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The thesis deals with Andrés Molina Enríquez’s pro-miscegenation theory. Molina (1868-1940), a Spencerian evolutionist who believed race struggle is history’s driving force, departs from the premise that Mexico will not be a cohesive, progressive nation until all Mexicans become mestizos—i.e., the product of racial intermingling between Spaniards and Indians. Thus, the analysis of this theory is the main objective of the thesis.

In order to analyse Molina’s theory within its historical context, however, the preliminary section of the thesis briefly describes the thoughts of those Mexican intellectuals who had previously proclaimed ethnic homogeneity—via miscegenation—the key to national stability and development. Similarly, the last part of the thesis presents the ideas of some of Molina’s successors, those who were in favor of miscegenation—not only a racial one but also a cultural one—in postrevolutionary Mexico.

The first and last parts of the thesis allow us to see pro-miscegenation as a current of the Mexican intelligentsia’s quest for national identity. The central part of it—the one devoted to Molina’s theory, undoubtedly the most important and sophisticated
CONTRIBUTION IN THE FIELD- GIVES US A GENERAL PICTURE OF THE CONTRA-
DICTORY NATURE OF THIS CURRENT OF THOUGHT. EVEN THOUGH IT IS CLEAR
THAT A PERVERSIVE MISCEGENATION MADE EVER MORE MEXICAN INTELLECTUALS
ENDORSE THE IDEA THAT MESTIZOS ARE THE REAL PEOPLE OF MEXICO, THE
ANALYSIS OF MOLINA'S WRITINGS SHOWS THAT HE ATTEMPTED TO PREDICT
THE SUPREMACY OF MESTIZOS WITH A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK THAT LEADS
HIM TO THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION. INDEED, NO MATTER HOW MUCH HE TWISTED
IT, SPENCERIAN EVOLUTIONISM DID NOT SERVE HIM (OR HIS CONTEMPORARY
PRO-MISCEGENATIONISTS) TO PROVE WHITE-RACISM WRONG.

THE CONCLUSION IS THAT MOLINA, AS MOST OF HIS FELLOW
"MESTIZOPHILIA" SUPPORTERS, CHOSE TO HAIL THE ETHNIC GROUP THAT
REPRESENTED AN EVER-GROWING MAJORITY OF THE MEXICAN POPULATION,
AND TRIED TO BUILD A SCIENTIFIC THEORY TO PROVE THE SUPREMACY OF
THAT GROUP. BUT IN DOING SO HE HAD TO USE THE ONLY METHODOLOGICAL
TOOLS HE HAD LEARNED AT THE POSITIVIST SCHOOLS OF PORFIRIAN MEXICO.
THE RESULT IS A CONTRADICTORY THEORY THAT, NEVERTHELESS, SHEDS LI-
GHT ON THE PATH TO NATIONAL IDENTITY IN MEXICO.
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We have yet to discover the cipher to the unity of our soul. We make do with the knowledge that we are the product of the conflict between two races.

Alfonso Reyes

La X en la frente.
To Mexico, with the remorse of having had to travel far to understand it better.
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INTRODUCTION

The object of this thesis is to study the thoughts of Andrés Molina Enríquez on what we may call "Pro-miscegenation Theory." In its broadest sense this theory's central idea is that miscegenation, or racial and/or cultural mixture, is desirable. More concretely, Molina's version departs from the premise that the real people of Mexico are the Mestizos, who are of Spanish and American Indian ancestry. Molina Enríquez used findings from historical and socioethnic research to argue that Mexico cannot become a prosperous developed nation while the process of miscegenation is incomplete and the Indian and Creole minorities have not been fused with the Mestizo masses (1).

For the purposes of this study, the author made a comparative analysis of Molina's work by collating ideas Molina adopted with their original sources. Likewise, the author has analysed Molina's arguments and made an assessment of his contribution to the history of thought in Mexico.

Although Mexican pro-miscegenation thought existed before Molina and continued after his death, and despite the fact that Mexico is indeed a Mestizo country, little research exists on this subject (2). Given this, the author felt the need to incorporate a brief account of some of the theories that existed prior to and after Molina.

(1) For the purposes of this thesis the words "race", "ethnos" and their derivatives are used as synonyms.
(2) A noteworthy exception to this is the magnificent (although tangential) study of the theories of several Mexican mestizophiles made by Luis Villoro in Los grandes momentos del indigenismo en México (Ed. La Casa Chata, Mexico, 1979), pp. 175-223.
Molina's work contributed to and was enriched by these other efforts, and without such an account we would not be able to appreciate it in its context and would underestimate its value. A brief chronological description of the attitudes adopted by Mexican intellectuals concerning miscegenation (1) has also been included in an effort to rescue a line of thought that has been neglected by specialists. There is no doubt that Molina's theory is the most important and sophisticated in the field, but this does not mean that Molina's fellow intellectuals are not worthy of attention.

This thesis deals essentially with an idea. Therefore, we must first establish what sort of idea it is and situate it within a conceptual framework to enable us to understand its significance in the context of this analysis. For the purposes of this study, it should be borne in mind that the tendency to link miscegenation and what is essentially Mexican is basically a response to the search to define national identity. In this sense, pro-miscegenation theories can be included in the category of nationalism. Having said that, however, the limits of these concepts must be defined. Despite the numerous definitions that exist for this versatile term, several eminent authorities on the subject agree that nationalism should be interpreted as the

---

(1) The reader should note that although recognition is given to the importance of the views of famous foreigners such as D.H. Lawrence, for example, on miscegenation, this thesis is solely concerned with how Mexicans (and other Latin Americans) have reacted to this phenomenon.
process by which a "nation" (1), or group of people sharing the same sense of national awareness,endeavours to create a state, to contain and separate it from other "nations". Some authors stress the importance of the language aspect (Hayes) while others emphasize different aspects such as race (Akzin), religion, traditions and other factors providing unity (Kohn), basing their explanations around the standardization of culture generated by industrialization (Gellner) or the Kantian idea of self-determination (Kedourie). However, most authors, even those holding the most different of opinions have one common denominator: eurocentricity (2). In their studies on nationalism, even researchers from the United States of America have followed this tendency which explains why their theories are rarely applicable to Latin America (3).

In Latin America the process was the other way round:

-----------------

(1) For the different concepts of nationalism see Louis L. Snyder, The Meaning of Nationalism (Greenwood Press, Westport, 1977).
(3) On the other hand, with exceptions like that of Arthur P. Whitaker's Nationalism in Latin America (Greenwood Press, Westport, 1976) which analyses the quest to define what is essentially Argentinian, the few studies made on South American nationalism tend to concentrate on militarism which is an unfamiliar phenomenon in contemporary Europe. For example, see L.A. Costa Pinto, Nacionalismo y militarismo (S XXI, Mexico, 1974) and Ana Maria Bidegain de Urán, Nacionalismo, militarismo y dominación en América Latina (Ed. U. de los Andes, Bogota, 1983).
the states were formed first and efforts were made to create the "nations" later. When the Spanish colonies gained their independence from Madrid they tended to keep the same territorial divisions as the Empire had done. Thus, the viceroyalties became republics most of whose inhabitants had little feeling of any national awareness. The absence of a national culture of their own, poor standards of education and the isolation of the majority of the continent's inhabitants eliminated the possibility of plans to unite Latin America and caused that the notion of "nationality" could barely exist outside the minds of the elite (1). In such circumstances it was natural that Latin American nationalist movements were different from any European movement (2), and attempted to define the element that, to a greater extent, several European countries already possessed: national identity.

This is what happened in Mexico. The europeanization of Mexico's intelligentsia encouraged crude imitation, exalting the mexicanidad whatever that meant- while the anti-colonial and even the Pan-Latin American tendencies


(2) According to Seton-Watson, there were three kinds of European movements: gradualism ("the old continuous nations"), integrationism, and separatism; Great Britain and France, for example, fall into the first category while Italy and Germany are in the second, and Hungary and Rumania are in the third. See Hugh Seton-Watson, Nations and States (Methuen, London, 1982), pp. 15-191.
were still alive (1). Thus, the concern to find common denominators and factors for national unity attracted increasing numbers of followers. This is what enlarged the Mexican pro-miscegenation school, which attributed the disorder and anarchy that prevailed in independent Mexico to the population’s racial differences which it fought to eradicate. This situation soon brought about the creation of a lasting nationalist movement which proposed miscegenation as the essence of Mexican identity. Given this, it is rather surprising that studies made of this type of movement in Mexico have concentrated on the appropriately named "Creole patriotism"—which rose and fell during the New Spain era and left behind the phenomenon of the veneration of the Virgin of Guadalupe—instead of devoting its attention to what could be called "Mestizo nationalism"—subject of this thesis—which is still alive today in more than one sense (2).


(2) Nowadays, however, studies on nationalism in Mexico tend to focus on the aspect of political struggle, as John Breuilly does in Nationalism and the States (Manchester U. Press, 1985), p.3. For examples, see Rafael Segovia’s view on revolutionary nationalism in "El nacionalismo mexicano: los programas políticos revolucionarios (1929-64)", in Lecturas de política mexicana (El Colegio de México, Mexico, 1981), pp. 37-53, and Enrique Montalvo, El nacionalismo contra la nación (Grijalbo, Mexico, 1986). No recent efforts have been made to include all the concepts of nationalism
The main bulk of the thesis is divided into three parts under the following headings: "The origins of the Pro-miscegenation School", "Andrés Molina Enríquez or the Mythicization of the Mestizo", and "The Outcome: the death or rebirth of mestizophilia". The first part describes the attitude of the colonial elite towards the Mestizo and covers a few of the pioneers of mestizophilia ("Colonial Mexico: miscegenation against the grain"); the attitude of the liberals towards the Indian and racial problems ("Liberal Mexico: a good Indian is an invisible Indian"); and an analysis of the theories of three of the forefathers of mestizophilia ("Francisco Pimentel: humanitarian genocide"; "Vicente Riva Palacio: a compromise between races"; and "Justo Sierra: the Mestizo becomes bourgeois."). At the end of the first part, the author makes an assessment of the regime of Porfirio Díaz with respect to matters concerning the Indian population ("Positivist Mexico: theory versus practice.").

The second part, which deals with Andrés Molina Enríquez, is divided into two sections entitled "Life and Work: the beginnings of an obsession" and "Critical Evaluation: a problem of packaging." The first section includes the sequence of events in Molina's life ("Biographical Note") and a description of his work on mestizophilia during its three stages ("The Formation of

in one study as Frederick C. Turner did in The Dynamic of Mexican Nationalism (The U. of N. Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1968.)
Molina’s Pro-Miscegenation Theory”; “The Consolidation of Molina’s Theory”; and “Molina’s Theory Revised.”) The second section in this part contains a criticism of Molina’s theory from the viewpoint of the theories which inspired him and of the contradictions in his methodology (“Classifying the Unclassifiable” and “The Heart of Molina’s motivation.”) This section concludes with a description of the aspects that were fruitful in his time or that are still relevant today (“The Germ and Fruit of Molina’s Legacy.”)

The third and final part of the thesis deals with the mestizophilia boom and ideologues of the Revolution (“Revolutionary Mexico: miscegenation becomes popular.”) In it the theories on mestizophilia of two of Molina’s most important successors are analysed in the sections entitled: “Manuel Gamio: the reincarnation of the Indian” and “José Vasconcelos: Mestizos of America unite!” This part ends with a glimpse at the presence of the new cultural mestizophilia contained in a few studies on Mexico (“Post-Revolutionary Mexico: the death or rebirth of mestizophilia?”) The author’s conclusions are included at the end of the thesis. The bibliography used by the author is generally comprised of the works written by the different thinkers named throughout this work, their biographies and the biographical material that situates each of them within the context of their times. As far as Andrés Molina Enriquez is concerned, official biographical documents such as his birth certificate, his academic records, appointment documents were used. Likewise, the author studied material written about Molina, the works of writers that influenced him and
secondary sources providing information about the anthropological trends of his time. Although the author only mentions books and pamphlets written by Molina in the section on his theory, articles written by him for publication in newspapers and periodicals were studied and used in other sections to explain his political attitudes and provide a better understanding of his thought. Most of Molina's work on his theory of mestizophilia, however, is to be found in his non-journalistic writings and in particular in his most important work, Los grandes problemas nacionales (Great National Problems.) By looking at Molina's work prior to and following the publication of this book we can only gain a foretaste of, or appreciate small amendments made by Molina to the profusely detailed ideas contained in it. As for other information, there is apparently no Molina archive. With some exceptions, it has thus been impossible to locate his unpublished documents and correspondence.

(1) The only known collection of documents belonging to Molina is owned by his grandson Alvaro Molina Enriquez. Unfortunately this collection is a small one and has not been classified. It is identified in this thesis by the letters "AAME."
1. ORIGINS OF THE PRO-MISCEGENATION

1. Colonial Mexico: miscegenation against the grain.

The concepts of miscegenation and Latin American-ness are closely related. With perhaps the exception of the southern cone comprising Argentina, Uruguay, and, to a lesser extent, Chile, the region could indeed be referred to as "Mestizo America". Latin America differed from the Yankee melting pot, which not only opposed the mixing of whites with Indians (or whites with blacks) but even opposed immigrants from northern Europe mixing with other Europeans of Latin extraction. Instead, the south of the American continent was an area of ethnic mixture, where people of very different races were gradually brought together. In fact, the extent of race mixture in Latin America is hardly rivalled elsewhere in the world (1).

Despite the enormous qualitative and quantitative differences between the civilizations that inhabited the continent's tropical regions and the northern Indians, there was one decisive factor that was vital to the mixture of the Spanish and Indian races: very few women immigrated to the Iberian colonies in America (2).

--------

(2) According to Aguirre, 90% of the Spaniards who emigrated to Mexico were men, and 10% were women. See Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, "Los símbolos étnicos de la identidad nacional", contained in Obra Polémica (SEP-INAH, México, 1975) pp. 121-123.
As could be expected, this situation led to the union of Spaniards with Indian women, providing the origins of a new population (1). This later became a source of worry to the Imperial authorities. Unlike other empires, however, it is likely that Spain did not reject this consanguinity because of its lack of inhibitions concerning its own multiracial background. Moreover, although it was not the general policy, the Spanish authorities even came to officially encourage miscegenation. Barely 11 years after Columbus discovered America, Governor Ovando received royal instructions in Santo Domingo in 1503 that he was to encourage marriages between Spaniards and Indians so as to allow the Indians to become "civilized". Later, in 1511, King Ferdinand, one of Spain’s Catholic Monarchs, wrote to Viceroy Diego Colon instructing him to foster marriages between the two races to prevent concubinage. Three years later, Ferdinand issued a royal warrant that formally authorized mixed marriages. Bartolomé de las Casas also favoured mixed marriages and, in 1516, he proposed the "mixture" of children of Spanish labourers with their Indian

(1) It is important to mention that the black slaves also contributed to Mexico's miscegenation, especially in the coastal areas. For the purposes of this thesis, however, closer consideration is given to the Spanish-Indian race mixture. For the black influence in Mexico, see Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán, La población negra de México (FCE, Mexico, 1972.)
counterparts (1). Cardinal Jiménez de Cisneros, Regent of Castille, was more practical when he gave orders the same year for Spaniards to marry Indian women who were the daughters of Indian caciques. The purpose behind this order was to be able to use the future Mestizo offspring as a tool to wield political control in the colonies (2).

Despite its intervention, the Spanish crown did not alter the miscegenation process. And although the Catholic church approved marriages between Spaniards and Indians who had been baptized, it too was unable to do much (3). Irrespective of rules and regulations, race mixture proliferated largely thanks to unlawful relationships. The Spanish and Indian couples produced illegitimate offspring, who were soon subjected to pitiless discrimination. The terms "Mestizo" and "bastard" were soon used synonymously. During the second half of the seventeenth century segregation laws were introduced, but it was already too late — the number of Mestizos had multiplied at an overwhelming rate and their social conditions were in most cases deplorable. The Mestizo had entered the colonial period through the back door to take

his place alongside the rest of society's outcasts. Just as the Spanish conquerors had not been outraged by the idea of mixing their race with the Indian population, they showed no indignation when there were confronted by the idea of bringing a human being into the world that only inspired them scorn (1).

The situation was the same in New Spain. Mexico, where miscegenation became widespread (2), embarked upon its process of racial synthesis with one exception -- the formal engagement of Gonzalo Guerrero, a shipwrecked sailor, to the daughter of an Indian cacique from the Yucatan peninsula around the year 1512. This couple produced the first Mexican Mestizos. The rule, however, did not take long to be established. The semi-legitimate state of Guerrero's offspring (considered legitimate by the Indians and illegitimate by the Spaniards because they were the fruit of a pagan union) ended after the conquest when both sides came to consider all Mestizos as illegitimate. The example set by Hernán Cortés, who recognised four of his Mestizo children, was not enough to inspire the other Spanish settlers. Martín Cortés, who is the classic example of a Mexican Mestizo, the son of the Conquistador and the Malinche, who was declared legitimate by the Pope himself, ended up as an illusion for

(1) For a description of the Mestizos situation in the colonial period see Morner, op. cit., pp. 35-90, Rosenblat, op. cit., pp 61-64.

the common Mestizo. The new illegitimate hybrids, who faced the same practical disadvantages as the castes and had none of the legal advantages of the Indians, were those who fared worst in the clash between the two worlds (1).

The development of Creole patriotism, however, initiated a process which would eventually alter the image of the Mestizo. After the conquest, the descendents of Spaniards born in America were discriminated by the Iberians, who kept the best jobs and were at the top of the social pyramid. Gradually, the outrage of each of the Creoles merged to form a feeling of collective aversion towards Spain. As a result, the Creoles developed a school of thought to revalue their autochthonous customs, those which were not of Spanish origins. Siguenza y Góngora and Mier were responsible for the intellectual manifestations of this discontent in Mexico in their efforts to establish connections between Quetzalcoatl and Saint Thomas Apostle, and Tonatzin and the Virgen of Guadalupe: the aim of their work was to demonstrate that New Spain did not have Spain to thank for Christianity (2). However, the catalyst that accelerated this school of thought was undoubtedly the violent criticism unleashed by European writers such as Buffon, De Paw and Robertson during the second half of the eighteenth century against the New World and its inhabitants. The pride of the

(1) For a brief description of miscegenation in Mexico, see Rosenblat, *op. cit.*, vol. II, pp. 33 and 54-66.
(2) For a description of this theory, see Jacques Lafaye, *Quetzalcoatl y Guadalupe* (FCE, Mexico, 198).
Creole intellectual elite was hurt by this and it responded with a shower of arguments defending creolization and the Creoles' pre-Hispanic heritage. In Mexico, this heritage was very rich but, unlike Peru, there was nobody to rouse to rebellion on its behalf. This situation prompted Creole patriots to what has been described as a virtual expropriation of the Indian past for their own (1).

The Creoles' adoption of the Indian past made them aware of their identity crisis, as they felt obliged to defend a nation but were unsure of who represented it. On the one hand, the Creole intellectuals had to fall back on the Indians to justify their clash with Europe, while on the other, they felt they could not accept them as their fellow countrymen. The natural solution to their dilemma was to boast of the glory of the dead Indian past and to turn a blind eye to the plight of the Indians living alongside them. This arrangement, however, which the Creoles hoped would help them cut the historical umbilical cord that prevented them from putting themselves on a par with Spain, could not be sustained for long. Although it allowed them to claim a tradition of their own and to shake themselves free of the tag that they were the scum of Spanish society, who would only create another warped copy of Spain, it soon drew their attention to the shortcomings of their "spiritual miscegenation" (1). Despite their enthusiasm for the mythical Anáhuac warrior, the New World Creole felt no affinity whatsoever with the ordinary Indians and even less

(1) David Brading, Los orígenes del nacionalismo mexicano (Era, Mexico, 1983), pp. 37-42.
with their culture. Nonetheless, the first although incomplete step had been taken — why, if the conquerors acknowledged the distinguished background of the vanquished race, could they not accept the offspring of a mixture of both as the product of the new American continent? After all, it was obvious that it would be difficult to forge the new motherland the Creoles had in mind if there was antagonism between the two races.

This opinion was shared by Francisco Javier Clavijero. Well ahead of his time, this distinguished representative of Creole patriotism shaped an introduction to what would eventually form the mestizophile school of thought in 1780. According to him:

It would have been wiser if the Spaniards had married into American families instead of bringing European women and slaves from Africa with them, so as to have created a single nation in its own right (2).

(1) Besides the need for legitimacy that led the Creoles to adopt the pre-Hispanic past as their own, it is interesting to note that their daily contact with the Indians provided another source of "spiritual miscegenation". See Fernando Benitez, Los primeros mexicanos (Era, Mexico, 1984), pp. 241-242.

(2) Francisco Javier Clavijero, Historia antigua de México (Porrúa, Mexico, 1958), vol. II, pp. 200-209. It is interesting to note that Clavijero himself is a perfect example of the Creole identity crisis. This is clear from the way in which he uses words such as "Mexican", "national" and "Spaniard". See Lafaye, op.cit., pp. 166-169.
The value of Clavijero's comment lies not so much in his diagnosis as in his solution to the problem. The lack of mixed marriages cannot be attributed to the presence of European women precisely because there were very few of them who came to America, and there can be few complaints concerning the relations between American families and the Spaniards because they were already "close". Nonetheless, Clavijero established an important precedent: miscegenation provided a way of uniting society and creating a new nation, and was no longer considered as a generous gift of civilization from the Spaniards to the Indians (Las Casas) or as an instrument to be used for political manipulation (Cisneros). Despite the "historical Mestizo awareness" of thinkers such as Alvarado Tezozomoc and Alva Ixtlixochitl, it is difficult to know what the Indians or the Mestizos thought of racial fusion (1). There is no doubt, however, that the Creoles, who formed the dominant class in New Spain after the Iberians, began to notice the limitations of a divided land. Although Clavijero discarded miscegenation as a lost opportunity perhaps to conceal his rejection of the idea of a Mestizo fatherland, he paved the way for a new project. Thus, given the racial opinions of the time and the fact that the Mestizo represented the sole hope for national reconciliation, things began to look up for him.

(1) For an account of Mestizo historiography, see Enrique Florescano, Memoria mexicana (J. Mortiz, Mexico, 1987), pp. 155-181. Unfortunately there are no comprehensive studies that continue the splendid work of Miguel León Portilla and his Visión de los vencidos (UNAM, Mexico, 1984) on the colonial Mexico.
Towards the end of the colonial period, despite the changes in historical perspective and the progress that had been made in the racial context, pro-miscegenation had still not matured. Fifty years after the publication of Clavijero’s comments, the Creole fatherland that he, Eguiar y Eguren and other Creole patriots had attempted to define was becoming reality. The brief crossing of ways between the Creole elite and the Indian and Mestizo populations, who were united in their aversion for Spain, had sparked off an independence movement, which culminated in the supremacy of the Creole (1). Moreover, the subject of miscegenation was not even considered in the ensuing ideological dispute. The conservatives felt that Spain should be taken as the desired model for life in Mexico and although even Lucas Alamán admitted that the castes were “capable of both good and bad” (2), they had little to say for miscegenation. The liberals, who would lead Mexico’s revolutions, considered the solution lay in the theoretical egalitarianism that they believed in and thus eliminated the racial differences in one fell swoop. At the wave of a magic wand the Constitution had made the Indians disappear and had replaced them with a mass

(1) See Francisco López Cámara, La génesis de la conciencia liberal en México (UNAM, Mexico, 1977), pp. 140-146.

of abstract Mexican citizens. Only a handful of foresighted people predicted that this legal determinism would end in failure. (However, they probably would have underestimated how long that would actually take.) Right from the proclamation of the first liberal Constitution in Cadiz in 1820, José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi, the famous "Mexican Thinker", had ridiculed the miraculous effects of legislation concerning the Indians' ancestral problems (1) and the renowned Indian deputy and school teacher, Juan Rodríguez Puebla, did the same with the 1824 Constitution. Rodríguez Puebla rejected the notion of constitutional equality and his request for special treatment for the indigenous populations drew attention to the gap that still divided Mexican society. "It does not matter how often I am told that I am descended from Spanish stock," he exclaimed, "how can I believe it when looking back through my past at my forefathers I am unable to find even one who did not suffer at the hands of the Spaniards?" (2)

With constitutional equality, some would argue, there was no reason for miscegenation to exist. Why mix races if a homogenous situation had already been reached? That was what the new ruling elite felt, pushing the Indian past and Fray Servando's pre-Hispanic veneration of the Virgen of

(1) José Joaquín Fernández de Lizardi, El indio y la india del pueblo de Actopan (Jose Maria Betancurt, Mexico, 1820), pp. 6-7.
(2) Juan Rodríguez, Discurso (...) sosteniendo el dictamen de que se apliquen al Colegio de San Gregorio los bienes del hospital que fue de naturales (Imprenta del Supremo Gobierno, Mexico, 1824), pp. 8-9. Speech delivered on 11 October 1824.
Guadalupe to the backs of its minds and replacing them with the European trend of liberalism which was gradually taking hold of the country. By rejecting the colonial past and ignoring native elements in its definition of national identity, independent Mexico staked its future for the liberal cause. For the nation's founders "nationality and liberalism were indeed one and the same" (1). In the battle to impose different versions of this panacea everything else paled into insignificance. The dust kicked up between escoceses and yorkinos (freemasons) covered up the ethnic problems of the young Mexican republic, where controversy was running rife. Thus many of the most renowned liberals of the first three decades of independence ended up showing contempt for the Indians and, in the best of cases, considered them to be a burden that would have to borne for humanitarian reasons. There are several eloquent examples to illustrate this: Lorenzo de Zavala proposed educating the Indians or, in the case of the most rebellious Indians, he suggested following the examples set by the United States of America which would have involved forcing them "to leave the territory of the Republic" (2), and Mariano Otero declared that while the Indians remained uneducated and "semi-wild", they "would hardly be fit to be considered as a part of society." (3) And just to make the situation absolutely

(1) Jesús Reyes Heroles, El liberalismo mexicano (FCE, Mexico, 1982), vol. II, p. 454.
(3) Mariano Otero, "Consideraciones sobre la situación política y social de la República Mexicana en el año de 1847", in Obras (Porrua, Mexico, 1967), vol. I, p. 130.
clear, José María Luis Mora took it upon himself to deny the Mexican nationality to those "short, repugnant remainders of the ancient Mexican people", and, most importantly, he made it explicit that although everybody was equal, the Creoles were "more equal" than the Indians or the Mestizos:

The white population is by far the dominant class of the day given its size, enlightenment and wealth. Likewise, the exclusive influence it has on public business and the advantages of its position over other sectors means that it must form the basis on which the quest to define Mexican identity must be founded. The whites must establish the concept that will be formed of the Republic in the rest of the world (1).

There was no way of appealing this sentence. None of the Indians or Mestizos would dare to tarnish the Creoles' idyllic image of Mexico.

Racial fusion continued to occur in this context, but the distance between the parties involved was greater than ever. There were, nonetheless, a few exceptions such as the plan for a Mestizo monarchy proclaimed in 1834 by the priests Carlos Tepisteco and Epigmenio de la Piedra. Under their plan a congress was to be formed by the twelve most direct male descendents of the last Aztec emperor of Mexico, Montezuma II. The congress was to be entrusted to elect an emperor. If their choice turned out to be Indian, he would have to marry a white woman, and if he were white he would have to marry a "pure-blooded Indian woman" (2). However,

the mainstream began to swing towards xenophobia and became obsessed with attracting European settlers. It was not long before the watchword was "the whiter the better". Between the years 1846 and 1848, while Mexico was at war, the Congress discussed a project to permit religious tolerance for foreigners. The idea behind that proposal was to make immigration more enticing to the Nordic protestants of Europe (1). While the conservatives yearned for a European prince to govern their country, the liberals, who continued to speak of legal equality for all and to condemn racial prejudice, battled for an alternative along the lines of Europe and the United States of America. Regardless of whether they were discussing monarchies or republics, centralism or federalism, they agreed that the model was to be found abroad, and more specifically was to be found in the white nations. Not even the triumph of the most progressive theories appeared to improve the situation: in Mexico the Indian was far too close to describe him in terms of Rousseau's noble savage. This goes to explain why it has been said that the pre-reform Creoles bristled at the thought that democracy could mean government under a Mestizo such as, Vicente Guerrero or the participation of the Indian masses in the nation's politics (2). The slogan of the privileged classes of the day could well have been that a good Indian was an invisible Indian and this attitude also applied to the Mestizos.

(2) Charles A. Hale, El liberalismo mexicano en la época de Mora (S. XXI, Mexico, 1985), p. 306. It is worth mentioning that Hale supports my reading of the appreciation of the Mexican liberals' contempt for anything Indian. See op. cit., pp. 221-254.
Nonetheless, the Indians refused to disappear and they showed their determination to fight for their rights. Their rebellions convinced the Mexican intelligentsia, which until then had looked down on them, that sharing republican citizenship with them had failed to create bonds of identity between the different ethnic groups and that no real feelings of national awareness existed. Public opinion was especially shaken towards the end of the first half of the century by the caste war in the Yucatan which broke out just as the country was suffering the effects of an aggressive onslaught of expansionism from the United States. At the end of 1848, the newspaper *El Monitor* voiced the feelings of the inhabitants of the urban settlements in a report that said that the Indians would either have to be exterminated or made to disappear in the racial melting pot (1). In the same year, the Yucatan separatist Justo Sierra O'Reilly published a book in which he called for the expulsion of the Yucatan's indigenous populations for not having "amalgamated" with the rest of the community (2). Afraid that the uprisings would escalate and affect their class interests, or because they sincerely wanted to prevent the country pulling itself apart in domestic skirmishes, the Creole ideologues changed course. And in 1849 it was the same Dr. Mora, who thirteen years earlier had decreed the theoretical expatriation of the Indians, who gave the signal for a complete turnabout from his diplomatic mission in London by advising the

---

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 244
(2) González Navarro, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-37.
government on:

the need to not only stop the castes uprising but to ensure that this could not be repeated. And the only means of achieving this is to fuse all the colours and races in the republic to make one (1).

Perhaps because the damage inflicted on his family by the hordes of Indians and Mestizos who followed Hidalgo had not been forgotten (2) Mora continued appealing for European immigrants who he now saw as a way to prevent the race becoming darker in colour as the process of miscegenation pushed relentlessly on. There was no turning back. Although the Indians' belligerant irreducibility had not been able to do much to free them from exploitation, without intending to they managed to stir up speculation surrounding the Mestizo as the typical Mexican of the future.

Thus, those who dreamt of a Creole Mexico were brought down to earth and reality with a nasty jolt. Attitudes were gradually changing in as far as the existing anarchy was interpreted as a result of ethnic heterogeneity. The new generation, which had a better grasp of humanistic doctrine, had already manifested a different concept of the world in the voice of Guillermo Prieto. Although the Indians continued to be considered as an "abject, repugnant race", Creole perception made a complete turnabout: "We," lamented Prieto, "are foreigners in our own land." (3) It is difficult to

(1) José María Luis Mora, La gestión diplomática del Dr. Mora, (SRE, Mexico, 1931), p.151. Communiqué dated 31 July 1849.
(3) Guillermo Prieto, "Zacatecas-VI Toltecas", in Guillermo Prieto (Journalists of Mexico Club, Mexico, 1962), p. 293. Originally published 28 Nov. 1843 in El Siglo XIX.
conceive a more drastic change of perception.

Things changed even more when Prieto's generation assumed power: who would underestimate the blood that flowed in the veins of Juárez and Ocampo or the Ramírez or Altamiranos of that time? The second great chapter in the history of Mexico was written by Indians, Mestizos and Creoles side by side as unprecedented equals under the leadership of a direct descendent of the Indian race. Of course, the Indians and Mestizos in question had been creolized and only retained the traces of their ancestors that could not be removed. However, this was more than enough for those times, which were still far from instituting cultural miscegenation. That "abject and repugnant race" had produced a leader of great ability and dignity as well as some of Mexico's outstanding talents. It was only natural that mestizophilia would win support in this context. One of its followers was none other than Gabino Barreda, who introduced positivism into Mexico and created Juárez's system of education, which was to mould several generations of Mexicans. The words written by Barreda in 1870 on educational reform deserve to be quoted in full because they reflect one of the first official attempts at putting miscegenation into practice in Republican Mexico:

Another highly important aspect of social influence that could result from this fusion of having all the pupils in a single school is the rapid elimination of race distinction or other differences of origin which prevail in the Mexican people as everybody would be educated in a like manner and in the same establishment. This will create links of brotherhood and will foster new bonds between families -- this is the only way we can erase
the disastrous divisions of race (1).
The change was great: with the reassessment of the Indian much respect was lost for the Creoles' purity. And if that were not enough, two years later the finishing touch was provided by Ignacio Ramírez, el Nigromante, who spoke of a cosmic race — "the man of the future," he said, "will not be able to boast of the homogenous nature of his origins because his blood will be African, Eskimo, Caucasian and Aztec all at once." (2) By adhering to the national plan others would join in. It would not be long before Creole Mexico would only be able to raise its head in secret.

3. Francisco Pimentel: humanitarian genocide.

The second republic had not yet been founded when the first serious, detailed work dealing specifically with miscegenation was published. In the early second half of the nineteenth century, Mexico was still under French intervention when Francisco Pimentel (1832-1893), a philologist from Aguascalientes who was born into the

Creole nobility, wrote his work entitled *Memoria sobre las causas que han originado la situación actual de la raza indígena* (1864) (Report on the Causes of the Current Situation of the Indian Race). He dedicated this book to Emperor Maximillian "as a token of love and respect." Little can be said about Pimentel's life without mentioning his ill-fated incursion into politics. After receiving an excellent education at the hands of private tutors, Pimentel devoted himself wholeheartedly to the study of indigenous languages. It was a little later, while still young, that he collaborated with the Austrian emperor as his mayor of Mexico City. In addition to this post, Pimentel also accepted recognition of the title of Count of Heras which was conferred upon him. Following the triumph of the republicans, Pimentel returned to his private life where he suffered economic and moral reprisals. Despite this uncomfortable situation, he managed to sustain the unique mixture of liberal conservatism that he had had in common with the second empire. Over time, however, his international prestige as a linguist, which gained him membership to several scientific associations in Europe and the United States of America, allowed him to be readmitted to Mexico's cultural circles. Odd as it may seem, it was Altamirano who expressed his admiration of him and invited him to collaborate on his literary seminar entitled *El Renacimiento* (The Renaissance). The Society of Geography and Statistics, which had expelled him for his role in the imperial government, also agreed to readmit him to its
circles. Likewise, he was admitted as a member of the Hidalgo Lyceum, where he sustained debates on controversial points of literature with the institution's director, Ignacio Ramírez. He remained detached from politics for the rest of his life and devoted his time to his academic and intellectual activities. Although he wrote works on political economics and the history of Mexican literature, he never again matched the success of his famous *Cuadro comparativo de las lenguas indígenas de México* (1862) (*A Comparative Study of Mexican Indigenous Languages.*) (1)

It was Pimentel's analysis of the Indian population that led him to propose miscegenation. He reasoned that the Indians' wretched situation was the result of the unfavourable conditions they lived in. He explained that the fact that the Indian was serious, taciturn, gloomy, phlegmatic, cold, slow, long-suffering, servile and hypocritical and only possessed "virtues related to resignation", was "the natural result of the sad events that had educated him." He also affirmed that the Indian could be civilized because his chief anthropological characteristics matched those of the Europeans. The key to success would be to educate him in the same way as white people are educated (2).

(1) For a description of Pimentel's life and work, see Francisco Sosa, "Noticia preliminar. Vida y escritos de Francisco Pimentel", in Francisco Pimentel, Obras Completas (Tipografía Económica, Mexico, 1903), vol. 1, pp. V-CX. It is worth noting that Sosa was also a mestizophile although his comments on the Indians' attitude to miscegenation are both denigrating and unfair. See op. cit., pp. XLIV-LIV.

(2) Francisco Pimentel, *Memorial sobre las causas que han originado la situación actual de la raza indígena de México y medios de remediarla* (Imprenta de Andrade y Escalante, Mexico, 1864), pp. 210-214.
Pimentel said there was one main reason for why this situation could not continue -- it was holding back Mexico's homogeneity and the establishment of common beliefs and purposes. In other words, the plight of the Indians was preventing Mexico from aspiring "to nation status in the fullest sense of the word." In answer to the question that could be posed concerning the analogy between the white man and the Indian in Mexico, Pimentel had the following to say:

The white man speaks Spanish and French; the Indian has more than a hundred different languages to express his ideas in. The white man is Roman Catholic or indifferent; the Indian worships idols. The white man is a landowner; the Indian is proletarian. The white man is wealthy; the Indian is poor and wretched. The descendents of the Spaniards have knowledge and all the scientific discoveries at their disposal; the Indians live in ignorance. The white man dresses according to the dictates of Paris fashions, using the most luxurious cloths; the Indian is naked. The white man lives in cities in beautiful houses; the Indian is isolated in the countryside, living in pitiful shacks. This is the contrast that Mexico presents -- Humboldt was very right when he called this the land of inequality: there are two very different peoples living on its soil, but worst of all is the fact that they are two peoples who are each others enemies to a certain extent. (1)

This division and the lack of patriotic cohesion that accompanied it meant that the Mexicans did not form a real people, and explains why a foreign army had to bring peace to the country.

On rare occasions has a more vivid picture of the socio-racial reality of nineteenth century Mexico been painted. Of course, Francisco Pimentel's view is that of a Creole who, having been shocked by the Indian insurrections in Sonora and the caste war in the Yucatan, thought the cause of Mexico's chaos was ethnic diversity.

(1) Ibid., pp. 217-218.
Nonetheless, his analysis contained observations that went beyond his class consciousness. In his condemnation of the enthusiasm to mount great material works before attending to the human element that provides their foundations, Pimentel precociously spotted an error made by several Latin American governments. His criticism of the spectacular modernisation programmes which only benefited a small portion society is still valid today:

We want railroads while most of our population only knows how to walk; we want telegraph services which the Indian calls black magic; we want gas in our cities while nearly all our fellow countrymen use ocotillo for light; we want to expand our trade and there are no consumers. (1)

Clearly the Count of Heras was no socialist, but despite his come down in the aristocracy, his fervent belief in laissez-faire was never questioned. Quite simply this was the common sense of a man whose aristocratical tendencies did not blind him to the obstacles in the way of creating a nation that was ethnically homogenous. His reasoning was clear. If his country as such was to progress, the Indians would have to be "de-indianized." They would have to forget their language, their religion, abandon their communal lands and adopt the culture of the Creole. "This is the only way they can forget their worries and form a homogenous people alongside the white population, and create a true nation."(2)

Up to this point there was nothing in Pimentel's arguments that implied a need for miscegenation. From them we could say that his aim was a culturally uniform country.

(2) Ibid, p. 226.
which, of course, does not exclude racial variety. However, there was a serious obstacle in Pimentel's path: an educated Indian would be even worse than an ignorant Indian because he would be better equipped to vent his grudge against the white man. So what could be done with the Indians? If they were eliminated that would be inhumane and the very thought made him "pale with fright." No, what had to be done was to take the bull by the horns and bring the Indians closer to the level of education of the white population so that they could be considered as equals. This would ease the process of racial fusion in which the Indians would sooner or later be compensated for by just enough European immigrants. If they were well educated the Mestizo offspring of the two would inherit the virtues and the vices of their parents. Much more importantly, there would not only be mixing between whites and Indians but also between whites and Mestizos, who already formed a majority. Such mixtures would guarantee the gradual "whitening" of the Mexican population. Thus, "the mixed race (...) would be an intermediary race because in time the whole population would gradually become white." This, of course, was of great relief to Pimentel. However, perhaps the thought that this "mixed race" might inherit the Indians' stubbornness along with other characteristics that would stall the "intermediary" period, don Francisco decided to defend the Mestizo. This was not difficult as he realised the Mestizos were strong since they had won the war of independence. That experience had also shown, according to him, that the Mestizo was happy, spendthrift, astute, confident and had better taste than the Indian. This was
enough to decide him as when all was said and done it was not a matter of choosing between the Mestizo and the Creole -- who had already won the battle -- but between the Mestizo and the Indian. This led him to an obvious conclusion: "the Mestizo can be corrected if he is controlled in an atmosphere of healthy discipline; but where can we find a tonic strong enough to bring the Indian up to the levels required by civilization?" (1)

It is interesting to look into who influenced Pimentel. He based himself on Clavijero and Humboldt to emphasise the importance of the role of Indian education and quoted Alamán to back his rejection of racial or environmental influence on character. He maintained that neither race nor environment could curb the effect of the law, which could alter any trait of human behaviour. This interpretation of fate based on personal will, however, did not fit in very clearly with his obsession with European immigration as a means of bringing about genetic change. Furthermore, it proved the feasibility of miscegenation which was supported by a fact that contradicted his faith in the omnipotence of the law. The four million Mestizos he estimated were living in Mexico showed that miscegenation was possible and question the effectiveness of the segregation laws. However, none of the

(1) Ibid., pp. 231-237.
ambiguities in his opinions concerning the Indians and Mestizos detract from the conclusions of his study as they were not his main concern. He was more interested in the white future of Creole Mexico. As he said:

we want the word "race" to disappear from among us not only in theory but also in practice; we want the same customs and interests to prevail throughout the country. We have already shown the way for this to be achieved — immigration. (1)

As we can see, Pimentel cannot be accused of having been a hypocrite. It is very clear that the "same interests" he proposed referred to Creole interests, and his wish for the word "race" to disappear did not mean that people would stop referring to the white race. Like his predecessors, Pimentel's mestizophilia was relative. For him the Mestizo was a Creole in disguise, a means to whiten the coloured population. The old dream to eliminate the Indians charitably, or to commit what could be called humanitarian genocide, had finally transformed into a theory. Pimentel decided that miscegenation was the best means to creolize this sector of the population. With this formula Francisco Pimentel brought a stage of the pro-miscegenation trend to its conclusion.

------

(1) Ibid., pp. 238-240.
4. **Vicente Riva Palacio: a compromise between races.**

Twenty years after the publication of Pimentel's *Memoria* a new form of mestizophilia emerged. The republic had been restored, Juárez and the reform had made their impact on school textbooks and Porfirio Díaz's doctrines began to come into their own through Manuel González. A book was published against this background that did not take long to be considered as one of the classics of Mexico's history. It's name was *México a través de los siglos* (Mexico Through the Centuries) and it was published in 1884. The author of this masterpiece was Vicente Riva Palacio (1832-1996) and it was his second book. Riva Palacio was a famous general, politician and scholar. He was born in Mexico City and was a Mestizo descendant of Vicente Guerrero, his maternal grandfather. His career was very varied. He studied at San Gregorio College and the Toluca Literary Institute while his father was governor of the State of Mexico, but after a brilliant military career he left the legal profession and was made a general. Riva Palacio was chief of staff under Gonzalo Ortega and military leader during the French intervention on the side of General Ignacio Zaragoza. On the death of Arteaga he was made chief general of the central army. His military feats against the empire included the siege and taking of Toluca and Zitacuaro, and his involvement in the siege of Queretaro. His political career was equally successful. He was made a parliamentary deputy three times and initiated this stage of his life as a substitute during
the 1856 Constituent Congress. During the French intervention he acted as governor of the states of Mexico and Michoacán, and was given a cabinet post as minister of development. (Incidentally, it was Riva Palacio who was responsible for erecting the first monument of the Aztec emperor Cuauhtémoc in Mexico City.) He was narrowly defeated by José María Iglesias for the post of president of the supreme court and could even have defeated Porfirio Díaz for the presidency of the republic. As his popularity constituted a threat he was exiled to Madrid as Mexico's ambassador in Spain.

His fighting spirit and aggressive nature led him to spend time in prison. He was imprisoned several times and was finally given his freedom when Manuel González came to power. It was while he was in the Santiago Tlatelolco prison that he wrote México a través de los siglos in which he expounded his ideas on miscegenation. His favourite weapon was satirical journalism and he was well-known for his attacks on the government of Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada, which were published in the El Ahuizote newspaper. He contributed to almost all aspects of the arts, writing plays, comedy, poetry and short stories. He is considered to be the founder of the romantic novel using colonial themes and backgrounds. He was a member of the Geography and Statistics Society, the Natural History Society and several foreign intellectual associations. He was also president of the Hidalgo Lyceum. (1)
Vicente Riva Palacio's approach to miscegenation as a Mestizo is fundamentally different from the approach adopted by his Creole contemporary, Francisco Pimentel. Rather than advocating change in the Indian, Riva Palacio wanted to see the creation of a single people with its own identity. For him, the colonial period marked the start of the process of race mixture which he hoped would lead to the creation of "a new race that would shape Mexican nationality." He also considered that emancipation from Spain would be achieved as a result of the development of racial fusion. "All attempts towards independence," he says, "failed while the process of race mixture did not produce a new, exclusively Mexican people." He explained himself by adding that while there are different ethnic groups in a country there can be no feeling of national spirit because this is opposed by the idiosyncrasies of each race and these cannot be counteracted by education. "The feelings, thoughts, beliefs and desires of man are not only dictated by his origins -- his race is also involved." Therefore, to achieve the harmony and strength provided by patriotic unity, the individuals who belong to a certain society must be subjected "to the same morphological and functional vicissitudes" and "the same epidemic dangers." In other words, they must belong to the same race. In Mexico, racial homogeneity can be achieved by

(1) For a description of the life and work of Vicente Riva Palacio, see Clementina Dias y de Ovando, "Prólogo", in Vicente Riva Palacio, Los cuentos del General, (Porrúa, Mexico, 1968). This book is considered to contain the best of his narrative work.
making changes which the Indian, who was considered to
totally lack genetic dominance, slowly introduced into the
Spanish race through miscegenation. These changes, which
"gradually became more and more marked, will shape the true
Mexican in another couple of centuries, and this will be the
Mexican of the future who will be as different from the
Spaniards and the Indians as the Italians and Germans are."
(1)

As we can see, differentiation forms the essence of Riva
Palacio's proposals. Strictly speaking, neither the Creoles
nor the Indians are Mexicans because they are more like the
Spaniards or the ancient Aztecs and Mayans. For the first
time, a clear link was drawn between miscegenation and what
can be identified as being Mexican, and the Mestizos were
granted the exclusive right to claim Mexican nationality. The
implied reasoning behind his thoughts is very revealing. What
justification for its existence would Mexico have had if it
was destined to shelter people who felt more at home in
Europe or on an Indian reserve? If Italy is for the Italians
and Germany is for the Germans, Mexico is for the Mestizos.
The Mestizos are the only people who can feel that Mexico is
their fatherland because nobody else can be distinguished
from the inhabitants of Spain and the Anáhuac Valley who
belong to nations that are far removed from the Mexican
nation both in sense of space and time. The criteria for

(1) Vicente Riva Palacio, "El Virreinato. Historia de la
dominación española en México desde 1521 a 1800", in
México a través de los siglos (Ballesca y Cía, México,
making the distinction continue, of course, to be based purely on race. In effect, the contribution of the pre-Hispanic element, which Riva Palacio considered to have little to offer to the Mestizo from the cultural point of view, is based on this aspect. However, from the anthropological viewpoint and "in accordance with principles of the evolutionist school," Mexico's indigenous race is superior to the European race. There are several sources providing proof of the Indians' "physical superiority" which speak of their absence of useless "cutaneous appendages" which cover parts of the white man's body, their perfect teeth, the replacement of a canine by a molar, their lack of wisdom teeth, and the presence of an "extra" leg muscle in the Otomi Indians. (1) Riva Palacio thus displays a new concept of miscegenation. For him the Mestizo not only improves the Indians but also the Creoles, who can benefit from the Indian's superior evolution. In this way the proposed deal looks fairer and turns into an exchange: intelligence for anthropological strength. Most importantly, however, the burden of change now falls equally on the shoulders of both sides, which will have to surrender their existence to a new third party. Seen like this, the pact has became a sort of compromise between races. (2)

Riva Palacio obviously based his analysis strictly on

(1) Ibid, p. 472. It is worth mentioning that Riva Palacio thought the Indian race came originally from America.
(2) Riva Palacio also attributes the Spaniards with having contributed greater ease of adaptability. See op. cit., pp. 479-480.
evolutionism. He made explicit use of the work of Darwin and Haekel, and used Spencer as his tacit reference. However, his case is more complicated than it appears at first glance. Riva Palacio represented the Mexican intellectuals of the period of transition between early nineteenth century liberalism and late nineteenth century positivism, and was reluctant to leave what he called "the saintly and noble principle of universal fraternity" to one side to become involved in the jungle of social Darwinism. This explains his Krausism and ambivalence towards the anti-racist stance held by Renan (1) as well as his contradictory performance with respect to what would soon be the official doctrine of the porfirist regime. Little remains of his arguments in favour of miscegenation thanks to his unnecessary sidetracking into the murky realms of genetics, which leads us to ask if the indigenous race was "totally devoid of genetic dominance" what good was their physical superiority to miscegenation? His tacit handling of the cultural aspect also suffered a similar fate. Everything would appear to indicate that for Riva Palacio miscegenation was a response to a need for divergence and to the idea that a human group that is not ethnically different to others cannot justify its existence as a nation. This view, which Pimentel also held although to a lesser extent, did not come from romantic German nationalism but from stereotyped notions of what the European nations were, and the belief in racial instinct.

(1) Ibid., p. 471.
It led him to ignore, or at least underestimate, the equalizing-diversifying role of culture. He had nothing to say on this subject and did not seem to question the prospect of a culturally Europeanized Mestizo, who would be indistinguishable from his former masters. In his defence, however, in accordance with his theory it could be assumed that the creation of a new race would bring about the formation of a new culture. Nevertheless, to be quite honest, his opinions did not greatly help the cause.

Where Riva Palacio scores is in his novel historical interpretation. According to him, while the number of Indians fell at the end of the sixteenth century due to epidemics and ill-treatment, and the Spaniards continued to reproduce at a normal rate, "the castes multiplied rapidly and began to feel they were united by bonds of misfortune and hope, which led them to form the nucleus of a future nationality." This growth was accentuated by the desire of the women of the "defeated race" to prevent their descendents being taken into slavery. However, the Spaniards detested the Mestizos because they:

were the powerful germ of a new people on earth which by accumulating virtues and vice from the different races they were descended from and by multiplying over time would eventually acquire the undisputed right to claim autonomy, thus forming a new nationality in that land which so many races had seized from each other and which in view of its geographical location and its wealth of natural elements was destined to be the seat of an important nation in the American continent.

Since the Spaniards "acknowledged and confessed that the Mestizos had outstanding intelligence and showed great aptitude for science and the arts," they left them on the fringes of society and did their utmost to hold them back.
This treatment made the Mestizo hybrids:

astute because they realised that only their cunning would help them progress in that society made up of two naturally antagonistic races. Each of the members of these races saw the Mestizo as their enemy and not as their blood brother (...)

It is not surprising that the viceregal government saw the Mestizos as cunning, scheming and untrustworthy. It is even more understandable that the Mestizos never "gave up thinking about claiming independence from Spain" while in the meantime they became even more "homogenous" with the Creoles. (1)

Riva Palacio's two great contributions were his revindication of the Mestizos and his historical treatment of their plight. He sketched an ethnic interpretation of the history of Mexico in which the new protagonist was the hero. Thanks to Riva Palacio, miscegenation cast off its character as a Creole ruse and came into existence in its own right. The Mestizo had ceased to be a means and had become an end in himself; he had finally become a desirable element not because of his proximity to the white man but for what he was becoming. Likewise, it was the Mestizo who began to dominate the historical scene by assuming the role of a patriot liberating an oppressed people. His defence was complete; the vices stayed with his progenitors and their virtues were accumulated in him:

The violent organization and historical conditions of the colonial period had produced the moral defects in the inhabitants of New Spain, but the national virtues of the races were alive and germinating, and the patriotism of Pelayo and Cuauhtémoc were borne in the hearts of the new population. Likewise, the Latin steadfastness, selflessness and chivalry were represented in the new race. (1)

---

(1) Ibid., pp. 478-481.
Riva Palacio did not write in response to the indigenous question as Pimentel had done; he wrote as he felt dictated to by his own feelings. His historical interpretation of the Mestizo is perhaps a reflection of his own image as the heir of Guerrero's patriotism during independence and as an unequalled figure in the struggle for the restoration of the republic. Although the Mestizo of New Spain did not acquire his full independence in Riva Palacio's analysis as he was forced to borrow successes from the Creoles, such as the canonization of Saint Philip of Jesus and the success of Carlos de Sigüenza y Gongora, so as not to feel that his was an "inferior race" (2), this probably stems from the fact that Riva Palacio did not reject the Creole elite of liberal and porfirist Mexico. His ideological affinity with the Creole intellectuals of the reform did not detract from his assessment of the Mestizo. He may have felt that the Creole was a good ally, but it was the Mestizo and nobody else who embodied the spirit of the true Mexican nationality.

(1) Ibid., pp. 481.
(2) Ibid., pp. 667-669.
5. **Justo Sierra: the Mestizo becomes bourgeois.**

Only five years separated the publication of *México a través de los siglos* and the work which would continue the trend of mestizophilia. Porfirio Díaz had been in power for several years when an essay entitled *México social y político* (Social and Political Mexico) appeared in the first editions of the *Revista Nacional de Arte y Ciencia* in 1889. This essay took up from where Riva Palacio had left off. The author of this work was Justo Sierra (1848-1912), who was a historian, scholar and teacher from Campeche. He was the grandson of the Creole cacique Santiago Méndez who had sought independence for the Yucatán peninsula and son of the recently appointed representative of the separatist government in Washington, the famed legal expert Justo Sierra O'Reilly. Justo Sierra was born during the United States invasion and the Castes War. He spent his early years in Campeche and Merida before moving to Mexico City, where he entered the San Ildefonso College to study law. His early fame as a writer came about thanks to Altamirano, who took him under his wing and opened the way for him in the acclaimed literary evenings which were attended by the most prominent intellectuals of that time. The guest list included figures such as Ignacio Ramírez, Guillermo Prieto, Manuel Payno and Vicente Riva Palacio. During the first government under Porfirio Díaz, Sierra joined with Telesforo García, Francisco G. Cosmes and Santiago Sierra to publish *La Libertad*, a "liberal-conservative" newspaper which reflected his political versatility. Sierra pronounced himself to be
in support of a strong government based on "order and progress" in the paper. At the end of the administration he was made substitute deputy for the State of Sinaloa in the Congress of the Union, and he managed to perform his duties while continuing to give history classes at the National High School. By that time, his doctrinal stance was well defined: in his clash with José María Vigil he took the side of the emerging "scientific" group against the old guard liberals. He later occupied posts as a Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice and as Undersecretary and then Secretary of Public Education and Fine Arts during the last decade of the porfirist regime. Towards the end of this decade he founded the National University. After Madero's triumph in the Mexican Revolution, Justo Sierra was appointed as Mexico's ambassador in Madrid, where he died. His splendid works cover practically every sphere of the arts. As a historian he received special acclaim for his work entitled Evolución política del pueblo mexicano (The Political Evolution of the Mexican People.) This book was published in 1910 and soon became a classic in Mexico's history. His intellectual fame spread far beyond the borders of Mexico as we can see from his correspondence with people such as Victor Hugo and Miguel de Unamuno. (1)

According to Sierra's theory the Indians were "incurably

(1) For a description of the life and work of Sierra, see Agustín Yáñez, "Don Justo Sierra. Su vida, sus ideas y su obra", in Justo Sierra, Obras Completas (UNAM, Mexico, 1977), vol. I, pp. 9-218.
passive" thanks to having been oppressed and subjected to Spanish paternalism. Sierra saw this as a collective problem:

Occasionally a powerful form of individuality emerges all of a sudden from this inactive, uniform social mass to show the moral strength it is still capable of. This individuality, however, lives and advances on another plane while the Indian world remains calm, monotonous and silent.

Sierra felt the problem of the Indians was merely a problem of "nutrition and education." The Indians' diet makes them "good sufferers", but holds back their creativity; they can copy and assimilate but are unable to improve their situation. However, Sierra was not unduly alarmed about this because he termed the problem as "physiological and educational" and recommended that they should eat more meat and less chillies, and should learn about science. He believed that by so doing the Indians would change and added that he believed that many of the Indians had indeed "changed":

They have changed and have become Mestizos (...) The Mestizos are now correctly speaking the Mexican people as they have a type of their own while still retaining a general type. This is becoming increasingly more noticeable. At one extreme, the Mestizos are closer to the Indians whose customs and habits they conserve, and at the other, they are closer to the exotic elements who are predominantly white.

Sierra says that as the Indian is capable of change the fact that he does not practice "Malthusian principles" will probably be a good thing -- "when to govern is to populate." He adds that proper feeding, education and in particular miscegenation will take care of the rest. The challenge was clear: "The Indians are seated and must be brought to their feet." He felt this would not be difficult because the rapid
absorption of races allows us to see "a time not too far off in the future when almost all of the nation's inhabitants will be Mexicans". (1)

Unlike Pimentel, it is clear that Justo Sierra did not worry much about the fate of miscegenation. Like Riva Palacio he treated race fusion as if it were an inexorable fact. Nonetheless, in contrast to his two predecessors, his concept of the Mestizo is both ethnic and sociological. The categoric inclusion of himself in the "Mestizo family", to which he attributes indigenous "customs and habits" that he was far from possessing, and his talk of white "elements" which were not "exotic" at all, makes his classification even more misleading. Racially, the Mestizo is an Indian who has undergone changes. This is probably what unsettled Sierra as the fear to Indians was probably passed on to him by his father, with whom he shared experiences during the Castes War. Socially, the Mestizo would appear to represent the incipient porfuirist middle class which he belonged to as an intellectual and politician. If there were Indians or not in Sierra's past is irrelevant because his ideological and social attitudes compensate any blood differences. His indignation at the denigrating statements made by "foreign intellectuals" such as Gustave Le Bon concerning the hybrid race, recreating the "prophecy of our incurable impotence" which encourages pessimism, was not in vain. As the Creole patriots had done a century earlier through the likes of Buffon, Sierra now took up the defence of everything Mexican.

Looking back at Mexico’s history, he reminds us that the independence and the reform were "acts of immense energy of Mexico’s bastard race." "The most energetic man who has appeared in our short and tragic annals," he adds decidedly, "is José María Morelos, the great Mestizo." With these words, he refuted the attack on the Mestizo. (1)

Sierra, however, went even further and he did not rest until he had set an important precedent in mestizophile thought: for the first time ever the Creoles were accused of being conservatives and traitors to the fatherland. He softened the blow slightly, however, when he spoke of the "wealthy Creoles" by saying they have:

constituted a passive class for which political dogma has been the Mexican people’s radical inability to govern themselves and the need for intervention, and where there is love, if it exists at all, towards the Mexican fatherland, it only exists because of vanity and is not a deep, active form of love.

His words lifted a taboo and he went on to say that the wealthy Creoles belonged to a "pseudo-aristocracy with no roots in the past" which devoted itself to spending its gains in the pleasure centres of Europe. He added that this class was "reduced by mixture" and "replaced by white men of different origins with other aspirations." According to him, Mexico owed nothing to this "passive class." On the other hand, however, he said that the transformation of the Indian "will bring strength and greatness to our country because a whole race will have risen to the realms of civilization."

--------

(1) Ibid., pp. 128-130.
Moreover, the progress that has already been made came about thanks to the Mestizos, or "neo-Mexicans", who historically speaking, have been our patriots and democrats:

Despite its mistakes, the vice of its youth and lack of education, the Mestizo family, which had to absorb the elements that had given birth to it, has been the dynamic factor in our history (...).

Thanks to this family and nobody else, "the Mexican nationality f.e.a.r.a.d.a. se" in the not too distant future. Sierra saw that in order to accelerate this process and be able to pay off the debt the "neo-Mexicans" ("who now govern the country") owed to the Indians ("our brothers in misfortune for more than a century"), it was necessary to "activate the mixture" by fostering immigration from Europe. He added that if miscegenation were encouraged, all Mexico’s socio-economic problems and the "supreme problem of nationality" in particular would be resolved. (1)

As we can see, Sierra’s ethnological analysis cannot be separated from the social question. His proposals undoubtedly sound like those that we could expect from a porfirist intellectual who has acquired a "modern" conscience and who proposes doing away with the remains of the old landowning aristocracy that originated during the colonial period. Like Abad y Queipo, he stressed the importance of the emergence of a middle class comprised of small landowning Mestizos. Having said that, however, his aspirations went even further as he also said he wanted to see

(1) Ibid., pp. 130-133, 140, 148, 152 and 167.
industrialization which would consolidate the preeminence of the urban centres, which were traditionally the preserves of the "neo-Mexicans." By basing himself selectively on Ricardo and Mill, and rejecting his admired Spencer’s maxim of "benevolent state activity", he examined the three main economic factors of nature, work and capital, and played with relating the concepts of race and class to them (1). It is precisely in this form of his analysis that we can find the strongest and weakest points of his study. Although he was right in wanting to overcome the ethnic monism of his predecessors and to relate the race problem to social factors, he crossed too indiscriminately the boundaries of each of the two variables—race and class. As a good evolutionist, Sierra was aware that Europe’s industrialized societies never had problems of ethnic heterogeneity as Latin America had, and its elimination would have to be the first step towards the advanced industrialization of the Latin nations. The whole matter boils down to a question of having two points on one agenda and confusing them unnecessarily at times. The fact that the Indians, who he said could be redeemed by "eating more meat and less chilli" and by getting a better education, were going to be transformed into Mestizos, did not guarantee that they could be made to adopt city ways, and even less that their social status would be improved. Likewise, at the other end of the scale,  

(1) Ibid., pp. 131-151.
the development of the middle class did not automatically provide a safeguard for racial synthesis. In Mexico, it is true to say that there is a close link between the colour of one's skin and one's social status, but if miscegenation and industrialization were destined to absorb all the country's inhabitants, the proletariat would also have to be classified as "neo-Mexicans." Finally, Sierra's proposal in favour of encouraging immigrants from Europe to settle in Mexico to act as a catalyst for miscegenation is incongruent because there was no need for colonisation since the "Mestizo family" had shown itself to be just as prolific and progressive. This proposal even contained hints of the ominous "national pessimism" produced by the "prophecy of our incurable impotence." Justo Sierra did not contemplate these matters and this detracts from the value of his contribution to mestizophilia, which was nonetheless considerable. It would therefore be up to the next generation to get to the bottom of the problem and continue the good work.

6. Positivist Mexico: theory versus practice. (1)

The generation that would take mestizophilia to its height in the twentieth century developed and gained form during the years under Porfirio Díaz. Paradoxically, Díaz ———

(1) As an example, see Moisés González Navarro, "El Porfiriato — vida social", in Historia moderna de México (Ed. Hermes, Mexico, 1957), esp. pp. 134-194.
acted both as a hindrance and a help to the trend. On the one hand, mestizophilia was up against the era of institutionalised xenophilia, obsession with European immigration, social contempt for the "indigenous ballast" and the political will to destroy it, using armed force if needs be. It was, thus, a time when it was fashionable to Frenchify society, and when very few people seemed to be bothered by the military campaigns launched to wipe out the Yaqui and Mayan Indians. On the other hand, however, the second half of the nineteenth century marked the high point of mestizophilia. That was a time when the intellectual circles were spurred on by the images of the great Indian and Mestizo leaders of the reform and their new Mestizo dictator, Porfirio Díaz. Likewise, they looked back into their pre-Hispanic past and began to come to terms with their ethnic background. Although what happened in practice may appear to contradict the theory, the porfirist state established the theoretical bases of indigenism and provided the climax of the pro-Mestizo current through those members of the intelligentsia who were unsmitten by European racist theories and adapted them to suit their needs. (1) One of the main symptoms of this was the favourable response to Altamirano's call to establish a unique form of Mexican literature. Despite its late appearance -- if we take the novel El periquillo sarniento (The Scabby Parakeet) as the

---

(1) On this point, see Martin S. Stabb, "Indigenism and Racism in Mexican Thought: 1857-1911", in the Journal of Inter-American Studies, 1, Jan. 1959, pp. 405-423.
pioneer of this genre — the Mexican novel became the base element for the nationalist cultural movement. Literature written at the height of the porfiriist period reflects the revaluation of the indigenous race and the acceptance of Mexico’s racial condition. What is more, this tendency went beyond the confines of literary works and in the last decade of the century the press expressed the same concerns. (1) A process had started and there was no going back.

As we will see later on, the ambiguity and apparent contradictions of this period had a great deal to do with Díaz’s official doctrine. Barreda introduced positivism in 1867 and thus allowed France to "recover" Mexico after losing it under Napoleon III. (2) Auguste Comte did what Maximilian had never been able to do. But the Comte dynasty did not last forever and there was soon a new English rival on the scene contending for the positivist sceptre. The doctrine of Herbert Spencer gradually ousted Comte and even won over some of his supporters. In 1877, the Gabino Barreda Methodophile Association held a debate on Darwinism, the sociological version of which provided Spencer’s bases of evolutionism. The sole purpose of the debate was to confirm that Darwin’s theories were widely accepted by the members of

(1) See Juan Gómez Quiñones, Porfirio Díaz, los intelectuales y la Revolución (Ed. El Catallito, Mexico, 1981), pp. 61-84 and 130-134.
(2) The term "positivism" is used throughout this study in its general sense and covers the schools of Comte and Spencer.
the association with the notable exception of Barreda himself. (1) A year later Barreda was exiled for his opposition to porfirist policy and was sent to Berlin as Mexico’s ambassador in Germany. This marked the end of Comtist supremacy. Although orthodox Comtians such as Agustín Aragón still adhered to his doctrine as we can see from the pages of the Revista Positiva in the decade before the Mexican Revolution, most of the porfirist intellectuals claimed they had been social Darwinists for some considerable time. (2) The influential group of científicos, which had been so important during Díaz’s regime, was basically made up of politicians of this type. As we will see later on, although Spencer’s doctrine appeared to be less suitable than Comte’s to defend mestizophilia, it is significant to note that even Limantour, a fervent supporter of the theory of survival of the fittest, ended up extolling Mexican miscegenation. (3) The new positivist group of the porfirist age was definitely very versatile.

The dispute sparked off by Francisco G. Cosmes in 1894 is a good example to show just how versatile that group was. Cosmes was a positivist who had worked on the editorial staff of the La Libertad newspaper.

--------


(2) As an example, see the ideas of Miguel Macedo and Manuel Ramos in 1877 in Leopoldo Zea, El positivismo en México (FCE, Mexico, 1984), pp. 166-178.

He was an ardent supporter of Díaz's "honourable tyranny" (1) and managed to cause a scandal when he said Hernán Cortés was the father of the Mexican people and Cuauhtémoc was as Mexican as Socrates in a series of articles published in the El Partido Liberal newspaper. The case is worthy of attention. In his delirious contributions, Cosmes showed that he was a fervent hispanophile and fanatically anti-indigenist. He even went as far as to say that "the modern Mexicans owe what they are, what they are worth, what they will be and what they will be worth in the future" to the Spanish civilization. He also contrasted the Spanish civilization with "that almost worn-out source of our dubious indigenous ancestry, which represents the wretchedness of incurable servitude, mental weakness and barbarism (...)" Although he was forced to acknowledge miscegenation, he still maintained that:

there are two components in today's society: one of them is apt for civilization and descends from the Spaniards in the blood or spirit, and the other, the Indian, is totally unsuitable for progress.

Cosmes, thus, concluded that if we seek "triumph in the fight for existence", the intellectual elements and morals of Spanish origins, which fortunately prevailed in the fusion, must be kept intact. The existence of the Indian, whose instincts meant he was considered to be "only marginally better than a beast of burden", had to be prolonged out of charity "for as long as possible", bearing in mind Spencer's warning that a society that preserves its weakest members

(1) On his ideas, see Zea, op. cit., pp. 255-261.
artificially is condemned to extinction. For Cosmes, the Mestizo-Creole majority did not pose any cause for alarm because "intellectually and morally speaking we are all Spaniards although we have undergone some changes thanks to our environment." (1)

What is surprising about Cosmes' sharp remarks lies not so much in his hispanicism as in the reaction they produced. Polemicists such as Del Toro, Ezequiel Chávez and Justo Sierra spoke out indignantly in reply and spread the controversy to other papers such as El Monitor Republicano, El Siglo XIX, and Diario del Hogar to name but a few. Their reply centred around the defence of Mexico's pre-Hispanic legacy and refuted the exclusiveness of Spanish influence on modern Mexican nationality. However, the shower of criticism that fell on Cosmes, who felt he was doing Cuauhtémoc a favour by calling him a "savage hero", is the best indication of the high acceptance of the indigenous population and its culture by the porfirist intellectual circles. With the exception of Telesforo García, who wrote the prologue for Cosmes' articles, few people dared to support Cosmes. García, however, who by the way was Spanish by birth, was so inaccurate in his work that a mere fifteen years prior to the start of the Mexican Revolution he said that "indigenism has been dead and buried in history's graveyards for centuries." (2) Needless to say, when the revolutionary movement showed

----------

(1) Cosmes' articles were compiled and published two years later. See Francisco G. Cosmes, La dominación española y la Patria Mexicana (Imprenta del Partido Liberal, Mexico, 1896), pp. 4, 42-44 and 83-85.

(2) Ibid., p. VI.
that indigenism was alive and kicking, García's reputation as a visionary was seriously damaged. Although the upper classes discretely welcomed Cosmes' remarks, Mexico's population was experiencing a growing miscegenation, and the nation's intellectual elite began to accept the Indian half of the Mexican. Anti-indigenism, like mestizophobia, was becoming a very touchy subject, as Cosmes' controversy shows.

Five years after the start of this dispute another well-known scientist claimed to support miscegenation. Justo Sierra had taken the first step and now Francisco Bulnes, Sierra's colleague in misfortune, took the second. Bulnes, who was a famous iconoclast, had justly fallen prey to a wave of unpopularity along with Sierra in 1884 when his parliamentary activities in favour of paying Mexico's foreign debt to Great Britain turned the student movement led by Carlos Basave and Diodoro Batalla against him, and resulted in the students at the National High School boycotting his engineering classes. (1) Bulnes, however, never avoided controversy and took the bull by the horns. The problem prompted him to write a book in which he explained his views on the race matter. In it he argued that there are three races in the world which are differentiated from each other by the type of grains they consume. He said two of these races -- the rice-eaters and the corn-eaters -- were weak

because they did not eat enough minerals in their diet. The wheat-eaters, however, are the most powerful because of the nutritional properties contained in what they eat. He said that this described the real problem facing Mexico and that the ethnic problem per se was not as serious in itself. In other words, Bulnes said the Mexican people would progress if they ate well. He also said that the Mestizo in particular was especially apt for civilization because he possessed "very sound mental faculties", was liberal by nature, anticlerical and Jacobin. In other words, Bulnes thought the Mestizo was progressive. Like the Creoles and Indians, the Mestizo's defects largely stemmed from the Spanish influence and its irrational conservatism. Nonetheless, Bulnes recommended colonisation as the best solution to Mexico's problems saying that:

> a large dose of immigration will kill us, turn us into slaves or regenerate us if we are worthy of living thanks to the remaining Celtic blood that flows in our hearts, which have been pierced by the archaic sentiment of corrupt barbarians.

Bulnes' solution can thus be reduced to two key ideas: proper nutrition and immigration. (1)

Although he reached a similar conclusion to Sierra, Bulnes' reasoning is not based so heavily on sociology. Biology comes into the picture again bringing with it his yearning for hitherto unsuspected "Celtic blood" and contempt for the "corrupt barbarians." Nonetheless, the most unusual thing about his case is the fact that a staunch iconoclast

(1) Francisco Bulnes, El porvenir de las naciones latinoamericanas (El Pensamiento Vivo de América, Mexico, ?), pp. 9-42, 137-138 and 253.
such as Bulnes could accept, although reluctantly, what would
soon become the great Mexican myth. It is easy to imagine
the effect his acknowledgement of the Mestizo's potential had
on the thoughts of those who lapped up his ideas. If the
most sceptical of the porfirist positivisits claimed to be in
favour of miscegenation, who could possible object? Bulnes
had loaded on the straw that broke the camel's back and began
to permeate public opinion: mestizophilia, either open or
dignified, proud or ashamed, was becoming vox populi. Even the
newspapers caught onto it and by the start of the century a
few of them identified miscegenation with nationality. Thus,
in the light of the progress that had been made, it was clear
that miscegenation would soon become dogma. (1)

Not everything was going well, however. The porfirist
society was gradually becoming more polarized with the
country's wealth in the hands of just a few while the Indian
and Mestizo masses were drawing closer and closer to the
depths of the most miserable poverty. Models for social
behaviour and fashion looked abroad more than ever before for
inspiration, and the image of Mexico in the western world was
very similar to the image dreamt of long ago by the Creole
liberals. Such was the thin air breathed by the new
generation; Mexican intellectuals had broken through racial
prejudice and had started to accept Mexico's ethnic reality,

(1) Gómez Quiñones, op. cit., p. 132.
and yet Indians and Mestizos suffered discrimination. If the coexistence of "antagonistic" races had caused instability and injustice, the Mestizo, who symbolised unity and patriotism, was now the only figure capable of taking Mexico off the path of deep-rooted domestic conflict. At least, that was the way a young man who followed the fate of mestizophilia interpreted the teachings of his masters. This young man was a new writer who was beginning to draw attention to himself because of his progressive ideas. Over the years, this same young man would broaden and deepen the scope of mestizophilia, raising it to the status of an authentic, comprehensive theory. His name was Andrés Molina Enríquez.
II. ANDRES MOLINA ENRIQUEZ OR THE MYTHICIZATION OF THE MESTIZO.

1. Life and Work: the beginnings of an obsession.
   a) Biographical Note. (1)

   In the mid-1830s in the rural Otomi region of Mexico the destiny of a man who would not be born until thirty years later was shaped. The union of a Creole man and an Indian woman on that occasion was more significant than the usual relations of that type in the then century-old phenomenon of miscegenation. This marriage represented the mixing of blood that would weigh heavily in the consciousness of one of the grandchildren of the union as the grandson in question was obsessed with his genes and converted his inheritance into a commitment.

   This is how the story goes if this grandson is to be believed. His grandfather was señor Enriquez, the owner of a stagecoach service in Jilotepec, whose parents were originally from the Spanish region of Aragon. He may also have had some sephardic blood. His wife, señora de la Cabrera, has been described as a "pure-blooded" Otomi Indian. (2)

   They had a daughter called Francisca who married

---

(1) With the exception of the details contained in the footnotes in this section, the facts used were obtained from the following sources: Alvaro Molina Enríquez, prologue to Antología de Andrés Molina Enríquez (Ed. Oasis, Mexico, 1969); Renato Molina E., "Conciencia de México: Andrés Molina Enríquez", in Boletín bibliográfico (SHCP, Mexico, 15 Aug. 1955); "Historiador indiano", Pensamiento y obra de Andrés Molina Enríquez (SEP, Mexico, 1969).

(2) See Andrés Molina Enríquez, La guerra del Pacífico (SEP-TGN, Mexico, 1937), p. 5. Molina's claim that his maternal grandmother was a "pure-blooded Indian" is difficult to prove because the parish records in
Anastasio, who was the son of a captain of a military garrison in Veracruz. The captain was of West Indian descent and was called Agapito Molina. The consequences of this union are worthy of mention: Juan Ignacio Enríquez and his wife opposed the marriage of their daughter to Anastasio, who was a lawyer in the state capital of Jalapa and who had become a notary public in Jilotepec after working as a minister of the supreme court. The reason for their opposition was that Francisca was very young and had spent most of her life in the Girls' School. For Anastasio, who was fourteen years older than his bride, this was his second marriage. To be able to marry him Francisca had to run away from school to force her parents to allow them to get married. As generally happens in these cases, the couple got its own way and went on to have five children: Everardo, Agustín, Cristina, Elodia and Andrés, the child whose existence was so indelibly marked by his grandparents who had tried to prevent his birth.

Andrés Eligio de la Luz Molina Enríquez was born at 11 p.m. on 30 November, 1868 (1) in Jilotepec, his mother's

Jilotepec only specified the Indian origins of the christened child when both parents had been christened. In any case, it is highly unlikely that a well-off Creole such as Juan Ignacio Enríquez would have married an Indian woman, which means it was more probable that señora de la Cabrera was Mestizo.

(1) Birth certificate number 326, Jilotepec, State of Mexico; registered 10 Dec. 1868. His christening certificate states that he was legitimate and is contained in book 60, page 552 of Jilotepec's parish records dated 1 Dec. 1868. His godfather was Enrique Molina.
hometown. Jilotepec, a country town in the north of the State of Mexico, played an important role in the life of Andrés Molina Enríquez. It had also been an important ceremonial centre for the Toltec and Otomi Indians and greatly affected the image of Indian-Mestizo Mexico which was soon imprinted in the mind of young Andrés. In 1867, 8,255 people lived in Jilotepec and most of them were Indian peasants. During the porfirist regime Jilotepec and its surrounding areas provided good examples of the injustices committed by the Creole landowners. (1) Although the Enríquez family owned a hacienda at Doxicho and did not suffer as the campesinos did, the liberal-progressive tradition of the rest of Molina's ancestors—which included a state governor who supported Benito Juárez, a republican guerrillero and, more directly, a former director of the Toluca Insitute—(2) contributed to his immunity to the latifundium mentality. On the other hand, Molina was not rich, and even though his family was from a good background he had to apply for a scholarship to be able to continue his studies. (3) Andrés was certainly no stranger to city life

(1) On Jilotepec, see Antonio Huitrón H., Jilotepec (Jilotepec de Molina Enríquez Town Hall, State of Mexico, 1987). It is interesting to note that Molina also shared a popular belief that the Malinche is buried in Jilotepec.


(3) See "Certification made by the Political Chief of the District of Jilotepec on 2 June 1882 (...) that the child called Andrés Molina Enríquez belongs to a local poor family that is unable to meet the expense of school fees."
and the person who said the he learned to speak an "indigenous language" before Spanish is incorrect (1) — there is evidence showing that he never learnt to speak the Indian languages. Nonetheless, it is clear that this did not hold back his sensitivity in objectively seeing the wickedness that existed in Mexico's rural areas and the suffering of the Indians. The Rinconada de San Fernando house where he lived in Mexico City was once described as being "half-farm and half-city" (2) and represented the spirit of a man caught between two worlds in more ways than one.

Andrés was awarded a scholarship by the Jilotepec town council to study at the famous Toluca Literary and Scientific Institute. It is not known, however, whether he was given the scholarship on account of his own merits or because of his father's political influences. (3) If we take into consideration that his first images were of

(3) For details of this discrepancy, see Antonio Huitrón H., "Lic. Andrés Molina Enríquez:1868-1940", in Lecturas (...) de cronistas municipales (special edition, 1 Aug. 1986), p. 5, and Raúl Gustavo de Santiago Gómez, Teorico del nacionalismo mexicano" Andrés Molina Enríquez", 1, in El Sol de Centro (Aguascalientes, 23 March 1986). The latter affirms that Molina failed a few subjects which meant that his scholarship application was turned down in 1880 and 1882 despite the "fraudulent" efforts made by his father.
his maternal grandmother and his birthplace, his time at the
Institute is the third as it must have had a bearing on his
future intellectual work too. The Institute was a bastion of
anti-conservatism founded by Lorenzo de Zavala and its former
students included names such as those of Altamirano and
Ignacio Ramirez who was responsible for the establishment of
the scholarship system that benefited Molina. (1) It was
during his time there that Molina became familiar with the
bases of positivism. Molina qualified as a lawyer in 1901
(2) and gave his first law lectures the same year. In other
words, it was while he attended the Institute that he passed
the test of fire and became a conspicuous supporter of the
great Mexican liberal tradition, which he would make take on
a new turn. While he was still a student he married Eloisa
Rodea Miranda, at some point in the last decade of the
century. She also hailed from Jilotepec and together they
had two children, Andres Augusto Napoleon, whose name
reflects his father’s inclinations and personality, and Jose
Dolores Renato. (3) Once he had qualified and gained
experience as a public scribe at his father’s notarial

(1) These grants were originally intended for poor Indian
pupils. For more details, see Ignacio M. Altamirano,
"Biografia de Ignacio Ramirez", in Ignacio Ramirez,
Obras, op. cit., vol. I, p. XXXI.
(2) Some sources affirm that Molina studied part of his law
degree in Mexico City where he met people such as Jesus
Urueta, Jorge Vera Estañol and Francisco Olaguibel.
However, there has not been much investigation into this
stage of his life. What does exist, nonetheless, is an
official document dated 26 Aug. 10 and 14 Sept. 1901
that states he passed his professional examinations
before the high court of justice for the State of
Mexico.
(3) Very little is known about Molina’s loves, but it is
known that he had at least two other children -- Victor
and Gabino -- with Asuncion Garcia.
practice, he was made a judge in a court of first instance in Tlalnepantla in 1902. It was probably while he held this office that he became friendly with Luis Cabrera who was to play a very important role in his life. Both his work in the courts and as a scribe in Jilotepec in 1891, in Toluca in 1893, in Sultepec in 1894, in Tenancingo in 1898, and in Otumba and Tenango in 1899 (1) contributed to consolidate his aversion towards socio-ethnic inequality.

Towards the close of the century Molina founded and edited the La Hormiga newspaper, started to write articles for the press (2) and published his first booklets. By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century Andrés Molina Enríquez had learned to combine his government responsibilities with his writing and thinking. This was a skill that he demonstrated for the rest of his days. Although his career in the state government ran smoothly under General Villada, he did not receive the first great boost in his academic activities until his first book La Reforma y Juárez (Juárez and the Reform) was published in 1906. Thanks to its success, Genaro García invited him to join the staff of the National Archaeology, History and Ethnography Museum to teach ethnology in 1907. Over the next few years he only left the museum for brief periods of time.

--------

(1) AAME.
(2) Molina also wrote editorials for a time. See Luis Cabrera, "Andrés Molina Enríquez", in Obras completas (Ed. Oasis, Mexico, 1975), vol. IV, p. 409.
generally because of some misfortune. (1) The first and perhaps most tragic of these absences came very shortly after he had started work at the museum. Molina was a keen observer of porfirism and was concerned about the fate of the regime. He also understood that it was impossible to postpone arrangements for a peaceful transition of power. Like many other intellectuals who had been cast aside by the scientific group, Molina therefore decided to support General Bernardo Reyes as the eventual successor to Porfirio Díaz. He was very active in his backing of Reyes and even said that his most important work, *Los grandes problemas nacionales* (Great National Problems) (1909) was published thanks to Reyes’ help. (2) Nonetheless, when the dictator dealt the final crushing blow to Reyes and his policies, Molina decided to fall in with the ranks and, unlike his fellow Reyists, accepted the nomination of Corral as candidate and tried to persuade the científicos to accept the urgent need that existed for social reform. Likewise, he rejected Madero at

(1) It is believed that he also opened a legal practice in conjunction with Luis Cabrera. With respect to his post at the museum, it is worth mentioning that he lectured to scholars such as Miguel Othon de Mendizábal. For more details, see Horacio Labastida Muñoz, Prologue to Andrés Molina Enríquez, *La Revolución agraria de México: 1919-1920* (UNAM-M.A. Porrúa, Mexico, 1986), vol. I, p. XX.

(2) Molina’s support for Reyes can be seen in several of his press articles. See Andrés Molina Enríquez, “Lo que significa el reyismo”, and “La fórmula de solución momentánea del conflicto político actual”, in *México Nuevo* (Mexico, 21 Sept. and 20 Nov. 1909). On his support for Reyes, see Molina, *La Revolución agraria*, vol. IV, p. 45-46.
first and even rejected the principle of the Revolution. (1) However, the popular movement grew and Molina soon became an ardent and sincere revolutionary. He became so radical that he considered Madero's political project was inappropriate and reactionary. (2) He believed that since the Mexican people had turned to violence, the insurrection had to serve to establish deep changes in the agricultural and socioeconomic structures of Mexico. With this in mind and as he considered that the pact made between Madero and Francisco León de la Barra betrayed the real motives behind the peasant uprising, Molina set to work on the elaboration and proclamation of the Texcoco Plan (1911). (3)

The plan was as revolutionary as it was romantic. It did not recognize either the federal or state governments and

---

(1) See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Un buen consejo a los revistas" and "La solución del conflicto revolucionario", in El Tiempo (Mexico, 9 March 1910 and 31 March 1911). A little later Molina accepted the existence of four political forces which he felt should have become political parties: the "pure conservative", the "progressive conservative", the "evolutionist renewal" party and the "radical renewal" party. They would have been led by Manuel F. de la Hoz, Rosendo Pineda, Carlos Basave and Madero or Vázquez Gómez respectively. See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Lo que Madero dería pedir", in El Tiempo (Mexico, 27 April 1911).

(2) Molina affirmed that he inspired Article 3 of the San Luis Plan, that Madero visited him at home and that although Madero did not agree with his social reforms, he offered him a senatorial seat. See Andrés Molina Enríquez, Dictamen acerca de la legalidad de las fuerzas zapatistas, (9 Aug. 1923, BCN 5,6; 423), and La Revolución agraria, pp. 143-146 and 169.

suspended constitutional order handing over provisional control of the legislative and executive powers to its author. The plan also called for five decrees to be issued and these provide a valuable insight into Molina’s thinking on subjects such as the breaking up of large properties; the freedom to import and export grain; the protection and gradual dissolution of rural communities and tribes; the elimination of political caciques; and the control of wages or daily rates. However, in spite of Paulino Martinez’ collaboration and Zapata’s alleged approval (1), the plan turned out to be a failure. The El Imparcial newspaper reported that Molina Enríquez, who was "very well-known in intellectual and political circles", wanted "to blow up the barracks that the horseguards at the Texcoco garrison lived in", to free the prisoners and head off to attack the haciendas. Although the paper sensationalized the matter and reported that a "multitude of peasant supporters" were initially involved, the truth is that nobody backed the rebellion and Molina was easily arrested. (2) Moreover, communications secretary Manuel Bonilla shortly after said the Texcoco Plan was "hilarious" and that its author, described by a "high-ranking government official" in one of the paper’s articles as "a very strange man", would be ...

(1) Several sources affirm that Zapata knew of the plan and one says that he supported it. See A.N. Molina Enríquez (son), El agrarismo de la Revolución: exégesis, crítica y reencauzamiento, (Mexico, 1953) p.25.

(2) Magaña, who was a friend of Molina, says that if Molina was "so well-known as a thinker and idealist in the cultural centres, he wasn’t among the peasants" which explains why he was "virtually on his own" in the Texcoco Plan. See Gildardo Magaña, Emiliano Zapata y el agrarismo en México, (Ed. Ruta, Mexico, 1951), vol. II, p. 50.
examined by "psychiatrists." Worst of all, however, was the fact that comments that the failed rebellion had been "truly laughable" were attributed to Emilio Vázquez Gómez, the political leader that Molina had had in mind when he designed the plan. (1) It was also reported that Vázquez had said that the person who had engineered the plan should apologise for his folly. (2) The fact that this newspaper, the conservative bastion of the científicos, made such bitter epithets about the plan was understandable. However, it was not so understandable that Molina had set out on an adventure that had guaranteed him a spell behind bars right from the start. It was not until later that he would reveal his reasons -- the Texcoco Plan had been destined for political and military failure for the sake of ideological propaganda success. (3)

It is worth pointing out that it was not just the journalists who provided this ideological propaganda. This was one of the advantages Molina managed to get out of his time in prison, where he converted none other than Pancho Villa, and other leaders on Zapata's side. (4) In prison he also strengthened his revolutionary ideals and defended a

(2) See the notes and editorial dedicated to "La Revolución" by Molina Enríquez in *El Imparcial* (Mexico, 25, 26 and 30 Aug. 1911). It is worth mentioning that Molina's relationship with Vázquez Gómez lasted a long time as both his children married two of don Emilio's daughters. With respect to the accusation that he was suffering from demencia, Molina says that attempts were made to have him committed to an asylum. See Molina, *La Revolución agraria*, vol. V, p. 92.
progressive stance in the journalistic debate on agrarian reform with Wistano Luis Orozco. From his correspondence written in prison we can see that it was there that he became convinced of the triumph of the Revolution. (1) When he was released from prison in 1912 (2) he went back to his teaching post at the museum and initiated the first stage of the El Reformador newspaper (1913). This periodical was sponsored by Cabrera and his parliamentary group known as the "diputados renovadores." More than twenty years later, during the second stage, El Reformador was able to boast that it had been the only paper in circulation during the coup d'état directed by Victoriano Huerta. (3) His later anti-hispanic feelings can perhaps be explained by the fact that his position on the newspaper earned him the ill-will of a group of Spaniards, at whose hands he was persecuted. (4) After the coup Molina was commissioned by Huerta to draft legislation and accepted a few government posts. This later made him a target of incomprehension of several critics.

---

(1) Letters from Andrés Molina Enríquez to Carlos Basave y del Castillo Negrete, dated 20 and 26 May 1912 and written in the Penitenciaria de México prison. In them he asks his friend to lend him 75 pesos to send correspondence from Zapata to Pacual Orozco. He also speaks of the imminent triumph of the Revolution. AAME.

(2) In a curriculum vitae prepared by Molina himself a year before his death he affirms that he began his term as a political prisoner on 15 July 1911 and was freed on 25 March 1912 (AAME). Neither of these dates can be relied on if we take into account the letters that he sent to his friend Basave.


His collaboration with Huerta also got him involved in minor elections. Molina had already experienced the glory of political campaigns — he served as an administrator (syndic) in Jilotepec in 1890; he won a local election to select deputies in Utumba in 1910; and, after the announcement of the formation of the "Evolutionary Renewal" Party, he stood as a candidate in the gubernatorial elections in the State of Mexico in 1911. On that occasion, however, he aimed high and announced that he would be standing for the office of vice president of the republic as the official candidate for the "Great Republican Liberal Party." The party's presidential candidate was David de la Fuente. It is worth mentioning that men such as the Catholics Federico Gamboa and Eugenio Rascon, and the liberals Manuel Calero and Jesus Flores Magon also stood on that occasion in the hope of overthrowing Victoriano Huerta and Aureliano Blanquet's military government. Molina and de la Fuente's manifesto

His support of Huerta was in keeping with his ideas on the Mestizo dictatorship that Mexico needed and never lacked criticism of the dictator, especially when he became convinced of the regime's conservatism. See Andres Molina Enríquez, "El Pacto de la Ciudadela" and "La finalidad del gobierno del Sr. Gral. Huerta" in El Imparcial (Mexico, 21 and 14 June, and 2 July 1913). Moreover, twenty years later, when Huerta had been condemned by the historians, Molina continued to defend the general's positive points. See Molina, La revolucion agraria, vol. V, pp. 132-142.

Also see "Convocatoria Renovador Evolucionista" (for the formation of the party) in El Tiempo (Mexico, 20 May 1911), and "Dos de las leyes del Pueblo que expedirá el Sr. Lic. Don Andrés Molina Enríquez, si es electo Gobernador del Estado de México (...)" (Mexico, June 1911), BCN, 1-4, 83.

For more information on these candidatures, see Manuel Gonzalez Ramirez, La revolución social de México (FCE, Mexico, 1960), vol. I, pp. 394-395.
made it very clear that their aim was to prevent a reactionary victory and that their support for Huerta was based on the fact that they also believed that only an authoritarian government could control the "revolutionary euphoria" and "make it fruitful." (1)

Molina Enríquez’s role in Huerta’s regime, nonetheless, was secondary. His time under the usurper only helped him to secure his future source of income -- he worked in public office while continuing to produce his intellectual works. He started in local government for the State of Mexico, and while he worked and elaborated on his theory in support of miscegenation he held the posts of assistant in the Government Secretary’s Office in the General Government Secretariat (1900), head of development section IV in the same secretariat (1901), government secretary (1904) and member of the Boundaries Commission (1905). He later crowned his career when he was made government secretary general, and may have been put in charge of the governor’s office in his absence (1917). (2) He was also a renowned interim

--------

(1) "Manifesto de los señores Gral. Ing. David de la Fuente y Lic. Andrés Molina Enríquez, candidatos del Gran Partido Liberal Republicano para la Presidencia y Vicepresidencia respectivamente, dirigen a sus conciudadanos, exponiendo su programa en demanda de votos en las próximas elecciones" (Mexico, 19 Oct. 1913); BCN, 2-1, 91. The manifesto emphasises Molina’s dictatorial inclinations and his contempt for electoral democracy.

(2) In his account of a trip made with Carlos Basave and Antonio Cortés to Mineral de Sultepec, Molina affirms that he "once led this Government (of the State of Mexico)." See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Expedición de estudio del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia y Etnografía al antiguo Mineral de Sultepec, Estado de México", in Anales del Museo Nacional (…). (Mexico, 24 April 1930).
magistrate in the supreme court of justice in the State of Mexico and was appointed as a magistrate twice (1918 and 1938). It was while in the federal executive power that he was given numerous bureaucratic posts: officer of the Agriculture Board (1911), director of the Institute of Ethnographic Industries (1914), technical adviser to the Commerce and Industry Secretariat (1914), interim head of the Woods and Industry Board at the Development Secretariat (1916), representative of the Treasury Secretariat before the National Agriculture Commission (1916), consultant attorney of the Assistant Office of the National Agriculture Commission (1916), the Water Boards of the Agriculture and Development Secretariat (1917), for Agriculture at the Treasury Secretariat (1919) and at the Interior Secretariat (1922), head of the Legislation and Treasury Policy Department (1920), representative of the Federal Treasury Probate Department (1925), engineer on the Rural Communities, National Land and Settlement Board at the Agriculture and Development Secretariat (1934) and economist at the same secretariat (1935). (1)

These posts in the main were only occupied by Molina for short periods of time -- he held few of them for more than a year. To make ends meet he had to give classes in ethnology and devoted his energies to directing the ethnology

(1) AAME: Molina was also a tax agent for inheritances in the district of Tlanepantla (1913), Jilotepec's representative before the General Congress of Town Halls of the Mexican Republic (1920), consultant lawyer at the Banco de Guanajuato (1918), and special course teacher at the Public Education Secretariat (1929).
department at his beloved National Museum. His career in the legislative power was equally brief; he first worked as an adviser to the Constituent Congress in the drafting of article 27 (1916), and then as an assistant consultant to the Interior Secretariat's Technical Commission in the Chamber of Deputies (1925). Perhaps the only lasting exceptions in his career were his jobs as legal compiler at the supreme court of justice, where he worked for almost ten years (1920-1929), and as professor of history at the Training Institute for Teachers of Secondary Education, where he remained for another ten years (1927-1937). Nonetheless, despite his low posts in public office and his failure to excel in Mexican politics, at his sixty-odd years of age Molina was a renowned character. Presidents and artists alike respected him and several of them were his friends. He was a welcome guest at the home of Obregón, who was often invited to lunch at Molina's Balbuena home along with the likes of Emilio Portes Gil, Narciso Bassols and Diego Rivera. Calles appointed him as his personal adviser in the Interior Secretariat and, as we will see later, allowed him to defend his personal interpretation of the 1917 Constitution and in particular of article 27 in an official gazette. He also appointed Molina as chairman of the National Agriculture Confederation (1925). (His reason for this was probably to cut ground from under the National

(1) Ibid.
Agrarian Party). (1) By this time there was no doubt about Molina's intellectual prowess, and the days when his critics had said he was "mad" because of his daring and originality had become a thing of the past. (2) Moreover, his fame as a jurist and revolutionary ideologue had earned him a permanent place among the movement's veterans, which led many governors to seek his opinion. (3) He had been very young when he was admitted to the Mexican Geography and Statistics Society (1902) and the Alliance Scientifique Universelle of the Association Internationale des Hommes de Science (1908), and if this were not enough, in his own lifetime he received great international acclaim for his book Los grandes problemas nacionales, which was described by a professor in the United States of America as being on a par with the works of Humboldt and Calderón de la Barca, as one ———

(1) Before this he had left the National Agrarian Commission and had become the first vice-president of Calles' Confederation in 1924 during the presidency of Gildardo Magaña. (His son, Napoleon, was the Confederation's 1st Secretary). See the National Agrarian Confederation poster postponing a convention (Mexico, Aug. 1924), BCN, 3-5, 325, Andrés Molina Enríquez, "El Partido Nacional Agrarista ha hecho más daño que los mismos latifundistas", in El Demócrata (Mexico, 26 May, 1925) and Santiago Gómez, op. cit., V, in El Sol del Centro (Ags, 8 June 1926).

(2) There is evidence that at the time of Molina's early writings there were rumours that he was mad. See, for example, Baltasar Sánchez Vega, El pensamiento agrario del licenciado Andrés Molina Enríquez (Undergraduate thesis in Law, UNAM, 1950), p. 27.

(3) AAME. In a letter dated 28 April 1931, the Governor of the State of Nayarit, Luis Castillo Ledón, asks Molina for his "intellectual cooperation" in solving a tax conflict between the state and the federation.
of the three most important works written on Mexico. (1)

We will add a personal description of Molina to this account of his fame. Carlos Basave y del Castillo Negrete, who was his boss at the Loans Fund and his life-long friend, described him as a solemn, austere man, who was "always serious and deliberate" in his acts. (2) And Ricardo Cortés Tamayo who knew him well despite the great difference in their ages, paints a clear picture of him:

we remember Andresito well: he was of average build -- we thought he was very tall -- strong, broad-shouldered, with a thick well-groomed, greying beard and a flowing moustache. He had a strong head a bit like don Justo's (...). He wore light-coloured clothes and was rarely seen in anything dark. He wore a wide-brimmed hat, which was rather bohemian and revolutionary (...). He carried a thick walking stick, which was common in those times. (3)

His style went well with his discreet character. He never left Mexico and rarely strayed far from the Valley of Mexico. (4) His world was in the highlands which fed him

(1) AAME. The professor was Dr. Priestley of Berkeley University. It is worth adding that there is a version that this university refused to give Molina the financial aid he sought to be able to write La revolución agraria. This aid was finally provided by the Mexican government. See Santiago Gómez, op. cit.
(2) Unpublished memoirs of Carlos Basave y del Castillo Negrete, p. 33.
(4) All the evidence would appear to indicate this. It is likely that he may have visited the north of Mexico once when he went to Chihuahua in 1915. See Santiago Gómez, op. cit. There is no evidence to indicate that Molina ever visited the south -- he affirms that Gen. Cárdenas invited him to the Yucatan but he turned the invitation down on account of his health. See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "La gloriosa caruzada del Mayab", in Molina et. al., El ejido en Yucatán (Ed. Mexico Nuevo, Mexico, 1937), pp. 7-8.
and to which he gave the best of himself. This image was conveyed in his work, which reached its climax during the second and third stages of El Reformador, which became a forum for Mexico's Indians and Mestizos (1935-1937). The Molina Enríquez of the thirties had undergone several changes. He was now the Creoles' enemy and violently challenged anyone who dared cast doubt on his having fathered article 27. (1) He was also a converted supporter of Lázaro Cárdenas and got involved in a dispute with his friend Cabrera over his defence of Cárdenas' agricultural policies. Molina defended the Indians and denigrated the Spaniards, and he was named as the leader of the struggle against the "Spanish colonial octopus" to achieve Mexico's economic emancipation (1933) in a special proclamation of Mexico's "Second Independence." (2) This was a Molina who shied away from his former admiration for the Hispanic culture and drew closer to indigenism.

By this stage Molina had little left to live. He said he felt at ease for having managed to get the five volumes of his third and last book Esbozo de la historia de los

(1) On his allegations in this context with Pastor Rouai and José N. Macías, see his comments in El Universal (Mexico, 18 April 1921 and 23 Sept. 1937). By comparing them we can see the changes Molina's attitude underwent.

(2) See El Reformador, second stage, (Mexico, 15 July 1935), p. 3, the date this happened on coincidentally was 16 Sept., the anniversary of Mexico's independence. It is also worth mentioning that Molina felt great admiration for Cárdenas and this was evident from Cárdenas was nominated as presidential candidate. See Molina, "La gloriosa cruzada del Mayab", p.31, in which don Andrés compared Cárdenas with Harún Arraschid, and Molina's preface to F. Palomo Valencia, Los ejidos de Yucatán y el beneguén (Librería de Pedro Robrado, Mexico, 1934), p. 1, which describes his early support of the general.
primeros diez años de la Revolución Agraria de México de 1910 a 1920 (Outline of the History of the First Ten Years of the Agricultural Revolution in Mexico from 1910 to 1920) into print (1932-1936). In relation to his other activities, his services as a thinker and defender of social justice had been recognised to a certain extent. Undoubtedly, he wanted to rest and take life easy for the remainder of his days. However, the civil service, which he had served so well, did not find him worthy of a pension. Just before his seventieth birthday he received a reply to a message that he had sent to his much-admired Cárdenas. (The message probably never reached the president’s own hands.) Molina had asked for a pension of twenty pesos a day, as other teachers had been given, and after waiting nine months he received a note signed by a minor-ranking civil servant informing him that his request had been turned down. (1) The governor of his homestate, however, was wiser and offered him a magistrate’s post. Thus, Molina Enríquez returned to his homelands where he lived until his death. In the words of Luis Cabrera, it "was as if he had deliberately wished to die in silence." (2)

On 1 August 1940 Andrés Molina Enríquez died in Toluca.

(1) The request was made in an "ordinary message" (telegram) dated 3 Feb. 1938; it was addressed to Gen. Jenaro Amezcua, secretary general of the Revolutionary Union of Southern Agrarians by Victor Rendón, assistant director for credit at the Treasury Secretariat on 19 Nov. 1938. AAME.

(2) Luis Cabrera, op. cit., p. 409.
b) The Formation of Molina’s Pro-miscegenation Theory.

Molina Enríquez’s first work was published in 1895 under the title *El evangelio de una nueva reforma* (The Gospel of a New Reform). In it he proposed the elimination of inheritances as he said they were “the source of the unfair inequality existing between the capitalists and the workers.” Above all, this work illustrates the idealistic impulses felt by Molina during his youth when he was convinced that his doctrine would “change the course of human destiny” bringing about “the greatest and most beneficial” transformation “since that brought about by Christianity.” The young Molina stoically said he felt he could “bear all human pain and die on the cross like Christ if that would help mankind.” (1) However, the most important aspect of this work is that it already contains the makings of several of the constants of Molina’s later work, such as his positivist approach, which displayed unusual touches of a Tolstoy-style mystical Christianity, his desire for social justice which, despite his tendencies, rejected Marxism, his desire for agricultural reform as a means of revindication and whose importance would make it appear as an end in itself, and, of course, his mestizophilia, which was steeped in his obsession for racial uniformity.

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez, *El evangelio de una nueva reforma* (Toluca, 1895), pp. 1-5, 16-17 and 41. Molina’s theory is that capital is produced as the result of each individual’s instinct of self-preservation and is formed with society’s help; when a person dies society should receive this capital through the State, which in exchange should not charge its inhabitants taxes while they live.
In Molina's positivism there are both signs of ideological development and doctrinal indigestion. Although he proved he had already mounted a basic platform along the lines of Darwin and Spencer on the framework provided by the Comtists theories, typical of the first porfirist period, which allowed him to speak in terms of "selection" and "evolution", he also showed that he was capable of bringing down the very arguments of the evolutionists by affirming that "man is now no worse off than when Jesus Christ came to save him." (Clearly the idea behind his proposal to eliminate inheritances was to permit a fight for survival on equal terms.) In his quest for justice, Molina showed his indignation with society for forcing the underprivileged "to experience all the sufferings of a struggle which it is obvious they will lose right from the start" and makes them justifiably feel hatred towards the wealthy. Likewise, he also showed his contempt for "stupid socialist and communist ideas." (1) Meanwhile, Molina, the agrarian, felt benefit would be gained from his proposal as "land would be divided into smaller lots." Finally, Molina, the mestizophile, did not hide his desire to replace the conventional principle of nationality by "the principle of ethnographic nationalities" and even went as far as to imagine a future in which "mankind would form one single body." (2) However, it was Molina, the prophet, who lay behind all these ideas in foresight of the "future cataclysm" that would emerge from

(1) Ibid., pp. 1, 15/16 and 23.
(2) Ibid., pp. 34-35.
the wretchedness and destitution of the people. (1)

Molina Enríquez's attitude towards the international question was of the utmost importance in his theory. Fourteen years prior to the publication of his book Los grandes problemas nacionales he laid the cornerstone of what would become his theory of mestizophilia in the first outline of his thought which dealt with the link between race and nationality. His notion of ethnographic nationality, or the impossibility of creating a multiracial nation, marked the prelude to his future theory in support of miscegenation. Although at the start Molina may have appeared to have relegated this theory and have been more inclined towards racial segregation, it soon crystallised in his work as the sole realistic option open to Mexico. His dream of a world without frontiers was in fact a precocious extrapolation of what would not take long in becoming his creed: racial fusion.

In 1898, a year after he published a booklet on Porfirio Díaz which analysed the policies of the dictator's regime and its attitude towards the Monroe Doctrine (2), Molina Enríquez started up the La Hormiga newspaper in Sultepec. The small paper, which claimed to be the cheapest in Mexico (two editions for one cent), contained a mining section (sometimes in English), church notices and times of masses, a list of saints' days, a section on prices in the different

_________

(1) Ibid., pp. 21
(2) Notas sobre la política del señor General Díaz (Sultepec, 1897).
markets (which lashed out at the high price of onions), and
newsnotes and comments that ranged from the details of a
street brawl to the latest escape of a young lady of the town
with her sweetheart. Molina, who was the paper's "director
and chief", used *La Hormiga* as a personal platform to indulge
in polemics. For example, in one edition he affirmed that
"the poet is a harp that society makes sing", contradicting
his friend Francisco M. de Olaguibel and supporting
Victoriano Salado Alvarez, who had rejected Amado Nervo's
statement that literature is not the product of the writer's
environment. He also criticised the larger Mexican dailies
for looking down at *La Hormiga* and claimed that not a single
line had been written that did not contain local patriotic or
scientific interest" and that "given its size (the newspaper)
was worth more than any of the rest". (1) However, the most
relevant aspect of *La Hormiga* in relation to the development
of Molina's thought was that he endorsed his social
undertaking in its pages and said that "the moderately
well-off working class, which of course is not the most
educated class, is the most upright." He rebelled against
xenophilia and indignantly reported that a German national
publicly insulted the Mexican people and did not have to
suffer the consequences. Most importantly, however, he
divided national history into three periods: disintegration,
transition and integration, which coincide

(1) See *La Hormiga* (Sultepec, 11 and 14 Jan. 1898, vol. I,
Nos. 7 and 10).
with the First republic, the Ayutla Plan, and the Tuxtepec Plan respectively. As a result of Mexico's "environmental, racial and current background" he argued that independent Mexico was in need of:

a military organization with compulsory conscription as a preliminary stage to introducing voluntary enlistment of all units of society, which are divided by differences of race. This would lead to the domination of a physical environment that has been naturally opposed to conscription.

He added that this unification began in the second period and became established during the third. He said it was up to General Díaz to consolidate it and make sure it was extended to other "Spanish American nations" so that there would be "balance in America as there is in Europe." (1)

Shortly afterwards, in 1900, Molina displayed his full intellectual creativity. In a fascinating essay published by the Toluca Institute, whose name by then had been changed to the Porfirio Díaz Institute (2), he divided the history of mankind into four stages. These stages were separated depending on the form of expression that prevailed during each of them. The first stage was characterised by painting and covered from the ancient Egyptians to the Greeks. The second stage was characterised by sculpture and extended from the Greeks to the Middle Ages. This stage was followed by the architecture stage in the Middle Ages. The book stage

--------

(1) La Hormiga, (Sultepec, 4, 16 and 22 Jan. 1898, vol. 1, nos. 2, 12 and 17).

(2) Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Esto matará a aquello", in Boletín del Instituto Científico y Literario "Porfirio Díaz" (Toluca, 5 March and 5 April 1900, vol. III, nos. 1 and 2), pp. 1/5 and 19/23, respectively. Molina took the title for his essay from Victor Hugo.
which emerged with the Renaissance and an end to theocracy and feudalism. However, a new stage was approaching: "work will kill capital: the workers will kill the bourgeoisie: the phonograph will kill the printing press," as it marks the beginnings of its demise. "Like the middle classes, the labourers will dominate the world" when the phonograph, which will allow them to learn without having to know how to read, has spread the "unifying ideal" of eliminating inheritances. Inheritance has hindered natural selection and is a source of degeneration. The "new Napoleon" who manages to eliminate inheritances will most likely be from the United States of America and will dominate the world. When the phonograph era is upon us, property "will be distributed more effectively than now," the natural laws of supply and demand will triumph, there will be more brotherly love and music will reach its maximum heights.

What is interesting about this essay is what it reveals about its author. Molina adopted an eclectic approach and jumbled together bits of Spencer, Marx and Smith topped off with a touch of Tolstoy and Victor Hugo who he described as the last great exponents of the book stage, along with Emilio Castelar. Above all his essay suggests that at the time he wrote it he probably knew about Marx's theory, although it is likely that he only had heard of it through secondary sources. The essay also shows, however, that he only borrowed ideas related with the sense of justice from it and did not reject the notion of private property and market laws in any way. His primitive beliefs concerning the class struggle were always overshadowed by his belief in the
struggle between the races, and he made that very clear.

In a speech given by Molina barely a month following the publication of his essay (1), he called the race struggle the driving force behind history and for the first time he made an explicit reference to the clashes between the different ethnic groups in Mexico. Although only the Indians and Creoles were recognised in their own right at that time as most people believed the Mestizos either belonged to one group or the other, both groups now began to figure in Molina's arguments. The Indians were considered to be conservatives and the Creoles were liberals. Nonetheless, by that time Molina showed that he was a mediator between the two. He defended the conservatives by arguing that the notion of patriotism did not exist in those times and emphasised the bonds of brotherhood linking all the Mexican people. At this stage he had still not suppressed his romantic inclinations and some of these come through in his arguments. (2) Despite this Molina began the twentieth century with two of the key characteristics of his future work essentially defined, namely his social progressivism and

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez "Discurso pronunciado el 5 de mayo de 1900", in La Gaceta del Gobierno (Toluca, 9 May 1900).

(2) See as an example "Discurso ante la tumba del poeta José Bustillos", in La Gaceta del Gobierno (Toluca, 20 June 1901). It is significant that he quotes Schiller in this speech.
his ethnic conception of historical evolution. (1)

In 1902 Molina Enríquez took another step forward. After having reaffirmed his faith in "that immense and beneficent providence that Spencer calls selection" (2), he described his concern for "the deep racial differences" existing in Mexico in his speech of introduction before the Mexican Society for Geography and Statistics. By then it was clear that the bold student from the Toluca Institute had become a lawyer whose professional and intellectual experience was reflected in his maturity. He repeated ideas that he had expressed in La Hormiga to the society members but explained them with greater clarity and coherence. He pointed out that when colonial order and cohesion broke down during the independence, Mexico had been plunged in anarchy.

Fortunately:

the disorder of those times brought to light the race problem, which split the population in two. Each side rallied to defend its interests which implied integration on the one hand and struggle on the other (...), When two sides emerged, the clash was between the Creoles and the Indians, or more strictly speaking, between Indian blood and Creole blood. The ethnic

(1) The obsession with uniformity, another of Molina's key characteristics, could also be said to have taken shape at the start of the century. His rejection of federalism which he called an illogical imitation that broke up everything Mexican, is a continuation of this line of thought to a certain extent. See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Cuáles deben ser los bases de la legislación particular del Estado. Principios fundamentales de todo trabajo legislativo local", in Boletín del Instituto Científico y Literario "Porfirio Díaz" (Toluca, dec. 1901, vol. IV, no. 10), pp. 289-292.

(2) Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Discurso pronunciado (...) en la solemne inauguración de las clases del Instituto Científico y Literario del Estado", in Boletín del Instituto Científico y Literario "Porfirio Díaz" (Toluca, Jan. 1901, vol. III, no. 11), p. 215. This revelation, as we will see further on, was very important.
hybrids, who belonged to the Creole group, had already broken with one of the races they had to thank for their existence and now proceeded to break with the Indians. They attacked the Indians' religion, which was a mixture of fanaticism and idolatry, and their old communal interests. In these circumstances, what remained of the viceroyalties, the clergy and the privileged took the Indians' side. The Creoles became liberals and the Indians became religious conservatives. The liberals were the victors in this struggle and thanks to their triumph a power that was greater than any of them emerged in the country. Integration made progress and at last it looked as if power would dominate the racial differences.

In spite of everything, the triumph had still not been completed. The defeated race brought about the French intervention and Mexico had to wait for it to be put down before "the fatherland was finally established for the future." Thus, Mexico embarked upon the porfist age with its political problem solved. This period was the "integral period" of national consolidation. However, part of Mexico's economic problem and the agricultural dispute, which would require technical measures, still had to be solved. (1)

Until then Molina Enríquez had still not said anything about the need for miscegenation. His ethnographic analysis of history appeared to be satisfied with the existence of a dominant, authoritarian, concentrated power -- another of his constants -- that was strong enough to control friction.

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez, La cuestión del día: la agriculture nacional (Imprenta la Española, Mexico 1902), pp. 44-37. For Molina the other half of the economic problem had been solved with the arrangement concerning the debt and the tax reforms of the reform, which explains why he devoted a large part of his speech to several concrete propositions to solve two aspects of the agricultural problem: water and communications.
between the different racial groups. Molina's association of the Indians with the conservatives and his failure to distinguish between the Creoles and Mestizos lead us to deduce that he felt he had more in common with the Creoles at that time. Despite his compassion for the Indians, this explains his respect for the Creole and the fact that he did not take a more drastic stance against him. Nonetheless, there is not much ground between his initial racial concept of history and his pro-miscegenation theory.

He covered this ground and more in 1906. To mark the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Benito Juárez a literary competition was held in Mexico City. Molina entered his book whose original title was La Reforma y Juárez (The Reform and Juárez). He was awarded a prize for his work along with Porfirio Parra and Ricardo García Granados. (1) The book was published the same year and was his first real literary work. In it he affirmed that Juárez and the reform had been merely pretexts for expounding an interpretation of Mexico's history, and said that "once the conquest had brought about the intimate contact between the Spanish and the Indians, the only way to form a true nation would be to fuse them." It was thanks to the Spaniards' iron rule that what had seemed

(1) The competition was held by the National Commission to Mark the Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Juárez. Entries were also submitted by men such as Gabriel Mancera, Victoriano Salado Alvarez and Pablo Macedo. There were three topics: the biography of Juárez, sociological study of the reform, and poetry about Juárez. Molina wrote on the second topic and received an accesit. See prologue to Porfirio Parra, Sociología de la Reforma (Empresas Editoriales, Mexico, 1967), p. 7.
impossible began to occur — the two enemy races who had been separated by an evolutionary divide began to fuse. In view of everything that had happened, the mixture of the two races was the best alternative open to Mexico; the Spaniards alone would not have been able to develop in a foreign environment and the Indians would not have been able to forge a civilization as advanced as the Europeans without the intervention of the Conquistadors. The only criticism that could be made is that it maybe would have been preferable to have delayed the conquest a few years so as to have given the Aztecs time to unite and form a single race and culture out of all the different Mexican indigenous groups. If this had happened the process of ethnic synthesis and the emergence of a new nation would have been easier. (1)

To Molina Enriquez, however, the circumstances that the Spaniards had been up against justified their course of action. They had acknowledged that education was no substitute for evolution and acted on this. They also provided the Indians with a legal framework and created a series of sound laws. (2) Molina also affirmed that barring the Mestizo Morelos, only a Spanish prince could have

(2) See Andrés Molina Enriquez, Breves instrucciones de administración de los Ayuntamientos del Estado de México (Casa Editorial La Idea del Siglo, Mexico, 1903), p. 32. From this work on, Molina adopted colonial legal order as a point of reference when he first used the argument that independence had transmitted the King of Spain's authority to the Mexican nation.
organised an orderly, stable government in independent Mexico. However, as this did not happen the scene was set for the emergence of the anarchy that characterised the "disintegration" period during which the Creoles, who had inherited the superiority of the Spaniards, fought amongst themselves on the side of either the clergy or the government. Later, in 1854, Juan Alvarez defeated Santa Ana with the Ayutla Plan and this marked the start of the "transition" period. During this period the Mestizos came to power in alliance with one of the Creole groups and tackled the Church, which was the bastion of the other Creole faction. Finally, in 1876, General Díaz implemented the Tuxtepec Plan which consolidated the Mestizo triumphs of the reform and the republic, paving the way for the "integration" period. This period was perpetuated by the "nationality" period. (1) Molina summed up as follows:

Once the chicken has been formed it needs to leave the confines of its shell to hatch and become a fully-developed bird. The ethnic group charged with forming the Mexican nationality was created by mixing the Spanish race with the Indian race. This mixture created Mestizos. Before the Mestizos emerged in their own right they had to overcome the obstacles in their way. The independence allowed them to break out of their shells and the disintegration period cleared the bits of shell that remained in their way, laying the course open for the birth of a new nationality. (2)

There is no doubt that the Ayutla Plan was a watershed in Mexico's history as it provided a "starting point for our nationality." (3) After the implementation of the plan the Mestizos came to power with the great energy their Indian

(1) Molina, Juárez, pp. 73-97.
(2) Ibid., p. 74.
(3) Ibid., pp. 23-24.
blood gave them to thank for their victory. Their evolution was retarded, however, because of their Spanish blood. Although the Mestizos suffered the misfortunes of a hybrid race such as having inherited "Don Quixote’s madness without any of Sancho’s good sense", they were destined to eliminate the weaknesses of their races of origin and to preserve their advantages over the Indians and Creoles. It was clear just what these advantages were:

As the Mestizos were linked to the Indian race by blood, as they possessed great energy, as they had no traditions of monarchy, as they had no religious traditions, as they had no aristocracy, and as they formed a majority in the country, they improved their living standards, were able to rightly call themselves true patriots and say they were the founders of the Mexican nationality free of all civil, religious and traditional dependence. (1)

It is natural to wonder why the Mestizos had to turn to the anti-clerical Creoles during the transition period when they had so many advantages. Molina did not waste much time in his explanation and said that the Mestizos’ inexperience meant they were still not fit to rule. What they needed was the Creoles’ "administrative science", headed by Comonfort. Nonetheless, this alliance was severely strained when the powerful predominantly Mestizo Constituent Congress gave the 1857 Constitution too racist a turn for the moderate Creoles. (2) On top of this Miguel Lerdo de Tejada made a serious mistake when he failed to distinguish between the alienation laws for community property and commonly-owned property.

(1) Ibid., pp. 114-115.
(2) Ibid., pp. 101-133. According to Molina, the Mestizos intended to benefit from the distribution of the clergy’s property.
which affected both the Church and the Indians, whose land was divided into lots that were so small that the only way to make a profit out of them was to sell them off. Thus, the Creoles broke the alliance and the Indians who had been affected supported their counterparts in the lower ranks of the clergy who had protected them since the independence.

(1) The Three Year War broke out in the midst of this isolation. With the cards stacked against them, the Mestizos would have been easily defeated had it not been for Juárez, who corrected Lerdo de Tejada's mistake by limiting the laws to church-owned property. This measure attracted enough support to ensure a Mestizo victory. Juárez's indomitable will also brought about the final triumph of Colpulalpan through Degollado's effective although somewhat limited military action. This triumph helped strengthen Mexican nationality and all that had to be done now was to show it off to the rest of the world. This was done when Maximilian's Empire was finally defeated. (2)

Molina Enríquez's theory of mestizophilia was thus on the verge of ripening. He had made great progress in his work and had formed his basic idea. In this, his first book, he now affirmed that authoritarianism was insufficient to set a heterogenous Mexican society in order and that a nation could only be forged by eradicating racial difference. Besides calling himself a Mestizo in no uncertain terms and

---

(1) Ibid, pp. 123-146.
(2) Ibid, pp. 147-168.
trying to distinguish himself from the Creoles and the Indians (1), he said Spencer, Gumplowicz, Pimentel, Riva Palacio and Sierra had been his main sources of inspiration. At this stage, he was also talking of the "grain zone" as a strategic geographical centre and even went as far as to say that he felt the Mestizo would sooner or later feel he was destined to be the "master of America." (2) There was contradiction, however, in his thoughts that he was never able to unravel which lay in the fact that while he acknowledged that there was no definite division between the different races, he insisted on applying general rules casuistically to twist reality to suit his rigid stereotypes. Although his theory did not clearly define his view of the agricultural problem at this stage, he had already brought the question of land tenure into focus through his treatment of the history surrounding the race problem. What he still had to do was correlate it specifically with the ethnic groups.

It only took Molina a few months to do this. During the presentation of his draft of the waterways law he said the race problem could be resolved in relation to agriculture by:

eliminating the differences which are the final remainders of the former differences between the races and which divide the nation into the large country landowners, the haciendas, small estates with similar origins to the haciendas or created from haciendas that were split up, and communal lands (...). (3)

(1) Ibid., p. 123
(2) Ibid., pp. 31-46 and 113.
Molina could not have been more explicit: the different forms of land tenure corresponded to the different races. His theory on mestizophilia had now been completed and he only had to dig a bit deeper to perfect it, and develop his fundamental concepts. He did this in his book entitled Los grandes problemas nacionales which was published in booklet form by the El Tiempo newspaper. (1) Perhaps he had a premonition of the fame his book would achieve which made him feel he had created "the clay model that would serve for a bronze casting of the definitive work in contemporary national history." (2) Although it was unlikely that the work that had yet to come would be the last on the subject, the master destined to create this bronze casting was, of course, Andrés Molina Enríquez.

c) The Consolidation of Molina's Theory.

By 1908 Mexico's social and political effervescence was running high and there were warnings in the air of the storm to come prior to Porfirio Díaz's seventh re-election, which had been noticeable from the publication of La Reforma y Juárez. The times were marked by the biting attacks in the press mounted by Ricardo Flores Magón and the "regenerators", the bloody strikes at Cananea and Río Blanco, the worsening of the clash between científicos and revistas (Bernando Reyes' followers).


the emergence of intellectual opposition groups, and the unusual Díaz-Creelman interview. These events created doubt about the invulnerability of the inveterate mythical peace of rule under Díaz. Meanwhile, Molina supported Bernardo Reyes' efforts to become Porfirio Díaz' successor and polished up his most important book in which he shaped his thoughts on mestizophilia once and for all from his office at the National Museum.

Finally, in April 1909, he signed the prologue of Los grandes problemas nacionales. The book paid considerable attention to detail (1), and to whet the reader's appetite, Molina set out the bases of his analysis in a "scientific note." According to Molina man needs oxygen and carbon to live because these are the materials that produce energy in his organism. While oxygen is found in the air we breathe, carbon is only present in sufficient quantities in edible grains. From this Molina deduced that agriculture is of prime importance for society's existence, and the "fundamental zone" of any civilization is the area where cereals are grown. In Mexico the "fundamental zone" is located primarily in the central plateau of the inland highlands. This region is the only part of the country where good-quality cereals are produced in quantities greater than those required by its inhabitants. Consequently this

(1) The following paragraphs only contain a synthesis of the contents of Los grandes problemas nacionales and avoid all comment and judgement that are not Molina's own.
area is the most densely populated and powerful area in Mexico. This had such an effect on the lives of the Indians that numerous tribes from the north that came to live there evolved to a greater or lesser extent while they controlled it.

Their evolution, however, was relative. Molina gauged it by analysing ownership rights, which give an approximate indication of the level of development of any society. The scale he used ranged from a total lack of territorial ownership, such as in nomadic societies, to the forms of private ownership which prevail in the most modern societies. The most advanced Mexican Indians were those who lived in the grain zone, but even so, Molina estimated that they were barely halfway along the scale when they were conquered by Spain, which was one of the world's most powerful nations at that time. Since the Spaniards were so much more advanced than the Indians it is only logical that integration began during the colonial period and not during the pre-Hispanic period. Land tenure played a very important role in this integration. The Spaniards' great legal instinct was second only to that of the Romans, and they thought up and obtained a Noverint Universi bull from the Pope to justify the conquest and give the crown rights over the new territories. This led to a series of legal instruments for land division and created a new social structure -- the Conquistadors, missionaries and their successors monopolised most rural land, but instead of making the land produce they saw it as a status symbol of their aristocracy and lived off their incomes from mining or provided by the Church. Most of the
immigrants in Mexico belonged to the lower classes of Spanish society and they became small farmers or lived in settlements. The Mestizos, who were the product of the mixture between Spanish men and Indian countrywomen, stayed on their ranches when they were recognized by their fathers or sought refuge in the lower ranks of the clergy when they were not. The Indians, who had been left with the poorest land, owned their land communally which was recognized by the Spaniards. As Molina said, "all the sociological aspects involved in the great problems of our development are rooted in the colonial period, which was our period of formation." (1)

Again Molina felt it was necessary to draw up another of his scientific notes to explain his concept of race. According to him, the influence of the environmental forces on what Haekel called the "internal formative force" in his History of Creation produces racial groups in mankind. These groups expand within the confines of their geographical limitations and when they have grown sufficiently they start to undergo qualitative improvements through what Darwin called "selection." Once perfected, the races tend to expand beyond their natural confines and clash with other races. These clashes either herald the extinction of the race or its mixture with another. This explains why there are some states like Imperial Germany, where the original race prevailed, and others like Great Britain where several races

---

fused. Whatever the case "race" is understood as being "a group of people who have lived in the same conditions over a long time and have acquired certain uniformity in their organisation. This is indicated by certain uniformity in their appearance." (1)

Once miscegenation had been legitimised, Molina began his description of the process of socio-ethnic change in Mexico. It showed that over time a slight mobility had emerged in the structure of the viceroyalty. The Creoles and some farming immigrants had gained limited access to the class of large landowners while the rest of the farmers of Spanish origins had gradually become Mestizos thanks to the growing race mixture in rural areas. Mexico's independence consummated the phasing out of the stratification that had prevailed early on in New Spain. After the expulsion of the Spaniards the Creoles monopolised the first rung of the social ladder and were divided into "Creole lords", who took over the mines and land released after the sharing cut, and the "Creole clergy", who replaced the clerics that had been expelled. The first group was divided into "conservatives" and "politicians or moderates." They improved their economic situation and became the nation's rulers while those in the second group, comprised of members of the clergy and lay assistants, made up the reactionary party, and moved up from the middle ecclesiastical class to the privileged class. The Mestizos became the owners of agricultural properties and

(1) Ibid., pp. 102-104.
left the ranks of the lower clergy to take advantage of the better options now open to them as office workers, professionals and "revolutionaries." The Indians filled the gap left by the Mestizos in the clergy, enlisted in the army, or stayed where they were as communal farmers and day labourers. Finally, a new group had appeared called the "new Creoles or liberals." This group emerged as a result of the arrival of non-Hispanic immigrants from Europe, whose origins were to thank for their liberal tendencies.

These racial groups formed the driving force in Mexico's history, which Molina explained along the lines set out in his study of the reform. However, by this time he had developed his early ideas and was in a position to explain some of his points more clearly. These included the alliance between the political Creoles and the Mestizos to combat the Church, which he attributed to the fact that their interests coincided — the groups which were more monarchist than Catholic wanted to impose their hegemony by diminishing the wealth of the clergy, which they wanted to keep for themselves. The link between the two groups was Comonfort, whose intermediary position as a new Creole allowed him to attract support from both sides. Nonetheless, to appease the Catholics and the moderate Creoles, represented by Lerdo, they had to disguise their attack against the clergy and hand over the confiscated land to the liberal Creoles. This prejudiced the interests of the Indian owners of communal property and the Mestizos. The Church took advantage of their discontent and counterattacked the government with the help of Indian soldiers and clergy under the direction of the
Creole clergy. Their action drove off the conservative Creoles involved in the struggle and won a position of neutrality for the new or liberal Creoles. Then Juárez, who was confused about the Mestizos, took the movement over and solicited help from the United States in his haste to find a solution. He handed over military leadership to the "immensely brilliant" Degollado who mounted two decisive interventions. Degollado understood that power could only be held by whoever was in control of the grain zone and he prevented the reactionaries from consolidating their control of the capital. Likewise, when he saw that the Mestizos were seizing the property that had belonged to the clergy he persuaded Juárez to issue nationalisation laws. Although all these actions paved the way for the victory of the reform and the establishment of the first formal Mestizo government, they did not prevent the imposition of a Second Empire. However, as Sierra pointed out, the intervention was destined to fail because of its inability to grasp the significance of the role of the different racial elements. To triumph, the groups that opposed the Mestizos should have been brought together to repudiate the liberal reforms, as this would have harmed the interests of those who gained most from those reforms (the new Creoles) most of whom were French. France did not find either of these options acceptable and decided to allow Maximillian and his only allies, the conservative Creoles who now had nothing to do with the reactionary Creoles, fall. Thus, the demise of the empire showed the world "the strength of the Mestizo government." (1)
For Molina, this part of history, which covered the disintegration and transition periods, was extremely important. If the colonial period "had inclined towards the fusion of all the groups" (2), independence increased the friction between the different racial elements when it broke with the rigid structure of the viceroyalty and pressed forward along the long path towards integration. "The greatest advantage of the republican form is to have created civil equality which favoured contact, mixing and the fusion of the two races, opening the way for the creation of a single race." In spite of everything, however, there is still a clear division between the races which justified the use of the "certainly incomplete and defective" but valid classification to describe the relation between the racial groups and the social classes. (3) This classification prevailed during the integral period and was added to thanks to two events that occurred during the porfhirist regime. With the consolidation of Mestizo rule, the revolutionaries were relegated to "director" status and became civil servants, military chiefs and official and rural "army" officers. The second event was the development of the railway and industry which attracted immigrants from Europe and the United States on a temporary basis. During this process, workers were divided into two groups -- skilled and unskilled workers.

(1) Ibid., pp. 102-117.
(2) Ibid., p. 97.
(3) Ibid., p. 105
These groups were composed of Mestizos and Indians respectively. So in the year 1909 the different races were divided into the following social classes:

- **Foreigners**
  - U.S. Americans
  - Europeans

- **Creoles**
  - New lords
  - Moderates
  - Clergy
  - Conservatives

- **Upper or privileged classes**
  - Directors
  - Professionals
  - Office workers
  - Army
  - Skilled labourers
  - Low-ranking clergy

- **Middle classes**
  - Mestizos
    - Small landowners
    - and farmers

- **Lower classes**
  - Indians
    - Unskilled labourers
    - Communal landowners
    - Day labourers
Molina felt there were serious irregularities in this structure as the existence of solid lower classes and a broad middle class meant these groups could put up resistance to the oppression of the privileged classes. But this was not the case because only "five categories of the lower classes, three of which are comprised of Indians, bear the colossal weight of the twelve upper, or privileged, classes." As a result:

For now our society is disproportionate and top-heavy. From the thorax up it has the body of a giant and from the thorax down it has the body of a child. The weight of the upper part is so great that the body as a whole has problems in keeping itself upright and it could even topple over. Its feet are getting weaker every day. (1)

Indeed this was one of the matters left over from the integration period -- the economic problems originating from the faulty structure of Mexican society had yet to be solved. The hoarding wealth by the minority, the unequal distribution and inefficient use of most of Mexico's territory, the oppression suffered by the farming communities and the stagnation of industry, which was a result of the lack of a domestic market, were the consequences of racial heterogeneity and the socio-economic heterogeneity this in turn produced. Society had to be balanced by achieving racial integration and imposing social justice if these problems were to be solved. (2)

(1) Ibid., pp. 304-305. Molina does not explain the sequence of the groups in social structure on the previous page.
(2) Ibid., pp. 305-322.
What Molina had said up to this point implies that the racial groups fitted in with specific characterizations to a certain extent. We can see from the following quotation that Molina had no doubts about this:

The Creole is generally of upper class blood. Typical Creole surnames are Escandon, Iturbe, Cervantes, Landa, Cortina, Cuevas, de la Torre, Rincón, Pimentel, Rui, Terrenos, Moncada, Pérez, Galvés, Icaza etc. The Creole is generally fair-skinned like the people in the south, or olive-skinned. Olive-skinned is defined by the Academy as a colour between fair and dark with dark eyes rather than blue eyes. He is proud and is more frivolous than serious. His overall appearance is delicate and refined. Generally he is a Man of the World, polite, educated and refined. His gestures are elegant and he is pleased by honours and likes courtly manners. He paints coats of arms on his carriages and calls himself "decent." (1)

In contrast, "the moral characteristics of the pure-blooded Indians stemmed and still stem from their servile submission; those who have been incorporated are hypocrites, the subdued Indians are sincere and the Christian Indians are semi-idolatrous." The following was said of the Mestizos:

The Mestizo is plebeian. His typical surnames are Pérez, Hernández, Flores etc. He is dark-skinned but for the women this colour is said to be brown-skinned. Their skin is darker than the skin of the southern Europeans but not as dark as the pure-blooded Indians. The coastal Mestizo is coffee-coloured. His hair is usually dark and unruly, and his beard is sparse and black. His body is thickset and strong. He is serious and has a strong, melodious voice. The Mestizo, who has always been poor, is rude, suspicious, restless and ---

(1) Ibid., p. 106. The reader should note that the Creole described here is the typical Creole lord. Molina associated other surnames with the new Creole, such as Barron, Robert, Dupont, Burst, Lanz, Henkel, Lancaster, Comonfort. Likewise he used different adjectives to describe them and these included the words "hard-working, sober, thrifty, cautious, calculating, extremely envious, educated, sociable and wise." See op. cit., p. 112.
impetuous. However, he is also stubborn, loyal, generous and patient. Nothing portrays him better than the word "chinaco" which the "decent people" use to describe him. "Chinaco" comes from the word "chinacatl" which can be translated literally as meaning "shabby." He enjoys the sensual pleasures. He is not as elegant as the Creole lords nor as given to luxury in his spending habits as the Creoles who later on are called "new Creoles." He is simply a spendthrift. (1)

Although the Mestizo was the result of the union between the Creoles and the Indians, he yearned for separation and to triumph over these groups for whom he felt mutual aversion. The Mestizos felt repugnance for Catholicism and the Creoles' "feelings of authority" just as they did for the Indians' idolatry and "wretched servility." This explained why they fought with a "mixture of anti-religious, egalitarian, vengeful, iconoclastic fervour" to free themselves of their shackles and why they turned to "liberalism and aspired to the comfort that would permit them to improve their race. This was obvious to Molina and he said that the phenomenon could be described as "something as clear, certain and easy to prove historically that there is no need to study it in depth in this study." (2)

Nonetheless, after this we could be left wondering exactly what did the advantages offered by the Mestizo consist that made Molina consider him as the element that was to be responsible for giving form to the new Mexican nationality. The answer to this question lay in the Mestizos' energy which came from his "anthropological background and selective strength" on the Indian side. ---------

(1) Ibid., p. 110.
(2) Ibid., pp. 108-110.
Molina said that the Mestizo was not "a new race" but formed a part of the Indian race as an element that had undergone changes because of the mixing with Spanish blood. Riva Palacio correctly said that the Indians were physically superior to the other races, which showed that they went back to "very early times and are made up of units of very powerful racial strength." He also said that this strength made them superior to the whiteman. Proof of this lies in the fact that they were able to adapt without any trouble to the most inhospitable areas of Mexico where the Conquistadors did not dare go. On the other hand, the Spaniards were drained of their energy in America and met their downfall in Europe. The idea behind this was that although the white race was superior in terms of "action" as a result of its more advanced evolution, the Indians were superior in terms of "resistance" which came from their more advanced selection.

Molina explained this strange distinction with another of his scientific notes, saying that evolution is always a consequence of selection, which can either occur on an individual or collective level. Individual evolution ensures the survival of the fittest individuals within any particular group -- as in the case of overpopulated China. These individuals adapt to their environment while collective evolution measures the survival of the strongest group out of several groups by perfecting the individuals in it, and Molina cites the case of beligerant France as an example. The geographical isolation of the Mexican Indians meant they belonged to the first category as they adapted to their
environment better than any other people in America. This explains why they are not famed for their physical beauty or their culture and are noted for their strength to resist physical hardship. They passed on their strength in its full force to the Mestizos because just a small number of Spaniards and Creoles had mixed with countless Indian women. Furthermore, the Mestizo men continued mixing their blood with that of the Indian women, leading to the gradual absorption of the Indian. This explains why the Mestizo came to prevail and dictate what the shape of Mexican nationality would be. (1)

Molina felt this situation implied that the Mestizo had not always been destined to wield power. During the transition period his political predominance was strengthened when the nationality law was passed. This law was passed "reluctantly" by the Creole Lerdo de Tejada but failed to balance society by establishing a middle class of small landowners as had been intended. Although the law permitted the Creoles and even the Mestizos to seize Indian property it did not divide up property owned by the Church. If that had been done as the Mestizo Ocampo had wanted, "the peace that characterised the times of Porfirio Díaz and fills us with pride could have been peace for all time." (2) In any case, there was peace and with it came the man responsible for it thanks to his "inspired, happy and fortunate policies." That

(1) Ibid., pp. 333-354.
(2) Ibid., pp. 118-131.
man was Porfirio Díaz, the great Mestizo, who was successful because he managed to triumph over all the different sides and racial groups. He concentrated Mexico's political power and exercised it by handing out favours and by being firm, which he determined according to the "amount of steel in each race." Thus, this man who had "deep knowledge of the Mestizos" gave them posts in public office, backed their corruption and allotted them excessively large budgets. He also gave his revolutionary friends posts in the cabinet, the senate and diplomatic missions where they mixed with Creoles. He turned the office workers and professionals into civil servants, the farm workers into soldiers, and the bandits formed rural battalions. Unfortunately, neither the treasury nor industry could support all the Mestizos and there are still many of them today who disturb the peace with their passionate protests in penny dreadful-type newspapers which spread their "vague, disorderly, confused aspirations." Nonetheless, although General Díaz identified himself with the Mestizos and saw his own "ilk, race, nationality and the future" in them, he also saw the need to bestow favours on the Creole lords, whose opinions were aired in El Tiempo (1), and the Creole clergy, who were represented by El País. He also felt he had to punish all these groups just as Louis XI or Richelieu would have done when he thought it was necessary. His iron fist thus guaranteed political order and his regime could be described as "the viceroyalty

---

(1) The reader should remember that Molina published excerpts from Los grandes problemas nacionales in this "Creole" daily.
adapted to the circumstances." As a result of having successfully brought the different racial groups together under his government, Díaz has been described as having carried out a task hitherto "unprecedented in the history of mankind." (1) Díaz, however, was always faithful to his friends and protected the Creoles' property. This act constituted the first major problems that affected all of Mexico. A train journey through the grain zone showed just how unproductive the broad expanses of land belonging to the haciendas were and, basing himself on Orozco and Jovellanos, Molina said that the hacienda represented a form of unfair, unproductive "rural feudalism" kept alive by the "pride and vanity" of the landowners. On the haciendas, he said the dictatorial owners "give orders, shout, hit, punish, imprison, rape, and even kill" without having to suffer the legal consequences of their acts. He added that the haciendas were a waste of this important region which would have produced enough grain to allow the population to expand if it had been populated by small farmers. As always, the victims of the evils of the outdated large land holdings were the Indians and the Mestizos, who occupied the lowest rungs on the social ladder.

In this situation the only feasible option was to divide the haciendas up and sell them. Molina proposed that laws should be drafted to tax property and provide incentives for voluntary division. As a last resort he proposed forcing the

(1) Ibid., pp. 132-147.
expropriation and compulsory division of the land on the
death of the owner. Although the last proposal may sound as
if it breaches the right to own property privately, we should
remember:

in our country, all restrictions on the ownership of
private property that aid the formation, constitution and
consolidation of our nation shall be constitutional
and legitimate as long as they do not send private land
ownership under. (1)

However, for the division of large properties to serve this
aim, the plots of land had to go to the Mestizos as any other
outcome would have disturbed the racial balance achieved by
Porifiro Díaz and would have worsened the social situation
because it would have "shifted the nation’s centre of
gravity" from under the feet of those who have sustained it
"through their closeness to the land, their independence and
their energy." (2)

The second serious national problem stems from this
situation. In an attempt to prevent the privileged class
comprised of foreigners and new Creoles using their wealth to
take over the haciendas seized from the Creole lords the
Mestizos had to be given the purchasing power they did not
possess. Failing this, the benefits gained from the division
of the land would be "immensely offset by the swelling of the
upper classes, the distance put between them and the lower
classes, and by the lack of weight in the middle classes."
This would cause "poverty" which history has shown is "the

(1) Ibid., p. 180.
(2) Ibid., pp. 151-199.
leprosy that eats away at us." (1) This meant that a system of land loans had to be established to give the Mestizos access to the land in question, and Molina also made a legal analysis of this situation. However, without water land is worthless, so Molina included the problem of irrigation in his study as the third great national problem. Water is not an abundant resource that can always be counted on in Mexico and given this, he applied the arguments on which he based his waterways law to solve the problem of irrigation in the grain zone. (In its strictest sense, the grain zone is the "basic grain-growing area that provides Mexico's general foodstuffs" because beans are also cultivated there.) (2) With land for small-scale farming at their disposal, loans to purchase it and water to make it yield, the Mestizos were now equipped to take over the nation.

The fourth great national problem concerned the population. Molina paid special attention to this problem and studied it in great detail from the way Mexicans hold their tortillas at mealtimes to the way the consumption capacity of each of the racial groups created a chronic crisis in the tortilla industry. He explained that this all affected the distribution and structure of the population and is reflected in society's warping. He said that the "absurd Creole" immigrant did not provide the solution to the problem because as well as fostering unfair discrimination against

(1) Ibid., pp. 178 and 199.
(2) Ibid., See op. cit., pp. 200-238 and 239-277.
the Mexican people in their own land, he had shown himself to be unsuitable because of the problems of adapting to Mexico's harsh conditions faced by other races. Molina felt that the Mexican people had everything they required to be able to develop, defend themselves and triumph in the inevitable clash with Mexico's northern neighbours in the United States when the process of miscegenation has been completed. He said the Americans owe their prosperity to the richness of their territory and are weak because they are made up of elements that are evolutionally advanced and who reject mixing with races with advanced selectivity. He estimated that when Mexico's population had grown in around 50 years time to some 50 million inhabitants, (1) it would send droves of workers to the United States. These workers would be different to the people of that nation. When the miscegenation process has reached its peak:

as will undoubtedly happen, our population, which will be comprised of people who are superior to the Indians who currently go to the United States, will then make their power and acts felt with greater intensity (...). The future holds many surprises for us. (2)

The fifth and final national problem is political and was so important for Molina that he made out another of his scientific notes for it. Molina also developed the ideas expressed in his other explanations in his treatment of this specific problem. In this case he tried to show that the fatherland is an organic extension of the family. He felt that over time this extension which stems from the family's

(1) Ibid., p. 356.

(2) Ibid., pp. 352-353. Molina goes into this point more in op. cit., pp. 278-356.
"unity of origins, living conditions and activities" would be equated with "the physical characteristics, customs, language, certain conditions related to the state of evolution, and the desires, aims and general tendencies" which in turn would generate "unity of the ideal." In short, he described the fatherland as "the unit of common ideal" and added if the fatherland is to exist there must be homogeneity. The clash between the "two different groups" must be resolved by producing one single group which can develop its own social cohesion." (1)

Molina considered Justo Sierra's definition of the fatherland as "the home and altar" was "too deep although correct." The altar symbolized the common ideal and the home represented the people and their territory. In Mexico, the home was not solid because the Indians' communally-owned property lacked the roots that individually-owned property had. Likewise, the large properties owned by Creole individuals lost these roots because of the "extension of rights." He considered it was more serious, however, not to have an altar because this implies a lack of unity with respect to origins, religion, physical characteristics, customs, language, evolution, desires, aims and aspirations. As a result of this there cannot be a common ideal. As a

(1) Ibid., pp. 359-370. According to Molina the clash between the two "different groups" depends on "the social cohesion coefficient" of each. If one or both come apart in the clash, the fragments will keep the cohesion that its group had and will absorb or will be absorbed depending on the size of its coefficient.
group in itself, the Indians totally lacked unity while the Creoles had common ideals, although they considered Spain and not Mexico was their fatherland. On the other hand, the Mestizos were united in both senses and this explains why they did not betray their country in history as the Creoles had done. In view of this, Molina considered that land division and the improvement of living standards as proposed would consolidate the home aspect. "When all the republic's inhabitants have a home, they will have to defend it and none other if we find ourselves at war against a foreign power."

The creation of an altar, however, presupposes that the factors related to the ideal have been united, and we should study each of these factors. (1)

First of all, Molina continued his speculation and said that unity of origin would exist once the "adopted" members of the Mexican "family", or the Creoles, had been "dissolved" and "merged" to form a part of it. He said that the Creoles would naturally try to prevent this happening at all costs and would call on the help of some of the "lost Mestizos" and foreigners. This would mean Mexico running the risk of becoming another Cuba or Poland. In order to rule out this danger, the Mestizos would have to neutralise the Creoles' foreign inclinations using Theodore Roosevelt's arguments from The American Ideal. This would involve using foreign capital to finance agricultural reform and would attract

-------

(1) Ibid., pp. 375-396.
powerful interests in support of their efforts to shape the Mexican nation. Secondly, he said that the bases of religion had already been established and only needed to be strengthened. All the racial groups were Roman Catholic in their own way which meant that only the Mestizos' liberal tendencies would have to be surmounted for there to be religious uniformity. The question of physical appearance was the third aspect on Molina's list and he said there would be uniformity when the Mestizo had become generalised, adding that it would help to tell them that "their appearance will be improved and more refined when they have obtained their well-deserved standards of welfare." The fourth question dealt with customs, the dreadful influence principally from the United States which undermined Mexico's moral values and affected eating habits, ways of dressing and life in general. However, since the Mestizos had more weight than the American invaders, Molina expressed his confidence that they would be able to impose their "pure and healthy" traditions sooner or later. "(1)

To achieve unity in language -- the fifth point --, "our beautiful Spanish language" must be taught to all the Indians and must be defended against foreign influences. Molina's sixth point, evolutional unity implied the promotion of Indian and Mestizo development and the holding back of the Creoles. He said, however, that it was unfortunate that the

(1) Ibid., pp. 396-409.
Fusion of the racial groups would bring about the loss of some of Mexico's finest culture in its early stages, but that the homogeneity produced by the fusion would accelerate long-term progress. Molina saw this as the only alternative open to Mexico because by now the 'Creole belief in the substitution of education for evolution, as Elysee Reclus proposed in Los Primitivos, was an outmoded false impression of reality. Finally, his last point concerned the unity of desires, aims and aspirations. He said that unity would come from one person alone -- the Mestizo. "The Creole is worth little as a constituent factor of nationality because he is weak" whereas the Mestizo, who possesses the best traits of the Indians, "could not be a more powerful or stronger" as his rise to power has demonstrated. (1) He went on to say that the remaining Creoles and Indians would have to be "adapted" to the Mestizo so as to be able to "form a true strong, powerful nation with one life and one soul" with the backing of the country's whole population. (2)

As we can see, for Molina all the factors of unification leading to the creation of a common ideal would come from the fusion of the different ethnic groups, culminating in the creation of a single race in Mexico. As with "any work undertaken in the future for the good of the country" the fusion would be produced by the "continuation of the Mestizos

(1) According to Molina, "There are exceptionally few Mestizos who do not have great aims." Ibid., p. 420.
(2) Ibid., pp. 409-424.
as the prevailing ethnic element providing Mexico’s political leaders." So why the Mestizos? Molina’s answer to this is that they comprise the largest, strongest, most patriotic group in Mexico. (1) Once the home and the altar had been established nobody would complain about his lot or envy what anyone else had because the "notion of patriotism" would be clear:

Everybody will be a member of the same family with the freedom to exercise his right of action united in the fraternity of the common ideal and obliged by this fraternity to equally distribute the profit of the common inheritance, and to display mutual toleration for differences originating from this profit.

Molina felt that once everybody thought like this, "when class differences and differences in living standards that have set our people at odds with each other, have disappeared," when we have managed to make domestic development thanks to our own efforts and without foreign influences (as recommended by Spencer and as Japan did), in short, when "the Mestizos have completed their work," Mexico will be great. "Then there will be a Mexican fatherland." (2)

The fatherland must be preserved and to do that it must be able to defend itself both materially and morally—speaking. Molina drew up a strategic military plan to ensure Mexico’s material defence. On the subject of moral defence, he proposed maintaining development, unity and

---

(1) Ibid., pp. 357-359.
(2) Ibid., pp. 424-427.
the "strength of spirit" of love towards the fatherland. (1) He was equally precise in his recommendations for Mexico's foreign policy. For matters outside the confines of the continent, he said that the most sensible course of action would be to accept the Monroe Doctrine and support the United States and the rest of the continent. In affairs generated within the continent itself he said the best policy was non-intervention. Here Mexico's geopolitical situation had the advantage of being "morally healthy" given that its relations with a powerful country such as the United States allowed it to understand weaker nations like Guatemala, and vice versa. In other words, he felt that Mexico's relations with its neighbours should be based on "friendship and generosity" towards its Guatemalan brothers and on "dignity and friendship" towards United States. He added that there was no reason for aggression towards the United States as each nation "has a soul that always bows down to ideals of superior justice" and it puts this before its material interests. Moreover, in consideration of its sheer size, Mexico is not and will never pose a threat to its northern neighbour. (2)

This explains the essence of Molina's theory on mestizophobia as he described it in his book Los grandes problemas nacionales. For Andrés Molina Enríquez the conditions that were necessary for the great transformation

(1) Ibid., pp. 428-431.
(2) Ibid., pp. 434-448.
to take place already existed:

It is high time we form a nation -- the Mexican nation -- in the proper sense of the word, and we must ensure that this nation has absolute sovereignty over its destiny and is lord and master of its future. (1)

The Revolution would illustrate the truth behind his words.

In short, the die had been cast.

d) Molina's Theory Revised.

Los grandes problemas nacionales was not exactly a publishing success. (2) and Madero's book La Sucesión Presidencial (The Presidential Succession) definitely had more impact on intellectual and political circles.

Nonetheless, Los grandes problemas became gradually popular as agrarian reform progressed and as foreign academics -- as will be noted later -- praised it in their words about Mexico. This should not be considered a surprise: the book turned out to be prophetic in more senses than one.

---------

(1) Ibid., p. 448.

(2) Testimonies available coincide on this. In his speech on the reconstitution of ejidos given in the Chamber of Deputies (3 Dec. 1912), Cabrera said Los grandes problemas nacionales was a book that hardly anyone had read and he said this was because it was "extremely heavy" and it contained few quotations from foreign authors. According to Cuadros Caldas the book was withdrawn from circulation on orders from Porfirio Diaz. See Cabrera, "Discurso ...", in Obras completas, cit., vol. I, p. 141, and Julio Cuadros Caldas, México soviético (Santiago Loyo ed., Puebla, 1926), p. 9.
Molina’s hopes grew with the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution. However, when he thought the movement was coming to its end without having found a solution to the nation’s great problems, his desperation led him, as we have said, to insurrection and imprisonment. While he was in prison he was given a booklet by his friend Carlos Basave in which Wistano Luis Orozco, who had been a source of inspiration and teacher to him, attacked his project for agrarian reform, saying that it constituted an attempt on the freedom to hold private property. From his prison cell, Molina set to writing a response to Orozco’s criticism, which he entitled *Filosofía de mis ideas sobre reformas agrarias* (The Philosophy of My Ideas On Agrarian Reform). In this work, Molina reiterated his "radical" opinion that "property exists for society" and not the other way round. This undoubtedly was the most revealing statement in Molina’s booklet. Although Molina was only really involved in an agrarian argument and said he had based his proposals on the project to "germanize" Polish Prussia, he did not lose sight of his main objective which was to bring about Mexico’s "social and economic transformation so as to create an organic nationality with greatness and strength, wealth and good fortune." (1)

Molina interrupted his writing for several years on

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez, *Filosofía de mis ideas sobre reformas agrarias*. Contestación al folleto del Sr. Lic.D. Wistano Luis Orozco (signed in the Mexico Penitentiary 30 Oct. 1911; booklet printed in Guadalajara), pp. 5, 10 and 15. "Great social change," said Molina, "cannot be brought about by one person. As my intelligent friend Carlos Basave says, the main thing is to "open the way" so that the current itself can form the channel later."
account of the Revolution. Although he did not abandon his journalistic and academic activities completely, his bureaucratic duties absorbed a great deal of his time. Finally in 1920, he made his reappearance with the publication of Clasificación de las ciencias fundamentales (Classification of the Fundamental Sciences). This book was published thanks to his "good friend", the "wise rector" of the National University of Mexico, José Vasconcelos. In it Molina endorsed his positivist faith by including a compilation of the doctrines of Comte and Spencer, and their scientific classifications, and gave his own order and nomenclature for the basic sciences. (1) At about the same time he wrote an article in which he repeated his rejection of immigration. This article contained signs of the turn his thoughts would soon take and in it he stressed that "the Mestizos are really little more than Indians who have undergone a few changes." He also referred to Cuauhtémoc as a hero and called Cortés a villain. (2) Two years later, he expressed his uncensored ideas on a legal analysis that had been made of the 1917 Constitution in a rare bulletin published by the Interior Secretariat, which was headed at that time by Plutarco Elías Calles. In his articles, letters and interviews, he declared that the Constitution was imposed

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez, Clasificación de las ciencias fundamentales (Antigua Imprenta de Murguía, Mexico, 1920), pp. 3 and ss.

(2) Andrés Molina Enríquez, "El problema de la colonización nacional", in Revista de Economía Rural (Mexico, pp. 27-38.)
on society by a minority and if the Spaniards really had been the beneficiaries of the great Roman legal instinct, then Mexico as "the most difficult land on earth to govern" was Spain's beneficiary because representatives of the whole spectrum of human evolution lived among its people. (1) In 1924, in a speech given to mark the death of Zapata, Molina displayed awareness of a "geoethnic" distinction which, although it was given little importance in his opinion of the country, acknowledged that northern Mexico was predominantly Creole and the south was Indian while "a perpetual racial struggle" was being waged in the centre. This meant that instead of speaking of national problems it was more accurate to speak of regional problems. (2) After a few years of silence, Molina published a booklet in 1929 which manifested the impending onset of his future campaign against the university. He described the institution as being behind the times and said it was incapable of feeling the peoples' "palpitations." This prompted him to propose the creation of a system of primary education for teaching language under the term "school of expression." This proposal gives us an

(2) Andrés Molina Enríquez, Aspectos de la cuestión agraria (excerpts from the official speech given in Iris Theatre on behalf of the National Agrarian Confederation, Mexico, 10 April 1924). In this speech Molina affirmed that the northeners were concerned with political problems because of their ethnic characteristics while the southerners were concerned about agricultural problems, in an apparent allusion to Madero and Zapata.
insight into his reevaluation of his former low concept of education and shows that he now saw education as the means to instil awareness of the differences of race and nationality in Mexico's children. (1)

Nonetheless Molina’s scanty intellectual production during the two decades following the publication of Los grandes problemas nacionales added very little to the theory of mestizophilia that he had developed in it. He made no major changes to his theory as it was presented in 1909 until the 1930s when his thinking underwent a marked polarization. The new version of his mestizophilia began to take shape in the first volume of his third and final book, La Revolución agraria (The Agrarian Revolution), published in 1932. The following are a few of his new ideas: he said the world was divided between two cultures corresponding to the East and the West. These cultures are differentiated by their form of writing, taking into consideration both the visual and phonetic forms. He also reaffirmed his belief that the cause of the differences between the racial groups was their form of evolutionary selection, which he said occurred either on an individual or collective level. (2) He said that the Mexican Indians originally came from Asia and that America would have to act as the bridge between East and West. It is significant to note that he repeated his belief that the

(1) Andrés Molina Enriquez, La reforma urgente de la escuela primaria elemental, y un nuevo tipo de universidad para los estados (Revista de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Mexico, 1929), pp. 13 and 5-9.
different people of the world do not share a "common path" nor a single goal in their course towards "civilization" while he insisted that the Spaniards were "more advanced" than the peoples they conquered. (1) He denigrated Cortés and the Conquistadors for having taken advantage of the peaceful nature of most of the Indians to exterminate them and spoke of the "indianization" of the white immigrants thanks to environmental factors, the black influence and the formation of castes. Finally, he affirmed that the process of miscegenation, which resulted from the "meeting of two cultures", tended to come down more on the Indian side than on the Spanish side giving examples such as the land ownership system, language, handcrafts, the paintings of Diego Rivera, the music of Julián Carrillo and the architectural forms designed by the Spanish but interpreted and executed by the Indians in their own style. References to Jilotepec also abounded in his list. (2)

In the second volume, also published in 1932, Molina analysed the history of Mexico during independence, basing himself selectively on Pereyra and Bulnes. He said that independence should be celebrated, and will be celebrated when the process of miscegenation has been completed, every 6 November as it was on 6 November 1813 that the Mestizo Morelos declared Mexico's independence from Spain. Hidalgo, a "Creole to the end" (although Molina

(1) Ibid., pp. 31-60 and 74-75.
(2) Ibid., pp. 61-81, 107-129 and 129-152.
sometimes doubted this because he was not convinced by the portraits made of the priest), had not wanted to separate Mexico from Spain as he feared that the Indian masses who belonged to his army might take over the country. This explains why he never mounted an attack on Mexico City. Mexico’s history would have been very different if independence had culminated with the Mestizos and Indians seizing Spanish and Creole property to gain the "economic strength they need to feed the people" and form a new nationality. However, nobody took any notice of Morelos, who proposed land redistribution to give power to the Mestizos and allow the castes to blend in with the general population and who had never complained about the Spaniards’ religion or their political system. This gave rise to article 13 of the Plan of Iguala, which promised respect for individuals and their property — including for the Spanish and the Creoles. Because of this disposition, the article has been called root of "all the evils that befell the nation after the independence." (1) Molina showed that he was loath to go into detail on the most tragic chapter of Mexican history and limited himself to justifying the loss of half of Mexico to the United States, saying it had been inevitable. Likewise, he repeated his admiration for the United States and said the Mexicans owed their protection from Europe to the Monroe Doctrine. (2)

(1) Ibid., vol. II, pp. 30-35 and 54-59.
(2) Ibid., pp. 89-106.
From his analysis of the reform and the French intervention it was clear that Molina altered his racial classification of some famous historical figures; he now referred to the "Creole army of Santa Ana" and to Comonfort as a Mestizo and said most of the men who prepared the 1857 Constitution were Creoles. Moreover, he said the Constitution was "individualist par excellence." (1) Finally, Molina rejected the "racial matriarchy" that Spain claimed it exercised over the "Indo-Hispanic nations" and compared the Indians to a plant onto which the Spaniards were grafted. However, after time it was the plant that had to adapt to the graft to form the "units of a new race, a new heart and a new culture" of the Mexican nationality. (2)

The third volume of his book appeared in 1933. After quoting Rousseau's social contract theory (he described Rousseau as a "late eighteenth century French philosopher"), Molina said because individual liberty was respected in the East slavery had never existed there and this meant that a classic analysis of the region's history was not applicable in the West. This explained why the Mexican Indians, who he said were from the East and were therefore devotees of liberty, fell foul to the "acts of terrible violence and merciless ferocity" committed by the Conquistadors, and why

(1) Ibid., pp. 107, 110 and 117-118. He also said the Creoles made "Class Laws" in their own favour against the Mestizos and Indians. As an example, he cited the amparo trials. See ibid., p. 146.
(2) Ibid., pp. 147 and 154.
they preferred death to being taken into slavery. (1) Although he accepted that a minority of natives practised human sacrifices and cannibalism, he pointed out that most of the pre-Hispanic religious practices were "peaceful and political" in comparison with the "aggressive, intransigent, fierce" catholicism practised by the Spaniards. (2) The Indians were not inferior to the Spaniards, as an erroneous interpretation of the theory of evolution that supposed there was "only one common course towards development that all human groups had to follow" would have once had us believe. Molina affirmed that the theory of evolution was "fundamentally accepted as still being correct", but that people were now aware that there was more than one path to development -- even in terms of the economy -- and acknowledged that "industrialism" is not a stage of higher evolution. This showed that the conquered peoples' plan for civilization was just as valid as the plan the Conquistadors had had. (3) Finally, with respect to the role played by the racial groups in the history of Mexico, Molina insisted that the Creoles only sought to subdue the Mestizos and the Indians. Since there were very few Creoles and they were

(2) Ibid., pp. 64-66. Molina lamented that a national church did not emerge during the independence.
(3) Ibid., pp. 34-36.
tied to their Spanish background, it was obvious that creolization could not be "the main aspect of the nation" because the Spaniards had always been behind the Creoles as the "disseminators of disorder." For instance, they were responsible for the preparation of the French intervention and had it not been for the protection provided by the United States through Poinsett, the French would have penetrated even further. (1)

The history of the agrarian revolution finally began to burgeon in 1934 when Molina's fourth volume was published. By then Molina was working on an analysis of the porfirista regime, which he described as "favourable and monumental." He said Díaz discovered "the definitive formula for the national governments," in other words, an "Indian Mestizo" dictator who united the Indians and Mestizos, "rooted out the caciques and made "little politics and much administration." Díaz was wise to have resorted to electoral fraud "to keep the Mestizos in power" because if the elections had been democratic "the Creole minority would have occupied all the public posts by taking advantage of loopholes in the law." Díaz's downfall was the result of the abominable influence of the Creoles, who managed to entangle him in a "net woven with the charms of a new Delilah," the Creole Carmelita. Later, his old age made him betray his own people when he passed the vacant lands legislation, reestablished the university (and appointed the hispanophile Justo Sierra as rector), and was

(1) Ibid., pp. 44-53.
responsible for the elimination of Cajeme and Yaqui Indians.

(1) His betrayal peaked when the new Creoles, who now belonged to the científicos group, put paid to the aspirations of the Mestizo candidate to the presidency, General Bernardo Reyes. Molina described Reyes as "the greatest state governor of all time." Finally, it was the accumulation of the effects of all these acts that sparked off the Epic Revolution. The Creole lords, who by then had slipped into oblivion, decided that the time was ripe to make their comeback backing Madero. The United States supported Madero thanks to Díaz's decision to reject its request to use Bahía Magdalena to defend President Zelaya of Nicaragua and this brought about his subsequent downfall. (2) Molina, however, decided to leave the consequences of the Revolution for his next volume, which was published two years later. For the time being he felt satisfied with what he had written as it had helped:

   the components of our nationality to shape their new race, allow their hearts to swell with pride and speed the crystallization of their own culture by allowing them to discover the solution to their organization problems for themselves. (3)

In 1936, when Cardenism was at its height, Molina


(2) On Gen. Reyes, the causes of the animadversion of the United States and the transition from the regime under Porifírio Díaz to the regime under Madero, see op. cit., pp. 45-49, 53-61 and 129-176.

(3) Ibid., pp. 9-10. Molina adds, it is necessary to do away with "the error that we are a Spanish nation" and therefore Latin which Limantour tried to use to catch Mexico up. See op. cit., p.133.
finished work on the fifth and final volume of La revolución agraria. As a finishing touch he decided to make "a sensational confession" and (like Marx) expressly acknowledged that evolutionism was wrong to believe that there was only one path towards progress. In this book he also claimed to raise ethnology to the highest levels of advanced science, way above the realms of history. (1) Next he went on to give his version of the development of the "two great hegemonies of the western world" -- Great Britain and the United States -- and the emergence of economic imperialism. He quoted Lenin, whom he described as "an exceptional author", and said it was impossible to erase "the idea that a great part of any fortune is stolen" from the minds of the people. In this international ocean "there are no longer people with absolute sovereignty," and he noted that Mexico had reached its time of revolution. (2) The Revolution was started by the Creole Francisco I. Madero who thought he could bring it to its climax with the approval of the United States. However, Pascual Orozco, unleashed a new movement which ironically ended in a putsch staged by the felicista Creoles, who were not content with the agrarian turn taken by Madero's movement. Fortunately, the coup d'état brought Victoriano Huerta to power. Huerta was a Huichol Indian who never felt he was inferior to the Creoles or foreigners. He was on the verge of structuring a

(1) In fact, Molina said he had made an "ethnological outline" that was concealed behind the apparently historical nature of this work, which was intended to create "a universal model." See op. cit., vol. V, pp. 9-12.

(2) Ibid., pp. 13-61.
a dictatorship that could have been even more effective than Porfirio Díaz's when he was ousted from power by the United States because of his racial background. Following this, the "triple Mestizo" Emiliano Zapata joined forces with the Mestizo Francisco Villa to defend the Indians and the Mestizos. Villa had "a magnificent physique and represented the potential of the men forging the Mexican nationality." He soon became "the greatest figure of the Revolution." (1)

The winner turned out to be Venustiano Carranza who was recognised by Woodrow Wilson because he was the only white candidate in contention. Although Carranza revised his agrarian reforms and made them more radical because of pressure from the Indians and Mestizos, they never fulfilled their potential because he entrusted them to men such as Luis Cabrera, who, although they were gifted, were Creoles first and foremost. As such they were incapable of hating the latifundium system as strongly as the Indians and the Mestizos. The sides were clearly defined with the Creoles and "Creole Mestizos" backing Carranza while the Indians and Mestizos flocked to support Villa and Zapata. Although the Mestizo influence triumphed with respect to article 27 of the 1917 Constitution in discovering the synthesis of western private property and eastern patriarchal property in the preeminence of the nation over the individual, this did not

(1) On the Revolution from Madero until the Aguascalientes Convention, see op. cit., pp. 63-153.
detract importance from the fact that:

the Revolution (....) has not finished because the Indians and the Indian Mestizos, who have been paralysed by their incomprehensible inferiority complex, have not managed to free themselves from the apparent social superiority and perverse political action of the Spaniards, Creoles and Creole Mestizos. (1)

There is no room for speculation in La revolución agraria, which contains three basic changes in Molina’s attitudes: he abandoned his mestizophile balance and became hispanophobic almost to the point of being indigenist; he endorsed cultural miscegenation, which he had skirted around before, and he broke with evolutionism in favour of a multilineal concept of human development. He also made minor changes to his original scheme in this book — he divided the previously monolithic group of Mestizos into two sections — the Indian Mestizos and the Creole Mestizos. This split was made on the basis of the type of blood that predominated in them. Likewise, Molina now said that Mexico played a full role in the international context since foreign action, which was given secondary importance in Los grandes problemas nacionales, affected the course taken by Mexico. Of course, the variations mentioned were not chosen at random. To redress the balance in favour of the Indians (it could be argued, however, that the former balance favoured the Creoles) Molina had to attack the Spanish culture, reassess the pre-Hispanic culture, and discard the scale of

(1) On Carranza’s regime, the World War and the final conclusion, see op. cit., pp. 155-193. Note that Molina acknowledged that Carranza’s foreign policy was worthy of merit, and he placed him on a par with Juárez in this context.
evolution that had focused on Europe. The division of the Mestizos into different classifications is a subtlety of his methodology that served the same purpose. As a finishing touch, his inclusion of the extranational variable provided room for the reappearance of the Spaniards' debasement and illustrated the universality of the race struggle. Despite all these changes, the essence of Molina's original theory on mestizophilia had been left untouched. He continued to argue that the process of miscegenation had to run its full course before a true Mexican nation could emerge. He also continued to insist that the Mestizo or Indian Mestizo was the only representative of what was essentially Mexican.

Molina analysed his tendencies in greater depth in the rest of his works written during the last ten years of his life. In 1935, in his contribution to the Seventh American Scientific Congress, he confessed that the only means he could find to free the Indians from the pressures of western culture was to raise their "mental influence" sufficiently "so that they can confront the mentality of the whiteman." (The word "indigene" had been dropped from use by then as apparently it was said to have been of Creole origins.) He added that "the mental unification of the Indians" would provide "the key to the secret of their salvation and the starting point for the final stage in the creation of a new culture" which must be the Mexican culture "and possibly the culture that will dominate the whole continent." In the same document he said that since the American Indians were of Asian origins, they think through sight like the Chinese and not through their hearing like the Europeans. Given this, no
proposed replacing the Indians' phonetic writing with a visual system based on the roots of different symbols used by the indigenous groups. He also proposed hiring the services of a Japanese teacher for this purpose. (1) This illustrated Molina's new stand in favour of rescuing the pre-Hispanic culture, which he had despised so much, to the detriment of the Spanish culture. (By this stage he even rejected "Spanish" as the official name of the language and asked for it to be called the "national language.") And the quotation at the beginning of his document in which he reaffirmed his own racial awareness in rather racist terms is even more significant: "If you are not of Indian Mestizo blood, don't touch the Indians; you will not understand them and no matter what you try to do for them, you will only end up harming them instead of doing them good." (2)

Later that year Molina showed that the change in his assessment of the Hispanic and Indian cultures was not detached from a change in his own view of himself. In his book La guerra del pacífico (The Pacific War), which dealt with the debate he sustained ten years earlier with Rafael Nieto, the prologue, signed in May 1935, included a definition of his new image of himself in the phrase "the Indian in me." This phrase followed a declaration of his Otomi ancestry and a statement that said he was "educated in

(2) Ibid., pp. 3-4.
the western or European culture with all its cruel prejudices which have made a system out of depredation and a religion out of violence." Despite this, he said "infinitesimal atavisms" had allowed him to be more influenced by the "balanced, peaceful and refined delicacies of eastern culture." He had not followed the progress made by Japan since the days of his youth in vain in the hope that the strength of that country would save the Asian people from the "western imperialist barbarians." However, like other Mestizos, Molina's tendencies allowed him to swing between eastern and western cultures, which were the main source of "national misfortunes" throughout history. Given this, he proposed the following:

In other terms, we as individuals, our country as a nation, and our continent as a whole from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego does not and should not belong to the western or European culture nor to the eastern or Asian culture -- we must shape our own culture halfway between the two. This should be a new culture that must form the culture of the American continent in which Canada and the United States are the economic forces and Mexico and the non-Spanish Indian Latin countries shape culture.

To justify his Pan-Americanism, he said "there is no task more baneful" than that of preaching the union of Latin America under the hegemony of Spain, which said it would support England in its intentions against the United States. Molina added that anyone who supported this had not understood that if the citizens of the United States ever wielded economic control over America, Mexico would dominate with its cultural strength. (1)

(1) Andrés Molina Enriquez, La guerra del Pacífico (SEP-Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, Mexico, 1937), pp. 5-7
Molina's concern for the creation of a new culture was as new as it was important. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to infer that his new cultural mestizophilia detracted from his belief in ethnic superiority. Quite the contrary. His opinions on race were reinforced in *La Reforma agraria* and it is safe to say that "the new culture" he refers to is a natural consequence of the creation of the "new race." This line of reasoning was expressed in his unfinished work *Tratado de Etnología* (Treatise on Ethnology) which was never published and was probably written in the mid-1930s. In it he rejected polygenesis, explained the beginnings of the different races, and suggested that man's origins could be traced back to the discovery of grains and cereals and the inclusion of these in his diet, giving him the strength to stand up straight. Following this, Molina stated that for any group of human beings racial unity implies that they share the same mentality, which creates "bonds of reciprocal connection" and leads to the creation of a nationality of their own with its own cultural characteristics. (1) If this were not enough, in *La gloriosa cruzada del Mayab*, his agrarian criticism of Cabrera published in 1937 along with documents written by Palavicini and González Aparicio, he defended the *ejido* as a provisional form of land tenure and forerunner of small land ownership that was necessary to destroy the *hacienda* system, basing his arguments on the fact

that this system awoke the powerful energy that lay latent in the Indian blood that was inclined towards communal land ownership as in Asia. (1) Obviously the new Molina found that culture did not exclude race but complemented it and is a result of it.

Finally, in what was to be the last stage of his intellectual work, Molina Enriquez revived his old agrarian platform, El Reformador, on 1 August 1935, beginning a "second age." His aim in doing this was very clear and each edition carried the warning that the newspaper was written from the Indian and Mestizo Indian point of view as they "are not currently represented by the nation's press." In fact, the newspaper went beyond being indigenist in its tendencies and at times was even racist. Of course it goes without saying that it was, anti-Spanish -- it branded Creole indigenists such as "our friend" Manuel Gamio as false, called the preface of the "Great Indian" Altamirano "the best novel in the world and of all time," and said the worst thing about the San Rafael paper monopoly was not so much the fact that it was a monopoly but the fact that it was Spanish. Likewise, it copied all sorts of attacks on the Spanish as if it were a manifesto that had promised to respect the lives and interests of all foreigners except those born in Spain.

(2) Molina also used the paper to wage a campaign on the

(1) Molina et. al., El ejido en Yucatán, pp. 14-22.
(2) See the articles and editorials of El Reformador (Mexico, 15 July and 15 August 1935, and 1 March 1937). The "best novel" for Molina is María, by Jorge Isaacs.
university which he called "mediaeval" and "elitest." In an obvious reference to Vasconcelos he accused the institution of adopting a "slogan which, for the ideology of the young, affirmed Mexico’s racial reincorporation to Spanish decadence and suppressed the existence of Indians throughout the whole continent." (1) With respect to international affairs, El Reformador both openly flirted with facism while rejecting it as a foreign ideology. It was moderately pro-Yankee and declared that it opposed Great Britain, the "number one world enemy," and its subject Spain. It said that if British imperialism were to disappear "all the rest of the world’s problems would be resolved into the bargain." (2)

Despite his extremist views, Molina conserved his most important principles in his post as editor, which by now were marked with his characteristic pro-Indian bias. The paper’s epigraphs were more than eloquent: "NEW RACE - NEW HEART - NEW CULTURE" (printed in capital letters in the newspaper); "In the long-term the Indian-blooded anvil will be capable of more than the hammer of Spanish blood"; "the spark does not fly from the chain that hits the ground -- it comes from the flint that resists it." His idea that "nationality and the fatherland both imply the existence of an ideal for the children of a particular country and cohesion in the defence of their interests" was repeated without having undergone any

---

(2) See the articles and notes in El Reformador (Mexico, 15 Oct. 1935 and 1 March 1937).
significant change. (1) Where there was a contrast, however, was in his clear and rather strange tendency towards racial segregation. However, his racism was basically a reaction to inequality and was intended to act as a stabilizer. Molina, who always understood the importance of social equality as a racial catalyst, now gave his pro-miscegenation preaching second place, stressing the redemption of the Indians because he believed "the union between Spaniards and Mexicans for racial reasons" was absurd while wealth was unfairly distributed because it was the Mexican people "who have nothing" and those who do, have thanks to "the continuance of the conquest's plundering." This was a turn in tactics for Molina, who on a more practical level, decided to give the redistribution of wealth everything he had instead of continuing to describe the advantages gained from the resulting homogeneity. Contrary to how this may look at first sight, Molina was far from giving up his theory of mestizophilia and was in fact strengthening it through his denial that the economic inferiority of the Indians and Mestizos was congenital. (2) In an effort to bring them up to the standards of the rest of the population he formed the "National Organization for the Indians of the Republic." (The "General Constitutional Bases" of this organization dealt "only with pure-blooded Indians and the Indian

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez, "La mistificación del anti-imperialismo con fines políticos", in El Reformador (Mexico, 1 Nov. 1935).
(2) Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Los Causantes de la Misericordia", in El Reformador (Mexico, 1 Sept. 1935).
Mestizos who have the obvious physical characteristics of the Indian or who have an Indian mentality, and whose blood is predominantly Indian" rather than Spanish or of any other nationality. (1)

The illusion of redemption did not last for long. In 1938 El Reformador published its last issue and the Indians and the Indian Mestizos again found they had nobody to represent them in the national press. Andrés Molina Enriquez would only live another two years and almost prophetically he decided to return to die in his home state. He thought he would be able to live more peacefully there. By this stage his work was complete and ready to provide guidance for whoever decided to shape the Mestizo fatherland once and for all, creating a home for the single, true Mexican national identity.

2. - Critical Evaluation: choosing the packaging.

a) Classifying the Unclassifiable.

Andrés Molina Enriquez's contribution to the ideological record of the Mexican Revolution has been emphasized by some

(1) "Mental guidance" as a compensating factor for the Indians' "physical characteristics" (which he did not possess) was dedicated by Molina to himself, as we will see later on; see the note on this subject in El Reformador (Mexico 1 Jan. 1936). To illustrate the passion with which Molina was involved in his racial crusade, during the "third stage" of the newspaper he boasted of having managed to get Lázaro Cárdenas to declare that his government gave "preferential" representation to "the Indians and the Indian Mestizos"; see El Reformador (Mexico, 2 April 1937.)
writers: Frank Tannenbaum and Guillermo Bonfil Estalla called *Los grandes problemas nacionales* the most important serious study ever made of Mexico's social problems; Anita Brenner and Luis Chávez Orozco said it was as important as Rousseau's *Le Contrat Social* was for the French Revolution; Luis Cabrera displayed great perception when he affirmed that "Molina represented for the agrarian revolution what José María Luis Mora represented for the War of Reform," and said Molina's book was "the most important document prior to the Revolution in both the social and economic aspects"; *Los grandes problemas nacionales* was described by Juan Comas as the most influential work of the post-revolutionary era and by Agustín Cue Canovas as "the most noteworthy sociological study ever produced in Mexico." *Los grandes problemas nacionales* was even considered as "the Bible of the Revolution." Victor Alba called Molina a "clairvoyant" and this was qualified by Arnaldo Córdova who said that along with Madero, Molina was "the greatest ideologue of the Mexican Revolution" for having created the movement's "true political theory." (1) In addition to this praise his

---

1943), Lucio Mandieta y Nuñez, "Los antecedentes del artículo 27 constitucional", in El Universal (2 Oct. 1946); Jesús Romero Flores, "El Lic. Andrés Molina Enríquez, y el estudio de nuestros problemas", in the El Nacional supplement (13 March 1949); Salvador Ortiz Vidales, "Don Andrés Molina Enríquez", in El Nacional (13 April 1953); Manuel González Ramírez, "Un precursor revolucionario", in Novedades (21 Aug. 1953); Alfonso Francisco Ramírez, "A. Molina Enríquez", in El Universal (18 Sept. 1956); Andrés Herestrosa, "La nota cultural", in El Nacional (28 Nov. 1956); Roberto Calvo Ramírez, y la reforma liberal y Don Benito Juárez", in Excélsior (20 March 1958); Román Badillo, "El padre de la reforma agraria", in El Nacional (3 Aug. 1958); Salvador Azuela, "Una antología de Molina Enríquez", in El Universal (2 Dec. 1959); Raul Lemus García, "Andrés Molina Enríquez" in El Día (14 March 1980). Finally, it is worth adding that there is evidence that José C. Valdés prepared a piece of work on Dr. Mora, Flores Magón and Molina Enríquez. This work was never published. See Abelardo Iparrea Salaia, Mensajero de la Revolución (I.P.N., Mexico, 1982), p. 109.
recognition reached far beyond the intellectual circles of his home state. After his death his remains were laid in the Rotunda for the Famous Men of Toluca, a statue to his memory was erected in the local chamber of deputies and a bust of Molina Enríquez was placed in his birthplace, which is now officially called "Jilotepec de Molina Enríquez." (1)

Although Molina's work is often quoted, very little of it has been studied. Moreover, most of what has been written has concentrated on Molina as a forerunner of the agrarian reform which earned him the title of "the classic among the classics of agrarianism" (2), and it was only recently that

(1) The town's former name, "Jilotepec de Abasolo" was changed at the request of Lic. Antonio Huitrón. See Proposición que dirige el C. cronista municipal de Jilotepec, México (Toluca, 12 July 1985) and decree number 106 by which the state legislature made the change official in Gaceta del Gobierno (official newspaper of the govt. of the State of Mexico, vol. CXLII, no. 35, Toluca, 18 Aug. 1986). It is curious to note that although the federal congress "froze" measures in 1985 to inscribe Molina's name in gold letters in the chamber of deputies, the then president of Mexico, Miguel de la Madrid, entitled one of his own books Los grandes problemas nacionales de hoy, which just goes to show the high level of political prestige Molina's work enjoys today.

(2) Chávez Orozco, op. cit. Díaz Soto y Gama called him "an authority on the subject" and Barba González said he was the "great champion of the agrarian reform", while González Navarro put him in first place as an agrarian ideologue and Huitrón said he was the person who systemized agrarian law. See Antonio Díaz Soto y Gama, La revolución agraria del sur y Emiliano Zapata, su caudillo (Mexico, 1960), p. 57; Silvano Barba González, La lucha por la tierra (ed. del Magisterio, Mexico, 1963), p. 75; Moisés González Navarro, "La ideología de la Revolución Mexicana", in Historia Mexicana, vol. X, April-June 1961, p. 631; and Antonio Huitrón H., prologue to Andrés Molina Enríquez, precursor de la reforma agraria (U.A.E.M., Toluca, 1959), p. 15.
a new facet of Molina as an ideologue of authoritarianism has been appreciated. His work in this field has situated him in the "genius" category. (1) However, as a theorist of nationalism, or mestizophilia as the answer to the national identity crisis, Molina is still sunk in oblivion. (2) It is very significant that this situation illustrates both Molina's success and his failure. There is absolutely no doubt that his agrarian and presidentialist ideas transcended the intellectual circles to become accepted facts while in the best of cases his theories on mestizophilia still belong to a fair extent to the realms of myths. Perhaps the fact that mestizophilia has not been the object of much study is a symptom of the pragmatism that shakes the history of ideas for a few moments at a time.

Molina Enriquez was much more than a mere ideologue of the agrarian reform or the presidentialist regime. He was surpassed by Wistano Luis Orozco in those fields and was preceded by the porfirian sociologists and politicians. What made him different, however, was his concern for shaping a nationality that was truly and uniquely Mexican in order to bring an end to internal divisions. For Molina the problem of rural land tenure and the question of political leadership

(1) Córdova, *op. cit.* pp. 52-54.
were just the means to achieving the unification of a Mestizo fatherland and his agrarian proposals probably would not have been so vehement if the hacendados and their labourers had been Mestizos. Likewise, he probably would not have given so much importance to his dictatorial urges if the ethnic differences had been eliminated through miscegenation. He wanted to establish a massively powerful government so as to keep the Mestizos in power and benefit the Indians through them. This would also have enabled him to divide the haciendas into smaller properties. The intention behind giving the land to the Mestizos was to put them on an equal footing with the Creoles and bring about the culmination of the miscegenation process. He wanted to see this Mestizo nation because for him racial unification was the demiurge of the uniformity required in a cohesive nation, and would give rise to a culture in its own right. In short, what Molina wanted was for Mexico to emerge with a "new heart" that would make it a fairer, stronger and greater country.

Luis Cabrera, who was better known and understood than Molina, knew this very well. Although it was Molina, the agrarian, who had most influence and who the authorities said was the brain behind article 27 of the Constitution (1),

(1) In the controversy concerning Molina's influence in drafting article 27, the fact that he was its author has been questioned. It has not been doubted, however, that he inspired the article. See Gabriel Ferrer Mendicles, Historia del Congreso Constituyente del 1916-1917 (I.N.E.H.R.M. Library, Mexico, 1957), pp. 135, 136 and 143.
the Ayala Plan and the Law of January 6, Cabrera did not lose sight of the fact that for his friend both the agrarian reform and the Revolution had been merely steps towards his goal of establishing a great Mestizo nation:

The basic idea around which Molina Enríquez’s spirit and heart turned, and to which he devoted his efforts as a thinker and intelligence as a writer, was that of making Mexico great. And that could only be achieved thanks to the vital strength of the Mexican Mestizo (...) (1)

In fact, Molina thought that for Mexico to become great the process of miscegenation had to be completed and this explains why he so wanted the different racial strains to be brought together: the Indian was not so far removed from the Mestizo and would soon be absorbed by him. However, there was a wide social, economic and cultural gap that separated the Mestizo and the Creole, preventing them coming together and mixing. Molina thought the best way to rectify this situation was to implement the agrarian reform, giving the land to the Mestizos and elevating them to the landed classes. (2) In order to initiate this reform, as with any

---

(2) Contrary to how it may appear at first, Molina was always a staunch supporter of small property ownership thanks to his evolutionism. Even during his Cardenist period when he defended the ejido as a useful tool for destroying the hacienda and necessary for the development of the Mestizos and the Indians, he continued to consider small family-owned property as the desired long-term goal. Numerous references were made by him in this context; as examples from different stages in his life, see Andrés Molina Enríquez, "El aspecto fiscal del problema agrario", in El Independiente (Mexico, 17 Sept. 1913); "Si la Revolución es la paz", in La Convención (Aguascalientes, 28-30 April and 3-6 May 1915); the interview "Cómo se juega el agrarismo en el país y cómo debe resolverse este problema", in Excelsior (Mexico, 16 Sept. 1924); and the article written in 1937 "La gloriosa cruzada del Mayab", in El ejido en Yucatán, cit., pp. 5-31. His main agricultural influences were
other that prejudiced the interests of the Creoles, it was necessary to have a source of dictatorial power. Agrarianism and authoritarianism were, thus, two basic requirements for shaping a Mestizo Mexico. This sums up the logic behind Molina’s mestizophilia.

It may be rather exaggerated although not at all surprising to say that it was the form in which Molina put his message across and not the substance of what he had to say that contributes to the lack of knowledge about his work and opinions on miscegenation. Those who have tried to study his writings will be more than familiar with the problems this task implies and very few people have experienced the sensation of triumph that is always present when someone has discovered that he can explain Molina’s thought in detail. The complications did not arise solely out of his literary style, however. Although his style is as Jesús Silva Herzog warns “profuse and difficult and tedious to read at times”, or “abominable” and “frankly poor and often pedantic” as David Brading and Arnoldo Córdova (1) describe it, the problem in reading Molina’s works largely stems from the fact that he was not successful in bringing together all the elements that go to form his complex theory of mestizophilia.

From his style we can safely judge that he did not have much

Jovellanos and Crocco, who supported small property ownership; see Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, Informe sobre la ley agraria (Instituto de estudios Políticos, Madrid, 1925), and Wistano Luiz Crocco, Legislación y jurisprudencia sobre terrenos baldíos (Imp. de El Tiempo, Mexico, 1925).

to say for syntax. Although it is relatively easy to identify the general outline of his theory, it is up to the reader to supply the missing conceptual links and definitions if he is to grasp the underlying arguments. (1) However, it goes without saying that these problems do not detract from the substance of his theory. Molina was well aware of what he wanted and if he contradicted himself, as we will see later on, it was not because his ideas were in disarray but because his doctrine was inadequate.

And that leads us to ask just what his doctrine consisted of. There is no doubt that Andrés Molina Enríquez was a self-styled positivist. He became heavily involved in positivism when he was a student at the Toluca Institute. He studied from Comte to Spencer and adopted their views on evolutionism and social Darwinism. (2) It is difficult to explain just how deeply he studied their works — at times he gives the impression that he was unfamiliar with elementary facts such as those on evolutionism in Spencer’s Social Statics just ten years before the publication of On the Origin of the Species — (3), but there is no doubt that he

(1) This is very probably the reason why José López Portillo y Rojas (who disagreed with Molina’s agrarianism) referred to the “very famous and very boring Molina Enríquez” in a letter to his daughter, Blanca López de Portillo de Basave (dated 13 July 1913, BON 5-2, 392).

(2) These two terms are generally used as synonyms although strictly speaking the first refers to Spencer’s doctrine in general and the second to the part of it establishing the struggle for survival as the driving force behind human society.

(3) See Molina, Clasificación de las ciencias, p. 42.
knew them alright. Molina, who was a man of his times, found
Spencer's theory more in keeping with Mexico's political
circumstances and he came to form part of the school of
Mexican positivism that prevailed during the years of the
Diaz regime. Like his colleagues, Molina looked for a
variation of his Spencerian beliefs that he could use to
justify the need to put order before liberty, which in Mexico
could only come from the coercive eradication of anarchy.
(1) Spencer's theory divided social evolution into two
stages -- the military stage and the industrial stage. He
said that the endemic conflict in the "barbarian" societies
was produced by fear and reverence for power and the only way
to obtain the cooperation needed for development was to
impose a rigid centralist hierarchical system or, in other
words, a dictatorship. Progress could only be ensured if
there was discipline, and only when the stage of anarchy and
violence was over could society embark on the
industrialization stage. The English sociologist concluded
saying that by then there would be voluntary cooperation and
the state would have to give way to individual liberty. (2)
Thus, by moving away from Comte's "libertinism" Molina found
what he was looking for and more: he found a theory that was
linked to both Darwin's new discoveries and offered an

(1) On Mexican Spencerianism, see Leopoldo Zea, El
positivismo en Mexico (F.C.E., Mexico, 1984), pp.
303-309.
(2) A concise explanation of this process is contained in
David Wiltshire, The Social and Political Thinking of
organic "scientific" explanation of man's evolution. Naturally the attraction of such a theory was impossible for a man who was so involved in the overwhelmingly "scientific" atmosphere to resist.

With Spencer's comforting support and Justo Sierra close at hand it was natural that Molina did not hesitate in saying that "until our fatherland is definitely constituted" it was absolutely necessary for Mexico to have an autocratic government. (1) Only thus could the motley group of antagonistic racial strains, who were only too ready to confront each other, be united by ethnic fusion. As the Creoles margined the Mestizos and the Indians, disrupting the country and holding back the miscegenation process, there was no other alternative but dictatorship. This situation explains the advantages Molina saw in the viceregal system and the excellence he attributed to the porfirian system, which, by concentrating power in the hands of a Mestizo, had not only prevented national disintegration but had also encouraged race mixture.

It was precisely on the subject of race mixture that Spencer's theory fitted in with and served to justify tyranny in a society as backward as Mexico's. However, it was also on this subject that Molina's selectivity came through: he only took what he thought suited his mestizophilia from Spencer. He did not accept Spencer's individualist

(1) Molina, LGRN, p. 434.
corollary of this (1) and did not apply his principle concerning the evolution of militarism through to industrialization. With respect to Spencer’s individualist theory there is no doubt that Molina always gave society priority over the individual and always tended more towards Comte’s increased social control than Spencer’s fanatical support for socio-economic laissez-faire. (2) On the second point it could be said that the periods of disintegration, transition and integration used by Molina to divide the history of independent Mexico cease to correspond exactly to the evolutorial duality in question (and even less to Comte’s trilogy, as we will see further on when he started using the Mestizo triumphs instead of industrial development to measure progress. (He ignored the pre-Hispanic and colonial period entirely.)

As we can see Molina could not be accused of having

(1) Arnaldo Córdova appreciated this, in Córdova, op. cit., p. 26. We can speculate, however, that if as some people say, contrary to its aim, evolutionism contradicts individualism, then Molina had a better understanding of Spencer than even Spencer himself. See Wiltshire, op. cit., pp. 2 and 256.

(2) For a comparative analysis of this aspect of Comte and Spencer’s ideological views, See John C. Greene, "Biology and Social Theory in the Nineteenth Century: Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer", in Marshal Clagett (ed.), Critical Problems in the History of Science (The U. of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1959), pp. 428-431. Comte and Spencer’s arguments are contained in Auguste Comte, Cours de Philosophie Positive (J.B. Bailliere et fils, Paris, 1864), vol. IV, pp. 393-441, and Herbert Spencer, "Reasons for Dissenting from the Philosophy of M. Comte", in The Classification of the Sciences (Williams and Norgate, London, 1864), pp. 40-41. It is interesting to note that Molina was closer to Comte in his concept of love — and not interests — as the basis of a social unit.
allowed himself to be influenced by other doctrines. Although he was basically Spencerian, his tendencies were neither exclusive nor unconditional. (1) As a good positivist Molina never abandoned Comte and showed preference for his theories in certain respects, such as for his classification of the sciences. (2) Molina's ecclesiastic tendency, which went beyond the limits of positivism, often landed him in problems. For example, Esteva Ruiz, who supported re-election, made one of the first and most perceptive criticisms of Molina as early as 1909 when he accused him of not being familiar with "the cosmic laws." (3) The contradiction he implied Molina was guilty of was based on the fact that an evolutionist should want Mexican society to evolve towards ethnic uniformity, which implied a change from a state of heterogeneity to homogeneity. According to Spencer, who always stressed the biological aspect of evolution, progress could only be achieved the other way round, starting from a homogenous state moving towards to heterogenic state, and said that social differences would only be eliminated when society was close to decadence. (4) However, Spencer made no mention of race differences and Molina affirmed that the English philosopher was unfamiliar

---

(1) In fact, few of Spencer's supporters adopted his doctrine in full. See Wiltshire, op. cit., p. 256.
(2) See Molina, Clasificación de las ciencias, pp. 20-21.
(3) R.A. Esteva Ruiz, "El progreso y la democracia", in La Reelección (Mexico, 16 Oct. 1909).
with the state of affairs in Latin America since his opinions were based on societies that had never faced problems of ethnic division. (Molina made an implied but nonetheless explicit complaint about Spencer in this sense in Los grandes problemas nacionales.) (1) This explains why Molina was not overly distressed by this discrepancy. On the contrary, he seemed to accept the justification discovered by Leopoldo Zea concerning the Spencerians of the porfirist age in the sense that Mexico had to seek homogeneity before embarking on its quest for heterogeneity. (2) In any case, Molina's silence on the matter indicated that he had not the slightest intention of neglecting his main task of converting others to miscegenation to squabble over doctrinal trivialities. For him, diversification would come in its own good time and the problem was not insurmountable.

Nonetheless this situation raised the following question: where did Molina get the idea from that a nation needed racial homogeneity? This is an especially relevant question because it was a subject that exposed him to criticism for his eclecticism and was something that did not fit in with the scheme of evolution. Did Molina's theory stem from a stereotyped interpretation of the ethnic map of Europe, like Pimentel's and Riva Palacio's, or did he use a different doctrinal source? The answer to both these questions can be summed up in a name: Pasquale Stanislao Mancini. Strange as it may seem Molina took what in 1901 came to be known as "the

(1) Molina, LGPN, pp. 421-422.
(2) Zea, op. cit., p. 305.
theory of ethnographic nationalities" from Mancini. (1) How he came across him so early cannot be explained especially considering that the most widely known views in Mexico when Molina was young were those of Darwin, Spencer, Haekel, etc., and Mancini was relatively obscure. (2) However, he appears to have been familiar with them and adopted them in essence. Mancini was a nineteenth century Italian jurist who suggested using nationality as the basis for international law, arguing that the nation was the political successor of the empire. Mancini's notion of nationality covered the aspects of national territory, race, tradition, language and religion, which he said were the elements he felt constituted national awareness. (3) However, Mancini's most interesting aspect was his defence of the right of self-determination and his affirmation that ethnarchy was the perfect state of the nation. He also foresaw the possibility of several races sharing the same territory and said that in these cases the only way to shape a single nationality would be for the different strains to mix and form just one. (4) Does this sound familiar? The displeasure that Molina caused the "pure" positivists was not really surprising. They were horrified when they saw that he was about to invade their chaste...
In spite of everything, Mancini served merely as a starting point for Molina. He was his catalyst and provided the justification he needed for his mestizophilia, and he did not hark back to him for the rest of his work. He used another source for his historical interpretation and the influence it had on him grew towards the last decade of his life. This influence was the theory of race struggle. Although he only quoted this theory on one occasion to prove his idea that history is the result of the acts of great figures, it is likely that it was Ludwig Gumplowicz who was responsible for influencing Molina in this respect, although Molina never admitted it in so many words. (1) Gumplowicz was a Polish sociologist who reduced social Darwinism to the ethnic plane. He affirmed that the inevitable struggle between different races would be transformed into a struggle between different classes and parties over time. He was an observer of events in Europe and believed in polygenesis. He claimed that all societies started out with racial heterogeneity and became united as they became more developed. (2) The main essence of Gumplowicz's theory can be summed up as follows:

The struggle of the different races to dominate and wield power in all its forms, either violent or latent, is the driving force of history. (3)

These words could easily have been written by Molina. However, as Molina was probably only familiar with parts of Gumpelwicz’s work indirectly, or maybe disagreed with his historical arguments and polygenetic stance, he did not use Gumpelwicz to defend himself against the purists. What is clear, nonetheless, is that Molina adopted the idea of racial conflict as the driving force behind history and used it as his cornerstone.

The influence of Gumpelwicz or any other of his contemporaries on Molina is more significant than it may appear to be at first sight as it provided the roots of the controversy surrounding Molina’s Marxist tendencies. Some people even found the subject worthy of unnecessary deep discussion. (1) None of the authors of the preface to Los grandes problemas nacionales skirted round the matter: Chávez Orozco said that if we were to change the term “race” for “class” there was no doubt of Marx’s influence in the book, while Hiriart said that he felt the concept of class went back to earlier times than Marxism. Neither of them, however, grasped that the real source of Molina’s historical analysis was, as Córdova said, to be found in the theory of race struggle. (2) As it would be simplistic to call Molina

(1) See James, L. Hamon and Stephen R. Niblo, Procesores de la Revolución agraria de México: las obras de Wistana Luis Orozco y Andrés Molina Enriquez (SEP, Mexico, 1975), pp. 110-119.

a "typical nineteenth century liberal," (1) there is no doubt that he was a long way from being a Marxist either wittingly or unwittingly. Although it is likely that Molina became familiar with basic Marxism in his youth, he probably did not study Marx or Lenin seriously until the 1930s when he quoted from them and showed evidence of having studied them in his book La revolución agraria. In this book he changed his use of terminology. (2) In it, he noted that the doctrines of Marx and Engels were read in French in Mexico during the porfirist regime and that there had even been some "positivist communists." He alleged to have been influenced by socialists but, different to his earlier works, La revolución agraria contains comments that back this up, such as his complaint that "the Mestizos win power with revolutions and the Creoles always want to take it away from them with elections." Nonetheless his handling of the concepts of infra- and superstructure, and his appraisal of Marx, who he accused of ignoring the ethnic question, did not provide any indications of having stemmed from scientific socialism, which he continued to reject with the same vehemence as in his earlier works. (3) The very first of his works, which called for the eradication of inheritance, contained nothing to show that his ideas were the product of

---


(2) This decade also saw the consolidation of the Soviet regime, the emergence of the New Deal, the rise of Cardenism in Mexico, and the increased popularity of Marx's and Lenin's theories.

the proposal made in that vein in the Communist Manifesto.

(1) Despite this, it could be said that the whole of Molina's work contains indirect superficial signs of socialist influence. These signs, however, did not follow the same style as used by the popular unorthodox Henry George and probably came from the theory of the race struggle insofar as the Marxist influence is to be found. (2) In any case it is clear that both theories are mutually exclusive and Molina never strayed away from the limits of his field—he had his own special homo ethnicus to offset the homo economicus. Nevertheless the problem was really rather more complex and stemmed from Molina's theory of mestizophilia, or more precisely from his homo ethnicus with whose help he intended to create a race of Mestizos to provide the basis for the development of a new Mexican society. However, as this race was a hybrid, a few scientists of that time insulted the Mestizos saying that they were sterile. Because of this they questioned how the -----------

(1) In La revolución agraria, vol. IV, p. 33, Molina confessed that the theory of El evangelio de una nueva reforma did not come from the strategy proposed by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in The Communist Manifesto, as may have been inferred but was inspired by the "German philosopher" (sic.) Nordau. This affirmation can be corroborated by consulting the Austro-Hungarian Max Nordau’s Spencerian argument against inheritance in Conventional Lies of Our Civilization (William Heinemann, London, 1895), pp. 244-255. (This work also influenced Ricardo Flores Magon; see Ibarrea, op. cit., p. 49).

responsibility for the formation of a fatherland could be placed in the hands of such a race, which would have to multiply its numbers before all else. Fortunately the Mexican Mestizos' rapid multiplication did not take long to dispel this slanderous opinion. And if there was any doubt left, Darwin, who had approved of hybridism, could always be consulted. (1) If his opinion were not enough, hybridism had also been supported by Ernest Haekel, a German proponent of Darwin, from whom Molina took his anthropological bases such as the carbon theory and the "driving force theory." (2) Haekel, who claimed there was continuity between Lamarck’s theory of inherited characteristics and Darwin’s theory of selection, made it clear that fertility was transmitted in hybridism and that hybridism was also the source of new species, unlike selection. Molina, nonetheless, lost more than he gained on that point — although Haekel supported race mixture he had a terrible impression of non-Caucasian races, which, of course, included the Mexican Indians and their Mestizo descendents. (3) This began to give shape to one of Molina’s inevitable contradictions. The fact that Molina had been inspired by a forerunner of German racism largely explains his dilemma as

he had placed all his hopes in a being that even he at times had to consider as being a member of an "inferior race." (1)

The fact that the Mestizo was capable of reproduction and could form a new race, however, meant that he was a long way from being "scientifically" condemned to inferiority. In fact, Spencer, who had also doubted the hybrid's fertility, categorically stated that societies composed of mixed races were destined to anarchy because of their inadequate organization. He took none other than the mythical Mexican Mestizo as an example of this and said:

The half-caste, inheriting from one line of ancestry proclivities adapted to one set of institutions, and from the other line of ancestry proclivities adapted to another set of institutions, is not fitted for either. He is a unit whose nature has not been moulded by any social type, and therefore cannot, with others like himself, evolve any social type. Modern Mexico and the South American Republics, with their perpetual revolutions, show us the result. (2)

It would be difficult to imagine an intellectual drama of greater intensity than that which faced Molina Enríquez as Spencer mercilessly destroyed the bases of a theory that had been mounted on him. It is ironic that Molina's doctrinal champion turned out to be his worst enemy. However there is no need to exaggerate Molina's dilemma. Although it is true that he was not the only mestizophile to face these problems (3) perhaps nobody had analysed mestizophilia as deeply or

--------

(1) See Molina, _LBN_, p. 110.
(3) All the positivist mestizophiles had the same problem, and not only in Mexico. Hale says that the intellectual self-denigration in Latin America reached its height during the positivist era thanks to the adoption of discriminatory doctrines. See Charles Hale, "Political and Social Ideas in Latin America, 1870-1930", in _The Cambridge History of Latin America_ (Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge, 1986), vol. V, p. 400.
suffered as much as he had. His problem was obviously structural: he had to base his claims in favour of a coloured race on theories designed to legitimize the imperialism of a white race. Obviously Spencer's contempt for miscegenation was not directed at the Europeans or the North Americans, who he said were the product of a happy mixture of different Caucasian groups, but at the people who came from a mixture of "very different" races. (See what he had to say on the subject of the contamination of Spanish blood by Indian blood.) (1) In his scale of evolution, the Mayan and Aztec Indians were very fortunate to have received the title of "advanced savages" in relation to the other American races, and he considered them to be on a par with the Ancient Egyptians. How could it be possible that a hybrid society, formed from these "uncivilized tribes who had to be permanently subjected to "compulsive cooperation" to prevent chaos, could be capable of evolving enough to enter the industrial age? (2) This contempt, of course, was not exclusive to Spencer. The Belgian "anthropologeologist" Elie Roclus summed up the opinion held by other nineteenth century western evolutionists of the American natives in his book, which greatly influenced Molina. His frank, eloquent summary reads as follows:

(1) This is the same idea used by Le Bon that bothered Justo Sierra so much. It consisted of saying that the mixture of very different races only provoked degeneration. See Gustave Le Bon, Les lois psychologiques de l'évolution des peuples (Ancienne Librairie Germer Bailliére et Cie., Paris, 1894), pp. 45-52. See Spencer, "The Principles of Sociology, cit. pp. 574-578.
If there had only been a single path of evolution for all the different races in the world, they could have been compared with each other and classified as either primitive or civilized, exploitable or civilizing (guess which races were destined to be colonized and which were the chosen races to lead them to their salvation, according to this eurocentristic view...) This line of reasoning is almost complete in itself. One step more and it could have been described as racist.

It is worth reminding the reader, however, that racism was only fostered during the nineteenth century as its roots go back further. In this sense it was perhaps desirable to fall a step short. This period left a legacy of an essentially static non-evolutionist conception of race, whose most famous representative was Cuvier. The main tool at that time was comparative anatomy, which is a strictly racist attitude which prevailed during the first half of the century and reached its height in the 1860s. (2) It was at this time that the terms "anthropology" and "racial determinism" became almost synonymous when the Count of Gobineau published his famous essay, which became one of the leading works on

---


racism. (1) However, from then on, the eighteenth century theory of environmental determinism on which Buffon and others had based themselves, began to gain strength and gradually won the the previous school of racist thought round to the idea that races are far from being immutable and are the product of the environment. For obvious reasons, Spencer and Molina adhered to this tendency. Both were aware that evolutionism could not work if the races were considered to be immutable.

Nonetheless, the fact that races were susceptible to changes produced by the effects of the environment did not cancel out the possibility of labelling races as being either superior or inferior, even if just for short periods of time. For Herbert Spencer, the characteristics of each race became organic over the different generations through genetics. (2) Given this, the racist label is not so inappropriate for Spencer, although he may have been affected by a touch of "ethnoenvironmental" determinism. As the environmental factor is a constant for any race, Molina

(1) See Harris, op. cit., pp. 103-105. It is worth pointing out that although Gobineau believed in monogenesis, he felt that once the races had been created by the environment and other factors ethnic differences would become permanent. See M.A. de Gobineau, Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines (Librairie de Firmin Didot Frères, Paris, 1853), vol. I, pp. 197-236.

like Sierra, based himself on the principle of the three elements that Taine said determined man's society -- race, environment and time. (1) Even so his situation was extremely complex: he still relied on a mestizophobe who fervently defended the supremacy of the white races. (2)

Obviously this complexity was not solely related to Spencer. All of the so-called "scientific" group who influenced Molina to some extent or another -- Gumplovicz, Haekel, Roclus, etc. -- opposed Mexican mestizophilia because of their belief that dark skin was unquestionably linked to barbarism. (3) Molina was able to and in fact did try to disprove these theories to provide a basis for his own, but he was definitely in a much weaker doctrinal position than, for example, his Yankee counterparts. While Molina accomplished eclectic feats to adapt these European doctrines to his Mestizo Mexico, in the United States, where racism had already mutilated Mexican territory, social Darwinism fitted in perfectly with the white imperialism of Fiske and Strong, and made a good job of providing a "scientific" explanation for what was called "obvious fate" and Roosevelt's fervour

---

(2) Spencer's attitude to racism and environmental determinism are described in Wilsire, op. cit., pp. 209-213. On the spread of these ideas in Europe, see Harris, op. cit., pp. 84 and ss., and Pierre L. Van den Berghe, Race and Racism (John Wiley & Sons, N.Y., 1967), esp. pp. 11-18.
(3) For more details, see Stocking, op. cit., pp. 131-132.
for expansionism. (1) Although there were thinkers in Europe who did not believe in or who actively opposed racism, Molina seemed to have been determined to disregard anything that had to do with it.

In fact, the range of European ideas in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries also included humanist options, and besides the option of discrimination, the well-known idea of the "noble savage" which portrayed man as pure and unsullied by civilization and therefore theoretically useful as a unit of human measurement was applied to the problem that the existence of the "savage" has always represented for the western mind. (2) Molina knew of these options and he also knew that in the midst of the evolutionists' euphoria and nineteenth century racism the defenders of racial equality were making headway. In France Durkheim was working in this field as was Mill, the positivist, in Great Britain. Renan's classic essay was also published against this backdrop in which he refuted ethnographic criteria and called it obsolete in terms of the definition of a nation. (3) In any case, Molina did not even have to look to these ideas for support.

(1) Social Darwinism also served the anti-imperialistic Yankees who wanted to protect the "purity" of their race. See Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915 (U. of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1945), pp. 146-166.
(3) For more on the racial egalitarians mentioned, see Harris, op. cit., pp. 101 and 464-470. The essay mentioned is of course Ernest Renan's speech given in the Sorbonne entitled Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? (Calmann Levy Editeur, Paris, 1882).
because he had the work of a man who provided him with a better framework than Spencer for his mestizofilia. That man was none other than Auguste Comte. Unlike Spencer, Comte did not "biologize" sociology and thus avoided the temptation to explain progress in terms of the product of conflict on an individual or racial level. He did not speak of "universal brotherhood" and did not predict the transformation of the species in one "individual." However, perhaps Molina's reticence to accept Comte's ideas, or anyone else's for that matter, stemmed from his deep attachment to the idea which with Spencer, who was a follower of Malthus rather than Darwin, brought to fame to social Darwinism. This idea consisted of the belief in the everpresent purifying struggle between individuals and peoples for survival. After all, biology and ethnology for Spencer and Molina were the sciences by another name, and people who did not base

---

(1) Molina's work contains signs of contradiction with respect to the breadth and variety of his reading. Valades, however, suggested that Molina was a "half-educated" man, see Jose C. Valades, *Historia general de la Revolucion Mexicana* (SEP-Gernika, Mexico, 1985), pp. 58 and 162-163. In any case, it is clear that he was able to read in French and to a lesser extent in English in his search for sources.

(2) See Greens, *cit.*, pp. 422-427, and Edward Evans-Pritchard, *A History of Anthropological Thought* (Faber and Faber, London, 1981), pp. 51-52. Although Comte coincides with Spencer on the influence of the environment and not race, his conviction in the basic equality of man is deeper. Given this, it was sufficient for him to study the course run by the European societies towards the positive state to define the model that would benefit all of mankind sooner or later. See Auguste Comte, *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (Bachelier Imprimeur-Librairie, Paris, 1842), vol. VI, pp. 972-973.

(3) On the influence of Malthus, see Burrow, *cit.*, p. 183. It should be noted that Spencer also flirted with the idea of race struggle; see Greene, *cit.*, pp. 437-441.
themselves on science were losing out of the greatest value of the positivist age -- scientific discipline.

Despite the existence of several points of incompatibility, Molina worked things out so as to remain loyal to "science" and laboriously dodged Spencer's attacks on his mestizophilia. On the one hand, there was no other option open to him than to accept that the Mestizos just like "all hybrids reflect the faults and defects of the primitive races." However, he comforted himself in the confidence that social welfare and even education, which he had despised so much, would allow the Mestizos to evolve successfully. On the other hand, he skillfully refuted Spencer's accusation that the Mestizo was inherently politically unstable by arguing that no race is naturally revolutionary and that the Mexicans' violence was a response to social oppression. (1) However, neither this adaptation nor his theory cleared the way completely and there were still several doctrinal stumbling blocks that had to be dealt with. One of these obstacles was identified by Humberto Hiriart who failed to understand why a positivist should say that "religion is the mortar of nationality if that stage has already been superseded." (2) Although Comte outlined three stages of human development, corresponding to the theological stage, the metaphysical stage and the positive stage, Molina's hopes that the aspect of religious unity would be

(1) Molina, LGP., pp. 109 and 420-421.
(2) Hiriart, op. cit., p. 31.
"the most important of all those comprising the ideal." (1) To a certain extent, this was like taking a step backwards as Mexico was at the metaphysical stage, and in the best of cases, to entrust the cohesion of the fatherland to Catholicism implied a continuance of the monotheistic regime in a society that having overcome polytheism would have to fight for "mankind's religion." (2) On this point, of course, Molina could have reasonably argued that he was not using Comte's evolutionary criteria in his analysis. The problem was that all the positivists, including the supporters of Comte, Spencer, etc., agreed that it was not scientific to resort to religion. Although Spencer came to Molina's aid in a rare, fleeting occasion when he contradicted Comte by justifying religiousness as an inborn tendency in man, both philosophers soon joined forces against Molina with their categoric condemnation of conventional religion. Although Spencer refuted Comte's backstepping to channel religion towards a known and finite being such as mankind, he also acknowledged that the "systems of dogmatic theology" hindered the development of social science. (3) In the face of this, Molina -- an "idealized" Catholic to the end? -- (4) chose to ignore the contradiction and as always

(1) Molina, LEPN, p. 400.
(4) As we can see from his work, Molina was greatly influenced by Tolstoy-style Christianity in his youth. This may explain why he allows us to glimpse his own "idealized" version of Catholicism. See Molina, LEPN, p. 402.
did not appear to have been disturbed by it.

However, his calm was deceitful. Molina was becoming gradually more aware of his incongruity which was accentuated after the publication of Los grandes problemas nacionales by his conversion to a strange combination of revolutionary evolutionism. Later on, in the last few years of his life, he discovered the answer to this awkward situation. The change that this implied, which went virtually unnoticed by scholars of his work, (1) was extremely radical and well deserved the "sensational confession" he announced in the final volume of La revolución agraria. In short, his new opinion evolved around the idea that the industrialization process in Europe and elsewhere was merely a manifestation of the western version of human development, and that there was no such thing as advanced or backward societies in the world only "different peoples that live and fight in accordance with their circumstances and their own abilities." (2) Molina did not beat about the bush. Nobody could have asked for greater proof of his break with Spencer and his kind. Although Molina spent forty years preaching the word of Spencer, these had not passed in vain. Molina insisted on refuting Spencer with "bio-organic" analogies which did not contradict his evolutionism (3) and said that the resulting

(1) Perhaps the only person who noticed the change was Abelardo Villegas in his article "Andres Molina Enriquez, un científico del agrarismo" in Ciencia (Mexico, vol. 31, no. 3, Sept. 1990), pp. 134 and 137-138. Villegas, however, did not identify the source of the change.


(3) See op. cit., vol. III, p. 35. As we already know, organic analogies were Spencer's seal.
inertia led him to a contradictory futile attempt at conciliation. This was a complete turn about for him. No matter how much he wished to soften the attack on his former mentor, he had gone straight for his throat. Moreover, in this new phase, the discipline that Molina had previously been admired for became shameful: if his only stigma before had been his conservatism, he now criticized the new Creoles in retrospect for having justified their arrogance in the "Spencerian language of the day" and underhandedly cursed positivism by condescendingly saying it was a Creole doctrine that went very well with the "pretensions of scientific smugness" of the new Creoles. (1) Molina’s dilemma was solved. He no longer had to swim against the current to protect mestizophilia.

However, we must explain where the new Molina found his arguments that would have made Spencer turn in his grave. Fortunately, in contrast to the vague origins of the racial background in his theory, there are no doubts about his new source. Franz Boas, a naturalised American anthropologist, founder of the doctrine of cultural relativity, was largely responsible for influencing Molina. (2) According to Boas' doctrine there was more than one course for man’s evolution. This meant that there was nothing to be gained from comparing different races with each other to decide which were superior or inferior. He also said that racist determinisms were

(2) Some people prefer to call it "historical particularism." See Harris, op. cit., p. 250.
fallacies because he felt racial development was conditioned by history and not by ethnic characteristics. Boas, who opposed the biological apricrism, made a distinction between the concepts of culture and race, and freed cultural inheritance of any genetic charge made against it. He maintained that the environment only had limited effects on culture and rejected Taylor's cultural "absolutism" and Spencer's social Darwinism. (1) However, it was clear that not all these ideas, which Molina probably re-read in Boas' series of lectures published between 1911 and 1912 by the National University of Mexico (2), were used by Molina in his selective schema. In fact, multilinear evolution was the only idea he adopted for his own use. If he had adopted Boas' opinion concerning the irrelevance of race to culture and his contempt for man's ethnic dimension, he would have had to kill off his beloved *homo ethnicus*, which besides being stronger than his positivist convictions, provided an alternative to fill the gap left by Spencer and support the weight of his theory of mestizophilia. This was not possible, however, as the new stage in Molina's thought demanded reversed racism that clamoured for the conservation

---


(2) Franz Boas, *Curso de antropología general* (booklets published by the National University of Mexico, Mexico, 1911-1912). The second of these lectures includes the passage quoted by Molina to back up his environmental determinism (the mention that Boas made of the physical changes undergone by immigrants in the United States): see Molina, *La revolución agraria*, vol. I, p. 53.
of important remains of social Darwinism. Although Molina never became an indigenist in the strictest sense of the word (1), he now delved into indigenism and wanted the Indian and the Indian Mestizo to have the opportunity to take revenge on the Creole. The time was ripe to settle old scores. The race struggle would not come to an end just because the white population was at a disadvantage for the first time.

Unfortunately, Molina's break with Spencer and his colleagues came too late. By then he neither had the time nor the will to reconstruct the theory on the base Boas had provided and decided to leave it intact in the hands of his enemies. In any case, his recapitulation is as praiseworthy as it is radical. Perhaps, as we will see later on, it had something to do with his temperament. What is clear, nonetheless, is that when he finally decided that evolutionism was the least suitable means for developing his mestizophilia, he seemed to feel he had been relieved of a great burden. A long time had passed since he could last write openly about his "temperament" and his "poet's soul" ("and as an artist and poet," he exclaimed in an article written in 1909, "I can say without boasting that I have

(1) Bonfil, op. cit., pp. 228-229. If indigenism is the non-Indian policy, as Aguirre Beltrán y Barre says, with respect to the special treatment the indigenous population has to be given within the national context, then Molina is not an indigenist just because he saw the Indians as merely another group or because he tried to join himself to them in his second stage against other sectors of the population. See Aguirre Beltran, "El postulado de politica indigenista", in Obra escéntica, cit., pp. 24-25, and Marie-Chantal Barre, Ideologías indigenistas y movimientos indios (S. XXI, Mexico, 1985), pp. 19 and 23.
always been mad." (1) Since then his emotions had fed a secret idealism that he could not admit to in the light of science. Nonetheless this came through on occasions when his subconscious betrayed him as it did when he admitted to his preference for "Spanish chivalry" as opposed to Anglo Saxon pragmatism. (2) The relief he felt when he managed to break free of his "scientific" bonds should not come as a surprise because contrary to popular belief there was vigorous romantic blood under Molina's thick positivist skin. His Tolstoy-like spirit, his mythicization of the Mestizo and his feelings of patriotic honour in particular, which led him to rebel against the triumph of the strongest and to shout "if we have to go it had better be soon" from the depths of his soul with poorly disguised resignation, betraying his romantic nature.

If we are always the final losers in everything, we will wander through the centuries like the Jews, without a land or home; but the name of Mexico will always be on our lips and its memory will live on in our souls. (3)

Who but a romantic idealist could have subscribed to Roosevelt's ideology of My country, right or wrong' without any qualms? And who could have put up with being called mad

---

(1) Andres Molina Enríquez, "Como te iba yo diciendo..." in La Democracia (Toluca, 20 March 1909). The article is a kind of love letter in which Molina links colours and feelings (green = hatred, red = ambitions, violet = mysticism, blue = ideals, pink = dreams). For more on his poetic inclinations, see Andres Molina Enríquez, "De rodillas!", in La Gaceta del Gobierno (Toluca, 16 Sept. 1893).

(2) Molina, LGPN, p. 407.

(3) Ibid., pp. 432-433.
for any length of time, as Herbert Spencer said he was. (1) No contradiction can last forever and there are no thinkers that would put up with it.

This marks the end of Molina's intellectual labyrinth. From what we have said so far, the reader can appreciate how wrong it was for someone who personified eclecticism to be judged as an "orthodox social Darwinist." (2) To label a thinker who defies all classifications by arguing purely and simply that he is nothing more than a positivist in general and more specifically a Spencerian is an unacceptable oversimplification. The only adjective that suits Molina is "mestizophile." His mestizophilia is the only point he never waivered on. Like Il Gattopardo, Molina changed to stay just as he was. Everything he did, he did in the name of miscegenation, and he was able to defend himself from charges of doctrinal incongruence by using Machiavelli to argue that the end justifies the means when a nation is being forged. The only thing left to see now was whether the means justified the end.

---


(2) For more on who made this mistake, see Stabb, op. cit., p. 407.
b) The Heart of Molina's motivation.

So what could prompt a Mexican who was so overwhelmingly influenced by theories that unavoidably led to contempt for the Mestizo to choose the Mestizo as the sole symbol of Mexican identity? Molina's case was very different to that of any of his mestizophile predecessors. However, he probably possessed a little of each of them as he was the product of the descending line of the school they all belonged to. Pimentel, Riva Palacio and Sierra were his mentors for the idea that Mexico could not be a real nation while the process of miscegenation was incomplete. Thanks to their influence Molina also decided that stability, originality and modernity had to be the desired results of miscegenation. However, Molina was in a unique position in relation to his predecessors and successors; of all of them, he had the least appropriate means of analysis to defend mestizophilia while it was he who embraced the subject with the most energy and provided the most sophisticated theory. The explanation for why this should have been so was very personal. As Molina lived in a country in which race mixture was an overall phenomenon that was on the increase, he merely responded to what he saw around him. The reason behind his mestizophilia was the fact that as gradually less and less of the population could claim to be of pure Indian or Spanish descent and as the process of miscegenation appeared to be irreversible the most logical conclusion was to promote the Mestizo as the symbol of national identity in ethnicist atmosphere that prevailed. However, this rather cold
conclusion was converted in passionate partisanship when the
correlation between race and class made Molina blame racial
differences for the social injustices that were committed.
Molina had witnessed the effects of this wicked correlation
at first hand in porfirist society during his notarial and
legal career and saw that the situation was worst in the
rural areas. This apartheid alienated Mexico's coloured
majority from having a say in the ethnic problem and ended up
enraging them.

Up to this point, the problem was simple, but it began to
get more complicated when we see that Molina's irritation did
not prevent him from viewing the social situation in Mexico
from the perspective of social Darwinism which naturally
inclined his opinion in favour of the Creoles. This provided
the beginnings of his dilemma and we do not have to dig very
deep to discover that another more profound motive was
involved: the bloody conflict between his logos and his
ethos. Although it may seem rather simplistic, why did the
race struggle that Molina was so obsessed with break out
inside him, tearing him between his rational preference for
the Creole and his sentimental preference for the Indian, or,
in other words, between his Spencerian education and his
desire to see justice done? His contradictions, however,
were merely the result of the argument in which positivist
reasoning gradually lost ground to what Molina's own grandson
described as "a highly reactive ethos" (1) and which Pastor

Rousaix rather severely attributed to Molina's "personal temperament", which:

means his thoughts and acts are dictated by the prejudices, likings or dislikes rooted within him. This means his ideas, which are always subordinate to his feelings, are developed by making facts and events fit in to support them. (1)

Although "the facts" at first refused to support some of the feelings he felt for the Indian, they later imposed themselves. (2) This explains why his mestizophilia, which never was anything else, started off inclined towards the Creole and ended up in passionate defence of the Indian.

This last point is worthy of more attention, and we could ask what it was that made Molina succumb to such passion. To understand it we must probe the depths of Molina's mind. Molina's problem was his need for affiliation and his search for personal identity, which was inextricably mixed up with his overwhelming quest for national identity.

As long as the logos and ethos were at odds within him he could not avoid the powerful existential impulse that constantly compelled him to take sides in a reflection of his idealized view of Mexico. Although he felt more Creole than Indian in his early booklets, time inclined his emotions ________


(2) As an eloquent example of his early weakness for the Indian, see the fiery challenge he made to the governments of independent Mexico on account of their discrimination. See Molina, *LGPN*, pp. 206-207. His final inclination towards the Indian is contained in his memorandum to the National Museum (28 Nov. 1938) in which he proposed "that the Indian should be considered as the dominant aspect of our nationality over the Spanish"; AAME.
towards the weaker side. Five years before his death, he wrote:

Although my health and heavy beard have given my face, which looks half-Arab and half-Jewish, a Spanish look to it, in my heart of hearts I feel I am a pure-blooded Indian because of the mixing of my ancestors from Aragón and Andalucía with Indians. (My maternal grandmother was a pure-blooded Otomi Indian). I am an Indian at heart and Indian because of my culture; I am just another of the many Otomi Indians that hail from the place I was born in (Jilotepec, State of Mexico.)

His physical appearance and ancestry in any case are irrelevant; with or without his Otomi grandmother, in his own mind's eye his skin had taken on a darker hue to blend in with the majority of the Mexican people. (2) But why did it take so long for his Indian Mestizo view of himself to surface? The answer to this lies in the simple reason that the image of a bronzed Mexico could not be used by him without making one of his famous doctrinal changes and this took place in three stages: 1) with evolutionist ideas firmly in his head, Molina felt obliged to class the Indians as inferior in keeping with the leading scientific authorities of the time; 2) compassion made him creative and because he could not come right out in favour of the indigenous culture, he stuck to the dubious hypothesis

(1) Molina, preface to La guerra del Pacífico, p. 5.

(2) The photographs and testimonies coincide with the Creole self-portrait he mentions; if he had been dressed accordingly Molina could have passed unnoticed in Spain. The testimonies were obtained from interviews carried out in Mexico City with his grandsons Alvaro Molina Enríquez (19 Dec. 1986) and Luis Molina Enríquez (14 April 1988) and with two other people who knew him personally, Blanca Basave (20 Dec. 1986) and Antonio Huitrón (29 Jan. 1987).
concerning the dark-skinned peoples' superior form of
"individual selection; J) as this weak pretext was
insufficient to back his growing emotional charge, which may
have been incited by the memory of former Spanish offences,
he finally decided to set the doctrinal obstacles aside that
prevented him from fully acknowledging and calculating the
worth of the Indians. In other words, he had to renounce
either his defence of the Indians or evolutionism if his
passion was to be brought into line with his reasoning, and
the chain broke at the weakest link. Boas appeared just at
the right moment to ease Molina's change of colour.

Besides resolving the problem of contradiction that
Molina had faced, Boas' amendment also at last allowed him
to reassess the value of the indigenous culture in relation
to the Spanish culture. However, in Molina's hands the
harmonizing spirit of cultural relativity acquired a hint of
revenge. In his final work, Molina showed that his
admiration for the "beautiful Spanish language" was a thing
of the past and proposed calling the language spoken in
Mexico "the national language." Moreover, he showed interest
in pre-Hispanic script for the first time and stopped
referring to the "great Spanish legal instinct" and the right
of reversion (1) speaking instead of the "plunder of the
conquest and the Indian influence in colonial architecture.

---------------

(1) Note that in 1929 Molina was still basing himself
legally on the power to revert the concessions the
Spanish crown had in New Spain. Andrés Molina Enríquez,
Condición jurídica del Hospital de Jesús (document
addressed to the president of the republic, Mexico, Oct.
(2) 1929); AAME.
In this sense, the best examples of this contrast can be seen by the difference in Los grandes problemas nacionales and La revolución agraria. In Los grandes problemas nacionales he based his defence of the Indian exclusively on the strong points of the Indians' physical constitution, as Riva Palacio had done, while in La Revolución agraria he gave the cultural aspect consideration after totally ignoring it in his other book. Likewise, he now said that the encounter between the two cultures had given way to the predominance of the Indian culture. This change announced the next great turn that would take place in the history of mestizophilia. (1) However, just as had happened with his departure from unilineal evolutionism, Molina's new cultural mestizophilia came too late. The delay and Molina's reminiscences which made it difficult for him to adapt to the new doctrine show that he was reluctant to appreciate the indigenous culture at times in its own context, making fall back on the oriental links with the native peoples of America. (2) In any case, however, it was finally the cultural factor that tilted the balance in favour of the Indian.

Despite the relevance of these extremes we should not lose sight of the principal role played by the Mestizo in our analysis of the Indian-Creole conflict that was being waged in Molina's mind. The Mestizo was a constant and acted as a conciliator between his antagonistic progenitors. The

---

(2) Molina was always an admirer of the eastern world. See María del Carmen Reyes, op. cit., p. 31.
Mestizo was also the image that never ceased to haunt Molina. The Mestizo was the wise dialectical solution to the conflict. From start to finish, Molina discovered two very different Mexicos that were antithetically attracted to each other. One was the sad Mexico of the Indian and the other was the triumphant Mexico of the Creole. Nonetheless, since the Indian Mexico was weak and the Creole Mexico was cruel and stateless, Molina began to envisage a third. This vision was the ideal Mexico and belonged to the Mestizos. In a very broad concept, the process of miscegenation ceased to be the vehicle imagined by Pimentel to "creolize" the Indians and provided the means to "indianize" the Creoles as El Reformador had hoped to do during its second stage without distorting the Mestizo. (1) Unlike Riva Palacio's view in which the Mestizo fell directly between the Indians and the Creoles, Molina's Mestizo did not acquire a personality of his own and finally appeared as an Indian that had undergone a few changes. Right from the first signs of friction in La Reforma y Juárez up to the aggravation of the racial strife in the writings of the thirties, the Mestizos shone out as partial mediators who were attacked together with the Indians by the Creoles and who only began to recover at the end. The reader should not find it strange that Molina's

(1) Although his concept of the good Mestizo varied, Molina never ceased to consider himself as "the most faithful representative of the Mestizos" in Mexico, as he said in 1928. (At that time he thought and felt "with the Latin heart and soul of the Spanish graft." See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Los Estados Unidos, el artículo 27 y la guerra mundial del Pacífico", In Excelsior (Mexico, 16 Jan. 1923).
work is a battlefield in more than one sense in which the side that seemed to have won was really the loser. After reading the string of abuse that the author used to describe his hybrid in his fruitless desire to defend him, we can almost hear the Mestizo ask for mercy.

In passing, we should add that Molina’s personal reasons for mestizophilia were as unusual as his theory. However, because of this and to provide a better perspective it is important to bear in mind that fascination with psychological subjectiveness meant Molina and the other Mexican mestizophiles were less objective in dealing with the subject that was their chief concern. Although comparisons may be hateful, at times they are very necessary. The Argentinian, José Ingenieros (1877-1925), who was also a sociologist and defender of social justice, arrived at a conclusion that was totally opposed to Molina’s even though they started out using the same bases — the ideas of Darwin, Spencer, Gumplovicz, etc. In a book published a year after Los grandes problemas nacionales, Ingenieros said that Argentina’s greatness was based on the fact that it was a white country which had been “rid or almost rid of inferior races.” (1) With an ease that any Spencerian mestizophile would have envied, Ingenieros took the doctrines that Molina had had to twist to suit his purposes through to their

(1) José Ingenieros, La evolución sociológica argentina (Libereria J. Menéndez, Buenos Aires, 1910), p. 102 (Also see pp. 21-52 and 85-105). For more on Ingenieros’ ideas, see Ricaurte Soler, El positivismo argentino (Imprenta Nacional, Panama, 1959), pp. 97-144.
natural consequences. Referring to Brazil, he said that "in a country in which most people are either black or Mestizo, there can be no hope of achieving hegemony over countries in which blacks are regarded with curiosity" and in which there are "only scanty remains" of the Indian populations. However, the Brazilian journalist and writer, Euclides da Cunha (1866-1909), thought very differently. Da Cunha was another of Molina's contemporaries and shared his doctrinal views although he had never been in contact with Molina.(1) Three years before the publication of La Reforma y Juárez Da Cunha reached the conclusion that in countries with as marked racial differences as Mexico and Brazil, the Mestizo was the nucleus of nationality. (He said that in a book that is considered to be the "Bible of the Brazilian nation.") Unlike Molina, however, and given Brazil's greater ethnic heterogeneity, da Cunha was in a position to choose between several types of Mestizo and thus minimized his violation of the anti-hybrid principles by accepting that mixture was generally harmful as the blacks living in the coastal areas had shown. Nevertheless, he added that the Indo-European sertanejo was an exception to this. (2)

There is no need to explain that this comparative

(1) During positivism's heyday in Latin America there was no contact between positivists in Mexico, Brazil and Argentina. See Arturo Ardao, "Assimilation and Transformation of Positivism in Latin America", in Journal of the History of Ideas (vol. XXIV, no. 4, Oct.-Dec. 1963), p. 516.

analysis did not set out to induce the fallacy that to be a mestizophile it was enough to live in a racially-mixed country. Racism is obviously not exclusive to societies with greater ethnic uniformity just as such societies are not mestizophobic. To illustrate this there is no need to look any further than Mexico. However, so as not to give a one-sided version of racial thinking in Latin America, here are two examples -- first, in 1909, in Bolivia, which was racially mixed, the first edition of a famous book written by Alcides Arguedas was published. In it Arguedas said that miscegenation was the only factor that explained the reason for Bolivia's backwardness. Secondly, in Chile, where the influx of white immigrants diluted the scanty number of Indians in the north of the country, Nicolás Palacios defended the "Araucanian-Gothic" Mestizo in 1904 saying he was the typical representative of the Chilean people. (1) We are not trying, however, to generalise in one sense and what we want to suggest is that the probability of a thinker studying miscegenation is directly related to the degree of difference existing between the different racial strains and to the degree of development of the process of miscegenation in his society. To explain this, using Perogrullo's accuracy, there is an extremely good recipe for making mestizophiles, using two ingredients: subjective hope for total ethnic

uniformity and the objective existence of invincible racial heterogeneity (which does not yield to segregation and/or genocide.) This recipe is virtually infallible and is potent enough to overcome any form of intellectual adversity when a third ingredient is added to it. This ingredient is the historical, palpable feasibility of fusion. It is safe to say that the fertility of the field of mestizophilia in Latin America stemmed largely from this common denominator which is the only factor that explains the fact that people as different as Brazil’s Gilberto Freyre and Peru’s José de la Riva Aguero agreed when they said that miscegenation was the national essence of their countries. The Brazilian Mestizo came from three sources and was Indo-Negro-European while the Peruvian Mestizo came from the “legitimate cross between Spaniards and Indians.” (1) If that was what happened to people who responded to the process of race mixture relatively late, it makes it more logical to suppose that the same motivation was felt by Andrés Molina Enriquez, the greatest exponent of mestizophilia in a country considered the mainly indigenous region of South America to represent a successful example of miscegenation. (2)

Besides the historical and demographic parallels that


(2) See José María Arguedas, "El complejo cultural en el Perú", in Formación de una cultura nacional indioamericana (S. XXI, Mexico, 1975), esp. pp. 1-3. The greatest progress made by the process of miscegenation in Mexico compared to South America was documented in the first part of this book.
can be drawn between Mexico and Peru, and despite the difference of time that their respective miscegenation processes took, there is one basic similarity between the two -- they both correlated race and class. It is not just a coincidence that the allegations in Peru in favour of social justice also emerged racked with an intense ethnic charge, as we can see from the indigenist claims of González Prada, Mariátegui and Haya de la Torre. (1) Just like Sierra, Molina Enríquez and many other Mexicans, leaving aside their ideological differences for a moment, all had problems in expressing this conceptual binomial which is hard to split in the history of Mestizo America. Nonetheless, with respect to Molina there was the danger that the extrapolation of the priorities that many of his Mestizo American colleagues gave to the socio-economic factor and the impossibility of resisting the temptation to give Molina's thoughts unlimited validity could cause an erroneous interpretation of his work. Scholars, for example, agree that Molina played with concepts of race and class, and this could make us think that he only used the race aspect to mask the social aspect. That was not the case. It is true, however, that if we remove the ethnological structure of his pro-miscegenation theory and add a few other changes, as the Peruvians did, we would have a coherent sociological analysis. Molina was a social fighter and he dedicated a large part of his life -----------

(1) A full description of this and other currents of South American thought mentioned in this analysis is contained in Alberto Zum Felde, Indice crítica de la literatura hispanoamericana (Ed. Guaranía, Mexico, 1954), vol. I esp. pp. 241-360.
and intelligence to the eradication of brutal injustice in Mexican society. It is logical therefore that his writings contained a critical examination of society. However, to affirm that his digressions used racial terminology to explain phenomena with extra-racial origins is going too far. What cannot be separated is not necessarily indistinguishable and the boundaries of Molina's theory were well-defined in this respect.

Molina did not propose a classless society. What he wanted was a nation without castes. The fact that class differences existed was the natural result of differences in aptitudes, which is fully justified by social Darwinism; however, the arbitrary evil socio-economic predestination of the Indian and the Mestizos roused his temperament. To a certain extent, Molina was more anxious to see racial justice done than social justice. His efforts were directed against the inequality of opportunities and he aimed to convert the fatalism of Indian failure into the determinism of Mestizo triumph. Although this liberal stance could be converted from "socioethnological" (this word was coined by Molina) (1) language to strictly sociological terms, meaning is bound to become distorted in the conversion since the terms used in the race-class context will disappear when the Mestizos have formed a single race and have permeated all levels of society. There is no doubt that Molina wanted to see a fair society structured with more balance. However, this would be a by-product of the emergence of an omnimestizo nation along

(1) Molina, LGPN, p. 322.
with other desirable results such as cohesion and patriotism. Efforts would have to concentrate on the planning of ethnic homogeneity because class differences were only tolerable when they were not combined with racial differences, and not vice versa. Molina made this very clear:

If the national population were homogenous and if the people belonging to the group that administers justice and those who have to suffer the wrongs of that justice because of wild outrages, were all from the same race, the wrong done would not be so serious because all the elements of the same race would feel they belonged to the same family, which shows sympathy for its other members. Although these feelings may deviate they are persistent, and the members of this family feel sympathy towards each other. However, in our country, where differences of race provoke fierce antagonism, there is a marked ill will felt by the Creoles towards the Mestizos and the Indians, and by the Mestizos and the Indians towards the Creoles. And as the Creoles, who are better educated, shape the atmosphere in which our governments work, as soon as a government is established the Creoles form a higher group to dispense justice. This group uses justice as a terrible scourge against the Indians and Mestizos. (1)

Although this allows us to deduce that racial strife is not the only cause of the existence of social classes -- each individual's struggle for survival also counts -- the above combined with Molina's repeated reference to "impulses of the blood" leads us to suppose that while a country is ethnically heterogeneous, racial instinct irrationally shapes the main factor of the nation which is adopted by the socio-economic structure and determines ideology. (2)

(1) Andrés Molina Enríquez, "El programa de paz y justicia", in El Imparcial (Mexico, 28 June 1913).
(2) Also see the articles (quoted) by Molina, "Lo que significa el revismo", "La fórmula de solución momentánea del conflicto político actual" and "La finalidad del gobierno del Sr. Gral. Huerta."
Even so the matter was not as simple as it appeared to be. In Molina's theory his explanations of causes, which were always vague, were numerous and intertwined. To start off with, we could say that the desired objective of the culmination of the miscegenation process was not so much an end in itself; what Molina sought was obviously not some form of aesthetic ethnic uniformity but the creation of a modern, developed nation based on the "ethnic energy" released by the fusion of the races. (1) In that sense, he proposed his plan for agrarian reform, inspired by a project to "germanize" Polish Prussia which proved counterproductive for Bismark, (2) as a means to achieve the "mestization" of the Creole, which in turn was another means to obtain political stability. In the long-term this would provide the setting for the creation of his dream-land. (3) However, from reading Molina's theory it is clear that he was obsessed with the race factor, or the "Aztec club" which Luis Cabrera so shrewdly distinguished in the agrarian dispute they were both involved in. This was also a sign of the corroboration of his ethnicist obsession by the man who knew him best. (4)

---

(1) On the idea of "ethnic energy" as the force behind social change, see Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Cuadro-programa de las necesidades y aspiraciones del país y del modo de satisfacer unas y otras", in México nuevo (Mexico, 21 Sept. 1909).
(3) See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "El aspecto jurídico del problema agrario", in El Independiente (Mexico, 9 Sept. 1913).
(4) See Luis Cabrera, "Tu Quoque, Brutus", in Otras completas, cit., vol. IV, pp. 160-166.
it was impossible for Molina to take facial measurements or calculate the amount of pigment in the skin of famous figures in history, he sometimes used cultural criteria to make his ethnic distinctions. However, his main source for making such distinctions was physical appearance and this explains his intense curiosity about Morelos' portrait and the reason why he included photographs of heroes in the first edition of *La revolución agraria*.

Nonetheless, from any point of view, the race question occupied a permanent position in Molina's thought, and, with the exception of a few insignificant lapsus, his comments on race were consistently in keeping with his anthropological definition of the term and with the close link he drew between race and the fatherland. Despite his admittance that the "fatherland and race can almost be confused with each other", he had a clear idea of what race was:

> By the same process of evolution that a family grows and becomes a fatherland, it forms a race; in that process the race is the material result and the fatherland is what we could call the moral result. (1)

For Molina, the fatherland cannot exist without race because racial unification produces community cohesion -- the altar -- which together with the territory -- the home -- forms the fatherland. What was not defined here is what the fatherland is, not what race is. Molina's mestizohilia can be confused with many things but his quintessential ethnic variable cannot.

---

(1) Molina, *LGPN*, p. 370. Here Molina endorsed his concept of race as the "grouping of human units with identical morphological characters which are derived from their equality and the continuity of the general conditions of life."
Where Molina gets into problems is with his racial generalization. He decreed that:

all the Indians are passive, insensitive and sullen; all the Mestizos are full of energy, perseverance and are serious; all the Creoles are bold, impetuous and frivolous. (1)

Although Molina acknowledged that it was difficult to distinguish races that have been mixed and that it is futile to separate groups which in any case form a single group, he dared to hazard a racial census that his political enemy Olaguibel had no difficulty in refuting. (2) Unhappy with this situation, he devoted several pages to his ethnic character types and went into subtle detail. He finally arrived at a geographical classification of the Mestizo as "insolent" in the north, "arrogant" and "boastful" on the coast, and "cunning" in the grain zone. There are several weak points in his classification which range from calling the Creoles, who were of French origin, "blond northerners" to sweeping statements such as saying that "if our Indians are generally ugly it is because they live in wretched conditions. (3) Behind these strange confusions, of course, lies his unfortunate insistence on exalting the Mestizos using a doctrine that denigrated them. Only in the light of his obstinancy can we understand that although he believed that only the Mestizo's "will power" was superior to that of the Creole as the Creole had "greater perception.

(1) Molina, LGRN, p. 418.
(2) Ibid., pp. 344, 358-359 and 427. Francisco Olaguibel's criticism is contained in La reelección (Mexico, 2 Oct. 1909).
(3) Ibid., pp. 419, 112 and 405.
better comprehension, greater strength of intellect, greater
powers of expression and are more competent", Molina claimed
that to entrust the future of the nation to someone who was
not Mestizo was "little short of treason." (1)

The manifestations of this contradiction, of course, have
t heir history. In his desperate quest for Mestizo virtues,
Molina, with Riva Palacio's help, became convinced that the
only evolutionist glimmer of hope for the supremacy of his
hybrid, which he always saw as a modified form of Indian, lay
in the "resilience" of his ancestral race. For mysterious
reasons, he attributed the "strong, burning, resolute love of
the fatherland" felt by the Mestizo to their Indian
background (2) and he clung obstinately to both ideas. Thus,
armed with strength and patriotism, the Mestizo received
Molina's blessing to confront the Creole, whose refined
European character -- we must not forget that Molina lived
during the porfirist age -- meant that he was weak and
stateless. However, other arms such as intelligence, culture
and even beauty unexpectedly came into the fray making the
battle unfair. At this point the Creole came over as an evil
turncoat who was ready to make a victim out of the patritic
but insignificant Mestizo. Despite his imminent defeat,
Molina decided to defend the Mestizo through to the bitter
end, filling the scene with contradictions.

However, the mestizophile spirit does not give in easily
and in his determination to save the Mestizo, Molina looked

---

(1) Ibid., pp. 416 and 395.
(2) Ibid., p. 419 and 393.
to prominent figures in history. Although he refused to see history as the end product of the acts of great men, at times he succumbed to weakness and was tempted by a Carlyle-style "heroic epic" (1) and towards the end of his days he even went as far as to dream of a kind of superman along the lines of Nietzsche. (2). This trend of Molina’s was manifested in his ulterior concept of the "real university", which he romantically imagined as a place:

where worthy professors who are totally devoted to study and meditation plot the future of our national destiny just as the priests and sorcerers of times long since past plotted the paths of the stars from atop their towers while furious attacks broke out underneath them as a result of the frantic unrest of the masses. (3)

Perhaps Molina had this idea in mind as he tried to plot the sublime destiny of the Mestizos from the top of his ethnographical tower and shaped his interpretation of Mexico’s history for that purpose. Molina was always loyal to the theory of race struggle and he vindicated the beaten Mestizo by assigning him a liberal role while leaving the conservative role to his Creole rival; as always, the Indian’s role was passive and his nature made him more inclined to support his liberal brother. If the Mestizo had been put down by sociology, then history would come to his rescue.

This casuistic analysis is conclusive. Morelos, Guerrero, Gómez Farías, Ocampo, Degollado, González, Ortega,

(1) This is how his grandson describes the atmosphere that Molina gives to history. See Alvaro Molina Enríquez, op. cit., p. 17.
(2) See Molina, Juárez, pp. 24-25, and "Desde muy alto", in El Reformador (Mexico, 2 April 1937).
Escobedo, Corona, Riva Palacio, Díaz and "many others who lacked little to achieve the heights of history achieved by these others" ranked among the Mestizo greats. The traitors to the nation were, of course, the Creoles. Molina made an ex cathedra ethnic evaluation and went as far as to fall back on prosody when he had to, as in the case of Porfirio Díaz, whose Mestizo background he reaffirmed by referring to the way he pronounced some words. (1) In general, however, he seemed to have been satisfied with the heroes' portraits and his unusual gift to be able to calculate the composition of people's blood. He flaunted this talent with his claim that Zapata had "fifteen per cent black blood" in his veins. (2)

To protect himself from scathing criticism from Esteva Ruiz, who would point out that there have been both good and bad men in Mexico's history belonging to all three racial groups (3), Molina took precautions to defend his generalizations—he converted Juárez, an Indian, into a de facto Mestizo and, as he was unable to do the same with the Creole Lerdo de Tejada, he accused him of having betrayed the liberal cause. (4)

Over time, when his radical nature pushed him towards the Indian Mestizos, he unabashedly exonerated Zavala, the "miscegenator", for his "denationalization" and formally

(1) Molina, LGPN, pp. 423 and 133.
(3) See R.A. Esteva Ruiz, "El progreso del retroceso: el programa étnico de la unificación de origen", in La Reelección (Mexico, 2 Oct. 1909).
(4) Molina, Juárez, pp. 116 and 152.
commended the Indian Victoriano Huerta. (1) These adjustments allowed Molina to confirm his racial stereotypes. (The only exception to the rule was his praise for Limantour, a Creole.) (2)

Molina's methodology was extremely meticulous for assessing these characters and he made it so versatile that not even Calero, a Creole, was safe, after Molina adjusted some of his turns of phrase substituting strange words such as "Jacobin" for "Mestizo. (3) Molina also devised a subdivision for the Creoles so that the presence of unmistakable Caucasians in the liberal ranks would not spoil his conclusions. Thus, the fact that Comonfort and the Lerdos were prominent characters who had participated in the reform is explained by the necessary but provisional alliances that the Mestizos made with the new Creoles and the moderate Creole lords, and not with the Creoles as such. These Creole factions were stronger than the Creole clergy and conservative Creole lords. However, as this classification was not flexible enough for his liking, Molina ended up creating a less sophisticated but more practical form of classification -- he divided the Mestizos into "Indian Mestizos", which covered the good Mestizos, and "Creole Mestizos", which he used for bad Mestizos. This


(3) See *op. cit.*, pp. 385-390.
added the final touch to his constant ethnic digressions with respect to Mexico's famous historical characters. Nonetheless, we are left with the suspicion that Molina left out the most important "scientific note" of all his work on this subject. When all is said and done, neither the grain zone nor individual selection explained what form of chromosomal influence motivated man to become involved in a bitter race struggle which above all else would determine his life.

None of this, however, prevented Molina from crowning his nationalist theory with his dissertation on the fatherland. In this dissertation he included an inevitable "note". Molina used a strange combination of the theories of Haekel, Spencer, Schopenhauer and Sieyes mixed with Roman Law and the Lord's Prayer, without hiding his Hobbesian view of man's nature and his patriarchal notion of the sexes, to explain in plain terms that the fatherland is an extension of the family. (1) What he never clearly explained was whether he really felt that the constitution of the fatherland is a forecast derived from a historical determinism or is a purpose deriving from the desire for justice. Likewise, it is difficult to distinguish the causes of the effects, especially in the case of the unification of the ideal, for which ethnic homogeneity sometimes appeared to be conditioned by the presence of the factors for cohesion that it generates. Likewise, after repeating time and time again

(1) Ibid., pp. 359-370.
that race implies nationality and then confirming this with his assertion that the advent of a race involves the emergence of patriotic feeling, he twisted everything round and said "these feelings may disappear, the fatherland may disappear while the physical characteristics will persist."

(1) There is also another source of confusion in his version of formative process of the fatherland, which concerns the bipolarity of the altar and the home. The ideal would in effect stem from the distribution of land, which Cordova said was the final stage of the only great national problem. (2)

In his last contribution to his already considerable conceptual confusion, Molina forgot to connect the final chapter to the preceding ones in Los grandes problemas nacionales. He obviously wrote this chapter apart from the others, leaving the connection of concepts as important as "nationality" and "fatherland" up to the reader's discretion.

These are the limitations of Molina's theory on mestizophilia. His theory expressed his coherent clear desire in a contradictory, vague justification. He was torn between the ends and the means and only managed to partially solve the problem too late. He never got over his confusing racial obsession. This prevented him escaping from the two worlds he found himself in to discover his Garden of Eden. He left his readers to judge just how desirable the Mestizo paradise would have been, or at least how to prevent a return

(1) Ibid., p. 371.
(2) See Cordova, op. cit., p. 25.
to racial heterogeneity. As he had done with many other matters, he left his readers to fill in the blanks.

c) The Germ and Fruit of Molina’s Legacy.

There is little doubt that the value of Molina’s contribution of mestizophilia to Mexico’s history would have been greater had it not been burdened with doctrinal problems. In fact after reading his work it is difficult not to lament that he lived during the positivist era. In any case the fact that Molina, who was so deeply attached to his circumstances, managed to overcome beliefs that had been instilled in him at sixty-odd years of age can be considered as a point in his favour. Likewise, many aspects of his work have been described as outstanding without any need to polish them, and although it is a paradox, the age in which he lived and which caused his intellectual unrest was also the source of several of his most interesting ideas. In fact — and it must be said — Molina Enríquez personified the transition from the porfirist age to the Mexican Revolution better than anybody else. As Córdova writes (1), the fact that Molina was the first person to criticize the porfirist age using the same scientific language as Díaz’s own supporters is the most obvious manifestation of the uncomfortable confusion he felt.

(1) See Arnaldo Córdova, La ideología de la Revolución Mexicana (Era, Mexico, 1984), p. 125.
concerning this metamorphosis. With one foot firmly in porfírist Mexico and the other in revolutionary Mexico, Molina had to be uncomfortable during the widening of the historical gap. However, it was he who decided to make it wider and, despite his difficult position, he stoically confronted the accelerated pace of life at that time. Molina acted as a bridge between the two different ages and we must admire the continuity of his ideas during so many difficult years. This continuity allowed him to come through unscathed and permitted Molina to foretell the emergence of the Revolution and even to predict some of the characteristics of the post-Revolution Mexican political system (1).

His demand for an introspective form of unxenophobic patriotism, which unleashed the race's "inner organic energies", his final rejection of foreign investment (this was the first aspect he hesitated on), (2) and, of course, his proposition that a supreme power could solve the "socioethnological" conflict are all tastes of his foresight concerning the tendency of several post-Revolution governments to promote nationalism as the driving force behind endogenous development. As we have already said, he

---

(1) See Brading "Social Darwinism", cit., p. 71. Molina's prophetic talents were also recognized in an unfortunate disparaging opinion voiced by one of Molina's and the Mexican Revolution's slanderers; see Daniel Cazés, Los revolucionarios (Grijalbo, Mexico, 1973), pp. 34-40.

(2) Molina's preference for endogenous almost isolationist development is clearly expressed in his praise of Japan; his rejection of xenophobia and his belief that it was unpatriotic "to murder a foreigner"; see Molina, LGPN, pp. 424-427. His opposition to foreign investment is described in Andrés Molina Enríquez, "La capitalización interior" in Boletín de la Secretaría de Cooperación (Mexico, vol. I, Sept.-Dec. 1922), pp. 385-386.
also predicted the establishment of a president as the pillar of the Mexican political system. Obviously, it is difficult to specify exactly to what extent Molina's theory of mestizophilia influenced the men who shaped Mexico's new political order but there is no doubt that several ideas bearing Molina's unmistakable hallmark were influential, at least in the setting up of the National Revolutionary Party.

Molina, the prophet, however, brought the full glory of his work to fruition through his contributions to culture. Independent of the crystallization of his form of thought in relation to the state, which is a subject that goes beyond the realms of this thesis, his work prefigured the so-called revolutionary cultural nationalism more than anybody else's. Through his mestizophilia, Molina laid the foundations for the consideration that Mexico ought to cease looking beyond its frontiers for the theoretical framework for the Revolution, which inspired the greatest artistic movement ever seen in this part of the world, and, as Villoro said made a myth of the Mestizo (3) (which in turn made a

\[\text{(1) On the inclusion of phrases such as "strengthen the consciousness of nationality using ethnic and historical factors" in the documents related to the setting up of the P.N.R., or on the recommendation to go into greater depth on the concepts of "race" and "environment", see Luis Javier Garrido, El partido de la Revolución institucionalizada (SEP -S.XXI, Mexico, 1996), pp. 100-115. Molina's influence in the new party is corroborated if we take Molina's proximity to Calles into consideration.}

\[\text{(2) With the exception, as we have just seen, of what could be called political culture.}

\[\text{(3) See Villoro, op. cit., p. 182).} \]
myth out of the Indian). Given this, schools of the stature of the muralists’ school raised the plastic arts to heights that were undreamed of until then, motivated by their desire for originality and attracted by the myth of the Indian Mestizo. In his rejection of Mexico’s cultural independence, Molina made the following prophecy in 1909:

> If our painters painted their own people (...) instead of exotic types (...) they would be more original, would make more progress and would contribute to the consolidation of our beautiful features in general. (1)

His struggle adopted an unusually strong tone and displayed opposition to any form of cultural invasion:

> There are fools who although they are Mexicans pretend not to speak their own language and prefer to use some other language that they only half-picked up abroad. The Creoles in this capital city leave the theatres where our own culture flourishes and excel to the Mestizos and fill others in which second-rate foreign companies present shows in Italian, French or English. (2)

These words were the first indications of the development of a “culture of our own.” Even though it is not clear at this point exactly what he meant by this, Los grandes problemas nacionales can be considered as a declaration of Mexico’s cultural independence.

While other people were obstinately preoccupied with the emancipation of Mexican culture, Molina moved ahead of his time and formed a series of ideas that made up a trend that would appear in many other forms. His theory went beyond the confines of art and his concern that Mexican writers were “losing the originality that they could have had if they had

(1) Molina, LGPN P. 404.
(2) Ibid. P. 409.
allowed their talents to develop freely, instead of preferring to produce slavish imitations of foreign works" (1) was soon resolved with the arrival of the novel of the Revolution. Music followed suit, and if that were not enough, Molina's inner desire to see Mexico probe itself to discover its "new heart" began to come true during the post-Revolution era. Molina could also be considered as the initiator of the inferiority complex that later attracted the attention of several followers of this current. In that respect, first of all he confirmed the reality of the times:

The fact is that the generally accepted opinion in our country is that we are a nation made up of social units that are less knowledgeable, do less and deserve less than the units belonging to the other nations of the earth. (2)

Later he traced the roots of malinchismo back to the isolation of the colonial period. (3) Finally, he called malinchismo "the curse that befell our history of independence" and never ceased to consider it as a result of the ethnic problem. (4)

So where did Molina's prophecies end and where did his role as an ideologue begin? It is impossible to say for sure. However, if we remember his friendship with Diego Rivera and his frequent discussions with Manuel M. Ponce and other artists, and consider the fame his work achieved in Mexico in the twenties and thirties, then we can safely say

(1) Ibid., p. 410.
(2) Ibid., p. 315.
that he was at least partially influenced by the revolutionary cultural boom. It goes without saying, of course, that this movement already existed before Molina and continued after him, but, in any case, it was he who managed to provide a logical explanation for something that was merely an incomprehensible impulse to many people. This made him a forerunner to a certain extent. The fact that he did not leave any famous disciples who had studied under him does not mean that there were weaknesses in his teaching or intellectual activities. Molina influenced more people than we can imagine, including José Vasconcelos, the most independent of Mexico’s mestizophiles. We must not forget that Vasconcelos was the Maecenas of muralism and was also one of the most conspicuous people involved in the cultural movements sparked off by the Revolution. No one can deny the influence that Molina’s mestizophilia had on the rebirth of culture in Mexico.

However, the answer contained in the previous paragraph could lead us to ask another question: did Molina’s influence die with him? This is a very good question because there are many signs that could lead us to a false conclusion. The fact is that although very little has

been written about Molina's work this does not mean to say that he did not make a great impression on many Mexican and foreign scholars. According to Brading, Molina's influence can be seen in later writers such as Eric Wolf, Francois Chevalier and Enrique Florescano. (1) He also influenced other foreigners at different times, such as Ernest Gruening, Nathan L. Whetten and, to a greater extent, Charles C. Cumberland. (2) Indeed, Molina's ideas were well received beyond Mexico's frontiers, although sometimes this was due to somebody else's work. This is the case of Frank Tannenbaum, whose profound influence on all sorts of analysts of post-revolutionary Mexico is well known. What is not so well known, however, is that Tannenbaum, who was a great admirer of Molina, was also one of his first converts to mestizophilia. In his book *Mexico: the struggle for peace and bread*, in which he prophesized on the supremacy of the Mestizo, several pages were virtually taken word for word from Molina (3) Even though Tannenbaum's "anonymity"

(1) Brading, "Social Darwinism", cit., p. 64.
(4) "The mestizo", says Tannenbaum, "has arisen from the strife between European and Indian to rule the present scene" see Frank Tannenbaum, *Mexico: the struggle for peace and bread* (Jonathan Cape, London, 1965), esp. p. 15. The influence of Molina's mestizophilia is also evident in Tannenbaum, *Peace by Revolution*, cit., pp. 3-33.
theory stopped him from acknowledging the intellectual leadership of the revolutionary Molina, (1) nothing prevented him from using Molina's mestizophilia as his guide. Thus, thanks to Tannenbaum, the theoretical life of Molina's theory was prolonged for a while.

It is ironic, however, that a man who was so immersed in his country should have received more recognition for his work abroad. Molina was not really very found of the exogenous variables in his analysis of Mexico. In his cosmo vision, especially during his first stage, international factors did not count for much in the formation of a Mestizo fatherland. In fact, he did not even seem to take the outlying parts of Mexico into consideration. For him, Mexico, the republic, was Mexico, the state and city, with a little more added on — his vision was similar to that of the former Anáhuac Valley five centuries on. At times it is necessary to know the outside world and its history to be able to learn from past mistakes. In this respect, one fact sums up Molina — he not only never lived outside Mexico, he also tried to make it illegal for other Mexicans to do so. (2) This notion of isolation, however, was radically changed over time and met its demise in the thirties after England and Spain were blamed for all of mankind's ills. Nonetheless, even during that period he presented Mexico's ethnic groups as the

---

(1) See op. cit., p. 119.
(2) In an article written in 1909, Molina made a vague proposal to legally prevent Mexicans form living abroad. See Molina, "Cuadro-programa."
architects of their own destiny. He never, of course, ruled out the possibility of an invasion prompted by the inevitable racial strife; he was more sceptical of outside interference and associated danger to the acts of certain groups of Creoles whose fusion:

has created a Scylla and Charybdis situation for Mexico — although it managed to escape the danger of a European Scylla intervention, it is still exposed to the danger of an American Charybdis. (1)

And although the "national ship" had still to escape from a monster that did not figure in Greek mythology — an Asian invasion — he said there was nothing to fear if there was solidarity among the American nations. (2)

This point contains another of the great contributions of Molina's mestizophilia — although somewhat buried under contradiction. This contribution is perfectly feasible and is also potentially extremely attractive. However, before describing it we must eliminate all the doubts surrounding it. Molina, who was a fervent Pan-Americanist, greatly admired the United States of America which had a profound influence on him. This feeling coupled with the reality of the Mexican people's geopolitical misfortune confused Molina on the attitude to adopt towards Mexico's powerful neighbour. In 1909 he appeared fickle on the subject when he first of all predicted an ethnic conflagration and even said that a Mestizo Mexico would "not only resist the inevitable clash against the North American people but would defeat

(1) Molina, LGPN, p. 385).
(2) See Molina "La doctrina Monroe de occidentes", in guerra del Pacifico, pp. 28-29
them." Later he feared that there would be a full-scale military invasion and even went as far as to envisage the American flag flying outside the National palace. Finally, he took everything he had said back and stated that Mexico would never be hostile towards the United States because it trusted in the honesty and uprightness that, according to Molina, characterized Yankee foreign policy. (1) Later, in the dispute he had with Nieto in 1925, he affirmed that if the Creoles leaned towards the west and the Indians towards the east, the Mestizos looked to the north because of the gratitude they felt towards "the powerful benevolent nation" that had helped them "in all their revolutions for freedom."

He also added that Latin powers such as Spain and France were aggressive towards Latin America, forgot the events of 1847, and proposed that Mexico should be responsible for drawing up the "western Monroe doctrine" so that the whole continent would support the United States in a future war against Asia. (2) Finally, in 1932, he endorsed his friendliness towards the United States and absolved it darwinistically of its sin of expansionism by blaming the Creoles. (3)

To explain Molina's attitude we need to go back in time. In 1898, Molina was a young thirty-year-old intellectual who watched the impressive display of Yankee power in astonishment. Like any self-respecting

__________

(1) Molina, LGPN, pp. 352, 432 and 446.
social Darwinist, the young Molina admired anyone who managed to impose his authority on somebody else, like it or not. That is what appeared to have happened to Molina. However, in contrast to his mixture of admiration and resentment for the Creoles' duality as winners and explorers, realpolitik tilted the balance in favour of his first feelings. As for the rest, the liberal tradition that he undoubtedly inherited and interpreted in his own way was far from instilling anti-American feeling in him. Thus, the expansionist target of '98, which was one of the few international events that made an impact on him, had more effect on him than even the First World War or the Russian Revolution, and led him to praise Roosevelt and propose a pro-American foreign policy. However, the most valuable aspect of this case is that his dabbling with Pan-Americanism did not prevent him from developing his mestizophilia and introducing the emergence of a new culture synthesis destined to be "the true flag of the whole continent" in Mexico. (1) The idea, which is far from implying cultural imperialism, was integrationalist and very suggestive:

The American continent appears to have been put on the earth to resolve the conflict of the divergence of two already formed cultures or, in other words, the incomprehension of the eastern culture and the western culture, by providing new guidance and procedures. (2)

It is clear that Molina was not disguising the subjection of Mestizo America before the superpower as the new culture would emerge there and not here "because the United States,

(1) Ibid., vol. IV, p. 10.
(2) Ibid., vol. I, p. 32.
which is essentially western, will not be able to create a culture. We, however, can create this new culture by contributing our eastern guidance to western culture." (1) Finally, just to rule out any doubts about his patriotism, Molina made the interesting prediction that the Mexican revenge on those who were responsible for reducing Mexico's territory will be taken by Mestizo immigrants in the United States, who "will undermine the soundness of that country thanks to their facial unity. (2)

At this point it is convenient to digress a little. Molina's newly defined proposition of cultural synthesis and his other ideas that we have looked at in this thesis as his living legacy, and the germ and fruit have been included for obvious reasons because of their relation to his theory of mestizophilia. However, the reader should note that his other intellectual contributions have been excluded from this analysis because of the specialized theme of this thesis and not because they are unworthy of mention. In addition to the praise from scholars of other aspects of Molina's work, Molina also deserves recognition for having ventured into many fields and for having contributed innovative ideas. He was the author of several articles on economics, (3) and

(1) Molina, preface to La guerra del Pacífico, pp. 6-7.
(2) Molina, LGPN, p. 353.
(3) See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Valor económico de la función legislativa", "Hay que reestablecer la normalidad de la tributación", "El peso mexicano como moneda de circulación universal" and "Las disidencias de la Conferencia de Londres y la estructura peculiar de los pueblos", in El Economista (Mexico, 19 April, 3 Nov. and 1 Dec. 1932, and 1 Sept 1933), pp. 3-4, 180, 260 and 850, respectively. On the other hand, more on his interesting intermediary position in this field, which came about after his rejection of Marxist and his
testimonies from one of his friends say that Molina was "instinctively" ahead of his time in some economic strategies he suggested. (1) There is also evidence that his creative interests spanned diverse topics such as tourism and political science. This came through in his desire to create a bank to develop tourism and his writings on the subject of dividing the state powers into four, based on Napoleon's state council. (2) There is, of course, plentiful evidence of his most praiseworthy concerns which earned him a higher place than that given to other mestizophiles of his time who, like Francisco Escudero and other members of the Mexican Indianist Society continued in their determination to maintain the status quo; Molina was sincerely concerned for the helpless and this turned him into a sort of negotiator for those less fortunate than himself during the last years of his life. (3)

prediction of the disappearance of the capitalist system can be seen in Andrés Molina Enríquez, "Conferencia ante la Confederación de Cámaras Industriales", La Raza (Mexico, 20 and 24 May 1922).

(1) This friend was Carlos Basave, Memorias, cit., p. 31.
(2) See Andrés Molina Enríquez, "El camino de la paz", in El Independiente (Mexico, 19 May 1913). The creation of the tourism bank was proposed in an undated communiqué that was not addressed to anyone; AAME.
(3) To appreciate the contrast between Molina and the members of the Indianist Society, see Bonfil, "Andrés Molina Enríquez y la Sociedad Indianista Mexicana", cit., pp. 218-221. Molina's work as a negotiator can be seen from the letters he sent Cárdenas, in which he asked for measures to be applied in favour of the helpless. (In one of them he proposes the creation of the "Indian Department."). Likewise, he received another letter from a person in prison asking for him to intercede on his behalf. See the letters from Andrés Molina Enríquez to Lázaro Cárdenas (Mexico, 22 Nov. 1934) and to Luis I. Rodriguez, Cárdenas' private secretary (Mexico, 14 Dec. 1934), and the letter from
This alone would have been sufficient to bring honour to his name.

However, for the purposes of this thesis there is no need to go into the thoughts of Molina, the activist. What we are interested in here is Molina, the thinker, and more specifically his ideas on mestizophilia. Given this we must close this review of the fruits of his theory with a global assessment of the theory itself. If we look beyond the doctrinal contradictions that fragment and upset the order of his theory and consider it as a whole, we may ask: what is left of it? There is no doubt that his views today on racism sound old-fashioned but there is no doubt that the ethnic factor has been and continues to be a vital aspect of the historical and sociological analysis of Mexico, despite Molina's current discredit. The fact that the atrocities committed this century in the name of racial anthropology made any form of ethnographic consideration taboo should not prevent us from acknowledging the importance of the race-class correlation that still exists in Mexico, without falling foul of sterile taxonomic limitations. If we set aside Molina's racial determinism and his "scientific" inflexibility, there are many valid, useful elements in his scheme that permit us to make an analysis of contemporary Mexican society. The marked heterogeneity and the racial prejudices were still undeniably a drawback to social

------------------------(footnote continued.)

Amador Reyes, who was in prison, to Molina (Jilotepec, 4 Nov. 1934); A.G.N., files 444.1/1 and 545.37119.
mobility in Mexico, although to a lesser extent than previously. Although it was recognised that prejudice more than heterogeneity had to be eliminated the detailed evaluation that Molina made of the ethnic situation in Mexico still constitutes a necessary source for reference for anyone trying to understand the situation, since the unpleasant segregationalist effects of the three classic racial groups were often portrayed as being involved in aesthetic rivalry which unfortunately kept the racial classifications of the colonial period alive, even though they were only related to social and cultural factors. As for the rest, how many Mexicans, intellectuals or otherwise, would currently disagree with don Andrés' key idea that Mexico is and must be a nation of Mestizos? Very few, I am sure. (1)

Likewise, if we consider history from the cultural point of view, which Molina himself adopted in the final stage of his work, his theory acquires unusual strength. The struggle between cultures -- not between different races -- took place and is currently taking place in Mexico regardless of how much the dominant western culture manages to conceal elements from other cultures, and this situation has survived quite admirably during more than four and half centuries of oppression. In that time the Indians' struggle to defend themselves from the bitter attacks mounted by the Creoles is and has been very real and is not a "socioethnological" masquerade. Finally, on the subject of the social background

---

(1) We will analyse the current situation concerning mestizophilia in Mexico further on in this thesis.
of Molina's approach, we could say that the sociological base of his mestizophilia is particularly valuable because it provides a complete understanding of porfirist society. It is also valuable if we are to tackle the imbalances that ail modern Mexican society from the point of supporting the preeminence of the social aspect over the individual aspect. If "de-racializing" Molina's theory distorts it, don Andrés would have known how to forgive this. After all, he knew that once ideas have been formed they have a life of their own.

All this and more can be extracted from Molina's theory by polishing up the material contained in his mestizophilia. This wealth largely springs from the fact that he was a man who stood at a crossroads on the vertex of time where two eras crossed paths. This made him a "disconcerting" (1) but nonetheless fertile author. Molina was neither a typical porfirist nor a typical revolutionary. He was an evolutionist with a touch of social unconformity thrown in for good measure. He neither felt at ease nor ill at ease with the two eras he lived in. His only deep concern was to see that the necessary changes were implemented to allow Mexico to advance towards the new Mestizo Mexico. Again it was Luis Cabrera who understood him:

He would have been a porfirist if General Díaz had understood the problems of land tenure during the latter part of his regime. Likewise, he would have supported Huerta if Huerta's regime had found a purpose for renovation (...) (2)

(1) The description comes from González Ramírez, op. cit., p. 137.
Contrary to how it may look on first reading, Molina's theory did not imply that he was an opportunist or a traitor. If one thing was clear, it was don Andrés' intellectual honesty and the deep love he felt for Mexico. Precisely because of this Molina was a revolutionary. He understood that there was no other way that the country could be changed, and this made him set himself above the different factions and the squabbles between caudillos. This stance allowed him to produce a rather contradictory theory of mestizophilia that was nonetheless rich and fascinating, and which is still worth recovering.

Perhaps it was this situation that allowed him to glimpse the dual purpose of his work in 1911. In October of that year, from the confines of his prison cell, Molina discovered the key to both his past and his future:

I can unashamedly confess that in most of the battles I have caused I have been the loser. Nonetheless, I have been able to draw public attention to the problems the transformation involves and have made the country confront them with determination. If I don't do anything else noteworthy that makes my fellow countrymen call me a patriot, I think it is only fair that this at least is recognized. I don't aspire to more because, like Degollado, I believe that I will not receive any other rewards while I live from my contemporaries but the imprisonment I have to suffer together with the indifference and oblivion I will have to suffer in the future. (1)

Molina had premonitions of his triumph because he knew that despite all his doctrinal contradictions his mestizophilia would keep the Mestizo dream alive. Likewise,

---

(1) Molina, "Filosofía de mis ideas", p. 6.
he sensed his failure as he was able to predict the long years during which the sad mixture of race and class against which he had fought would prevail throughout Mexico. Nonetheless, anyone who feels that Molina's was a lost cause should remember the prophetic gift he and a few others of his kind possessed. Armed with his Creole faith and his Indian patience don Andrés Molina Enriquez is still waiting to see Mexico make the Mestizo myth come true so that he can retire and rest in peace.
III. THE OUTCOME: THE DEATH OR REBIRTH OF MESTIZOPHILIA.

1. Revolutionary Mexico: miscegenation becomes popular. (1)

Andrés Molina Enríquez initiated what could well be considered an age of unprecedented development of mestizophilia. From the publication of Los grandes problemas nacionales on and thanks to the influence of the Mexican Revolution the link between miscegenation and nationality progressed towards its final enthronement. The introspective nature of the Revolution undermined the obsession with foreign models and put an end to the chimera of a Creole Mexico. At this stage there were only two alternatives left - Mexico would either be an Indian nation or a nation of Mestizos. In spite of the indigenist euphoria that momentarily fostered the illusion of a return to a pure form of pre-hispanicism, the reality of the times asserted itself. The three centuries of Spanish domination had permeated as deeply as the influences of pre-conquest life and there was clearly no use in envisaging a one-sided Mexico (2). History was there and challenged all those who refused

---

(1) Of the extensive bibliography on the Mexican Revolution there are two academically sound, recent works that situate this section in its historical context. See Historia de la Revolución Mexicana (El Colegio de México, Mexico, 1981-1982) and Alan Knight, The Mexican Revolution (Cambridge U. Press, Cambridge, 1986).

(2) There were, of course, indigenist mestizophiles and people who disagreed with the oldest forms of racism. However, these groups were minorities. As examples, see Pedro Lamiq (Crater), "Criollos, indios y mestizos", in Madera por uno de sus íntimos (Of. Ed. Azteca, Mexico, 1910), esp. pp. 16-113, and Alberto M. Correà, El peligro negro (speech given to the Mexican Geography and Statistics Society, 28 April 1910).
to accept Mexico's syncretism with all its might. The avalanche of the Revolution began to fall on them with its overwhelming force.

In these circumstances it was logical that the ethnic problem would be a source of concern to the ideologues of the Revolution. When Madero assumed the presidency in 1910, he devoted several pages of *La sucesión presidencial de 1910* (The Presidential Succession of 1910) to the lamentation of the brutalities of the profirist era against the Yaqui Indians and proclaimed the Indians to be a "sister race."

(1) From then on there were few people who shunned the subject. A week before the date set for the outbreak of the Revolution, following the lynching of a Mexican in the United States, Ricardo Flores Magón reprimanded American capitalism in his article entitled *Regeneración* (Regeneration) for having encouraged racial hatred. Although he declared he had been "freed from race principles" in his accusation he could not conceal his indignation concerning what he described as a "mob of white savages who viciously hurled themselves on a poor Mexican." (2) A short time later in his famous article directed at Madero, Luis Cabrera affirmed that the causes of the discontent were not "exclusively racial" but singled out preference for foreign customs and habits as one of the main sources of the nation's discontent. (3) Evidently, Mexico's

---


introversion was on the increase. The rejection of foreign
models went hand in hand with contempt for anything that
contradicted popular wish, and in both cases the enemy was
typically white. What Mexicans felt as their own and what
was popular was identified with the Indians and more
increasingly with the Mestizos. The irresistible attraction
for this was so great that many intellectuals of that time
succumbed to it. Likewise, many members of the new
generation of intellectuals also felt the call through the
influence of their teachers. (1) In that sense the
Aguascalientes Convention was the apotheosis. A renowned
observer of the time said the convention was "more nationally
representative (...) than all the congresses that we have had
since the independence to date" since its "members reflected
the ethics and ideology of miscegenation more effectively."
(2) Although there is always somebody who is ready to
disagree, Antonio Soto y Gama was almost shot down for having
made a show of internationalism and for having been
disrespectful to the Mexican flag -- patriotism was the
reigning feeling of the day along with a greater attachment
to (or the discovery of) popular Mexican tradition.
The above, of course, does not mean that the Revolution
was completely free of the remains of Creole ideology. In

(1) On the first indigenist teachers and mestiçophiles, see
Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, Nacionalismo y educación en
México (El Colegio de México, México, 1979), pp.
143-146.
(2) Carlos Basave del Castillo Negrete, Notas para la
historia de la Convención Revolucionaria (1914-1915)
the midst of this pre-constitutional, conventionist era a
book was published that claimed to be based on the principles
of the Revolution but excluded anything connected with the
Indians from what was "national" and decried the Mestizos for
being the "forced product of a physiological kiss, devoid of
love" of the rival races. (1) By these times creolism had
won over a new supporter who was none other than Martín Luis
Guzmán. Guzmán had no qualms about backing an out-of-date
cause. His words could have been written by any of the worst
of the nineteenth century racists:

The indigenous mass is a burden and a nuisance for
Mexico and it would be hypocritical to accuse it of
being a dynamic governing factor. In normal peaceful
life, just as when life is abnormal and turbulent, the
Indian has only one function — he is like a faithful
don who blindly obeys his master's commands.

Even so Guzmán at least included the Mestizo alongside the
Creole "master" as part of the "sociably governing" classes.
(2) The reason for that was that at that time there were
very few anti-indigenists who would have gone as far as to
have been mestizophobes. The hispanicists, like the
indigenists, thought up ways of seeing the Mestizo as one of
their own kind. Even the "latins", who insisted on
considering "Latin-ness" as the essence of what was Mexican,
accepted the Mestizos. A rather strange booklet published at
that time provides a good example of this. It called the

(1) This was Carlos Trejo Lerdo de Tejada, La Revolución y
el nacionalismo: todo para todos (Imp. y papelera La
(2) Martín Luis Guzmán, La querella de México — A orillas
del Hudson — otras páginas (Cía. General de ediciones,
Mexico, 1959), p. 20. The first work, which contains the
quote, was originally published in 1913.
Indians "degenerates because of their drunkenness and stupid in the company of idiots." After rapping out a series of epithets in a similar vein, the author wondered why the Indian was so distrustful and asked: "what evil fate can have intervened to alienate the Indian and make him fear a shameful alliance with us?" Even so, by challenging the "evil fate", the author gave his approval for the people of that "likeable race" to "come with us and join in the banquet of civilization", and accepted that "Spanish and Indian blood" flowed in the veins of the Mexican people. Finally, he expressed pride that this blood had given him "the spirit of El Cid and Cuauhtémoc." (1) As we can see, even though the Indian was still despised, the Mestizo was being gradually accepted.

Thus, independently of the reluctance of the Creole dream, mestizophilia was gaining ground quickly. The failure of the porfirist regime and its foreign tendencies, the powerful influence of popular movements such as those headed by Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa which mainly attracted Indian campesinos and Mestizos, and the gentle winds of justice and vindication of the Revolution all conspired in favour of mestizophilia. The result was a curious mixture of redeeming romanticism and progressive realism which compelled Mexico to cast its mask aside and proudly show the

---

(1) See José Cantú Corro, Patria y Raza (Escuela Tiz. Salesiana, Mexico, 1924), pp. 27-51. The contents of the booklet include a speech which the author, who was a Mexican priest, gave on 12 Oct. 1919.
world its real face. Old clichés were broken allowing Mexico to reveal its hidden countenance for the first time ever. All this happened thanks to the determination of the Mexican people to see themselves as they were without succumbing to distortion in mimicry of something else. The trend followed by the muralists, the novels of the Revolution and typical music were merely the artistic reflection of this awakening of collective awareness and the shaking off of the inhibiting complexes that had masked the real Mexico. The result was an antithesis of nineteenth century Mexico as the blooming of the Revolution made the country make a complete turnabout. With it, the country’s intellectuals became obsessed with the quest for their own roots. (A marvelous example of this is how Diego Rivera went as far as to mix his paints with juice from the agave cactus.) (1) Although what was "Mexico's own" was identified with what was "popular" in the predominant Indian classes, the result, of course, was the emergence of an eclectic cultural movement. Artists painted Indians using European techniques, jurists looked back to Spanish legislation of the Indies, and musicians at last made "Mestizo" music. Mexico was flooded by a torrent of symbiotic creativity. As one foreign observer commented: "If the Revolution followed a plan its aim was to create a nation." (2) We could add that its aim was to create a

(1) On the cultural nationalist movement following the Revolution, see Carlos Monsiváis, "Notas sobre la cultura mexicana en el siglo XX", in Historia general de México (El Colegio de México, Mexico, 1981), vol. II, pp. 1, 377-1 548.

(2) Frank Tannenbaum, "Algunas reflexiones sobre la Revolución Mexicana", in Ross, op. cit., p. 197.
Mestizo nation.

The circumstances were ideal for mestizophilia to reach its climax. The situation at home and the intellectual influences from abroad in the form of growing anti-racist humanism paved the way. With only one internationalist exception of note (1) the publications of the age exuded fervent patriotism. However, unlike the waves of patriotism that had rocked independent Mexico as a consequence of the plundering of 1847 and the French intervention which had responded to outside intervention, the revolutionary spirit looked inwards. For a lack of a foreign enemy to close the ranks on and show off Mexico's varied, abstract unity to, the new intelligentsia occupied itself in defining factors of cohesion that would unite the country once they were captured in the ideology of the Revolution. This time in history called for definite expression to be given to all aspects of Mexican life, and thanks to popular enthusiasm and the establishment of the prevailing homogeniety, miscegenation was the only feasible factor of ethnic identity. Following Molina's lead, Luis Cabrera gave his seal of approval in 1931:

I entirely agree that unification should be sought from Mestizo sources because the Mestizos form the majority, are the most homogenous, offer the best conditions for procreation and are the most resilient people in our climate for the growth of the population. (2)

(1) Rafael Nieto, Mas allá de la Patria (Andrés Botes e Hijos, Mexico, 1922). Nieto's internationalism, which was based on Marxism, was chiefly founded on an economic analysis.

Cabrera, however, was the last to present mestizophilia from the evolutionist point of view, which had been unable to take advantage of the doctrines which had accompanied the revolutionary process. There is no doubt that the emergence of more ad hoc schools of anthropology in justification of the Mestizo, and the fall of positivism (thanks to the work done by the young intellectuals who founded the Ateneo de la Juventud) eased the task of the up-and-coming supporters of mestizophilia. If this situation was able to develop albeit against the grain of the nineteenth century racist thinking, there was even greater reason to believe that it would flourish now that it had its own theoretical framework. It would flourish and bear fruit and Manuel Gamio and José Vasconcelos would see to that.


Manuel Gamio (1893-1960), an anthropologist and sociologist, was born in Mexico City to wealthy parents of Spanish descent from the region of Navarre. He commenced his long academic career in a series of private schools and after having completed his studies at the National Preparatory College he was admitted to the School of Mining. A short time later, however, he decided to leave the school to work on his father’s estate in Veracruz. While he was there, his close contact with nature awakened his interest in indigenist matters. Following the failure of his father’s businesses he was first admitted to the National Museum to study archeology and later to Columbia University in New York,
where he received a master's degree and a doctorate in anthropology under the supervision of Franz Boas. His professional career was closely related to several revolutionary governments. He started out as inspector general of archaeological monuments and then as director of anthropology under Carranza. During the Calles administration he was undersecretary for education until he was suspended from his duties as a result of his efforts to combat the corruption of the Puig Casauranc team. Later he was appointed as director of the Inter-American indigenist institute and he held this post from the final year of the Cárdenas administration until his death. He was also director of the International School of American Archaeology and Anthropology, and the magazine Ethnos, which he founded. On Ethnos he worked alongside Miguel Othón de Mendizábal, Lucio de Mendieta y Nuñez and others. Although he was a story writer, his interests covered a wide range of topics ranging from criminology to physics. His most important works were La población del valle de Teotihuacán (1920) (The Population of the Teotihuacan Valley), which is a great anthropological study that he presented as his doctoral thesis, and Forjando Patria (1916) (Shaping the Fatherland), which contains his sociological analysis of Mexico and is a classic on the subject. His treatment of the problem of emigration from Mexico to the United States also met with success and he published a second volume of sociology entitled Haciendo un México nuevo (1935) (Towards a New Mexico). He belonged to several American and European scientific associations and received honorary doctorates from the
University of Columbia and the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). He is considered to be the father of modern anthropology in Mexico. (1)

Gamio's interest in miscegenation was closely connected to his obsession with social homogeneity. To him most of the Latin American countries were not really nations because unlike Germany, France or Japan, they lacked ethnic unity and cultural identity. He saw Mexico as being made up of different "fatherlands" in which the Indians were marginalized by the white population. Given this, Gamio said the "advanced and happy fusion of races forms the most important solid basis of nationalism." (2) For the Mexican nation to be formed he said the "indigenous class" would have to be redeemed so that it could mix with the white population. He believed that no race was any better or worse than any other and although he felt the Indians "were four hundred years behind the times" he said they had "intellectual aptitudes that were equal to those of any other race." For him the problem revolved around the fact that Mexico's politicians governed with only the interests of the dominant social group in mind. This group was predominantly white. Likewise, they paid little attention to the anthropological and sociological aspects of government. Consequently the laws governing Mexico were only extralogical copies that ignored the Indians. In other words, "the origins, form and substance" of Mexican law

(1) More biographical information is contained in Angeles González Gamio, Manuel Gamio: una lucha sin fin (UNAM, Mexico; 1988).

(2) Manuel Gamio, Forjando Patria (Poncina, Mexico, 1940), pp. 7-13.
were foreign, just like the 1857 Constitution. What was needed was to give more importance to the Indians and bring them out of their wretchedness, bringing them closer to the level enjoyed by the Creoles. The rest would follow in due course as "the passage of time and the economic improvements in the Indian class will contribute to the ethnic fusion of the population." Cultural integration would thus emerge forming a real Mexican fatherland. (1)

As we can see, in the strictest sense of the word, Gamio was the first indigenist to belong to the mestizopnile school. Unlike his predecessors his interest in Indian welfare in relation to Creole welfare or the welfare of the nation as a whole, was the most important aspect of his crusade in defence of miscegenation. It is true to say that he also sought the elimination of the Indians but that can be explained because he felt their fate could not have been any worse. In this context we could say that what Gamio really wanted was for the Indians to be reincarnated as Mestizos and not for them to disappear altogether. Likewise, his obsession with homogeneity was an effect and not a cause of his notion of ethnic inequality as the source of injustice. It was primarily the idea of wrong being done that concerned him.

There is no doubt that there was a strange mixture of proud compassion for the unfortunate part of the Mexican people beneath his desire for unification:

(1) Ibid., pp. 13-39. Cultural fusion would also help this ethnic fusion.
Poor and sorrowful race! In your breast lie hidden the strength of the Tarahumara roughness which uproots cedar trees on the mountain, the exquisite attic of the holy people of Teotihuacán, the astuteness of the Tlaxallcn family and the unruly valor of the bloody Mexican. Why don’t you stand tall, take pride in your past and show the world your Indian ancestry? (1)

Underneath all the rhetorical questions Gamio expressed his concern which was both sincere and discouraging. Gamio showed that he was both romantic and pragmatic, and finally arrived at the conclusion that "Indian ancestry" would not eliminate the causes of his misfortune. Behind the Mestizo mask, however, he said that the Indian could sneak into the banquet of the modern age of urban industrialized Mexico that emerged after the Revolution. This meant that the objectives of miscegenation no longer involved the elimination of the Indians as Pimentel had wanted and no longer sought the prevention of white betrayal as Molina Enríquez had wanted, but were channeled towards gaining access for the Indians to the new society. (2)

Gamio also made another contribution which may even have been more important. Fifteen years after the belated introduction made by Molina Enríquez concerning the cultural variable in mestizophilia, Gamio converted art into the cornerstone of his analysis. He departed from the premise that "nobody is either excluded or favoured in art" and affirmed that:

(1) Ibid., pp. 21-22. This paragraph was originally written for an article by Gamio published in the Modern Mexico journal in 1907.

(2) Needless to say, the Creoles would also have to disappear in this context in the melting pot so as to prevent the continued existence of two races continuing the duality of those who exploit and those who are exploited.
When the middle class and the Indians share the same criteria in art, we shall have been culturally redeemed as national art will exist and will provide one of the firmest bases for nationalism.

Pre-Hispanic art was as good as Spanish art and the sharing of criteria should not imply the adoption of western aesthetic models, contrary to what had occurred in the past. National art should be the harmonious product of the uniting of two peoples. (1) In this sense it was the Creole who would have to take the initiative for obvious reasons — Gamio said that instead of europeanizing the Indian, "we must indianize ourselves a bit so that we can present him with a form of our civilization watered down by his own (...)" With the exception of the language aspect — without being disrespectful to the regional languages Gamio thought Spanish must be the national tongue — (2) the goal had to be to seek an "intermediary culture" that would be "consolidated once the ethnically homogenized population " understood it. Meanwhile, criteria would have to be adopted to help the Indian conserve his art while he adopted western science. (3) The race-culture relation is very important if we are to understand Gamio's theory. Although his thought belonged to the tradition which proclaimed the supremacy of racial mixture, from Gamio on the mestizophile current took on an irreversible turn — for the first time cultural

(1) Ibid., pp. 39-41.
(2) Ibid., pp. 109-111. Region could be added as another exception, although it is not very clear if the religious syncretism of the "Catholic-pagans" would prevail (also see pp. 85-92).
(3) Ibid., pp. 96 and 98. On the "scientific" and "commercial" criteria, see the article from America Indigena (Oct. 1942) included in the appendix to the edition mentioned of Forjando Patria, pp. 192-201.
miscegenation looked as if it would be an important catalyst for ethnic fusion in the future. No matter how much genetic factors continued to constitute the demiurge of homogenization, the exchange had now moved onto a cultural plane. Although the Indian civilization had produced some displays of art, Gamio said the problem was that:

it is a backward civilization in relation to modern science, which is producing better practical results to the production of material and intellectual welfare, which is a principal tendency in human activities. (1)

The Indian had art but lacked science and this constituted the crux of his misfortune. His situation was no longer considered to be a symptom of racial inferiority, but was the result of cultural imbalance. This imbalance exists everywhere and prevents the peoples affected by it from achieving "integral perfection" due to a "compensation law." (2) Using this argument, Gamio explained miscegenation's strong points and resolved his two main contradictions. On the one hand he reconciled his Herder-style romanticism with his Anglo Saxon pragmatism while on the other he satisfied his two chief influences which consisted of the cultural relativism learned from his teacher, Franz Boas, and the habits of evolutionism that the positivist teachers of the porfirist age had instilled in him.

(1) Ibid., p. 96.
(2) Ibid., pp. 104-106.
Although these contrasts manifested themselves in practically all of his work, his clearest image was contained in *Forjando Patria* and *Hacia un México nuevo*. In his relativist optimism boosted his spirit in *Forjando Patria*, *Hacia un México nuevo* was riddled with evolutionistic pessimism, which was probably the result of his disenchantment with Calles. While Gamio saw the Mestizo appear with "pristine purity" as the "first harmonious product of the conquest" in one, in the other he said that miscegenation was "far from eugenic" which explained why the product "emerged flawed and with a lack of speed." (2) Although readers can detect the influence of social Darwinism in all his works it is interesting to note that its influence increased over time instead of decreasing. In *Hacia un México nuevo*, which was published almost twenty years after *Forjando Patria*, Gamio's handling of concepts such as "selection" and "adaptation", and references to the "inevitable law of evolution" are clearer. However, we must remember that the references to the Indians' evolutional inferiority were not made on racial grounds. Gamio rather paradoxically believed in the impossibility of cultural miscegenation without the base of racial homogeneity as the provider of racial equality. (3) He felt this situation was merely due to a delay in the Indians' cultural development.

---

(1) Ibid., p. 66.
(3) This is the impression that reading his work creates although he affirmed in a short passage that it was not impossible to achieve cultural miscegenation without passing through racial miscegenation, but that it would be a very difficult, long process. See op. cit., p. 41.
which caused his socioeconomic downfall:

The Indian defended and continues to defend his cultural inheritance and this keeps him in the lower social strata since his culture is antiquated and inefficient, and no matter how interesting and picturesque it may be it cannot compete with European culture in the social struggle. (1)

Thus, Gamio felt that the level of culture in Mexico was "inversely proportional to the amount of Indian blood" in the veins of its inhabitants (2) and said that the solution to this (Gamio rarely speculated) was racial fusion and the synthesis of modern culture with the "useable characteristics of the decadent Indian culture." (3)

By this stage in his thinking Gamio was obviously disenchanted. His praise for pre-Hispanic art gave way to the insistence that Indian science and technology were outdated, and he even proposed that "kindred" European races should be encouraged to immigrate to Mexico to act as a catalyst for cultural development (4) and insisted that the Indians were a backward race. This could lead us to wonder how this evolutionary stance could be harmonized with Boas' relativism? The answer is simple -- as scientific and technological knowledge, which generates material well-being, evolve unilaterally in an upward direction, Gamio felt

(1) Ibid., p. 147.
(2) Ibid., p. 134
(3) Ibid., p. 228.
(4) Ibid., pp. 44-46. Later he specified that the Iberians, Balkans, Italians and even the Syrian Lebanese would be welcome. See Manuel Gamio, Consideraciones sobre el problema indigena (Instituto Indigenista Interamericano, Mexico, 1966), pp. 167-169. This book was originally published in 1948.
entitled to speak in terms of backward and developed societies; on the other hand, he said art and religion, ethical or political manifestations were the result of "merely conventional, emotional and sentimental" activities which had ups and downs throughout history. (1) Although Gamio did not make this distinction clear, he obviously based himself on it for the purposes of his theory. Nonetheless, he took care to state in no uncertain terms that superior races did not exist and repeated his rejection of the "aesthetic tyranny" of powerful races which tried to impose their standards for beauty (2), and he even went as far as to imagine a cosmic race of his own in his next book. (3) It is interesting to note that although this new work crowned his campaign for Indian modernization with his suggestion that "rural Taylorism" should be adopted, the Second World War forced Gamio to show his romantic side and fuelled his desire to see the "re-emergence of the Indian cultures" in harmony with western culture." (4) The repugnance in Europe for racism seemed to bring back his indigenist vehemence and prompted him to defend the autochthonous cause. Like Herder, he also proposed that the folklore of each nation should be respected. (5)

(3) Gamio, *Consideraciones*, p. 152.
(5) *Ibid.*, p. 229. It is worth mentioning that despite his proposal for world harmony, Gamio did not alter his former opposition to forming a part of "an international federation" in which he felt the stronger nations would subjugate the weaker nations. See Gamio, *México nuevo*, p. 22.
There was, however, one factor in Gamio's position that never varied -- his aversion towards imitations and his desire for originality. In this context, Gamio could be considered as a forerunner (after Molina Enríquez) of the cultural nationalism of the Mexican Revolution. Like Molina, Gamio sharply reprimanded "ridiculous foreign-lovers" and their "dissident culture" which he said belonged to "pedants and idiots." He extolled the virtues of muralism and the "Indo-European" music of Manuel M. Ponce, and called for the creation of national literature. (1) In fact, the moderate "centrist" attitude that characterized the resolution of Gamio's contrasting tendencies (he even preferred to be known as a "Mexicanist" rather than an indigenist (2)) took a back seat when he dealt with the subject of national culture. Gamio was middle-class and established a correlation between race and class as Molina Enríquez had done, although his analysis was not as far-reaching as Molina's. Gamio considered that only the middle-class Mestizos were capable of producing Mexican art (3) and blamed the ethnic, social and cultural imbalances caused by Spanish domination for the absence of a true national identity. Fortunately, he added that the Revolution corrected this situation. (4)

---

(2) Gamio, Forjando Patna, p. 153. Gamio's urge for balance and harmony does not just come through in his mestizophilia but also in his rejection of socialism and capitalism, his integral educational method and even in his conception of the "ideal woman." See op. cit., pp. 141, 159-161 and 119.
(4) Ibid., pp. 167-170.
Although there was still a lot of ground to be covered before "a powerful fatherland and a coherent, defined nationality" were formed, Gamio had fulfilled his intentions by proposing a plan of action. "Fusion of the races, convergence and fusion of cultures, linguistic unity and economic balance among the social elements" would be required because these were the pieces that made up the Mexican jigsaw. (1) Nobody was excluded from the mammoth task of fitting them all together — the Creole assigned an important role to the white population and the indigenist made the Indians the object of redemption. Both, however, would have to disappear. In post-revolutionary Mexico — and soon in all of Latin America — there would only be room for the Mestizo.

3. José Vasconcelos: Mestizos of America, unite!

The person who hoisted the flag for the unification of Mestizo America was José Vasconcelos (1882-1959), the controversial philosopher and teacher from the state of Oaxaca who managed to confuse so many of his supporters and opponents alike. Vasconcelos was born into a middle-class Creole family and he lived his childhood under the influence of his mother's religious spiritualism. The family lived in the border town of Piedras Negras where his father had temporary employment as a customs officer. He received his early schooling in Eagle Pass, where he suffered Yankee

(1) Ibid., p. 183. This is written in capital letters in the text.
discrimination against the Mexican population at first hand, and continued his education at a series of schools in the different parts of Mexico his family lived in. He finally graduated as a lawyer and practised his profession during different stages of his life. He founded the famous Youth Athaeneum together with Alfonso Reyes and Pedro Henríquez Ureña, and created the Popular University. The Revolution forced him to abandon his academic plans for a short time while he joined up with Madero's supporters, and he played an important role as an ideologue of the Anti-Re-election Party. He briefly occupied a post at the National Preparatory School before being suspended from duty by Carranza. Later he was made Minister of Public Instruction under the convention government of Eulalio Gutiérrez. He spent his time in exile traveling through the United States and Europe, and on his return to Mexico he was appointed to the post of rector at the National University during the interim government under De la Huerta (Vasconcelos devised the motto and emblem of the National University.) Shortly after that, Obregón made him Secretary of Public Education. It while he was in that post that he carried out the most productive work that Mexico has ever seen in the educational field. He set up schools, established literacy programmes, promoted culture and became a patron of muralism and the nationalist cultural movement in general. At the end of the Obregón administration he resigned from his cabinet post because he opposed the nomination of Plutarco Elías Calles to the presidency. He stood as a candidate in gubernatorial elections in Oaxaca but met with little success. After trips to Europe and South
America, and dabbling with journalism and literature, he accepted to run as a candidate in the presidential elections and challenged Calles in the famous ballots of 1929. Embittered by his defeat, he became one of the staunchest conservative critics of the Mexican political system and devoted himself to his writing. He ended his days as director of the Mexican Library. His intellectual works were chiefly philosophical and the most famous were *Estética* (1935) (*Aesthetics*), and his autobiographical works which included *El Ulises criollo* (1935) (*The Creole Ulysses*), which many people consider to be the best novel of the Mexican Revolution. His essays, *La raza cósmica* (1925) (*The Cosmic Race*) and *Indología* (1926) (*Indology*) are also well-known. He also wrote short stories and historical works. He was declared to be the "master of youth" in Central and South America, was admitted as a founding member of the National College and the Mexican Language Academy, and was vice president of the International Federation of Philosophical Societies. His friends (and enemies) were the most important members of the Spanish and Latin American intellectual circles, and he kept excellent relations with Romaine Rolland. (1)

(1) It is not surprising that the best biography on Vasconcelos is still his own despite him having been "the most "biographical" Mexican of the century" as Enrique Krauze said in "El regreso de Ulises", *Caras de la historia* (J.Martíz, Mexico, 1983), p. 108. What has been written about Vasconcelos, however, with a few notable exceptions, only contains rehashes of glorifying or denigratory arguments about him. As an example, see Joaquín Cárdenas Noriega, *José Vasconcelos, guía y profeta* (Ed. PAC, Mexico, 1985), and the unfortunate account of his life by José Joaquín Blanco, *Se llaman José Vasconcelos* (FCE, Mexico, 1983).
The first sign of Vasconcelos' mestizophilia was contained in his work entitled *Estudios Indostánicos* (Hindustani Studies). In this book he maintained that Mestizo races were the only races that could create great civilizations and cited the mixture of Aryans and Dravidians in India as an example. He also predicted that great artistic creations that would make contemporary European art pale into insignificance would flourish in the region close to the equator "because it is heat and not cold that conditions all true human homogeneic progress." (1) However, it was in *La raza cósmica* that Vasconcelos fully developed his theory of the same name. In that work he affirmed that "the different races of the world will tend to mix gradually until they form a new type of human being made up of each of the different races that currently exist." Of course, he said that the seat of this racial synthesis would be located in Ibero America, adding that people of black, red, yellow and white skin would form a "universal fifth race" which would be the fruit and improvement of all the former races. (2) Unlike the United States, Latin America would not restrict itself to repeating the exclusivist models of the mother country and would create a civilization "made with the genius and blood of all the people of the world, which will allow it to be able to live in brotherhood and adopt a truly universal vision."

(2) José Vasconcelos, "La raza cósmica", in *Obras Completas*, vol. II (LIMUSA, Mexico, 1958), pp. 903 and 918.
The capital of the new race would be called "Universopolis" and it would be located on the Amazon river in the heart of the tropics. If the whiteman had managed to triumph over cold climatological conditions then his science would combat the heat. When this has happened "the whole of mankind will flock to the tropics and the final civilization will return to the tropics." (1)

Vasconcelos based his prophecy on two theories. One was his "law of the three social stages", which maintained that man's evolution is divided into three stages. The first stage was the "material" or "warrior" period; the second was the "intellectual" or "political" period, and the final stage was the "spiritual" or aesthetic period. According to this law, man will gradually free himself of need as his main incentive which will finally be replaced by pleasure. The cosmic race will be shaped during the third stage and by then man will no longer be guided by material or intellectual motives and will obey a spiritual instinct. He will reproduce following the dictates of a "mysterious form of eugenics based on aesthetic taste" which will eliminate all the ugly and stupid people. The final civilization will therefore be composed of a superior race created by "selection by taste." In this way "life based on love will be expressed in forms of beauty." (2) The other theory he used was the interpretation of recent European and American history as the result of the clash between the Latin and the Saxon. After the

(1) Ibid., pp. 926-936.  
Ibid., pp. 909-912 and 916-919.
downfall of the Roman Empire, Spain emerged as the bastion of
Latin culture. However, it began to be overtaken by England
following the defeat of the Armada. Now that the clash had
crossed the Atlantic, he said the people of Latin America
continued yielding territory to the United States because of
their discord:

The race that dreamed of the world as its empire, the
alleged descendents of Roman glory, fell foul to the
childish satisfaction of creating petty nations and
sovereignties ruled by princes and inspired by souls
that saw a wall in every mountain range instead of
seeing the peaks.

To be able to triumph over the Saxons, Latin America would
have to be united. Although the Saxons were very capable and
had a great advantage they made the mistake of exterminating
the Indians. The Latins, however, assimilated them and this
made them worthy of being responsible for the "divine
mission" of carrying out "history's ulterior objective of
merging peoples and cultures." (1)

Like that of some of his predecessors, Vasconcelos'
mestizophilia was also relative. He never concealed his
tendency towards hispanicism, even during his best times
which were prior to 1929. In fact, his concept of the
pre-Hispanic world was so low that he had to turn to the myth
of Atlantis to avoid insulting the Indians. He showed he
was incapable of putting the Conquistadors on the same level
with the people they conquered and presented the autochthonous
population as the remains of the fabulous Atlantes, who
degenerated in "the stunted Aztec and Incan empires" and who
were "totally unworthy of their ancient, superior culture."

---

In this way he justified the admission of the red-skinned people to the cosmic race not for what they were but for what they once had been. He accepted them just as aristocrats who have come down in the world are accepted:

No matter what people say, the red-skinned races, the Atlantes who produced the Indians, have gone to sleep for millions of years and will not reawaken. In history there is no going back because it is full of changes and innovations. No race comes back; each has its mission which it carries out before it disappears.

To make his theory more coherent he announced the downfall of the white races:

The days of the pure-blooded whites, who are today's conquerors, are counted just as those of their forefathers were. By fulfilling their destiny of mechanising the world, they themselves have unwittingly laid the bases for a new period in which all the peoples of the world will fuse and mix. (2)

Nonetheless, besides not attributing a mission to the black races, Vasconcelos did not clearly explain which race was responsible for the task of miscegenation and just said that the red-skinned and white-skinned races had already completed their missions. What he implied was that the task of miscegenation belonged to a "sub-race" made up of a cross between the Caucasian and Latin peoples which has still to make its contribution because it was margined from the task of scientific advance by its white brothers. In the light of this Vasconcelos left nothing for the Indians but to wait for the creation of the Latin civilization to take them to the promised land.

As we can see, Vasconcelos' mixture was not very evenly

---

(1) Ibid., pp.907-909.
(2) Ibid., p. 917.
balanced. No matter how Mediterranean he may have been, it was still the whiteman who would call the cards. Vasconcelos showed little caution in his affirmation that Latin America "owes what it is to white Europe" and predicted that Caucasian features would predominate in the ultimate race. (1) In his essay Vasconcelos obviously tried to make an effort to harmonize his hispanophilia with miscegenation, but the delicate balance resulting from this crumbled when the resentment of his frustrated political career embittered the second half of his work from the 1930s on. From that point La raza cósmica became a "wretched little essay" and the chosen land of America became a "sluggish continent" inhabited by "second-class races." His work was full of anti-indigenism, and he said that without the Spanish influence Mexico would have been a "collection of tribes that were unable to govern themselves"; that the only legacy left by the Indian was his savageness; and that Molina Enriquez and Gamio were puppets of the Smithsonian and Carnegie institutes. (2) Thus Ulyses' astonishing talent for diatribe destroyed everything in its path and made it clear that his new project for a nation was clearly written in the most rancid Creole tradition, which unfortunately did not "turn New Spain into a better Spain than peninsular Spain." The marginalization of non-whites, the sin he had formerly accused the United States of, now constituted the example the Mexico

(1) Ibid., pp. 926-927.
(2) See José Vasconcelos, "La tormenta", in Memorias (FCE, Mexico, 1963), esp. pp. 531, 626, 674 and 795. Originally published in 1937.
should have followed. (1) By this time there were barely any traces left of the pro-Mestizo Vasconcelos. There is no doubt that it is a great shame that mestizophilia should have lost one of the greatest minds ever to come out of Mexico in this way.

From the above, there is one question that must be asked: what prompted Vasconcelos to formulate his theory of universal miscegenation? He was not motivated by fear of the Indian uprisings like Pimentel, he did not feel the urge for differentiation that Riva Palacio had felt, he did not have any desire to strengthen any social class as Sierra had had, he did not yearn for cohesion and justice as Molina Enriquez had, and he was not concerned with redeeming the Indian and homogenizing Mexico as Gamio was. However, there was one powerful argument that helped to persuade each and every one of the members of the mestizophile school and this argument centred on the irreversible reality of miscegenation. This common denominator, which influenced his predecessors to differing degrees, had a profound and explicit influence on Vasconcelos. He was generally known for being a romantic but he showed unusual pragmatism in this respect. In *Indologia* he affirmed:

> It is too late to attempt a change of practice; we can only bravely follow the adventure of miscegenation and strengthen our efforts through our powers of reflection and our knowledge, leaving the still unfathomable

meaning of its mission intact. (1)

In other words, Vasconcelos recommended that we make the best of an unavoidable situation. The Vasconcelos who wrote these words, however, had not yet become the "Creole Ulysses" and could still lament that he had no black blood in his veins and was still proud of having a small amount of Indian blood." (2) His intelligence had still not yet been confused. However, this is the Vasconcelos that interests us here. This Vasconcelos accepted the majority presence of the Mestizo and tried to convert him into the mythical axis of Latin American integration. And this was because the purpose of his prophecy was to make the cosmic race a myth and make the myth into a magnet to attract unification. His theory could be summed up in the following call: Mestizos of America, unite!

Vasconcelos' intellectual influences, which were so complicated in his philosophical work, were relatively simple in his work on miscegenation. Although he quoted Mendel and Leclerc du Sablon to back up his scientific assumptions and boldly tried to show that Spencer and Darwin had not influenced him, there are clear traces of pre-athenian positivism in his thinking. His law of the three social states contained the same form of unilinear progressivism as the French thinker, Auguste Comte, although his spiritualism

---

(1) José Vasconcelos, "Indología" in Obras Completas, vol II, cit., p. 1182. See the same idea in the book that he wrote together with Gamio, Aspects of Mexican Civilization (The U. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1926), p. 89. The influence of Gamio and Molina enriquez on Vasconcelos can be seen in this last book (see esp. pp. 87-93 and 96-97).

(2) Vasconcelos, "Indología", cit., p. 1080.
was very different. And his image of the cosmic man smacks of Nietzsche's blond beast no matter how often he explained that his cosmic man would be a "totem" and would be different to Nietzsche's superman. (1) The fifth race, in any case, would be formed by selection, and love and aesthetics would pave the way for the elimination of inferior beings, allowing the species to be perfected. Does that not sound discretely like Darwin or Spencer?

Of course, this did not mean that the theory in question would be entirely evolutionist. The influence of other masters on Vasconcelos, such as Bergson, is evident: the notion of taste as a behavioural guide is obviously intuitionist as are many of the arguments stemming from it. What happened is that Vasconcelos and several of his contemporaries who were educated during the porfirist regime had not totally been able to wipe this from their minds as thinkers of the Revolution. Despite his Plotinian neoplatonism and his crusade against positivism, the young philosopher was unable to shake himself free of his Barreda-style education.

Nevertheless, this does not undermine Vasconcelos' contribution to the school of mestizophilia one bit. Even though his theory of the cosmic race, which appeared to lack a purpose of social justice, meant he was not as advanced as Molina Enríquez and Gamio, Vasconcelos took a step forward and elevated the Mestizo to universal status. The national hybrids — he took Latin America to mean "the nation" — was

(1) Ibid., p. 1190.
longer had to suffer to consider themselves the equals of the "pure-blooded" foreigners as they were setting the example that should be followed. (1) The imperialistic intention to transplant the European model in the "new" continent had been reversed because "America did not sit in the wings for five thousand years for such a weak objective." (2) Here and in other parts, the prophetic tone is suitable for anti-colonialism. Before 1929, Vasconcelos was really an ideologue of the cultural emancipation of Latin America. Another of his merits was the fact that he did not only urge innovation in art but also in all aspects of knowledge. "It is precisely in the differences," he stressed, "that we can find the way; if we limit ourselves to copying others, we will lose; if we discover and create, we will triumph." And he added: "Each race that emerges needs to forge its own philosophy, the deus ex machina of its success." (3) He waged his struggle against mental colonialism, against the limitation of doctrines which would only be a source of self-contempt in Mestizo America. He was eloquent about Mexico and said that its history was nothing more than the successive superimposition of cultural layers that do not mix, (4) which explains his urge for originality that produced the idea of universal synthesis.

(1) Like Gamio, Vasconcelos subjected "internationalist" to national integration (in this case, they referred to sub-continental integration) because he felt it would consummate the triumph of the powerful nations. See Vasconcelos, "La raza cósmica", cit., p. 912.
(2) Ibid., p. 919.
(3) Ibid., pp. 912 and 915.
(4) Vasconcelos, Aspectos, cit., p. 5.
The theory of the cosmic race may sound rather rash today but at the time Vasconcellos published it it represented the rational effort of one of the most creative Latin American intellectuals to initiate a cultural tradition of the region's own. It is lamentable, however, that again his political frustration and innumerable controversies caused by it prompted him to embrace the most self-denigrating form of anti-indigenism and hispanicism, and the urgency for arms for the ideological debate made him abandon the creation of his own arsenal in favour of hiding himself in the trenches of the most anachronic form of conservatism. However, he must be congratulated in spite of his hispanicism for having encouraged the swelling of the ranks of mestizophilia. After all, his original genius was not dimmed by his subsequent aberrations.

4. Post-revolutionary Mexico: the Mexican under the magnifying glass.

La raza cósmica was the motto of the ethnocentrist era of the mestizophile school in Mexico and was preceded by the increasing incidence of the cultural variable in the works of Molina Enríquez and Manuel Gamio. Western racist thought had a great deal to do with this and it was not long before it exploded in the phenomenon of Nazi Germany and died in the Second World War. However, the new school created out of the evolution's introspection and the burst of creativity in
gave rise to was responsible for the demise of racial mestizophilia in Mexico. Besides the emergence of brand new tendencies in art, literature and music, the age following the Revolution witnessed the beginnings of a movement that sought to investigate what being Mexican meant and attempted to discover its distinctive characteristics. In particular, this movement devoted itself to discovering the reason for the nation's under development. This turn by the Mexican people upon themselves (the process of self-discovery went beyond the confines of the intellectual circles and attracted the attention of national film makers and musicians) was one of the least perishable fruits of the 1910 civil war. Since then gallons of ink had been used up in the quest to identify what was Mexican and constituted a continuation of the mestizophile current. In this movement, however, racial miscegenation lost its former importance and was no longer considered as a goal. Miscegenation passed into the history books as irrelevant except for its aesthetic implications. Thinkers of this age were primarily concerned with philosophy and psychology. Although Ezequiel Chávez, a mestizophile, had theorized on the character of the Mexican people, he was a post-revolutionary philosopher with inclinations towards psychology and he was responsible for inaugurating the new age. (1)

(1) Ezequiel A. Chávez, "Ensayo sobre los rasgos distintivos de la sensibilidad como factor del carácter mexicano", in Revista Positiva, 1 March 1901, pp. 84-89. Chávez maintained the need for Mexico's dissimilar population to be "pounded by history's mortar" in order for miscegenation to be culminated.
Samuel Ramos, who was a disciple of Coss and Vasconcelos, published his work *El perfil del hombre y la cultura en México* (A Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico) in 1934 and unleashed the disquiet. In Adler’s vein, he maintained that the Mexicans suffer from an inferiority complex which stems from their feeling of childish impotence in the face of Europe’s overwhelming presence. Independently of his theory, however, it is important to note that the thoughts on Mexican-ness began by taking a step backwards (although this may have been case of taking one step back to to be able to take two forwards.) Ramos was indeed a europeanist and had nothing to say for the indigenous culture. He saw the Indians as people who were naturally passive and indifferent. What was worse, however, was his rejection of cultural miscegenation and his affirmation that the contribution made by the autochtonous culture had been destroyed by the Spanish Conquistadors and that “the cultural sediment of the Creoles represented the strongest part of Mexican character.” (1) His attitude was extremely clear:

We must accept that our cultural perspectives are confined within the European context (...) We have European blood, our language is European, our customs, moral codes, and vices and virtues were passed down to us by the Spaniards. (2)

According to him, the Indians had not left any traces behind them, not even in their genes. Ramos, who flirted with Spengler’s idea of racial strife and even admitted that

"superior races" existed, felt he was part of the "Spanish race to which we belong." Although it may have looked as if the colour of his skin was getting darker at times, he called the Mexicans "coloured people" (could this have been a sign of Moorish influence?), and his statement that "our race is a branch of the European race" (1) was very clear. Nonetheless, the fact of having had to write while still under the influence of the final remaining racist ideas explains why Ramos arrived at the disconcerting conclusion that Mexican culture was not original and came from Europe. He shrilly exclaimed that "in order to turn our backs on Europe, Mexico has embraced nationalism ... which is a European concept." (2) There was no way out.

Samuel Ramos' great legacy, however, lay in the fact that he managed to awaken a sense of vocation among experts on Mexico and was responsible for having triggered off this controversy. The publication of his book and his professorship, like José Gaos', were to thank for the emergence of the Hiperión Philosophical Group in 1949. This group devoted its efforts to the study of Mexico and what was Mexican. Under the title *Mexico y lo mexicano* (Mexico and What is Mexican) the group published a collection of works edited by Leopoldo Zea, in which Alfonso Reyes, Zea, Jorge Carrión, Emilio Urquiza, José Moreno Villa and Salvador Reyes Nevare participated. (3) Meanwhile, other intellectuals

---

(3) The publisher was Porrua y Obregón.
continued the quest along different lines. The philosophical-psychological approach allowed the ethnic obsession to be overcome once and for all by substituting culture in its place. However, despite this, cultural miscegenation was considered as either something inevitable or something that was on the verge of being consummated, depending on whether this was seen pessimistically or optimistically. As a consequence, the new mestizophile school lost the sense of direction that its predecessors had possessed. It was no longer considered necessary to draw up plans to culminate the ultimate synthesis. For some, the Mestizo origin was as much a part of the past as something that the Mexican people remember to forget. That was how Octavio Paz felt, who said the following in his famous essay written in 1950:

The strange lingering of Cortés and La Malinche in the imaginations and sensitivity of present-day Mexicans reveals that they are more than mere historical figures: they are symbols of a secret conflict that we have still not resolved.

However, Paz also said that despite the clear duality of their origins, the Mexican people do not accept that they are hybrids:

the Mexican does not want to be either Indian or Spaniard. He does not want to be descended from them either. He rejects them. He does not see himself as a Mestizo but more abstractly as a man. He is nobody’s son. (1)

The Mexican people’s voluntary orphanhood thus became an identity crisis with an unknown ending.

Leopoldo Zea voiced a different opinion three years

later. He was optimistic about cultural miscegenation and said he felt its progress had been and would be inexorable for the good of Mexico. In contrast to the negative image given by Ramos, Zea affirmed that the "Mestizo spirit has produced a new feeling of security, superiority and efficiency." Likewise, he explained that even if the Mexicans continued to be influenced by western culture they were no longer copying it. "Western culture, which up to yesterday was false," he said, "is becoming essential to and part of our culture." This change was partly due to the acceptance of the indigenous roots which subtly and surreptitiously fed Mexican culture. Although there are unequal proportions in the mixture, Mexican culture is a hybrid product:

The Mestizo culture which is now beginning to shape itself is western. This cannot be denied but despite this it is different and unmistakable. This distinction is provided by the part that the Indian has contributed and it was the Indian who gave it that spirit or way of feeling that life, as we have seen, is Mestizo life, a life born of the white man and the Indian woman that emerged thanks to an accident. (1)

Although Paz did not pay any attention to the solution to Mexico's syncretism, Zea did not think it was problematic. He not only saw the cultural mixing as a desirable process but did not see any obstacles in its way. He did not feel there was anything wrong with saying that miscegenation was the product of two asymmetrical contributing factors. The

(1) Leopoldo Zea, Conciencia y posibilidad del mestizaje: Ensayos sobre México y lo mexicano (Torreón, Mexico, 1974), pp. 96-99. The quotes are taken from the second work.
supporters of a Mestizo Mexico could now rest: the advent of
the fatherland which they had fought so hard for was close at
hand.

For Santiago Ramírez, however, the matter was more
complex. As any good psychologist would have done (he was a
follower of Freud) he traced the source of the Mexican
people’s complexes back to their relationships with their
parents. He said that as the Mexican is a Mestizo originally
born of a Spanish father and an Indian mother, he feels like
a prisoner trapped between his mother’s Indian world which is
passive and full of stigmas and the violent, unobtainable
world of his father, and this situation is to blame for his
emotional imbalances. However, Ramírez did not propose
mestizotropical therapy; this ailment would have to be
treated using another remedy. (1) Two recent studies on the
Mexican people also adopted a similar attitude and it is
worth mentioning them to round off this brief review of some
of the most representative studies of this kind. One of
them, prepared by a Marxist who does not prescribe to the
more usual interpretations of this ideology, was not
satisfied with maligning miscegenation and even rejected the
existence of a “typical Mexican”, which he interpreted as a
“completely false problem that is only worthy of interest as
part of the constitution of the dominant political culture”
whose only end is to legitimize exploitation. According to
this theory (which can be used for dialectically softening
the excesses that had occurred in literature on Mexican-ness

(1) Santiago Ramírez, El mexicano - psicología de sus
motivaciones (Enlace-Grijalbo, Mexico, 1986), pp. 43-46.
even though it is somewhat exaggerated) the solution for Mexico is socioeconomic. In his interpretation, the "famous amphibian of miscegenation" served only as a metaphor to incite. (1) The other study in question is the most important work of the new current on miscegenation. However, it also shares the optimism of those who believe that the Mexican cultural synthesis is "advancing towards its full maturity" and is eliminating mimicry and inferiority complexes as it progresses. "Miscegenation, which is a consummated fact", the author affirms, "is also a process that still has to reach completion." However, the author's words indicate that the process will crystallize without having to confront any further major drawbacks. (2)

In short, there are two essential variations in the incipient Mexican neo-mestizophobia. The first consists of basing the approach to cultural miscegenation at the expense of the former concern for the racial aspect. The second is the perception of cultural syncretism as something as real as incurable, or as a beneficial process that is on its way towards its culmination without any intervention which implies the loss of the prescriptive character of the ethno-mestizophiles. This second version is understandable to a certain extent: these students of Mexican-ness were able to observe the situation from a better angle. However, it is obvious that cultural fusion has not made the same progress as racial fusion did as it was based on the

(1) Roger Bartra, La jaula de la melancolía (Enlace Grijalbo, Mexico, 1987), pp. 21-22 and 29-32.
(2) Agustín Basave Fernández del Valle, Vocación y estilo de México (Limusa, Mexico, 1990), pp. 591 and 603-42.
confidence in the inertia of racial miscegenation. However, this does not justify the hopes for progress with respect to cultural miscegenation. Finally, the relegation of the subject of miscegenation to a secondary level by contemporary Mexican thinkers has still to be explained. Miscegenation was at least given prime importance in the works of Molina Enríquez, Gamio and Vasconcelos but nowadays it barely accounts for a few paragraphs contained in studies on Mexican characterology. Is this a symptom showing that the debate is finished and that the clash between two worlds has finally given birth to a new nation that is different to how it was before? Or is it a sign of obstinate reluctance on the part of Mexican intellectuals who have chosen to consider this conflict as something that has been resolved and who shield themselves behind the mysteries of the Mexican Janus?
CONCLUSIONS.

Anyone who analyses the school of mestizophilia in any depth is bound to be amazed by its ill-assorted coherence. Thinkers belonging to the most varied range of tendencies coincide on the subject of mestizophilia and very often this is the only point that many of them have in common. Creoles and Mestizos, liberals and racists, positivists and romantics all arrive at the same conclusion: that miscegenation forms the essence of what is Mexican. Thus it is impossible to disregard the idea that many of these thinkers who started off from such different stances were in fact heading towards a preconceived goal. In other words, that their conclusion was also a premise. What makes these europeanized intellectuals opt for race mixture, which was so despised in their much-admired Europe? Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán sums up the answer very eloquently: while the Europeans were concerned with achieving unity so as to be able to protect the "purity" of their lineage, Mexican innovation was concerned with precisely the opposite; the only uniqueness open to Mexico lay in mixture. (1)

This was not a matter of personal obsession as it was obvious that there would have to be some other common characteristic between the Bravos and the Suchiates, who all called themselves Mexicans.

We must add, however, the factor of Mestizo-------------------

(1) Aguirre Beltrán, "Oposición de raza y cultura en el pensamiento antropológico mexicano", in Obras polémicas, cit., p. 44.
self-perception within the Mexican intellectual circles, which acted as a catalyst. Bearing this in his mind, the modeler became his own model or, as Luis Villoro said, the Mestizo turned out to be the "impulse and the end", and it was the Indian who became what he had been:

When the Mestizo looked at himself he saw his own project reflected in the eyes of the Indian. The Mestizo only became aware of his own ideals when he noticed the Indian standing there alone and apart in isolation. The Mestizo discovered himself by trying to help the Indian. (1)

Apart from being the only feasible option, the Mestizo was therefore the person who had been officially made responsible for Mexican "uniqueness." His situation was like that of being a judge and party to a fair cause at the same time. In addition to the objective rationality of Mexican mestizophilia, the subjective feelings of enthusiasm felt by the thinker who considered himself to be Mexican in one way or another also came into play.

There is no doubt that the most fascinating case of this was Andrés Molina Enríquez. Nobody else had to bear a doctrinal burden that was as overwhelmingly against him as he did and despite this nobody else took mestizophilia to such intellectual heights as he did. In spite of his contradictions, Molina’s theory of mestizophilia manages to integrate "socioethnology", history, politics and law in a single system. His race struggle theory makes him join the "conflict school" of Social Sciences (together with system Marx, Spencer and Gumplovicz) (1); but instead of

merely conforming to the adaptation of such theory to his purposes, Molina also formed his own conceptual structure. In this structure, we must add, his complex ethnological analysis is worthy of admiration nowadays and we should resist the temptation of claiming that it was just a form of camouflage that hid a sociological analysis. It is no wonder that somebody who lived immersed in the biological era should have believed in the pre-eminence of the race question. Likewise, there is nothing to prevent us from admiring his contribution in its historical context. After all, we already know that even nowadays any respected analyst of social conditions in Mexico must include the different ethnic groups in his research repertoire.

It does not require much intelligence to see that the correlation between race and class that Molina and his contemporaries attacked so hard still exists to a considerable extent in modern Mexico. (2) The Revolution, it is true, diminished racist taboos and eased the way up the social ladder for non-Creoles. However, there is no doubt that the presence of Indian characteristics in Mexico's people is still inversely proportional to the socioeconomic

(1) Like them, Molina interpreted mankind's future as the result of a conflict -- between races, in this case -- which would end with the advent of the ideal society.

(2) In spite of the difficulty of measuring, there is one study which shows the race-class correlation in Mexico with statistics. See José E. Iturriaga, La estructura social y cultura de México (FCE, Mexico, 1951), pp. 123-124.
standards they enjoy. The ethnic composition of the classes in Mexico represents a "racist sediment" which, in the words of Abelardo Villegas, "exercises great influence in aesthetic-erotic judgement." (1) There is no need to say who the loser is in this case.

This sums up the outstanding account for Mexican mestizophilia. The obsession with biological sociology has thankfully been overcome firstly because we now know that the ethnic variable per se cannot be used to explain human phenomena and secondly because the dynamics of racial mixture have shown that there is no longer need for racial mestizophilia. However, due to the sad race-class link cultural miscegenation was unable to make progress in the racist era. These aesthetic paradigms are still being spread in Mexico, even though they go against the grain of our official indigenist system of education (2). These paradigms denigrate most of our population. Furthermore, the absence of real cultural synthesis, which had caused the exaltation of a dominant western culture and the marginalization of a clandestine Indian sub-culture, is largely responsible for the fact that nowadays the concept of "Indian" is associated, at least in the urban centres, with a pejorative image (3). It is absurd that social inertia concerning cultural archetypes that denigrate its Indian

(1) Villegas, op. cit., p. 135.
(3) For more on this point, see Aguirre Beltrán, "Los símbolos étnicos de la identidad nacional", *op. cit.*, pp. 119-120.
roots should reign in a society that is overwhelmingly and knowingly Mestizo (1).

Those who have examined Mexican identity affirm that, for good or for bad, the process of cultural miscegenation has almost run its course. But can we use the term "miscegenation" to describe something that has been a wicked superimposition of cultures? Would it not be more exact to say that in that field, far from permeating the other social strata, the Indians have heroically kept themselves alive despite the onslaught of influence from the Spanish, French and United States cultures which have invaded Mexico? In fact, Mexican culture in many senses is clearly western and only surreptitiously Indian. Or, as Alfonso Reyes put it:

the Mexican spirit is found in the colour which the Latin water, as it came to us, acquired here in our home as it flowed during three centuries bathing the red clay of our earth. (2)

This is very true; although the water has turned a reddish tinge it is still Latin. Spanish spattered with a touch of Nahuatl. Christianity with a lingering aroma of copal resin. Barroque diluted by furtive Mayan symbolism. Time conceived as running a straight course over sporadic cyclical pirouettes. Pragmatic individualism which quells glimpses of a display of collective will. Thus the asymmetry of Mexican syncretism is irreversible in some cases and can be

---

(1) Nowadays it is common for the "Mexican current", as Aguirre Beltrán says, to consider itself to be Mestizo. See op. cit., p. 112.

(2) Alfonso Reyes, La X en la frente (Porrúa y Obregón, Mexico, 1952), p. 92.
compensated for as a whole.

Despite everything, the vitality of the pre-Hispanic substrate has to be admired. Downtrodden for several centuries and asphyxiated by the higher levels, the remains of the Indian cultures survive and are crouching behind the modern age, emerging for brief moments with great vigour. This is the "deep Mexico" spoken of by Guillermo Bonfil Batalla. This is the Mexico that also ventures into culture and turns Creole purity into a mere chimera. Even society has shown that from the moment Spain and Anáhuac began their fate of living side by side, Mexican culture could no longer be a European transplant in America as culture in the United States was. In the south of the Rio Bravo continent the future was much more complicated: Mexican identity would have to be shaped out of latin water and red clay.

So what could be done? It was obvious that a civilization that was truncated in the sixteenth century could not be fully incorporated into the twentieth century. Nor was it a case of inventing a new language or a new religion. However, the historical lesson had been learned and it was acknowledged that instead of whitening the people, what had to be done was to "mestizize" culture (1) so that nothing would prevent the hidden side of Mexico's face being

(1) This does not mean that culture should adjust itself to the race, but that an impositively asymmetrical culture, besides being unfair, is unable to generate solid national awareness. As for the rest, it is relevant to note the following coincidence: in the economic context, asymmetry, the absence of harmonious development which causes deep social imbalances, is the main characteristic of underdevelopment.
shown and this would enrich some aspects of the current cosmovision. Above all, what had to be done was to progress towards the maximum question of social justice: the face of the Indian had to be rescued from secrecy and be revindicated before the eyes of their own people as well as strangers. For this to be done, the aesthetic/cultural plans with western origins which caused inferiority complexes would have to be altered. However, a solution would also have to be sought to the problem of the Mexican identity crisis and to provide miscegenation with sympathy so as to renew a culture, that, if the truth be told, has not adapted itself to Mexican reality nor is known for its creativity. Just as Bonfil Batalla had wanted, the west had to be seen from Mexico and not the other way round. To do that:

The only way out, which besides being the only solution is also arduous and difficult, is to dig out historical will from "deep Mexico" to shape and begin our own plan of civilization. (1)

The result, however, would not be a "pluricultural nation" (that is what Mexico has been although rather disproportionately since the conquest.) The resulting nation would be unique, new and different to what all its predecessors were. This is what Bonfil was proposing without realising it. (2) Racial miscegenation in Mexico began beyond anybody's will. Cultural miscegenation ended up as virtually everybody's concern. Such is the magic of mestizophilia.


(2) What Bonfil really wanted to see was not cultural miscegenation but its fair sympathy. See op. cit., pp. 73-96 and 229-237.
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