gender in Colonial Mexico (Stanford: Stanford University, 2008); Francisco Pineda Gómez, *La irrupción Zapatista, 1911* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1997); idem, *La revolución del Sur, 1912-1914* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2005); idem, *Ejército Libertador, 1915* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2013); Renato Ravelo Lecuona, *La revolución zapatista de Guerrero* (Chilpancingo: Universidad Autónoma de Guerrero, 1990); idem, “La variante guerrerense del zapatismo,” in *Zapatismo*, 305-322; Arturo Warman, *Los campesinos, hijos predilectos del régimen* (Mexico City: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1972); idem, ...*Y venimos a contradecir: Los campesinos de Morelos y el estado nacional* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones Superiores y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 1976); idem, *Ensayos sobre el campesinado en México* (Mexico City: Editorial Nueva Imagen, 1980); idem, “Notas para una redefinición de la comunidad agraria,” *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, XLVII, 3 (July 1985), 5-20. I thank Jean Meyer for referring me to De Giuseppe’s work.

³ Richard Cobb, *Les armées révolutionnaires: Instrument de la Terreur dans les départements, avril 1793 (floréal an II)*, 2 vols. (Paris: Mouton, 1961/63).

they had there, to quit their communities, their communions, however poor they were, to go into relations incomparably worse, a vast, random, ruthless exchange, the labor market, to live indefinitely as strangers off wages among strangers, fend for themselves wherever they would have to go, especially if they did not yet know there could be new communities they themselves could make, good new communions they could learn, like comradeship.

To understand this problem of the translation you need to understand that in English when you say, simply, “they moved,” you mean simply they went away from where they had lived to live in another place, whether or not you know where the other place is, or even if that counts. The truth is the move, the leaving, the experience of it, the sorrow of it or the hope in it, or both, but not the addresses. So this move does not translate as *mudarse, cambiar de casa*, unless it is an official question, mail, say, or taxes, or the police. The translation in Spanish could go, “*no querían dejar sus pueblos*,” but I think the Italian is much better, “*no querían irse de donde eran*.” I certainly did not think then (or ever since) that “*no querían cambiar*, that “they did not want to change.”⁴ I certainly thought *los anenecuilquenses* and others like them in Morelos and elsewhere could change, as I described it in the prologue, where the old men turned to the young for a new kind of struggle, often through the book (in detail in Chapters VIII-XI), and in the epilogue, where thinking of all I had learned there, remembering the little boys playing so hard at their soccer (please, no indigenous typologies), I saw children there would grow into strong men and women, able in changing to beat the strain of the dangerous future before them.

Third, I did not write (or think) that the ELS’s domination of Morelos in 1915 was a “utopia” or a “paradise.” Carlos Fuentes, Adolfo Gilly, and others after them have so written, that so I thought, and that so they themselves did too. But they have been wrong about what I wrote, however they may have thought. The word “utopia” does appear seven times in that old book, three times about the planters’ utopia, four times about a concept, a vision, a social dream, not once about a fact, a social practice. The word “paradise” does appear once, in regard to real-estate “developers” in Morelos in the 1950s-60s. Yes, I thought (still think) Morelos was a better place for working people there in 1915, than it was in 1911, ’12, ’13, ’14, or ’16 or later. But I never thought or wrote that it was a utopia or a paradise. N.B.: Neither word is in the index.

Fourth, yes, as Pineda Gómez indicates, a bad contradiction opens in that old book between my sense of the ELS’s localism and its national consciousness, extra-regional expansion, and national ambition for justice. And yes, as he suggests, it did come from my ignorant reliance then on anthropologists, in particular on Vogt in his introductory lectures at Harvard (which in graduate school I audited), Redfield, localist and (at least wishfully) harmonist, but also Lewis, not a localist or a harmonist.⁵ I should have noticed my confusing

⁴ A few among the many who have thought that was my thought, some agreeing, others disagreeing with it: Armando Bartra, *Los herederos de Zapata: Movimientos campesinos posrevolucionarios en México, 1920-1980* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1985), 12, 15; Roger Bartra, *La jaula de la melancolía: Identidad y metamorphosis del mexicano* (Mexico City: Editorial Grijalbo, 1987), 61; Enrique Montalvo Ortega, “Revolts and Peasant Mobilizations in Yucatán: Indians, Peons, and Peasants from the Caste War to the Revolution,” in Friedrich Katz, ed., *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico* (Princeton: Princeton University, 1988), 308; Pineda Gómez, *La irrupción*, 60; Victor H. Sánchez Reséndiz, *De rebeldes fe: identidad y formación de la conciencia zapatista*, 2nd ed. (Cuernavaca: Instituto de Cultura de Morelos, 2006), 64. Cf. Arturo Warman, “The Political Project of Zapatismo,” in Katz., *op. cit.*, 324.

⁵ Evon Z. Vogt, “Anthropology 110a, Peoples and Cultures of the New World: North and Middle America,” Harvard University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, *Courses of Instruction for Harvard and Radcliffe, 1962-1963* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1962), 39; Robert Redfield, *Tepoztlan [sic], a Mexican Village: A Study of Folk Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1930); Oscar Lewis, *Life in a Mexican Village: Tepostlán [sic] Restudied* (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1951).

contradiction, should have corrected it, to show the real tension in the ELS, the tension typical in a locally originated, locally based guerrilla army when it begins to move into regular operations and warfare, about which I was reading then in Mao's military writings.⁶

Fifth, I did have the sense then not to write of "peasants" or "*campesinos*." The word peasant (or its plural) does appear 11 times in the book, but five times in the preface (on the same page), where I explain why I do not use it, six times in later pages, not in my voice, but once in reference to Tolstoy's and Kropotkin's notions, once in reference to Mexico City officials' notions, once in a quotation from a U.S. American journalist, once in a footnote (citing a title), once in the bibliography (citing the same title), and once in the index. The word *campesino* appears 25 times, but every time in a footnote, citing a periodical, *El Campesino*. The word in plural appears once, in the preface, in my explanation why "peasant" is the wrong word, but "*campesino*" would be right, if it meant not "peasant," but "people from the fields," "*gente del campo*," "people," as we used to say in Oklahoma, "from out in the country," "country people." I confess I did not understand then that for centuries it had been primarily an adjective, e.g., *el viento campesino*, not a noun, and in Mexico did not receive (imported) its full social or political meaning until the 20th century, and that, a complicated, inconstant meaning, as Kourí will soon explain in the clearest, most convincing, most enlightening argument I know.⁷

Sixth, finally, yes, Pineda Gómez is again right, that I was, still am, skeptical about "*indio*," skeptical that the ELS or "*Zapatismo*," as a movement, an armed movement, an armed revolutionary cause, was especially *indio*. Let me as careful as I can here. I do not mean the word, "*indio*," in the sense it often thoughtlessly intends or includes, "peasant," or "rural," or "country." I mean the sense of *indio* as (in English) "Indian," implicitly, in some accounts explicitly, indicating *indígena*, indigenous, genetically or culturally (or both). In fact I am not just skeptical; I flat oppose that view of *La Revolución del Sur*. Yes, "Indians" joined the ELS, supported it, hoped for it to win. But the villages in Morelos that were mainly indigenous were not its backbone, economically, politically, or militarily, nor did they in fact define it culturally, whatever others thought, against it or for it (then or since). In this regard, though it hurts, I therefore have to declare I think my old maestro in these concerns, my first mentor, and my friend Don Jesús was wrong. I can see a *raíz*, that originally, quite locally, and there only functionally, without the language, without the word, Anenecuilco made Emiliano Zapata its *calpuleque*. But not historically, not culturally, sociologically, politically, or militarily, given all I have learned from the historiography on the South over the last 40-odd years, can I see that this title fits *la razón* of the ELS's general in chief.⁸ So I think wrong too were *el gran nahuatlólogo* León Portilla, and brave, brilliant, admirable, *tan extrañado* Bonfil.⁹ (Never mind the romantics, structuralist or typologist, Paz, Gruzinski....)

⁶ Mao Tse-Tung, "On Correcting Mistakes in the Party," in his *Selected Works*, 4 vols. (Peking: Foreign Languages, 1963-65), I, 105-116; idem, "Problems of Strategy in China's Revolutionary War," *ibid.*, I, 153-254; idem, "Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War Against Japan," *ibid.*, II, 79-194; "On Protracted War," *ibid.*, II, 113-194; idem, "Problems of War and Strategy," *ibid.*, II, 219-235.

⁷ Emilio Kourí, "Sobre la propiedad comunal de los pueblos, de la Reforma a la Revolución," *Historia mexicana*, LXVI, 4 (April 2017), forthcoming.

⁸ Jesús Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón de Zapata* (Mexico City: Editorial Etnos, 1943), 192-200.

⁹ Miguel León Portilla, *Los manifiestos en náhuatl de Emiliano Zapata* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1978), 39-57; Guillermo Bonfil Batalla, *México profundo: Una civilización negada* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores de Antropología Social, 1987), 165-166. I thank Emilio Kourí for discussions with me on these concerns.

If I were to live long enough to finish all the new work I have before me (doubtful), then go back, not to rewrite that old book, inconceivable to me now, but to study “Zapatista” questions as they appear to me now, including questions relevant to the Revolution of the South in the Mexican Revolution, I would want most to study six questions, for the importance or the significance (or both) I now see in them:

First, intellectuals, of various professions and revolutionary commitments, of more or less preparation, culture, vision, sense of proportion, and analytical acuity and scope, principally: Elisa Acuña Rossetti, Jenaro Amezcua, Felipe Ángeles, Ángel Barrios, Rafael Cal y Mayor, Leobardo Galván, Lázaro Gutiérrez de Lara, Juana B. Gutiérrez de Mendoza, Octavio Jahn, Dolores Jiménez y Muro, Abraham Martínez, Paulino Martínez, Miguel Mendoza López Schwerdtfeger, Otilio Montañó, Manuel Palafox, Pablo Torres Burgos, Antonio I. Villarreal, and Pablo Zierold. And in this regard I would like to study the limits of the hegemonic Mexican political culture then, the contemporaneous conceptions of Juarismo, liberalism, social positivism, anarchism, socialism, and contemporaneous interest in the German Socialist Party (in particular at Erfurt, 1891), the Cuban War of Independence, the Boer War, the War of a Thousand Days, and the Russian Revolution of 1905.

N.B.: I exclude Ricardo Flores Magón, which I think I ought to explain. The main reason is, it seems to me for all his courage and passion he never overcame the confusion between his father’s *Juarismo*, his own Liberal constitutionalism, and the half-baked anarchism he learned from books and debates, 1895-1900, and later in confusion propagated bombastically through anti-government newspapers. In exile after 1903 (never back in Mexico) he could have learned critical clarity on revolutionary questions, including (above all) ideology and organization, but neither in San Antonio or St. Louis nor in Toronto or Montreal--why did he not try Kansas City, or much better Chicago?-- did he learn anything serious or strategic from the highly instructive disputes then among socialists, anarchists, and syndicalists in the USA and Canada.¹⁰

¹⁰ In the United States then, e.g.: Thomas J. Hagerty, “A Correction,” *International Socialist Review*, October 1902, 229-230; idem, “Socialism Versus Fads,” *ibid.*, February 1903, 449-453; idem, *Economic Discontent and Its Remedy* (Terre Haute: Standard Publishing, 1902); Robert H. Doherty, “Thomas J. Hagerty, the Church, and Socialism,” *Labor History*, III, 1 (Winter 1962), 39-56; Roland Boer, “Father Thomas J. Hagerty: A Forgotten Religious Communist,” <https://mronline.org>, February 14, 2011; James Connolly, “The Socialist Labour Party of America and the London SDF [1903],” in Aindrias Ó Cathasaigh, ed., *The Lost Writings of James Connolly* (London: Pluto, 1997), 68-71; idem, “The American SDP: Its Origin, its Press, and its Policy [1903],” *ibid.*, 71-75; idem, “Platform of the Socialist Labour Party [1903],” *ibid.*, 80-83; idem, “A Political Party of the Workers [1908],” *ibid.*, 94-97; idem, “Political Action [1908],” in Owen D. Edwards and Bernard Ransom, eds., *James Connolly: Selected Political Writings* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1973), 286-289; idem, “Michael Davitt: A Text for a Revolutionary Lecture [1908],” *ibid.*, 209-214; idem, “Roman Catholicism and Socialism,” *The Harp* (New York), September, 1908; idem, “Learning Their Lesson [1909],” in Edwards and Ransom, *op. cit.*, 138-142; idem, “Ballots, Bullets, or--?” *International Socialist Review*, October 1909, 354-358; idem, *Socialism Made Easy, in Two Sections* (Chicago: C.H. Kerr & Co., 1909); “The ‘American Father Gopon’ [Thomas McGrady, 1863-1907] and His Work,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, February 5, 1905; Louis Levine, “The Development of Syndicalism in America,” *Political Science Quarterly*, XXVIII, 3 (September 1913), 451-479; Jacob H. Dorn, “Comrade Father Thomas McGrady: A Priest’s Quest for Equality through Socialism,” *Fides et Historia*, XLVI, 2 (Summer 2014), 1-27; Earl C. Ford and William Z. Foster, *Syndicalism* (Chicago: William Z. Foster, 1913); William Z. Foster, *From Bryan to Stalin* (New York: International Publishers, 1937); idem, *Pages from a Worker’s Life* (New York: International Publishers, 1939); William D. Haywood, *Big Bill’s Book: The Autobiography of William D. Haywood* (New York: International Publishers, 1929); Gail H. Stimson, *The Rise of the Labor Movement in Los Angeles* (Berkeley: University of California, 1955); Melvyn Dubofsky, *We Shall Be All: A History of the Industrial Workers of the World* (Chicago:

Consequently, when he landed in El Paso in 1906 (no place then to learn ideological criticism either) determined to raise revolutionary rebellions in Mexico, he did incite, encourage, inspire them, but prepared no real coordination among them, so that all failed, badly. Much worse, in the failure, he lost to the Mexican government his files of revolutionary correspondence, so that thenceforth Mexican authorities managed close surveillance of him, his personal group, and their correspondents.¹¹ After 1907 he suffered in U.S. prisons almost all the way to the end of his brave life (in Leavenworth, 1922), ever a devotee of that sweet anarchist Kropotkin.

Second, certain regionally important or significant political and military men, a few of them historiographically so treated, others (I think) more important or significant (or both) than most historians have yet recognized, but about all of whom (so far as I can tell) we still know very little. Principally they would be Everardo González Vergara, Bardomiano González Vergara, Cipriano Jaimes Hernández, Francisco Leyva, Patricio Leyva, Francisco Mendoza, Genovevo de la O, Francisco Pacheco, José G. Parres, and Jesús Salgado.

Third, more interesting, I think, industrial labor in the country where the ELS made its main campaigns, especially industrially and technically strategic labor there.¹² I want to know much more how these workers mattered to the Southern Revolution, and vice versa. I would concentrate in particular on these:

San Rafael-Atlixco Railroad workers at the Amecameca shops;

Interoceanic Railroad trainmen, dispatchers, and switchmen on the Puebla-Izúcar-Jonacatepec-Cuatla line and the Mexico City-Los Reyes-Textcoco-Amecameca-Cuatla-Jojutla-Puente de Ixtla line;

National Railways (ex-Mexican Central) trainmen and traffic workers on the Mexico City-Tres Marias-Cuernavaca-Jojutla-Puente de Ixtla-Iguala line; not least the FCI and the FFCCNN yardmen at Puente de Ixtla;

Quadrangle, 1969); Philip S. Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the United States*, 6 vols., IV, *The Industrial Workers of the World, 1905-1917* (New York: International Publishers, 1972-75); Carl Reeve, *The Life and Times of Daniel De Leon* (New York: Humanities Press, 1972); L. Glen Seratan, *Daniel DeLeon: The Odyssey of an American Marxist* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1979); W. Dirk Raat, *Revoltosos: Mexico's Rebels in the United States, 1903-1923* (College Station: Texas A & M University, 1981); Juan L. Sariago 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); Philip J. Mellinger, *Race and Labor in Western Copper: The Fight for Equality, 1896-1918* (Tucson: University of Arizona, 1995); Sally M. Miller, *Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in Early Twentieth-Century American Socialism* (New York: Garland, 1996), 73-94; Edward P. Johanningsmeier, *Forging American Communism: The Life of William Z. Foster* (Princeton: Princeton University, 2014).. In Canada then: A. Ross McCormack, *Reformers, Rebels, and Revolutionaries: The Western Canadian Radical Movement, 1899-1919* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1977); Gregory S. Kealey and Bryan D. Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Canada, 1880-1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1979). The latest I know on Flores Magón: Claudio Lomnitz, *The Return of Comrade Ricardo Flores Magón* (New York: Zone Books, 2014). The best Magonista effect seems have been moral, its evocation of radical political courage, e.g., Hilario C. Salas, Cándido D. Pádua, Primo Tapia de la Cruz: Cándido D. Pádua, *Movimiento revolucionario – 1906 en Veracruz: Relación cronológica de las actividades del P.L.M. en los ex-cantones de Acayucan, Minatitlán, San Andrés Tuxtla y centro del país*. 2nd ed. (Tlalpan: n.p., 1941); Paul Friedrich, *Agrarian Revolt in a Mexican Village* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

¹¹ Thomas Furlong, *Fifty Years a Detective: 35 Real Detective Stories* (St. Louis: C.E. Barnett, 1912); and Isidro Fabela and Josefina E. de Fabela, eds., *Documentos históricos de la Revolución Mexicana*, 23 vols., plus index (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica-Editorial Jus, 1960-76), X, *Actividades políticas y revolucionarias de los hermanos Flores Magón* (1966), almost 500 pages of Magonista documents that the Mexican government's spies filed on the Magonistas.

¹² On industrially and technically strategic labor: John Womack, Jr., *Posición estratégica y fuerza obrera: Hacia una nueva historia de los movimientos obreros* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007).

Mexico City Light and Power workers, unionized in the Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas in December 1914, with vast strategic power at Necaxa over the mines of Pachuca and El Oro and over the Valley of Mexico, including the valley's modern hydraulic engineering and Mexico City's electrical transportation, especially (since no union station) for freight moving between the city's five railroad terminals, La Colonia, Buena Vista (including the Mexican Railway terminal), Peralvillo, San Lázaro, and Xico stations.¹³

Compañía Industrial de Atlixco workers at Metepec, Mexico's biggest, technically most modern textile mill in 1910, the republic's biggest concentration of factory labor, only 35 (mostly mountainous) miles east of Cuautla, and among these workers primarily the operative personnel at the mill's hydroelectric plant, electricians, generator operators, switchboard men, and repairmen, and the linemen maintaining transmission not only to the town of Atlixco but also to the modern, pump-irrigated haciendas in the vicinity.¹⁴

Fourth, the Roman Catholic Church and Catholicism in the Diocese of Cuernavaca, in particular episcopal, pastoral, and popular devotions there to the Virgin of Guadalupe. On this question I would especially recall the critical circumstances of the Church in 1914, its hierarchy pro-Huerta, as the Constitutionalist armies fought from the North into the much more densely Catholic central states, enforcing ever hotter anti-(Catholic)clericalism along their way.¹⁵ In other words, however honestly, however strongly, of heart, soul, and mind, the bishops and at least some priests in Morelos (and in Puebla?) were in their *guadalupanismo*, it certainly suited the Church and at least some clergy in 1914 to support any revolutionary force independent of

¹³ Thomas C. Martin, "Mexican Water-Power Development," *American Monthly Review of Reviews*, October 1905, 447-450; James Schuyler, "Recent Practice in Hydraulic Fill Dam Construction," *Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers*, XXXII, 8 (October 1906), 785, 824-829; F.S. Pearson and F.O. Blackwell, "The Necaxa Plant of the Mexico Light and Power Company," *ibid.*, 838-852; "Current Electrical News...Consolidation of Mexican Electrical Companies," *Electrical Review*, September 5, 1908, 360; "Conditions of Electric Railway Operation in Mexico City," *Electric Railway Journal*, May 1, 1909, 812-820; "Constructional and Operating Features of the Mexico City Tramways," *ibid.*, June 5, 1909, 1014-1023; T. Philip Terry, *Terry's Mexico: Handbook for Travellers* [sic] (Mexico City: Sonora News Co., 1909), 232-233, 236-239; L. Zodel, "High-Pressure Water-Power Works," *Engineering*, August 18, 1911, 237, 239-241; Ernesto Galarza, *La industria eléctrica en México* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1941), 26-36.

¹⁴ Leticia Gamboa Ojeda, *La urdimbre y la trama: Historia social de los obreros textiles de Atlixco, 1899-1924* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2001); Hans-Günthert Mertens, *Wirtschaftliche und soziale Strukturen zentralmexikanischer Weizenhaciendas aus dem Tal von Atlixco (1890-1912)* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983); Humberto Morales Moreno, "Economic Elites and Political Power in Mexico, 1898-1910," *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, XV, 1 (1996), 101-121; Mariano Castellanos Arenas, "Las obras hidráulicas de la fáb rica de Metepec, Atlixco, Puebla, 1898-1908," *Boletín del Archivo Histórico del Agua*, XI, No. 32 (January 2006), 50-56; Rocío Castañeda González, *Las aguas de Atlixco: Estado, fábricas, haciendas y pueblos (1880-1920)* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2005).

¹⁵ José C. Valadés, *Historia general de la revolución mexicana*, 10 vols. (Mexico City: Manuel Quesada Brandi, 1963-67), III, 288-289, 291, 354-357, IV, 170-171; Robert E. Quirk, *The Mexican Revolution and the Catholic Church, 1910-1929* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1973), 58-60; Ricardo Corzo Ramírez et al., *...nunca un desleal: Cándido Aguilar, 1889-1960* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1986), 48; Massimo de Giuseppe, *Messico, 1900-1930: Stato, Chiesa e popoli indigeni* (Brescia: Editrice Morcelliana, 2007), 137-187; Ben Fallaw, "Varieties of Mexican Revolutionary Anticlericalism: Radicalism, Iconoclasm, and Otherwise, 1914-1935," *The Americas*, LXV, 4 (April 2009), 485, 488-489; idem, "The Seduction of Revolution: Anticlerical Campaigns against Confession in Mexico, 1914-1935," *Journal of Latin American Studies*, LXV, 1 (February 2013), 93-94; Robert Curley, "Anticlericalism and Public Space in Revolutionary Jalisco," *The Americas*, LXV, 4 (April 2009), 513-515; Laura O'Dogherty, "El episcopado mexicano en el exilio, 1914-1920," in Hilda Iparraguirre Locicero et al., eds., *Otras miradas de las revoluciones mexicanas (1810-1910)* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 2015), 258-260, 264-265, 268-269.

the Constitutionalist forces, better yet hostile to them. On a different concern, popular *guadalupanismo* in Morelos, more broadly throughout *el Sur*, how extensive, how strong it was before 1910, how it moved working people there in 1914 (or thereafter), how strong other devotions were, I would gratefully start from Sánchez Resendíz and De Giuseppe, and go into any primary sources on this concern I could find that De Giuseppe may not (yet) have mastered, so not into the Mexico City archdiocesan archive, or the Cuernavaca diocesan archive, but into the Puebla and Chilapa diocesan archives, for references to anywhere in *el Sur*, into Defensa's archives, for complaints about (Catholic) clergy in the region, at large in search of old *exvotos* and *retablos* from there, and back into the Hemeroteca Nacional, to see who significant Catholic individuals were then in Morelos, Puebla, and Guerrero, the vicars, canons, governors and secretaries of the sacred mitre, rectors of seminaries, particular *curas*, laymen, and laywomen.¹⁶

¹⁶ On Guadalupanismo and other devotions in Morelos: Vicente Agüero, *Álbum de la coronación de la Sma. Virgen de Guadalupe*, 2 parts. + Appendix in one (Mexico City: El Tiempo, 1895), I, 103-148, 164, 173, II, v, 12, 18-21, 33, 43-44, 46, 57, 60, 65-67, 72-73, 85, 103, 115, 121, 140, 156-157, 177-180, Apéndice, 1-2, 14, 40; *The Official Catholic Directory, Clergy List for the Year of Our Lord 1906*, 3 parts in one (Milwaukee: M.H. Wiltzius, 1906), III, 167; Fortino Hipólito Vera y Talonia, www.catholic-hierarchy.org/country/mx; Francisco Plancarte y Navarrete, *ibid.*; Manuel Fulcheri y Pietrasanta, *ibid.* The ELS as Guadalupano: "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; Antonio Pompa y Pompa, "Calendarios litúrgicos en México," in Ernesto Jáuregui O. et al., *Los calendarios de México*, 4 vols. (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1969), IV, 10-12, 19-27; Arturo Warman, "El calendario de fiestas y ferias populares," *ibid.*, IV, 31-44; Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón* (1970), 429-430; Gustavo Casasola, ed., *Historia gráfica de la Revolución Mexicana, 1900-1970*, 2nd ed., 10 vols. (Mexico City: Trillas, 1973), III, 928; Victor H. Sánchez Resendíz, *De Rebeldes Fe: Identidad y formación de la conciencia zapatista*, 2nd ed. (Cuernavaca: Instituto de Cultura de Morelos, 2006), 48-49, 94-106, 110-120, 272-284, 300-306; Massimo De Giuseppe, "La Revolución escendida y el fantasma de Zapata, 'Católicos' e 'indígenas' entre guerra y paz," in Iparraguirre Lucicero et al., *op. cit.*, 201-243, for the reference to which I thank Jean Meyer. The DN-ELS parade into the city, the ELS again as Guadalupano: "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. From the HNDM, e.g., these bits: "La parroquia de Yautepec," *La Voz de México*, June 9, 1896; "Exámenes en Tlaquiltenango," *ibid.*, December 23, 1898; "Ante la patrona de México," *El País*, June 8, 1905; "El Sr. Robles Domínguez trata de convencer a Zapata que deponga las armas," *ibid.*, October 28, 1911; "En honor del ilmo. Señor Fulcheri," *ibid.*, December 24, 1912; "Banquete en honor del Ilmo. Doctor Fulcheri," *ibid.*, December 26, 1912; "Fiesta profano-religiosa," *ibid.*, October 17, 1913. The individual likeliest most responsible for the Church's welcome of the ELS and its specifically Guadalupano entry, Fr. José Pedro Benavides Lira (b. 1861, Aqualteguas, N.L.), 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 Guadalupano: "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*

Fifth, maybe most important, demography, especially in the complications of mobility and ethnicity, a primordial question in Mexico. Most important I think it may be, because buried (pretty deep) therein we may find the reason why the ELS's sacred scripture was not a *Plan de Anenecuilco*, or, say, a *Plan de Ayoxustla*, but the *Plan de Ayala*.

As mobility, migration alone is of major historical importance in *distritos morelenses*, already long before the Mexica conquests, inevitable and mandatory in the vicerojal congregations of the 16th century, and all the more special then because of sugar, i.e., the *zafra*, the utterly predictable, sharp seasonal spike in the demand for labor. This old, long history of migrant labor already casts some shadow on claims of pure Indian roots of pueblos in the sugar districts even in the 18th century. And capitalist expansion there, 1880-1910, railroads, technical renovation of sugar plantations, and a big new business, rice production, drew considerable new immigration into the state, permanent and seasonal. Though some core of Yautepec, or of Anenecuilco, or Tlaltizapán, or Tlaquiltenango, may have remained geographically in the very same place, "have always been there," from pre-Mexica times to date, the people there could not have been so continuous genealogically, much less genetically, so long in-bred (as, e.g., in some Ashkenazi villages).¹⁷ Besides migrant labor and definitive immigration, locals also relocated from one long-settled place to another in the vicinity. Gabriel Zapata, father of Emiliano, born in Mapastlán (when it was still Mapastlán/Mapachtlán), had worked years at Hacienda El Hospital before he moved to Anenecuilco and married into the old Salazar family there.¹⁸

Yet more interesting to me to understand the ELS is the history of emigration from the sugar districts, or flight from them. I do not mean here the individuals moving, long ago or in the new, capitalist times (like Eufemio, going off to Veracruz to grow watermelon). I mean collective moves, about which I learned most from Martin, von Mentz, García Martínez, and Amith, and from trying to articulate their arguments; I mean neighbors moving together, villagers in groups for whatever reason leaving their common place, their community, breaking from it, migrating to wherever they decided to plant themselves anew, settling little colonies there, maybe allowing others on the move to join them, making a new place, a new community, in time growing into a new pueblo, which eventually might well claim standing "since time immemorial," to gain official recognition and a legal claim to land. In effect, refugees or not, these people were pioneers making new villages.

In this regard most interesting to me is the emigration to the districts in Guerrero where (later) the Zapatistas *morelenses* had their strongest connection and support, the mid-Balsas, Jesus Salgado's country, from Teloloapan down the Balsas to Pungarabato (Cd. Altamirano). Let me here articulate my lessons from Martin, von Mentz, García Martínez, and Amith into a thesis: That as far back as the 18th century refugees of various kinds left Morelos to resettle down the

País, April 19, 1912; "No se ha nombrado nuevo srio. de la Sagrada Mitra," *ibid.*, March 17, 1914; "Notes of the Passing Day," *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; <https://familysearch.org>. See also the statue outside the Parroquia de Santa Cruz Acapixca, Xochimilco, D.F.

¹⁷ Cf. the logic in Stephan Thernstrom, *The Other Bostonians: Poverty and Progress in the American Metropolis, 1880-1970* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973), 9-28. I know old Mexican villages are very different from 19th-20th-century Boston. The point is the logic of mobility, moving, turnover.

¹⁸ Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón* (1943), 169, 191-192; Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón* (1970), 202-205, 218-219, 309-310, 336-344, 353-354, 369-371, 415-421, 557; María E. Arias Gómez, "Zapata: Sus años en Anenecuilco," *Revista BiCentenario*, I, 2 (2008), 32.

Balsas, that in the 19th century *arrieros* moved continually back and forth between Pungarabato, Cuernavaca, Cuautla, and Jonacatepec, while the poorest and youngest from the Balsas went seasonally upriver for the *zafra*, so that in 1911 the Zapatistas *morelenses* could draw on connections already 150 years deep. It is worth studying the censuses of 1895, 1900, 1910, to note which states had how many of their native-born residents in other states. It is Mexico State and Guerrero that have by far more natives in Morelos than other states do, all told not many, but much more than the others. And Mexico State, Michoacán, and Morelos have more natives in Guerrero than other states do, all told very few, but many multiples more than other *foráneos*.¹⁹

But the question of migration (including emigration) turns more seriously interesting if you color it, give it an ethnic quality, its racial quality, *de raza*, or as they used to say, *de sangre*. Then, as a few brave historians 30-35 years ago (Martin, von Mentz) were already teaching us, it turns into the profoundly rich question of Africa in Mexican history. Historians have long known that wherever in New Spain there were ports, mines, sugar haciendas, and heavy transport overland (roads and crossroads), wherever too there were cities of substantial wealth, so mansions, plenty of domestic service, and much urban portage, there were slaves, of African origin, genetically more or less African, and ex-slaves, genetically like them, legally free, but not being legally or visibly “Spanish,” *españoles*, or *indios, naturales*, nevertheless than before *negros* or *mulatos* or *pardos* of lesser degree, hardly trusted or respected by *blancos* or *indios*.²⁰ Because of sugar the populations permanently on sugar haciendas in Morelos from the 16th through the 18th century were maybe mostly, at least considerably, of African origin, slaves and ex-slaves. It is inconceivable to me, since the Hacienda San Francisco Mapachtlán extended right down to the barranca on the other side of which was the village of San Miguel Anenecuilco, that there were not romances, *amores* transcending the barranca, i.e., soon children of African and Mexican origin, born of free Mexican wombs, *de vientres libres*, so themselves free, and growing in freedom to have their own free children, all legally *indios* in their pueblo of birth (even if never fully accepted).²¹ But there and in other, comparable villages, for racial discrimination or other reasons, some would have left, at least not farmed in the village, but learned portable trades to make a migrant living away from their pueblos, e.g., *arrieros, carreteros, carpinteros, herreros, herradores, caballeros, vaqueros, comerciantes de ganado, de mulada, de caballada, caballeros de guerra*.²²

¹⁹ México, Dirección General de Estadística, Secretaría de Economía, *Estadísticas sociales del porfiriato, 1877-1910* (Mexico City: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1956), 74, 78-106.

²⁰ Broadly, e.g., Peter Bakewell, *Silver Mining and Society in Colonial Mexico: Zacatecas, 1546-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1971); Colin A. Palmer, *Slaves of the White God: Blacks in Mexico, 1570-1650* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1976); Ben Vinson III, *Bearing Arms for His Majesty: The Free-Colored Militia in Colonial Mexico* (Stanford: Stanford University, 2001); Hermann L. Bennett, *Colonial Blackness: A History of Afro-Mexico* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 2009). On racial distinctions: Rafael Altamira y Crevea, *Diccionario castellano de palabras jurídicas y técnicas tomadas de la Legislación Indiana* (Mexico City: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1951), 29-30, 188, 194, 204-205, 261, 270. On nabob-commissioned and collected 18th-century professional depictions of *razas* and their “mixtures” in New Spain: Ilona Katzew, *Casta Painting: Images of Race in Eighteenth-Century Mexico* (New Haven: Yale University, 2004), 39-61. Brilliant, profound, and essential for understanding this hyper-complicated racism: Martínez, *Genealogical Fictions*, especially 142-170, 200-207, 220-226, 228-264, 271-275.

²¹ Barrett, *op. cit.*, 10, 74, 78-86, 89-92, 133-135; Martin, *op. cit.*, 38-42, 77-78, 87-95, 123-144, 147-153, 156-158 ; Von Mentz, *op. cit.*, 82-88, 96-99, 105-120, 125-126, 129-130; Hernández Chávez, *Anenecuilco*, 27-36, 250-257; Scharrer Tamm, *op. cit.*, 11, 18, 26-27, 38, 126, 149-163, 174, 186-187.

²² Bernd Hausberger, “En el camino: En busca de los arrieros novohispanos,” *Historia mexicana*, LXIV, 1 (July 2014), 74, 87-89, 91-96. Locally, e.g., Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón* (1970), 280, 370-371, 416-418, 420-421, 427-430.; Martin, *op. cit.*, 156-158.

In the hegemonic historiography Africa in Mexico seems to melt at Independence into thin air. Imports of slaves ended, and slavery was abolished, so that no more Africans came as slaves or otherwise into Mexico. Mexicans of African descent were still there, obviously so for another generation (see *el padre, el general* Morelos, Vicente Guerrero, Juan Álvarez's *pintos*). But in most places their children and grandchildren, ever less obviously African (Juan N. [Morelos] Almonte! Vicente Riva Palacio y Guerrero!), no longer recognized as of any African origin, blended continuously into the general Mexican population, accepted historiographically before and after "The Mexican Revolution" as a blend of the only two culturally recognized *razas*, Spanish and Indian, *mestizos*, or transmuted by their own effort or by default into simply *indios*. Unlike historians, anthropologists did see African residues in Mexico, but only if, literally looking for them, or stumbling upon them, they actually laid eyes on them in the few neighborhoods where people "somatically" or "biologically" or "habitually" or "ritually" still *negro* lived.²³ The cream of the Mexican elite knew better, thanks to their refined noses: Pablo Escandón, who knew Morelos well from business and leisure (forget his political foray), could tell "*VERDADERA CAFRERÍA*" ["TRUE NIGGERDOM"] when he smelled it in revolution there.²⁴ One semi-exception proves the point: The most authoritative and esteemed Mexican sociologist of his day wrote in 1920 that Zapata himself had "*un quince por ciento de sangre negra*." But this, he declared, only made the Southern chief "*mestizo triple*," super-*mestizo*.²⁵ In effect, "Let us ignore Africa in Mexico, assume for the great majority the generic "*mestizo*." Confirmation soon came from the most egregious Mexican intellectual of the time, in his vision of "the cosmic race."²⁶ And thereafter for decades Mexican and foreign intellectuals and academics never notably wondered about any specific significance mulattos might have had in Mexican history or sociology.²⁷

The crypto-positivist mush they made of *mestizaje* (and kept remaking), a simple, narrow genetic fiction, was, still is, a critical mistake about Mexico, 1820-1960. At best it is an ethnic story, not social history. Empirical, inductive, linear, heedless of the unsensible, it ignores the deep consequences of slavery, the long effects all through a society working if only in part through slavery, the effects on slaves, ex-slaves, slave-owners, and others, at the time and dialectically developing for generations thereafter, never less than rich in meaning. This

²³ Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, *La población negra de México, 1519-1810: Estudio etno-histórico* (Mexico City: Fuente Cultural, 1946); idem, *Cuijla: Esbozo etnográfico de un pueblo negro* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1958); idem, *Medicina y magia: El Proceso de aculturación en la estructura colonial* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional Indigenista, 1963).

²⁴ Pablo Escandón to Pablo Macedo, March 29, 1912, in "El archivo de la reacción," *El Universal*, October 12, 1917, his emphasis. Hemeroteca Nacional de México, www.hndm.unam.mx: From January 1, 1821, to December 31, 1920, results for *cafrería* total 211. From 1821 through 1894 they number 88, 1.2/year; from 1895 through 1910 (the period of the Second Cuban War of Independence, the Cuban *Partido Independiente de Color*, and the Boer War), 90, 6/year; from 1911 through 1920, 33, 3.3/year.

²⁵ Andrés Molina Enríquez, *Esbozo de la historia de los primeros diez años de la revolución agraria de México (de 1910 a 1920), hecho a grandes rasgos*, 2nd ed., 5 vols. (Mexico City: Talleres Gráficos del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia y Etnografía, 1937), V, 147 (citing no source). In the old *sistema de castas*, if one of Zapata's four great-great grandfathers or one of his four great-great-grandmothers had all "*sangre negra*," he (of the fourth generation, 1/16th of his *sangre* being *negra*) would have passed most institutional tests as good as *mestizo*, regardless of his thick moustache and slightly *chino* hair: Martínez, *Genealogical Fictions*, 47-58, 81-83, 193-194, 203-204, 207-208, 215-222, 247-249, 263-265, 270-271.

²⁶ José Vasconcelos, *La raza cósmica, Misión de la raza iberoamericana, Notas del viaje a la América del Sur* (Madrid: Agencia Mundial de Librería).

²⁷ Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, "La presencia del negro en México," *Revista del CESLA* [Warsaw], No. 7 (2005), 351-367.

ignorance is especially delusive when the slavery is capitalist-appropriated, reorganized, and directed slavery, as Marx called it “direct slavery,” unmediated slavery, a capitalist ancillary.²⁸ “Direct slavery” was not the kind customary in mines, or ports, or cities. It was the kind inevitable on sugar plantations, slavery without qualification, essential to the plantations, not in their highly technical industrial work, cooking the juice, but in their agricultural work, in the cane fields. In this kind of slavery, in the cane fields, the productive force is unconditionally the owner’s personal chattel, *cosas muebles*, livestock, *ganado*, always liable at his will for sale into a slave market, a special labor market where not only the power of workers to produce, but the laborers themselves, the very embodiments of productive power, are a commodity, their labor the source of value, but their selves also, like mules, means of production, so that in this slavery slaves lived in absolute exploitation.²⁹ And in this exploitation they lived in absolute *Entäusserung*, as both Hegel and Marx called “alienation.”³⁰

It is worth harping on the German word. Much more than the English or Latinate words, it carries many different meanings, all at the same time, especially because its prepositional root

²⁸ Karl Marx, *Misère de la philosophie: Réponse a la philosophie de la misère du M. Proudhon* [1847] (Paris: V. Giard and E. Brière, 1908), “l’esclavage direct,” 158-159. Cf. idem, *The Poverty of Philosophy* [1847] (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishers, 1956), 124-125; idem, *Theories of Surplus Value* [1861-1863], 3 vols. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1971), III, 400-401; idem, *Capital*, 3rd ed., 3 vols. (New York: International Publishers, 1967), I [1867], 236, 266, 539-542, 759-760, III [1883], 332, 383-386, 776, 791, 804, 809; Ken Warren, *Karl Marx on American Slavery* (Chicago: Sojourner Truth, 1976). On “the direct relation”: Georg F.W. Hegel, *Wissenschaft der Logik* [1830], 2nd ed., 2 vols. in three parts (Berlin: Duncker and Humblot, 1841), I, Part 1, 368-370.

²⁹ Worst in the Western Hemisphere, 18th-century Haiti: Sidney W. Mintz, *Caribbean Transformations* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1984); idem, *Three Ancient Colonies: Caribbean Themes and Variations* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2010), especially 88-133; Robert L. Stein, *The French Sugar Business in the Eighteenth Century* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1988); David Geggus, “Sugar and Coffee Cultivation in Saint Domingue and the Shaping of the Slave Labor Force,” in Ira Berlin and Philip Morgan, eds., *Cultivation and Culture: Labor and the Shaping of Afro-American Culture in the Americas* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1993), 73-98; Robin Blackburn, *The Making of New World Slavery: From the Baroque to the Modern* (London: Verso, 1997), 279-306, 332-340, 431-443, 466-467. On chattel: Joaquín Escriche, *Diccionario razonado de Legislación y jurisprudencia*, 3rd ed., 3 vols. (Madrid: Colegio de Sordo-mudos y Ciegos, 1847), I, 606-607, 721-724, 844-845; “Chattel,” in J.A. Simpson and E.C.S. Weiner, eds., *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., 20 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), III, 59; and Joan Corominas [aka Colomines], *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*, 6 vols. (Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1980-91), III, 65-68. Cf. Walter Johnson, *Soul by Soul: Life inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1999); idem, ed., *The Chattel Principle: Internal Slave Trades in the Americas* (New Haven: Yale University, 2004).

³⁰ Äusser, äussern, äusserlich, Äusserliches, Äusserlichkeit, Äusserung, Entäusserung, Kraftäusserung, Lebensäusserung, veräussern, etc.: Georg W. Hegel, e.g., *Phänomenologie des Geistes* [1807] (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1988), passim, especially 320-355; idem, *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts* [1820] (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1988), 72-91, 103-110, 150-156, 226-227, 282-283, 289; idem, *Wissenschaft*, I-1, 58, 88, 124-130, 180-181, 184-185, 190, 207, 236-239, 243-256, 270-272, 366-368, 376-400, 408-410, 430-435, I-2, 19-24, 84, 86, 102-103, 106, 114, 129-132, 136-138, 170-183, II, 66-73, 90-110, 128-129, 140-141, 147-159, 164-165, 179, 187-258, 267-343; Karl Marx, e.g., *Ökonomisch-philosophische Manuskripten* [1844], in idem and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, 43 vols. in 45 (Berlin: Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus et al., 1961-90), XL, 472, 478, 511, 513-514, 521, 530-531, 537-539, 543, 550, 556, 571, 573, 576-580, 582-583, 585, 587; Marx, *Grundrissen der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* [1857-58], in Marx and Engels, *Werke*, XLII, 27-29, 78, 81-84, 91-97, 126-128, 134, 152-155, 160-161, 166-167, 169, 214-217, 228, 230-231, 242, 277-278, 290, 327-328, 360, 363-368, 374-377, 381-383, 395-396, 422, 447, 512, 522-523, 538, 551-552, 575, 580, 593, 605, 607, 617, 685, 712, 722, 726-729, 733, 767-768; Marx, *Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* [1859], in Marx and Engels, *Werke*, XIII, 29-33, 39, 42, 44, 53-54, 67, 74, 115, 118-119; Marx, *Theorie über den Mehrwert* [1861-63], in Marx and Engels, *Werke*, XXVI, 162, 166, 488, 505, 525; Marx, *Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* [1867], in idem and Engels, *Werke*, XXIII, e.g., 99-103, 117-120, 123-124, 130, 141, 143-144, 146-147, 149, 182, 185, 188, 208, 248, 275, 329, 342, 363, 433, 436, 535, 540, 597, 609-610, 655, 782, 789.

grows into a verb, a gerund, a gerundive, an adjective, an adverb, participles, and a noun, here a reflexive verb ergatively substantivized, reciprocally transitive and intransitive, a feminine noun in action and in subjection, both subject and object, its different senses all dialectically implicit--all these senses: emptying, giving away, voiding, selling, giving up, relinquishing, handing over, divesting, parting with, opening up, disclosing, surrendering, uttering, making manifest, spending, disposing of, turning inside out, realizing, expressing, taking away, renouncing, bringing out, removing, distancing, bringing to nothing, reifying, externalizing, and more--so many meanings that the word conveys much more richly than English or Latinates can the intricacy that exteriorization/ objectification/reification/alienation is at once doing and suffering, operation and undergoing, an essential estrangement (*Entfremdung*, Hegel's and Marx's other main word for alienation).³¹ And as with other commodities it comes out materially clearest in the market.³² Thereby absolutely thingified, *cosaficados*, *reificados*, commodified, depersonified, impersonalized, de-individualized, degraded to abasement, practically dehumanized, absolutely at the owner's disposition, cane-field slaves did not even have souls, except according to The Church, which did condition slavery elsewhere, but on sugar plantations, against the owner's will, did virtually nothing, spiritually or corporally, about his productive things.

In this special, direct slavery, beyond the conditioned pale, these slaves were (nevertheless human) practically indeterminate, indeterminable humanity. Totally outside the planter's particular and personal humanity, in absolute contrast, they were common humanity, humanity in general, collectively human without qualification. As means of production and commodities gradable for exchange in slave markets, they could sell at individually variable prices. Even so, in kind, as a lot, categorically, they were essentially indistinguishable, undifferentiated, ranked in common as simply field hands, purely slaves, all the same, so in their common humankind all equal. The truest concept of them is men, women, and children at work and in the market, always at the highest risk, of life or of all but life, all contingent on their owners' continually shifting necessities, so doomed unconditionally to cope with continual change, in a strange dimension where they were eternally strange, objects solely for exploitation

³¹ Martin Luther, *Die Bibel, oder die ganze Heilige Schrift des alten und neuen Testaments*, 2 parts (Berlin: Britische und ausländische Gesellschaft, 1872), II, 203 [for *ekénosen*, Philippians, 2:7, theologized into *kenosis*]; Hermann Cremer, *Biblich-theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräcität*, 2nd ed. (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1872), 353-355; idem, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*, 4th Eng. ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), 351-353; Jacob Grimm et al., *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 16 vols. (Leipzig: J. Hirschfeld et al., 1854-1971), I, cols. 1031-1037, III, cols. 490-491, 522-523, IV, cols. 125-132. Cf. Michael J. Inwood, *A Hegel Dictionary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 5-18, 35-38, 50, 93, 107, 133, 142-144, 160, 249, 252, 278; Félix Duque, "Glosario e Índice analítico de conceptos," in G.W.F. Hegel, *Ciencia de la logica*, 2 vols. (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid), I, 646, II, 465, for reference to which I thank Carlos Salinas de Gortari; and Ge. Wilh. Fr. Hegel, *System of Science, First Part, The Phenomenology of Spirit* (Bamberg and Würzburg: Joseph Anton Goebhardt, 1807), tr. Terry P. Pickard, whom I thank for his translation, and for reference to whom I thank Michael M. Fried and Robert B. Pippin. Cf. New Testament Greek, *kenóo*, *ekenosis*, theologized into *kenosis*: Cremer, *op. cit.*, 351-353.

³² Cf. Engels to Marx, January 7, 1858, in Marx and Engels, *Werke*, XXIX, 252: "...war is most like commerce. Combat is in war what payment in cash is in commerce, so it seldom actually has to happen, but as a result everything points toward it, and in the end it must take place and decide things [my translation]." Engels here glosses Carl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege*, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Berlin: Ferd. Dummler, 1857-63), in his *Hinterlassene Werke über Krieg und Kriegführung*, 10 vols., I, 41, 123: respectively, "The decision by arms is for all major and minor operations in war what cash payment is in commerce. Regardless how complex the relationship between the two parties, regardless how rarely settlements actually occur, they can never be entirely absent..." and "We therefore conclude that war does not belong in the realm of arts and sciences.... Rather than comparing it to art, we could more accurately compare it to commerce...."

and exchange. But in this very dimension, this common subjection to their owners, this common estrangement from them, set by owners absolutely against owners, in this common doom, absolutely, collectively parted from owners, they were also in a special communion with one another, so that mutually, anywhere they found one another, personally strangers or not one to another, they found themselves in one another, commonly, totally, together, nothing but human.³³

The contrast then was special between the life of enslaved field hands on a sugar plantation and the life of natives/*naturales* in their own corporately determined *pueblo*, between direct slavery and popular incorporation. The plantation was a mixed business, contradictory in its nature, capitalist in its production, slavist in its producers, a place of continual change especially on account of markets, for its bestial and human means of production and for its commodities. Its slaves always essentially foreign to the place, they lived and worked ever in tension before another unpredictable forced move, another unpredictable loss of all familiar to them, never more than temporary resident aliens, sojourners lost on a brutal pilgrimage, on the plantation only until by disease or overwork or an accident any day death took them, or the owner sold them, “by piece” or by lot.³⁴ In contrast, while the *pueblo* too was mixed, it was not a mixed business, but an inherited, inalienable community of mixed interests, an inheritance limited to the current native heirs in common, for production, exchange, insurance, and preservation. Its production, for subsistence and exchange, in the community and beyond, was proprietary, proprietor, producer, and trader mutual predicates; its insurance, familial and communal; and its preservation, a duty familial and communal, to keep the community going in its place, supposedly the same place continuously from time immemorial, to last there in the succession of future heirs forever, for generations untold. Royally recognized, a royally legitimized *república*, essentially cohesive, it was a trust/*fideicomiso* in perpetuity, its families communally bonded in common faith, in a mutual, integral commitment. Their *pueblo* could change, had changed, would change, but for all its changes it abode where it was, a community of internally determined natives in a definite place, always home for its own, always assuming its own, always open to them, reliable for them, but only for them. Whereas then a plantation’s directly worked slaves were born, bred, lived, and worked coping with continual, inevitable, but unpredictable changes, always surprising them, where they were or where they had to go, and often on the move, not only foreign wherever they were, but essentially rootless, a *pueblo*’s natives in contrast were born, bred, lived, and worked belonging always, exclusively, to the same, locally defined and continuously confirmed village, in common inheritance, continually beleaguered by plantations, but heirs and legators enduring, essentially opposed to alienation and

³³ Here taking “worst racial slavery” for “Jewish”: Karl Marx, “On the Jewish Question [1843],” in T.B. Bottomore, ed., *Karl Marx: Early Writings* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 3-16, 20, 25-31. Otherwise: Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963); George Jackson, *Soledad Brother: The Prison Letters of George Jackson* (New York: Coward-McCann, 1970); Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1982).

³⁴ Cf. the worst and its consequences and historiography: C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L’Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution* [1938] (2nd ed. (New York: Anchor, 1963)); Carolyn E. Fick, *The Making of Haiti: The Saint Domingue Revolution from Below* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1990); David Geggus, “The Bois Caïman Conspiracy,” *Journal of Caribbean History*, XXV, 1 (November 1991), 41-57; idem, “The Haitian Revolution: New Approaches and Old,” *Proceedings of the Meeting of the French Colonial Historical Society*, No. 19 (1994), 141-155; idem, ed., *The Haitian Revolution: A Documentary History* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2014); Laurent Dubois, *Avengers of the New World: The Story of the Haitian Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 2004)..

to alien, essentially bound (only) to one another right where they were and rooted right where they belonged.³⁵

From this special difference in life came another, between two kinds of mentality, two kinds of spirituality, mentality/spirituality all one in German, as in Spanish, *Geist, espíritu*. Since these absolute slaves had absolutely no security, practically as they were even God-forsaken, *dejados de la mano de Dios*, doomed to improvise continually for any hope of survival, taking nothing for granted, ever, they were also free from natural, customary, or thoughtless loyalty to anyone or any place or any past. Subdued externally, obedient as they were to their owner, they were internally, intimately, in heart, soul, and mind, absolutely defiant (*dis-fidus*)/*desconfiado* of him. Among themselves, in their common humanity, if they were loyal to others, free or slave, it was only by particular, reflective judgments, their own disciplined, studied decision, whom (if anyone), they might trust, a decision never easy, not only to put their faith in others, but also to make themselves deserving of another's trust, another's resolve to have faith in them, that they might believe in one another. Of this mind, in this spirit, they could make a kind of willed, conscious, decided, positive, mutual commitment, the same disciplined promise of all the trusting and the trusted, all the betrothed, the true, all for one, one for all, standing or falling with one another. Precisely therefore, out of slavery, as runaways, emigrants, refugees, or on slavery's abolition, negating their negation, they thought themselves free against any presumption of external rule, free to defy any external limits. But among themselves, intimately, among the trusted and true, they had all the makings for a special bond of empathy, as among companies of warriors, old veterans too, the urgent, demanding empathy of comradeship, not camaraderie (jolly friends?), but comradeship, different from friendship, different from kinship, and not *compañerazgo* either, but the bond among *camaradas*, whether they called it *camaradería* or not, again in German, *Kameradschaft*, or Russian, *tovarishchestvo*.³⁶ This was not a social contract

³⁵ E.g., Charles Gibson, *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1964), 32-57, 166-167, 188-190, 282-289, 296-299; García Martínez, *El Barquesado*, 52, 126-136, 144-146, 157-159; William B. Taylor, *Landlord and Peasant in Colonial Oaxaca* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1972), 67-110; Andrés Lira González, *Comunidades indígenas frente a la Ciudad de México: Tenochtitlán y Tlatelolco, sus pueblos y sus barrios, 1812-1919* (Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1983), 13-227; Margarita Menegus Bornemann, *Del Señorío a la República de indios: El caso de Toluca, 1500-1600* (Madrid: Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación, 1991), 161-216. Corporatism: 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 por el nombre de las Siete Partidas* (Madrid: La Hija de D. Joaquín Ibarra, 1808), passim, especially 78-82, 120-122, 124 n2, 129-132, 137-139, 143 n1, 149, 229-230, 240, 301, 342, 348, 426; Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Age* [1881] (Boston: Beacon, 1964), 2, 7-8, 22-30, 65-100; and Altamira y Crevea, *op. cit.*, 84, 120-121, 145, 260-262, 288-289. The logic of universality (*die Allgemeinheit*, the all-in-common, the entire), particularity (*die Besonderheit*, the special), and singularity (*die Einzelheit*, the individual): Georg W.F. Hegel, *Philosophy of Right* [1820] (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 110-122, 128-132, 152-155; idem, *Wissenschaft*, II, 34-63, 241-254, 287-294; Karl Marx, "Critique of Hegel's 'Philosophy of Right' [1843/1859]," in Joseph O'Malley, ed., *Karl Marx's Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970), 44-49, 99-115; Inwood, *op. cit.*, 302-305.

³⁶ The problem of translation between camaraderie and comradeship, *camaradería* and *Kameradschaft*: Romance languages have only *-erie*, *-ería*, *-oría*, etc. for the quality of association (or office or dignity, etc.), so that *camaradería* may mean either camaraderie or comradeship (*Kameradschaft*), whereas English has both *-erie* and *-ship*, German both *-erie* and *-schaft*, the difference in the respective suffixes a sign of distinction between the two qualities. The difference I mean here between camaraderie and comradeship (or *-Kameradschaft*) is that between being pals, chums, getting drunk together, and being ready in sober duty to another, or others, to act with them, or alone, for them, knowingly at the high risk of death, or indeed so acting, death at hand, or in sober duty actually dying, with them, or alone, for them. On the bond in war: Carl von Clausewitz, *On War* [1832] (eds. Michael Howard et al.), rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University, 1984), 101-109, 122, 187-189. "Comradeship" appears in

(pervious to theories of contract).³⁷ It was their common, mutual, awesome gift, to see the world universal, where like them others too were never really home, forever sojourners on a brutal pilgrimage they knew not where, ever moving, pioneers, blazing trails, hungry for justice, anywhere, anytime. The brave among them made comrades, and not only with one another, but again and again with others they met along the way and decided to trust, to believe in them, go with them, act with them, for good to the end.³⁸ This defiant gift lasted for generations. From the *cimarrones*, emigrants, and refugees out of the Cuautla, Yautepec, and Tetecala valleys, making their own places down the Balsas, to the Costa Grande *pintos* who followed the mulatto José María Morelos and after him the mulatto Vicente Guerrero for Independence, and later Juan Álvarez against Morelos sugar planters, to the Chiconcuac-San Vicente avengers in 1856, even down to their grandchildren, down to the revolutionary forces at Tlaltizapán and Tlaquiltenango in 1911, these *mestizo-mulato-moreno-pardo-chino-zambahigo-zambo-cafres* were the true core and live power of defiant, expansive, explosive, specifically Southern *rebeldía*.³⁹

print archtypically, in scholarly as well as in other literature, as only masculine, especially military, and everywhere, always, pretty much the same. The modern standard is Samuel L.A. Marshall, *Men against Fire: The Problem of Battle Command in Future War* (New York: Morrow, 1947). Cf. Christopher H. Hamner, *Enduring Battle: American Soldiers in Three Wars, 1776-1945* (Lawrence: University of Kansas, 2011). Lately emphasis is often on (male) soldiers' homoeroticism, if not homosexuality. A critique: Sarah H. Cole, *Modernism, Male Friendship, and the First World War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003), 138-184. The best contemporary military studies I know, where comradeship is implicit in the deep, cutting irony combat veterans share toward war, incompetent officers, and civic patriotism, whether they express it or not: Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (New York: Oxford University, 1975); idem, *Wartime: Understanding and Behavior in the Second World War* (New York: Oxford University, 1989); and Samuel L. Hynes, *The Soldiers' Tale: Bearing Witness to Modern War* (New York: Penguin, 1998). Historically, actually, this particular (therefore universalist) bond, called comradeship or not, is also feminine, as well as sexually and genderly integrated, not noteworthy eroticized or sexualized/genitalized, and not military. E.g., The Gospel of Matthew, 18: 15-20; The Gospel of John, 13:34, 15:13-17, 21:15-17; Epistle to the Romans, 13:8; Saint Augustine, "Homilies on the Gospel of John," in Philip Schaff, ed., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, 1st ser., 14 vols. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann's, 1977-86), VII, 317-319, 348-349, 354-355, 449-452; Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, 9-18; Edwin A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), 434; idem, *Johannine Vocabulary* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1906), 1-3, 103-104, 210, 240-242, 257-264; Ceslas Spicq, *Agapé dans le Nouveau Testament*, 3 vols. (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1958-59), I, xiii-8, 259-266, II, 9-269 (especially 141-157), III, 70-110, 127-218, 246-312, 326-357; Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); Lina Andronoviené, *Transforming the Struggles of Tamars: Single Women and Baptist Communities* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2014). The truest contemporary word I know: James Gormley, "A Fire Captain's Eulogy," *New York Times*, December 23, 2001. Three examples in fiction: André Malraux, *La condition humaine* (Paris: Gallimard, 1933); James Jones, *The Thin Red Line* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962); Octavia E. Butler, *Parable of the Sower* (New York: Grand Central, 2000).

³⁷ Michael Walzer, *Obligations: Essays on Disobedience, War, and Citizenship* (Cambridge: Harvard University, 1970), 5-10, 90-98, 172-185, 190-211.

³⁸ Habbakuk, 2:4; Romans, 1:17; Hebrews, 11:1; Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, 19-80.

³⁹ Cf. Daniel O. Sayers, *A Desolate Place for a Defiant People: The Archaeology of Maroons, Indigenous Americans, and Enslaved Laborers in the Great Dismal Swamp* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2014). The avengers: José Ma. Casasola, *Acusación fiscal que en la Tercera Sala de la Suprema Corte de Justicia, pronunció el Sr. Ministro Fiscal de ella, Don José María Casasola, en la causa instruida a varios reos, por el asalto, robos y asesinatos cometidos la noche del 17 y mañana del 18 de Diciembre de 856 [sic] en las haciendas de Chiconcuac y S. Vicente, del Partido de Cuernavaca, perteneciente al Departamento de México* (Mexico City: A. Boix, 1858); and four years later, "Proeza de los liberales.--Asesinato de españoles," *La Sociedad*, May 2, 1860; "Asesinato de españoles en Chiconcuac," *ibid.*, May 6, 1860; "Los últimos sucesos de Chiconcuac," *Diario Oficial del Supremo Gobierno de México*, May 8, 1860. Southwestern Morelos in the spring and summer of 1911: Womack, *op. cit.*, 73-82; "La horda salvaje y desenfrenada que saqueo [sic] Jojutla, asesinó inocentes y profanó cadáveres," *El Diario*, August 21, 1911. Tlaquiltenango, as *zapatólogos* know, was where Zapata and his chiefs went

Naturales in their *pueblos* certainly could revolt, did revolt, to revindicate their legitimacy, integrity, honor, property. Sometimes *pueblos* connected in several such revolts, making a big revolt, wreaking expensive destruction on neighboring estates lordly and capitalist, properties movable and immovable, even across several districts, until they won their justice, recovered their losses, or disconnected as some won and others lost, or the authorities crushed them all, or the time came to plant or harvest. Native *pueblos* naturally sought restitution, restoration of losses, repayment, each primarily for itself, its own justice for its own, its members. Each for itself could, did, make reasonable, mutually useful alliances with its neighbors. But on their own, without some odd expansive force inside them, or some external encompassing force, these big revolts could not extend far, even regionally, range far, or last long.⁴⁰

in November 1911 for the parish priest there (Lorenzo Castro?) to type their newly composed Plan de Ayala; and Tlaltzapán was where Zapata kept the ELS headquarters as long as he could.

⁴⁰ E.g., in the abundant historiography on Mexican *pueblo* localism (particularism) in protests and revolts: Frank Tannenbaum, *The Mexican Agrarian Revolution* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 29, 42-90, 232-235, 252-253, 320-328, 417-422, 500, 502; Hernández Chávez, "Pueblos y haciendas"; idem, *Anenecuilco*; William B. Taylor, *Drinking Homicide, and Rebellion in Colonial Mexican Villages* (Stanford: Stanford University, 1979); Leticia Reina, *Las rebeliones campesinas en México (1819-1906)* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1980); Robert Wasserstrom, *Class and Society in Central Chiapas* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983); Alan Knight, *The Mexican Revolution*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1986), I, 96-101, 104-115, 119-120, 152-170, II, 188-196, 219-220, 232-235, 285; Thomas Benjamin, "Regionalizing the Revolution: The Many Mexicos in Mexican Historiography," in Thomas Benjamin and Mark Wasserman, eds., *Provinces of the Revolution: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1910-1929* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1990), 319-357; Stuart F. Voss, "Nationalizing the Revolution: Culmination and Circumstance," *ibid.*, 279, 281; Eric Van Young, "Agrarian Rebellion and Defense of Community: Meaning and Collective Violence in Late Colonial and Independence-Era Mexico," *Journal of Social History*, XXVII, 2 (Winter 1992), 245-269; Luis Barrón, *Historias de la revolución mexicana* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económica, 2004), 161-181; and, in the beginning, in praise of local(ist) history, inviting it, god-fathering it, Luis González y González, *Invitación a la microhistoria* (Mexico City: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1973), 54-183. On different needs and interests of "peasants" even in the same village: Alexander V. Chayanov, *The Theory of Peasant Economy [1924-28]* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1986), 73-85, 106-110, 175-180; Eric R. Wolf, *Peasants* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966), 18-95, especially 83-95; Theodor Shanin, "Peasantry as a Political Factor," in his (ed.) *Peasants and Peasant Societies: Selected Readings* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 238-244. On the difficulties between villages and in combining multiple villages in Mexico's Center and South into a durable social or political organization, e.g.: Friedrich, *op. cit.*, 7, 11, 53-56, 78-95, 98-101, 105-115; Sotelo Inclán, *Raíz y razón* (1970), 525-533, 538; Shanin, *op. cit.*, 255-261; Taylor, *Drinking*, 115-128, 133-140, 145-146; Philip A. Dennis, "The Uses of Inter-Village Feuding," *Anthropological Quarterly*, XLIX, 3 (July 1976), 174-184; idem, *Intervillage Conflict in Oaxaca* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1987); Buve, *op. cit.*, 119-121, 127, 166-168, 286-287, 290-303, 358-359; Brunk, *op. cit.*, 93, 151-153, 168-169, 178-179, 187-188, 196-197, 211, 215, 221-222, 235; Hernández Chávez, *Anenecuilco*, 223-235. Cf. Geroid T. Robinson, *Rural Russia under the Old Regime: A History of the Landlord-Peasant World and a Prologue to the Peasant Revolution of 1917* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1932), 152-155, 159-160, 172-176, 204-207; David Mitrany, *Marx against the Peasant: A Study in Social Dogmatism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1951), 66-78, 248-249; Eric Wolf, *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969, x-xiii, 88-99, 294-302; Theodore Shanin, *Russia, 1905-1907: Revolution as a Moment of Truth* (New Haven: Yale University, 1986), 78-119, 130-137, 163-164, 169-172; Lucien Bianco, "Peasant Movements," in Dennis Twitchett and John K. Fairbank, eds., *The Cambridge History*

Between these two ways of life, these two kinds of *Geist*, both ways, both kinds of *espíritu*, strong by 1910 in working country people practically everywhere in Morelos, but in continually shifting strengths, and pulling differently, in tension turning inward, in tension turning outward, drawing close, pushing open, here is my point, my historical hypothesis about *La Revolución del Sur*. In Mexico's political collapse in 1910-11, "Indian" Morelos could have at most made 50-60 local revolts, say (why not?) 100 local revolts, more or less coordinated, also more or less competitive. But it could not have held their coordination for long, or prevented their competition for long, much less ever unified them, much less deliberately projected them beyond its immediate neighbors. Only "Afro" Morelos's sons, i.e., *mestizo-mulato-moreno-pardo* Morelos, could have made the Revolution of the South, pulled local revolts together, made them cooperate, organized the *Ejercito Libertador del Sur*, not Liberal, but actively, directly, objectively Liberating, projected the force of their regional army for a national cause, and kept fighting, fighting strategically, for nearly a decade for the cause. Of course from Anenecuilco forward some of Indian Morelos voluntarily joined the ELS, for the duration, for restitution (though all they got was grants in trust). But it was Afro-Mestizo Morelos that made the comprehensive, expansive, driving, revolutionary *fuera viva* for justice nationally from 1911 to 1920.

I do not want to leave any notion that my thesis is biological, a genetic thesis, a matter of DNA. It is my try in reflective complexity for the position I think best to take for a historically materialist socio-cultural argument to explain the Revolution of the South as at least in principle and intent an armed national socio-economic revolutionary movement, 1911-1920. This would be the argument to explain why, however it happened, whether by God's grace, or History's cunning, or Zapata's culturally induced intuition, or all three, the ELS's national plan already in 1911 most significantly bore the name not of an old "Indian" village (Anenecuilco, Ayoxustla), but of part of an old sugar plantation, long worked by Afro-Mexicans, across the creek from an "Indian" village, but a very different kind of place, grown into the little, open town of Ayala.⁴¹

of China, 15 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1978-2015, XIII, Part 2 (1986), 295-299, 302-305, 312-314, 318-319, 322-327; Manfred Hildermeier, *The Russian Socialist Revolutionary Party before the First World War* (St. Martin's Press, 2000), 204-206, 209-211, 217-218, 220-221, 225-228, 278-280, 286-287; Martin Ravallion, "Famines and Economics," *Journal of Economic Literature*, XXXV, 3 (September 1997), 1205-1242. Cf., reading (as the author did not write) "villages" for "peasants," the classic: Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* [1852] (New York: International Publishers, 1963), 123-126; and on Marx's eventually qualified view of "the Russian village commune," Theodor Shanin, ed., *Late Marx and the Russian Road: Marx and "the Peripheries of Capitalism"* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983), 98-126, 138-139, though one commune did not a communion of villages make. On the difficulty in using locally rooted forces for strategic military operations: Carl von Clausewitz, *Clausewitz on Small War* [1810-19] (Oxford: Oxford University, 2015), 196-206; idem, *On War*, 188, 220, 350, 372-373, 465, 479-483; Charles E. Callwell, *Small Wars: Their Principles and Practice*, 3rd ed. (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1906), 40-41, 145-148, 158, 177, 306-310; Mao Tse-tung, "Report on the Investigation of the Peasant Movement in Hunan [1927]," *Selected Works*, I, 24-29, 32-38; idem, "The Struggle in the Chingkiang Mountains [1928]," *ibid.*, I, 84-85, 93; idem, "Problems of Strategy in Guerrilla War against Japan [1938]," *ibid.*, II, 107-111.

⁴¹ On that moment, its context, antecedents, and quick results: Édgar Castro Zapata and Francisco Pineda Gómex, eds., *A cien años del Plan de Ayala* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2013), for which I thank Édgar Castro Zapata.

Finally, sixth, the question of how revolutionary the Southern agrarian projects, laws, and practices were, and (not quite the same) how they were revolutionary. In Mexico, 1911-1920, they were the revolutionary extreme, the clearest, most forceful reforms of capitalism for economic and social justice. But it is powerfully significant that by the international revolutionary standard for capitalist reform then (1911-20)--I mean not Lenin's Bolshevism (to overthrow capitalism), but the moderate, parliamentary Russian Socialist Revolutionary-Laborite reformism in the First and Second Russian Imperial Dumas--the ELS agrarian reforms lagged well behind the SR-Laborite proposals, for complete, outright nationalization.⁴² In other words, the ELS reforms were very revolutionary for Mexico then, but remarkably limited by comparison with the moderate SR program for Russia.

I think this is significant because, in connection with the prior question, it forces yet another question, which here I will barely open: If *el Sur* had all that terrific *rebeldia*, why did it not make more revolution, at least propose more, demand more, not by Mexican but by international standards? I will only declare here I think the fault is not in the ELS, but in the limits of Mexican political culture then: Mexican Liberal incomprehension of socialism, especially the comradely discipline (in all senses) that the struggle for socialism would require in the new world of imperialism; and almost everywhere Catholic incomprehension of the Hidden God's wrathful judgment on injustice. This relentlessly retentive culture made it practically impossible then for Mexican intellectuals, politicians, workers, or country people to think of more than "social revolution," to think of a socialist revolution in Mexico, much less think about how to do it.

Here we face a fundamental question: How, historically, to explain this limited culture? It would be well worth knowing, historically and for light and justice now.

Deo gratias

John Womack, Jr.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

⁴² Vladimir I. Lenin, *To the Rural Poor* [1903], 2nd ed., rev. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing, 1967); idem, "Revolutionary Days [1905]," *Collected Works*, 45 vols. (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1960-70), VIII, 101-123; idem, "On Our Agrarian Programme [1905]," *ibid.*, VIII, 246-251; idem, "The Revolutionary Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasantry [1905]," *ibid.*, VIII, 293-303; "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution [1905]," *ibid.*, IX, 15-140; "Socialism and the Peasantry [1905]," *ibid.*, IX, 307-315; "Socialism and Anarchism [1905]," *ibid.*, X, 71-74; idem, "What Is the Struggle About?," "The Economic Nature of the Agrarian Revolution and Its Ideological Cloaks," "Two Lines of Agrarian Programmes in the Revolution," "The Agrarian Programme of the Peasantry," "Why Had the Small Proprietors in Russia to Declare in Favour of Nationalization?," "The Peasants and the Narodniks on the Nationalization of Allotment Land," "The Theoretical Principles of Nationalization and Municipalization," "The Scope of the Political and of the Agrarian Revolutions," "Municipalization of the Land and Municipal Socialism," "The Right Peasants," "The Non-Party Peasants," "The Peasant Trudoviks," "The Socialist-Revolutionaries," in *The Agrarian Programme of Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907* [1907] (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing, 1954), 18-29, 34-40, 48-56, 88-96, 103-115, 115-120, 132-184, 215-227, 239-246, 276-280, 280-289, 299-308, 308-316; Robinson, *op. cit.*, 192-207; Launcelot A. Owen, *The Russian Peasant Movement, 1906-1917* [1937] (New York: Russell & Russell, 1963), 16-17, 30-34, 38, 93-95, 101, 103-124; D.A. Kolesnichenko, "Agrarnye proekty Trudovoi gruppy v I Gosudarstvennoi dume," *Istoricheskie zapiski*, No. 82 (1968), 40-88; Esther Kingston-Mann, *Lenin and the Problem of Marxist Peasant Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1983), 74-120; Shanin, *Russia*, 50-54, 83-137; Abraham Ascher, *The Revolution of 1905*, 2 vols. (Stanford: Stanford University, 1992).

September 29, 2017