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CHAPTER I

THE UNIVERSITY OF MEXICO

On October 19, 1833 the government of Mexico issued a decree closing the University of Mexico. This oldest of American universities might have been expected to provide a strong bond of national pride in the new Republic of Mexico, but political leaders presented an open and definite hostility towards it.

The University of Mexico had been chartered in 1551 according to the plan of the medieval universities; in fact, its charter was the same as that of Salamanca. The method of teaching followed was essentially scholastic as it had been in the medieval universities, and though the University of Mexico underwent various reforms subsequent to its founding its scholastic character remained unchanged.¹ With the coming of independence in 1821, education was made a political item and the University became a source of contention between Liberals who wished to change it and Conservatives who were satisfied with what they had. Its suppression soon followed.

¹George I. Sanches, The Development of Higher Education in Mexico (New York, 1944), 68.
and the various reasons given for that step seem contradictory and perplexing. Reforms or changes may have been necessary, but why total suppression of the old institution?

José María Luis Mora, Minister of Education responsible for the suppression of the University and the formation of a new educational system, condemned the University as useless, unrefordable, and pernicious. Those who regard Mora as the precursor of the Reform which laicized education, follow his views.

Lorenzo de Zavala, leader of the radical York Rite Masons, and Mora disagreed violently on political matters but agreed on the suppression of the University, both complaining that the religious atmosphere made learning impossible. A more conservative public figure, Lucas Alaman, also recognized the need for educational improvements, but saw in the suppression the Liberals' desire to crush the power of the Church and to

---

2 José María Luis Mora, Obras Sueltas (Paris, 1837), I, cxviii. "Revista Política" in the first volume is a review of the political situation from the formation of the Republic until 1837. Roman numerals are used for pagination.


4 Lorenzo de Zavala, Ensayo Histórico de las Revoluciones de México desde 1808 hasta 1830 (México, 1845), 289, 290.
remove the clergy from education. With Alamán's attitude many modern writers agree tending, however, to consider the University a "decrepit" institution which had outlived its usefulness.

The Liberals were eager to establish schools in the new Republic but they quarreled with the scholastic method, objecting to the "distinctly medieval flavor" of institutions of higher learning, and their perpetuation of "outmoded norms of a by-gone age." They began their campaign for the improvement of schools by closing the oldest and best known institution, and completely changed the existing system of education at a time when the government was in a state of flux. "Better no education at all than Catholic education," seems to have been their motto.

5Lucas Alamán, Historia de México (México, 1849), V, 861-862.
6J. Lloyd Mecham, Church and State in Latin America (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1934), 408; José Bravo Ugarte, Historia de México (México, 1944), III, 182; Mariano Cuevas, Historia de la Iglesia en México (El Paso, 1928), V, 196; George F. Kneller, The Education of the Mexican Nation (New York, 1951), 36.
8Crow, 287.
9Sánchez, 68.
10Kneller, 36.
The American Ambassador, Joel R. Poinsett, in a letter to Secretary of State Van Buren observed, "Less attention has been paid by this Government [Mexico] to the establishment of primary schools than in any other part of Spanish America. This has been a lamentable oversight, for not only do the great mass of the population require to be educated in order that the real principles of a representative government may be carried fully into operation, but to inspire them. . . ." 11 But this is not in harmony with an earlier opinion he had recorded in his Notes on Mexico where he commented, in rather surprised fashion, on the number of ordinary people he met who could read and write, and who, though "clothed in the garb of extreme poverty" had money to spend on newspapers which they read in the streets.12 "Previous to the Revolution the Creoles were discouraged from the attainment of knowledge,"13 he remarked, and "liberal studies were discouraged."14

On the other hand, a Spanish historian claims that the Spanish American revolutionaries could not argue that Spain kept them in ignorance, for they were better educated and more

11 Poinsett to Van Buren, March 10, 1829 in William R. Manning, Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States concerning the Latin American Nations (New York, 1925), III, 1675.
12 Joel R. Poinsett, Notes on Mexico (London, 1825), 112.
13 Poinsett to Van Buren, March 10, 1829 in Diplomatic Correspondence.
14 Notes, 113.
cultured than any other generation until late in this century. Their big mistake, this author feels, was to destroy the system instead of trying to reform it.

Nor does it seem fair to claim that education was for the aristocracy only, as the Reformers of 1833 were to claim. This had never been the Spanish ideal, for according to law, students who legally established the fact of their poverty were to be allowed to graduate without cost. American universities were rather remiss about obeying this (as other laws) and in 1770 the Spanish government issued a cédula requiring universities to graduate one bachelor in every ten without cost. This situation prevailed in Spain also. Nevertheless, it came to be a frequent complaint of the nineteenth century liberals that Spain had purposely kept them ignorant.

Priestley states that the University of Mexico gave "creoles of New Spain educational facilities far superior to those enjoyed by their pioneer fathers." He adds that intellectual life was not confined to the courses offered,


16 John Tate Lanning, "The Church and the Enlightenment in the Universities," *T Am*, XV (April 1959), 337.


18 Priestley, 153.
since contraband books of the French philosophers, particularly Rousseau, were smuggled into the country. More recent studies, however, belie this statement and disprove "smuggling" to a large extent; books forbidden entry were those damaging to faith and did not usually include science. According to the records of the Inquisition, permission was frequently granted for reasonable requests to read prohibited works other than religious. "The papers of the Inquisition show that teachers and pupils reading new books were innumerable. By the second half of the eighteenth century the universities commented with liberty on the authors accepted at the time in Europe." This is in accordance with Lanning's statement that by the end of the Enlightenment, American students could use the same authors and textbooks that were in use in Spain, Italy, France, and England. The Universities had their part in this, too, as is illustrated in the comment about the appearance of a book "whose modern theses were welcome to the colonial mind thanks to the authority of the university claustro." Modern


20 Herr, 161.

21 Garrido, 165.

22 John Tate Lanning, "The Enlightenment in Relation to the Church," T Am. XIV (April 1958), 490.

23 Garrido, 165.
scholarship has pointed out that what has been taken for reluctance on the part of the University of Salamanca to accept the Enlightenment was in reality a resentment against interference on the part of outsiders who were eager to have the University use particular texts. The administration was nettled by this attempted dictation and considered the independence and the autonomy of the University challenged, but actually the "new" learning had already found its way to students through their professors. Though Cartesianism and modern philosophy had been taught in the University of Mexico and new methods had been in use in some of the courses in mathematics and science, the University was traditionalist and not inclined to change either its curriculum or its methods at the behest of externs and University professors intended to maintain their assured income from traditional chairs.24 Speaking of the University of Mexico, a contemporary claims modern ideas did not penetrate Mexico only as contraband, nor by the Encyclopedists, but were sanctioned and supported by men of "más limpia ortodoxia".25

Professor Lanning, who has made a searching study of the problem of academic culture in Spanish America, urges comparison

24Lanning, "The Enlightenment in Relation to the Church," 490; Herr, 161, 166.

of the American student with his European counterpart rather than with scientists and heroes at peaks of thought and science. He denies the charge that the intellectual life of Spanish America was three hundred years behind that of Europe claiming that the difference was never very great, and "in the second half of the eighteenth century the gap closed so rapidly that only the time needed to cross the ocean remained." In 1763, for example, José Bartolache taught a modern course of mathematics in the University of Mexico and he is also credited with beginning medicine with experimental bases. Again, Lanning claims that the Spanish American student "had more books at his command than students in the United States fifty or seventy-five years ago had in institutions that now boast of their million-volume libraries," and he presents evidence that transfer from a purely authoritative system to one of doubt and experiment was accomplished in the last half of the eighteenth century in Mexico, as well as at Lima, Guatemala, and Caracas. European universities, the Sorbonne, Oxford, Salamanca, Bologna, were facing new attitudes, new methods, and new ideas of the


27 Garrido, 165 - 166.

28 Eighteenth Century, 346.

29 John Tate Lanning, Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies (London, 1940), 68.
modern era. The nineteenth century was a time of change and reorganization, but in Mexico the University had fallen victim to political strife which ended in suppression first in 1833, definitively in 1865 until the reorganization and reopening as a National University in 1910.

One must conclude then, that those who have made a serious and scholarly study of the subject are not at all convinced of the "decrepitude" nor of the "uselessness" of the University of Mexico, at least up until the time of independence. It is obvious that more study remains to be done on this subject.

But why did the Liberals have such a quarrel with education in Mexico? Their writings and attitudes make it clear that they regarded education as a primary necessity, yet they acted as though it did not exist in Mexico or among Mexicans. To understand the political structure the Liberals set up and the changes they made in the educational system, it is necessary to turn to the situation in which they worked and to the climate of opinion that prevailed in newly independent Mexico.
CHAPTER II

LIBERALISM IN MEXICO

It was not until the election of 1832 that victory came for a liberalist element which hastened to put its cherished ideals into practice to remake Mexican society. Before studying their work, it might be well to take a look at the workers themselves for an understanding of their ideals and policies.

The Mexican Liberalism of the second quarter of the nineteenth century found its greatest inspiration in the philosophy of the English Liberals, particularly that of the Utilitarians.¹ These Liberals tended to equate morality with happiness; for them a virtuous action was the one that promoted the greatest happiness. Social institutions were to be judged solely on the basis on their usefulness in bringing the greatest happiness to the greatest number. The eighteenth century had substituted knowledge for grace as a means of salvation² and the key to the

¹To what extent the English Minister in Mexico, H.G.Ward, was responsible for this would be the subject of an interesting study in itself.

happiness for which man sought was to be found, the Liberals were certain, in knowledge. They agreed that the minds of men are "blank sheets upon which the educationist can write whatever he thinks best, and morality, law-making, and pedagogy are consequently a single science." Under a good system of laws and education, all things might be hoped for. Ignorance and superstition they regarded as twin specters which could be conquered only by knowledge of the truth, and truth could be achieved only through the freedoms they sought: freedom of thought, of speech, of the press. "The mind must abandon itself to the abundance of phenomena and gauge itself constantly by them. For it may be sure that it will not get lost, but that instead it will find here its own real truth and standard. Only in this way can the genuine correlation of subject and object, of truth and reality, be achieved; only so can the correspondence between these concepts, which is the condition of all scientific knowledge be brought about." Liberalism, therefore, may mean a political system opposed to centralization and absolutism, but more often since the end of the eighteenth century the word has been applied to certain tendencies which imply a partial or total emancipation from

3Ibid., 182.

all external control. Man will be "his own critic, his own judge, his own advocate, his own administrator, his own ruler;" he repudiates "all ecclesiastical mediation in the service of his worldly interests. . . ." Liberalism may be absolute, contending that all laws are derived from the authority of the State, or moderate, in allowing the Church non-political authority in religious matters. In its work against political absolutism, Liberalism won the support of many who may have failed to realize its philosophical implications. Liberty, about which the Liberals spoke and wrote incessantly, meant to them not freedom for something so much as freedom from something. Liberty to them was freedom from political, ecclesiastical, social, and economic control; the battle of freedom for them was the long struggle of removing these external limitations on one's liberty of movement, intellectual or physical. Between authority and Liberalism, therefore, there has always been and must necessarily be strong antipathy and a tendency on the part of Liberalism towards anticlericalism. In a country where the Catholic Church was as strong as it was in Mexico, this is a factor to be considered.

Another force to be reckoned with in Mexican history is

---


Freemasonry, since the Masonic organization was that around which party politics developed. Freemasonry seems to have entered Mexico with the expeditionary forces from Spain in 1811 and drew its membership from upper class society, the members following the Scottish Rite (Escoses) which prevailed in Spain at the time.

An ardent champion of the march of progress envisioned by the Masons was José María Luis Mora, priest and professor of philosophy at the Colegio de San Ildefonso, whose role in the suppression of the University is under investigation. Mora had been born in Guanajuato, in the present city of Comonfort, in 1794 and had received his primary education at the Escuela Real de Querétaro, doing higher studies in the capital at San Pedro, San Pablo and San Ildefonso. After receiving the degrees of bachelor (1818) and licentiate in theology (1819), he was ordained in 1819 and soon won success as a sacred orator. At

---

7José María Mateos, Historia de la Masonería en México desde 1806 hasta 1884 (Mexico City, 1884), 6, 12. Mateos dates Mexican Masonry from 1806 when he says the first lodge was established, though he also states that regular Masonry was established in 1813 by Spanish troops.

8Wilfrid H. Gallecott, Church and State in Mexico, 1822 - 1857 (Durham, 1926), 37.

9There is some difference of opinion on the exact date of Mora's ordination. This follows Bernardo Couto's account in Orozco y Berra's Apendice al Diccionario Universal de Historia y Geografia, II, 585 - 587. This work will be cited as Apendice hereafter. Couto had been Mora's student at San Ildefonso before 1824 and remained his lifelong friend.
this time Mora considered Bourdaloue his model as the first of
the Christian orators and his friend and biographer, Bernardo
Couto, thought that had times been less turbulent, Mora
probably would have been content to spend the remainder of his
life in this peaceful fashion. In July of 1820 he received
his doctorate in theology, and in August of that year he was
named professor at San Ildefonso by the Jesuit rector, due to
the shortage of Jesuit teachers;10 here he served the chairs
of Latin and the humanities. At the end of 1820 Mora tried
unsuccessfully to obtain a professorship at the University of
Mexico.11

Couto contended that prior to 1821 Mora had not favored
the "novelties" of the Spanish Cortes. The strong anticleri-
calism of this Liberal Cortes soon proved to be one of the main
reasons for Mexican independence, but by the time the trigarante
army had occupied the capital in 1821, Mora had turned ardently
toward liberal principles.12 Mora says of himself that he had
had these principles long before, but his election as "com-
prisario" (elector) from the parish of El Sagrario in 1820
enabled him to put them into practice for the first time.13

10Mora Documents, 1806 - 1838.
11Ibid.
12Apéndice, 887.
13Obras Sueltas, I, ccxciiv.
After independence, Mora promoted the establishment of the chair of political economy at San Ildefonso and soon began his career as a public writer with the periodical El Semanario Político y Literario which contained the most liberal principles. Associated with the party of José María Pagoaga who was against Iturbide, Mora was among those who were imprisoned by the emperor for political reasons. He was sent to the convent of Carmel; eventually under the custody of the rector of San Ildefonso he was taken from the Carmel to the colegio and remained under "house arrest" there. After Iturbide's fall, Mora was elected member of the Provincial deputation from Mexico to the Constituent Legislature, and shortly thereafter he was named to a commission in charge of preparing the formation of a plan of studies to present to the next congress. On completing his task, he edited an exposition of the state of the Colegio of San Ildefonso in all branches of government and administration, proposing various reforms and changes which were praised by Lucas Alamán, then Secretary of State.

In 1824, Mora was named by the Constitutional Legislature to work for freedom of the press; he was also elected one of the deputies for the future Provincial Congress of the Mexican State. In 1825 he was president of the Congress of the State of Mexico and took an active part in the legislative acts.14 In all

14Genaro García, ed., Papeles Inéditos y Obras Selectos del Dr. Mora (México, 1910), xii, xiv.
of these activities, Mora was both a Liberal and a Mason and worked with men of like persuasions.

In Mexico, the first purely Mexican Scottish Rite lodge was begun under Nicolás Bravo and "this was the beginning of the Progreso party" composed of those who recognized the clergy as the "most terrible enemy" who confronted them. After independence and the establishment of the Empire, opposition to Iturbide grew and centered among the Scottish Rite, the lodges proving excellent centers of propaganda. Having ousted Iturbide, however, they split among themselves into Centralists and Federalists; the former, composed of those who had supported a monarchy but who had grown impatient with Iturbide's pretensions, wanted a strong central government, while the latter favored a federal republic, much like that of the United States. Under the inspiration of José María Alpuente, senator and curate from Cunduacan, the Federalists decided to form their own Masonic lodges which would be distinct from the Centralistic Scottish Rite. Lorenzo de Zavala organized the first of these and asked Joel R. Poinsett, Minister from the United States, to obtain charters for them from the York Rite Lodge. President Victoria and his Minister of the Treasury, José Ignacio Esteva, were also leaders in this movement.16

15Mateos, 4.
16Zavala, I, 257 - 258.
Poinsett's part in this Yorkist organization has been much criticized. Zavala, himself a Yorkino and a staunch upholder of Poinsett, insisted that the American did no more than obtain the charters for the Mexicans. Justin Smith, Poinsett's strongest advocate, commented that Poinsett, shortly after his arrival in Mexico found five York Rite lodges in a formative state but without regular standing. Knowing him to be a member of the rite (he had been Grand Master in South Carolina), the Mexican leaders approached him and asked for his aid and advice. In this Poinsett saw a golden opportunity, for he recognized in the Scottish Rite lodges a European sympathy and hostility toward the United States which, as a friend and supporter of the newly formed York Rite lodges, he could strive to counteract.

A Mexican historian follows this line of reasoning in charging that Poinsett's purpose in using this new rite was to strengthen United States influence in Mexico. Even Smith admits the establishment of these lodges as "the one definite and serious charge against him."

17 "Este paso, y la instalación de la gran logia, fue toda la intervención que tuvo este americano, calumniado por los aristócratas y varios agentes europeos en México, que han tenido más parte que el en los asuntos del país." Zavala, I, 258.
19 Bravo Ugarte, III, 168.
20 Smith, 88.
responsibility as "difficult to determine."  
21 Magna views this as a calculated step in Poinsett's policy to form an American Party in Mexico  
while Rippy blames Poinsett's mistakes on the British Minister, H. G. Ward.  
23 Schlarman speaks of the "insolent conduct of Joel Poinsett";  
24 Rives considers him "amazingly imprudent,"  
but Paxson thinks Poinsett is one of the best ministers of the United States in Latin America, an evaluation rather weakened by his observation that the others were mostly "thieves and scoundrels."  
26 The Niles Weekly Register discussed the "installation of the grand lodge of freemasons in Mexico by Mr. Poinsett," and quoted the newspaper El Sol which referred to Poinsett as "This renowned founder of Yorkism."  
28 Poinsett himself speaks of the Yorkinos

21Church and State, 51.
22James Magner, Men of Mexico (Milwaukee, 1942), 313.
23Fred Rippy, Rivalry of the United States and Great Britain over Latin America (Baltimore, 1929), 254.
24Joseph Schlarman, Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes (Milwaukee, 1950), 264.
27Niles Weekly Register (Baltimore), 29:259.
28Ibid., 38:4.
as "the American Party" in a letter to Clay, October 12, 1825. 29

Poinsett's guilt or innocence, however, is not the purpose of this study, but it is evident that the Yorkinos had a strong influence on the political developments of newly independent Mexico. They mushroomed from the original five to one hundred thirty lodges established in all the states of Mexico, and drew members from the older Scottish Rite. In fact, so many changed over to the new rite that Zavala commented that whole lodges abandoned the Escoceses and changed over to the Yorkinos "con fanatismo." 30 The rite which had been originally the party of Progreso became conservative by comparison with the new rite and on the whole, those who wished to maintain the status quo were found in the Scottish Rite. The basic principles of membership are difficult to determine; many secular and religious ecclesiastics who would be considered Retroceso in Mora's terminology 31 were numbered among the Yorkinos, while many who advocated religious "reforms" or were Progreso were among the Escoceses. Nevertheless, Progreso was found predominantly among the Yorkinos.

The emergence of lodges on the scene as the center of political activity meant a submission of all public affairs to

29 Poinsett to Clay, October 12, 1825 in Diplomatic Corres., III, 1638.
30 Zavala, I, 258.
31 Obras Sueltas, I, lx.
the action and influence of extra-legal associations which Dr. Mora lamented as a overturning of legal progress. Some of the party of Progreso who were not Masons, being fearful of their opponents' victory, offered their cooperation to the lodges. State governments and the supreme government, clergy and army, all were more or less under the influence of one or the other of these Masonic groups. Not only ceremonies of their rite interested the Yorkinos, who had the support of the Progresos now, but also public subjects, and herein lies their significance. But Poinsett's influence was resented, and in 1827 "un curioso fenómeno político" took place in the lodges. A group withdrew from the Scottish Rite and formed the Novenarios, so called because each member was to bring nine more. This group, enemies of the Yorkinos, and their radical politics, wanted Poinsett deported. They demanded the extinction of Masonry though they secretly maintained the rite themselves. To counteract this

---

32. *Obras Sueltas*, I, xi.


34. "... las elecciones, los proyectos de ley, las resoluciones del gabinete, la colocación de los empleados; de todo se trataba en la gran logia, en donde concurrían diputados, ministros, senadores, generales, eclesiásticos, gobernadores, comerciantes, y toda clase de personas que tienen alguna influencia." Zavala, I, 258 - 259.

propaganda, the Yorkinos also formed a new group to which they gave the appealing name of Guadalupanos. They, too, simulated a desire to end Masonry, but actually both continued in lodges with the formalities of their rites under a new name.36

Mateos gives the Masonic program as including these points:
1. Absolute liberty of opinions and of the press,
2. Abolition of the privileges of the clergy and militia,
3. Suppression of monastic institutions,
4. Improvement of the moral state of the people through education. He emphasizes that these were the principles not only of the Masons but of all who prefer Progress.37

The Scottish Rite was very much aware of its decreasing power and prestige, and under the old insurgent, Lieutenant Colonel Manuel Montaño, announced the Plan named for him on December 23, 1827. Their four-point program called for congressional prohibition of all secret societies (though they themselves kept their Masonic organization), removal of the president's ministers, expulsion of Poinsett, and observance of the constitution and the laws.38 The Yorkinos, of course, were the secret society they meant, and President Victoria was a

36 Ibid.
37 Mateos, 56 -57.
38 Hubert H. Bancroft, History of Mexico (New York, 1890), V, 37 - 40.
member. The Vice President and Grand Master of the Scottish Rite, Nicolás Bravo, led the army in an attempt to win acceptance of the Plan of Montaño and put an end to Yorkino politics. Against the Grand Master of the Escoceses, Secretary of War Gómez Pedraza sent the Grand Master of the Yorkinos, Vicente Guerrero, who attacked Bravo during an armistice and took him prisoner. 39 Bravo was permitted to leave the country, but from then on the Scottish Rite was "a laughing stock" 40 and the Movenarios were almost wiped out with this failure at Tulancingo. 41

In an effort to end the hostility between rival Masonic groups, Francisco García and Marcos Esparsa of Zacatecas began what they hoped would be a conciliatory group: the Imparciales. In Mexico City, their leading propagandist was Valentín Gómez Farías who claimed to seek a middle way between the radicalism of the Yorkinos and the conservatism of the Escoceses, 42 but still within the Masonic framework. 43 This group worked with Progress who were to be found primarily among the Yorkinos.

39 Bravo Ugarte, III, 169.
40 Church and State, 58.
41 Fuentes Díaz, 66.
42 Ibid.
43 Mateos refers to Gómez Farías as "one of the better Masons." Mateos, 62.
In the presidential election of 1828 the retiring president, Guadalupe Victoria, and his Minister of Treasury José Esteva favored the candidacy of Manuel Gómez Pedraza while the Yorkinos led by Alpuche, Zavala, and Poinsett supported Vicente Guerrero. Gómez Pedraza won the election with Anastacio Bustamante as his Vice President, but at the end of December the dissatisfied Yorkinos "pronounced" for Guerrero and refused to recognize Gómez Pedraza's election. General Antonio López de Santa Anna, who felt Gómez Pedraza as Secretary of War had slighted him, "pronounced" for Guerrero also, as did Zavala, then governor of the State of Mexico. President Victoria, disheartened and deserted, had no force to uphold him. The Yorkinos took over power, and Congress soon invalidated Gómez Pedraza's election and named Guerrero, "authentic exponent of the progressive and popular tendency, President-elect, in spite of the foreign influence which began to surround him at that moment." Bustamante remained as Vice President, and Zavala was named Minister of the Treasury soon afterwards.

Guerrero's election may be considered a distinct victory

---

44 Gómez Farías supported Gómez Pedraza more because of his opposition to Guerrero and the Yorkinos than because of admiration for the candidate himself, and he had won President Victoria over to his viewpoint. Fuentes Díaz, 68 - 69.

45 Santa Anna, 64.

46 Fuentes Díaz, 71.
for Poinsett and United States' influence, but on July 1, 1829 President Guerrero wrote to President Jackson that it would be necessary to give Poinsett his papers because of the public clamor against him, even on the part of those who had been his friends.47

Before Guerrero's term was over, the unpredictable Santa Anna and others had turned against him, and the unfortunate Guerrero lost his office and his life. To Dr. Mora it seemed that the assumption of the executive power by Vice President Bustamante reflected the efforts of Retresco, since Bustamante's cabinet was well disposed towards the privileged classes.48 When Guerrero had become president and the Yorkinos predominated in the government, Mora had retired from public life, but on Guerrero's fall he returned and reestablished El Observador de la Republica Mexicana, organ of the Novenarios49 which he had edited from 1827 to 1828. Some of his articles, especially those treating ecclesiastical subjects, displeased Bustamante, allegedly the reason no governmental appointment was given to

47William R. Manning, Early Diplomatic Relations (Baltimore, 1916), 369. Poinsett left Mexico when Guerrero was removed from office and was replaced by Anthony Butler who was warned to stay clear of Mexican politics. Ibid., 373.

48Obras Sueltas, I, xviii.

49Arturo Arnaíz y Freg, El Doctor José María Luis Mora (Mexico, 1934), 22.
Mora even though he was a member of the winning Scottish Rite party.  

Prior to 1831, personal antipathy seemed to prevent the friends of Progreso from working together, but in that year they united against Retrosceso and by mid-year the opposition which had been formed in the state governments began to go into action. Zacatecas was especially active through the efforts of Valentín Gómez Farías, deputy in the State Legislature, and Francisco García, Governor. The principles of Progreso were:

1. absolute liberty of opinion and suppression of laws which restricted freedom of the press,

2. reform of the clergy, despoiling them of all the civil influence which they enjoyed,

3. extinction of monastic orders, refusing civil support which was given them for the better observance of their institution, by means of plundering their income and lands and applying them to public necessities; and

4. a plan to improve the moral state of the people, multiplying the establishments of public education.  

50 *Ibid.*, 27; García, ix.

51 *Obras Suteltas*, I, 1; Mateos, 50.

52 Juan Suarez y Navarro, *Historia de Mexico y del General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna* (México, 1850), I, 248 - 249.
It was at this time, too, that the Zacatecas Legislature at the suggestion of Gómez Farías sponsored an essay contest on the subject of ecclesiastical incomes and ownership which attracted wide attention to the possibilities inherent in Church wealth.\footnote{The winning essay will be discussed in the next chapter.}

All this was but a prelude to the election of 1832 for which there was no lack of presidential hopefuls. The clergy and part of the military favored Bustamante, members of the old Scottish Rite were for Bravo, the old Yorkines for Santa Anna, and the "mass of the opposition"\footnote{Obras Sueltas, I, lxvi. Mora refers to Progreso, separating it from both Masonic groups.} were without a candidate but later settled on General Manuel Mier y Terán.\footnote{Not to be confused with Servando Teresa de Mier, the Dominican priest.} Mora lined up the parties thus: (1) that of Alamá supported by the clergy and military; their program, Retreroso; (2) that of the States which supported Progreso; and (3) that of the old soldiers who looked for a military dictator in Santa Anna.\footnote{Obras Sueltas, I, lxvi.}

Santa Anna himself assured everyone that Zacatecas had approved him for the presidency, but State leaders Gómez Farías and García did not agree. Another friend of Dr. Mora's, Miguel Santa María, under the name Monitor published a political work...
which Mora considered "classic for the purity of his language, exactness of his ideas, and force of vigorous reasoning," but Mora also lamented that its success was weakened because this "naturally caustic and impetuous gentleman" referred to some of the opposition as "rabble" and these angrily turned to the party of Santa Anna. 57

Even before the election, however, the Progresos felt uneasy in facing a presidential race with Bustamante in the presidential chair, since they considered him too sympathetic to Retroceso. Others, too, were dissatisfied with his regime, 58 but it was the party headed by Gómez Farías and García that directed the campaign against him and supported the restoration of Gómez Pedraza (their original candidate) to the presidency. In the rebellion that followed, General Mier y Teran refused to have a part. Gómez Farías and Mora were appalled, since it was he whom they hoped to use to replace Bustamante. Nevertheless, they threw themselves into the fight against the government in the early months of 1832. In July of that year, Mier y Teran committed suicide on the tomb of Iturbide and left the Progresos who had looked to him to unite Escoseses and Yorkinos without a candidate. In December, Bustamante capitulated. The plan of the Progresos had triumphed: Gómez Pedraza returned to finish

57 Ibid., lxvii - lxviii.
58 Fuentes Díaz, 87.
his term of office which would expire on April 1. But there was still the problem of a candidate for 1832. The wily Santa Anna kept himself in the public eye successfully enough to win this election and Gómez Farías was elected Vice President. Even before the election, Santa Anna told Gómez Farías that if they were elected, he would remain at his estate to restore his health and Gómez Farías was to take the oath of office. That "politics is the art of compromise" might never have been so true as in this election which found men of such different views and personalities holding the top executive offices.

The election of 1832 resulted in the victory of many Yorlings to Congress, and to Mora's dismay the "least part consisted in men notable for their virtues and talents." But he consoled himself with the thought that although they were of the "common people" and had "little delicacy in certain lines," they had none of the "lying and pernicious characteristics" he saw in the soldier-clericals of the preceding (Bustamante) administration. Once the sessions were under way, however,

59Ibid., 68.

60Obras Sueltas, I, lxxx.

61Arrangois commented that they were not only unknown in good society, but they wore gloves and dress coats for the first time when they attended the opening sessions. Francisco de Paula de Arrangois, México desde 1808 hasta 1867 (Madrid, 1872), II, 216. Another writer thought not fifty of them in both houses possessed a capital with which to live honestly. Suarez y Navarro, I, 54.

62Obras Sueltas, I, lxxx.
Mora, who was deputy from Guanajuato, discovered that those who had promised him that they would work for "reforms" under the hoped-for presidency of Mier y Terán now reneged, and the opposition did not content itself with mere opposition, but prepared a conspiracy sponsored, Mora insisted, by the clergy and the army. The recent opposition against Bustamante was, to his mind, completely justifiable, but against Progreso there should be no conspiracy.

Soon two tendencies became apparent in the government: (1) the military tended toward a dictatorship and absolute power under Santa Anna, and (2) the civilians (Progreso) openly explained their intention of abolishing corporations, and of maintaining absolute power under Gómez Farías. On May 26 the anticipated conspiracy broke out and Santa Anna requested and received permission to lead the army against the conspirators. He left the capital on June 2 (he had arrived on May 16 to take over the presidency) with all the forces available; the city remained unguarded under Gómez Farías. Santa Anna expected the army to "pronounce" him dictator and modestly withdrew from the soldiers' presence so it could be more easily arranged. General Mariano Arista "proclaimed" according to plan, but the cautious Santa Anna waited to see which way the wind would blow. Later he claimed to have been held prisoner at this time, but Arista

63 Antonio López de Santa Anna, Mi Historia, ed. Genaro García, Documentos inéditos ó muy raros (México, 1910), II, 30.
denied it, insisting that the army would not have permitted that to happen to its hero. Gómez Farias, in the meantime, had foreseen the likelihood of this action on the president's part, and prepared to meet the attack from Santa Anna's supporters within the city. They had not expected that, since Gómez Farias had but a small force at his disposal. He was successful, however, and Santa Anna, recognizing this determined resistance, returned to Mexico City with the story of his "imprisonment" and gave himself "all the honors of the triumph which men of good faith accorded him, believing him as sincere as themselves."65

The party of Progreso divided into two parts after their successful election of 1832: Ardientes and Moderados. The latter adhered to Retrósco "without adopting their principles" while Gómez Farias became the leader of the Ardientes. This group had won the first struggle of the new administration and with Gómez Farias as Acting President had already begun putting their program into effect. They followed their leader blindly "because he, without reserve, showed himself decided to abolish ecclesiastical and military fueras, to suppress monastic institutions, to depo the regular and secular clergy of all power

64Mariano Arista, Reseña Histórica de la Revolución que desde 6 de junio hasta 3 de octubre tuvo lugar en la república el año de 1833 a favor del sistema central (Mexico, 1835), 93.

65Obras Surtas, I, lxxxii.

66Ibid.
in civil business, to take over the Patronato and to occupy the Church lands, applying them to the public debt."67

67Suarez y Navarro, II, 70.
CHAPTER III

ATTITUDE TOWARD CHURCH-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

It was especially to Jeremy Bentham\(^1\) and his followers that Mora and the other Mexican leaders turned, agreeing with James Mill that if education did not accomplish everything, there was scarcely anything that it did not accomplish. They had an immense faith in the efficacy of education to remake their world. But in order to set up a system of education in harmony with these principles, it was first necessary to change the existing system, and here the Liberals inevitably clashed with the Catholic Church, which for centuries had been the educating force in Mexico as in all Spanish America. Any educational program had to take the Church into consideration, but they considered the Church the antithesis of the principles of freedom for which they stood. As Sierra put it, the Liberals had to

---

\(^1\)Mora's devotion to Benthamite principles may be seen even at the end of his life. Mora's straitened circumstances in his Paris exile were recognized by his old friends on their return to power in Mexico. His commission in 1846 to report on items of interest to the Mexican government was intended as a sinecure, but Mora took it seriously and sent in reports as requested. It is interesting to note that his first topic was a series on prison reform, a subject dear to Bentham's heart, but hardly "useful" for Mexico on the verge of war with the United States. -- Mora Correspondence.
transform the spirit of the new generation by means of education; without that there could not be liberty of religion or conscience basic to all others. "The Church would never consent to having liberty of conscience proclaimed and with justice; the denial of liberty of conscience was the very reason of her authority." The Liberals were convinced that they need only let the true and good emerge by free discussion and man's nature and innate goodness would inexorably impel him to recognize and act on his knowledge. "Not doubt, but dogma, is the most dreaded foe of knowledge . . . ."3

The members of Congress in 1833, therefore, were convinced that the power of the Catholic Church must be destroyed; with the Faith itself most of them insisted they had no quarrel. "... they were not anti-Christians, as some said, most of them were good Catholics; but full of zeal for equality of economic-political principles, they went to extremes which only the generation after them realized: to destroy ecclesiastical privileges . . . ."4 In its efforts to nullify the privileges of the

2"Jamás la Iglesia consentiría en ello; lo había proclamado, y con justicia: la negación de la libertad de conciencia era la razón misma de su autoridad." Justo Sierra, Evolución Política del Pueblo Mexicano, 2d ed. (México, 1940), 229.

3Cassirer, 161.

4"... no eran anticristianos, como se les dijo, eran hasta buenos Católicos la mayor parte de ellos; pero, saturados de anhelos por la igualdad y de principios económico-políticos, iban a tres fines que solo la generación que tras ellos vino realizó: destruir los fueros eclesiásticos. . . ." Sierra, 229.
clergy, the administration of 1833 followed a two-plank platform: first, it intended to render the clergy powerless by removing the source of their temporal power, their independent wealth; and second, it would assume the education of the young to prevent clerical influence on future generations. This program fitted nicely into the liberalist sentiment of the day and the Reformers spoke movingly of the joys of liberty of thought, and gradually of religious tolerance. Other bases for tolerance existed than purely religious ones, however, as for example, support of tolerance as a means of encouraging immigration to Texas and California. These leaders did not cease to consider and speak of themselves as Catholics, national rather than universal perhaps, and they desired to keep a guiding eye on the Church through the Patronato.

But the pope did not grant the Patronato, a fact which caused considerable perturbation. Regalism had regarded the old privilege of the Patronato as inherent in sovereignty, and Mexicans, accustomed to an atmosphere of Gallican-Regalism, believed their independence made them heirs of this right.

5Visente Roca fuerte, Ensayo sobre Tolerancia Religiosa (México, 1831), 40.

6A circular from the Secretary of Justice states that Gómez Farías, "firm in his political and religious principles, and conscious of his solemn oaths, is resolved to sustain the Constitution and the national religion." Juan Dublán y Manuel Lozano, Legislación Mexicana (México, 1876), II, 535.

7Alfonso Toro, La Iglesia y el Estado en México (México, 1927), 113.
They refused to see that the papacy was tied to the Spanish Government through the centuries-old privilege of Patronato which accorded the latter control of all communications between the Spanish domains and the Holy See. When the Spanish American countries declared their independence, Spain did not immediately renounce her political rights, nor did she renounce the religious rights accorded to her through the Patronato. This put the papacy in a dilemma: recognition of the new republics would alienate Spain which had, after all, kept the faith through the trying centuries past; refusal to recognize the new governments might cause the loss of the faith in all Spanish America. On both sides there was the possibility of schism and Ferdinand VII did not hesitate to threaten such dire consequences if the pope disregarded the right of the Spanish monarchy to the Patronato. The papacy vainly struggled to separate the political result (recognition of the American republics) from the religious result (vacant bishoprics in America) in the struggle between Spain and her New World possessions.

In addition, the problem must be viewed in its European setting. The downfall of Napoleon and the French Empire caused great satisfaction among the Quadruple Alliance which placed itself on the side of the old monarchies and a return to ancient rights. The pope, as well as other European rulers, supported the principle of legitimacy; and "considering the fact that all the powers, not even excepting the United States, had refrained
from recognition, it would have been imprudent and faithless for the pope to violate legitimacy by ignoring the royal rights of patronage.  

None of this seems to have been taken into consideration by the Mexican Liberals of this era. Dr. Mora had written that the practice of governments from the days of Constantine on was to discharge their duties as protectors of religion. This gave them the right to exercise control over the foundation of all, or at least the principal churches and their incomes. Therefore, the same should be true for Mexico, now a sovereign country. The Patronato was the right of the papacy to give, but Rome had no real grounds for refusing it.

As early as June, 1825, the Liberal viewpoint was made evident in the reaction to the papal brief, not an encyclical, of Leo XII in 1824, which advised the Americans to return to order, referring to "our well-loved son, Ferdinand" of "solid and sublime virtue." Modern scholarship has proved this document was written by a reluctant pontiff at the unrelenting insistence of the Spanish Government which remained dissatisfied with what it

8Mecham, 77.

9El Observador, August 22, 1827.

considered the pope's moderate language. Mexicans, who had claimed independence since 1821, were unaware of this contest between the pope and the Spanish Government, however, and their reaction was immediate and violent. Among the objections was one written by Bernardo Couto on the nature and limitations of pontifical authority, a subject suggested as a contest theme by the Congress of the State of Mexico, of which Dr. Mora was a member. Couto was the winner of the contest; his prize was two hundred pesos and publication of his essay. This young man had been a student of Dr. Mora's at the Colegio of San Ildefonso, and there is little room for doubt that it was at Mora's instigation, or at least with his encouragement, that he wrote the article. The substance of this article was an appeal for separation of Church and State, or the attitude that State affairs were not subject to Church control. In a letter to President Victoria on June 29, 1825, Pope Leo XII commented that internal political affairs of a country were not the concern of the papacy. However, his statement was overlooked by the Liberals.

11 For an excellent review of this subject, see the above-mentioned article, 115-150.

12 Years later, Couto printed a voluntary retraction of this piece of youthful exuberance, referring to it as shaded with false and exaggerated maxims, and though written in immodest and irreverent style, he said, it was accepted in "el vertigo general" at the time. La Sociedad (Mexico), January 28, 1858.

13 Medina Ascensio, 135.
This tenet of separation of Church and State was made much of in the years immediately following Mexican independence. In Latin American countries that theme "separation of Church and State" bears an entirely different meaning from its significance in the United States, a point that must be kept in mind in trying to understand this problem. The Church in the United States had never held a privileged position; in fact, it had met little but persecution in the years preceding the Revolutionary War both in England and in America. Catholics had always been a minority and a small one at that, of the North American population. In Mexico, however, the situation was entirely different. The Church had gone hand in hand with the Crown in the exploration and settlement of the New World; missionaries had accompanied the earliest discoverers and conquistadores; conversion of the Indians and maintenance of the Catholic Faith had been a prime mover in the tremendous work of the Spanish in America. After three such centuries there is no doubt that the Catholic Church was well established in Mexico. So true was this that in the considerations of the provisions of the Constitution of 1824 there was no thought but that the Roman Catholic Religion was the religion of Mexico and there should be no other. The Acta Constitutiva was drawn up January 31, 1824 as a kind of interim constitution until a federal constitution could be prepared. Miguel Ramos Arizpe, Liberal, priest, and Yorkino, was principally responsible for the Acta which provided in Article 4,
"The religion of the Mexican nation is and shall be perpetually the Roman Catholic Apostolic. The nation will protect it by wise and just laws and prohibits the exercise of any other."\textsuperscript{14} The Federal Constitution adopted on October 4, 1824, retained Article 4 without change though it made numerous additions on Church-State relationships. This is significant in that "it was demonstrated that the Mexican nation approved the retention of Catholicism as the State religion and opposed toleration toward other sects. It was not necessary for the Church to fight aggressively for a privileged spiritual position. That status was freely recognized by a populace which firmly believed as a principle of faith in the supremacy of the Church."\textsuperscript{15} Even such a Liberal as Mora said that absolute liberty of opinions was not to be confused with tolerance of worship, for in Mexico there was no other worship than the Roman Catholic professed.\textsuperscript{16} 

In practice, however, the Mexican Liberal had every intention of securing State control of the Church. In 1831, for example, another brief, this time by Gregory VIII, was rejected through the efforts, surprisingly enough, of the Minister of War

\textsuperscript{14}Mecham, 401. Poinsett gives a similar Act in the Appendix of his \textit{Notes on Mexico}, dated November 19, 1823, and signed by Ramos Arispe.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 401 - 402.

\textsuperscript{16}Obras Sueltas, I, xeii.
José Antonio Facio "making it appear strange that the Minister of War should be versed in the matter of briefs."17 The brief had been brought from Rome by Bishop Pablo Francisco Vasquez who had tried unsuccessfully to arrange for the national Patronato. It proposed a reform of the regular clergy in Mexico, and it met determined opposition from these religious and from the Liberals who preferred the destruction of the regulars to their reformation.18 Mora and two boon companions, José María Cabrera and Miguel Santa María, urged Facio's intervention after the Senate had advised Bustamante to accept the brief. Facio arranged that the brief should be explained to the ministers by two staunch Liberals, Quintero and Molinos, and the brief was rejected.19 It is difficult to see how this can be credited to the principle of separation of Church and State. Worthy of note, too, is the desire of the Liberals for the suppression of the regular clergy, who could not be affected by the Patronato as seculars could, and whom the Liberals considered as useless to the nation because of their great numbers and little active work.

Sierra states quite frankly that the efforts of the

17 José María Torrel y Mendivil, Breve Reseña Histórica de los acontecimientos más notables de la Nación Mexicana desde el año 1821 hasta nuestros días (México, 1852), 62.
18 Obras Suetas, I, cxxv.
19 Ibid., lxiv.
Liberals to convert Mexico into a laic society were due to the impossibility of maintaining a state within a State. 20 By separation, then, the Liberals, meant that the Church should have no part in State action, or in "politics" as they have frequently stated. But by "politics" they meant that marriages, funerals, education, and even holidays were to be controlled by the State alone, and morality was to be taught in State-controlled schools. This exaltation of the State and repression of the Church has been referred to as "Social Atheism." 21 The "separate existence" of the clergy was regarded as fatal to the national spirit and prosperity, 22 and the clergy must be brought under control. Their independent wealth, however, gave them a strong position, as Teran lamented in a letter to Mora. "The ecclesiastics love neither the republican government nor the federation; furthermore, they will never be happy with it because it is repugnant to their ideas, inclinations and education." 23 Teran became convinced, therefore, that it was necessary to abolish their privileges, to occupy their lands, and to suppress the regular

20 "... la imposibilidad para el Estado de subsistir con otro Estado dentro." Sierra, 228.

21 Raymond Corrigan, The Church and the Nineteenth Century (Milwaukee, 1938), 300.

22 Obras Sueltas, I, xcvii.

23 Quoted in Obras Sueltas, I, lxi.
clergy, Mora agreed wholeheartedly that to deprive the clergy of their power, "the natural thing was to begin with the goods which are the principal constituents of their force and independence."\(^{24}\)

Undoubtedly, the best-known article on Church property and income came from the pen of Dr. Mora in December of 1831. His "Dissertación sobre la naturaleza y aplicación de las rentas y bienes eclesiásticos, y sobre la autoridad a que se hallan sujetos en cuanto a su creación, aumento, subsistencia ó supresión" was written for a contest suggested by Valentín Gómez Farías to the Legislature of Zacatecas. The title is self-explanatory; the contest suggested as a theme that the essay was to answer the questions of the nature of Church ownership and decide who should control ecclesiastical wealth. In the event the Government's was the responsibility for control, the essay should explain whether such control should be exercised by the Supreme Government or by the State Governments. The prize was to be two thousand pesos and a gold medal. The winning essay was Dr. Mora's, but he never received the money.\(^{25}\)

The essay, composed of 88 sections,\(^{26}\) is introduced by a quotation from the Gospel of St. Matthew: "Render to Caesar

\(^{24}\)Ibid., cxxv.

\(^{25}\)Mora tried later when he was in Paris to collect but was unsuccessful. Mora Correspondence.

\(^{26}\)Reprinted in Obras Sueltas, I, 177 - 250.
the things that are Caesar's, but to God the things that are God's." The substance of the paper was a study of the nature of ownership and Mora followed the distinction of radical Liberals between ownership by an individual and by a corporation. The right of an individual to acquire property is natural, anterior to society, but the right of a community to acquire is purely civil, posterior to society, created by it, and consequently subject to its limitations.27 There is no doubt that the Church has a civil right to ownership of wealth, but this right is one of the community, entirely distinct from that of an individual in its origin, nature, and extension. The laws, Mora insisted, have always distinguished the ownership of the person from that of the "cuerpo"; the former has been given unlimited breadth while the latter has been restricted. The right of acquiring wealth has never had limits in an individual and it has always been licit to augment one's wealth by new acquisitions. With the corporations, however, the reverse has been historically true.28

27Ibid., 225. See Richard Schlatter, Private Property (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1951), 223, for similar arguments in debate in the French Parliament in 1789. Mora followed Locke rather than Bentham in his acceptance of individual Property as a natural right. Bentham held there are no rights anterior to the law.

28Obras Sueltas, I, 224.
Therefore, it should be certain that the Church as a political community can be deprived of the administration and ownership of wealth. The problem is not in this principle, though, but in its application; not in the right, but in the opportunity to exercise it. Mora gave two conditions as providing the opportunity. First, when the "public opinion" agreed to the exercise of this right, since even the most useful and just method will fail if it is badly received; and second, when the amount concerned is a considerable degree of the public wealth which is taken out of circulation. In another work, Mora had defined "public opinion" as "nothing else than the universal conviction of a truth owing to its examination and discussion." Examination and discussion he considered vital to the success of the course he planned to follow and from such discussion Mora was confident the truth would prevail.

Mora's essay concludes by summarizing the development of his thought. He considered that he had proved that the wealth of the Church is temporal both before and after its acquisition by the Church. The Church has the right to acquire and use temporal wealth only under the civil authority, which therefore has the right to prescribe the laws according to which this

29 Ibid., 234 - 235.

30 José María Luis Mora, El Catecismo Político de la Federación Mexicana (Méjico, 1831), 4.
wealth may be used, even without the consent of the Church. To
civil authority belongs the exclusive right of establishing
the expenses of Church worship, and in a federation this right
belongs to the States rather than to the Supreme Government. The "useful" advantage of this line of reasoning was that it
made the Church dependent on the Government and opened a fertile
field -- or rich bank -- to the impoverished Republic. In
October of 1833, Mora began to publish El Indicador de la
Federación Mexicana which contained many articles viewing Church
ownership in this fashion.

With the inauguration of Valentín Gómez Farías as Acting
President on April 1, 1833 the Liberals were in the driver's
seat and in a position to launch the program they had been
developing for years. They were out to destroy the power of the
clergy since opposition centered there but their program
attempted a positive as well as this negative approach. Mora
gives their program thus:

1. absolute liberty of opinion and suppression
of the repressive laws against the press

2. abolition of the privileges of the clergy and
militia

3. suppression of monastic institutions, and of all
the laws which attribute to the clergy the knowledge

31 Obras Sueltas, I, 249.

32 They also made clear their desire to destroy the militia, but that part of their program is not under consideration here.
of civil business, as the contraction of matrimony, etc.

4. recognition, classification, and consolidation of the public debt, designation of funds in order to use them as income and of mortgages to amortize it later.

5. methods to end and repair the bankruptcy of the national property, to increase the number of property owners, to aid the circulation of this branch of the public wealth, and to facilitate ways for the subsistence and improvement of the indigent classes without offending or taking away the rights of particular individuals.

6. improvement of the moral state of the popular classes, by the destruction of the monopoly of the clergy in public education, by the diffusion of the means of learning and the inculcation of social duties, by the formation of conservatories of arts and public libraries, and by the creation of establishments of teaching for classical literature, of the sciences, and moral.

7. abolition of capital punishment for political offenses.

8. guarantee of territorial integrity by the creation of colonies that have the Mexican language, uses and customs.33

These, Mora concluded, were the aims of all men of Progreso, both Ardientes and Moderados, but the latter did not favor prompt and energetic action as it was put into effect from 1833 to 1834.34

33Obras Sueltas, I, xci - xcii.

34Ibid. Note the similarity between this program and that of the Mexican Masons discussed in Chapter II.
Before turning to the educational program of Gómez Fariás' administration, it would be well to consider the implications of the anticlerical attacks that soon began. Frequently the statement is made that men such as these Liberals were not anti-religious, nor anti-Catholics, but merely anti-clerical, that is, against the clergy in politics. Mora's writings definitely give that impression for he never speaks against religion as such and often praises it highly. The principal aim of Progreso, he assures his readers, was to confine the clergy to their simple spiritual mission. How Mora, a priest, justified his own political position is not clear. The clergy were to be left absolutely free but were to be subject to the civil power. The ecclesiastical power, working in the purely spiritual orbit and using spiritual means, Mora considered beneficial and necessary to human nature; religious beliefs and principles of conscience are the most sacred property of man as an individual, he insisted, and the public authority cannot and should not prescribe them nor attack them in this spiritual character. But the same ecclesiastical power becomes a rival of the civil administration when it holds lands, exercises a coercive force upon the citizens, or imposes contributions. If this has been

35 Consider the quality of freedom in the aforementioned apostolic brief.

36 Obras Sueltas, I, 363.
allowed in a bad administration, (i. e., Bustamante's) then the evil must be corrected, and the primitive state must be reestablished. This the administration of 1833 wished to accomplish, not by imposing precepts on the ecclesiastical power, but by refusing them the sovereign sanction and civil cooperation.37

Three important laws were soon passed to achieve these aims. After October 27 payment of tithes (diesmos) was no longer to be made; on November 6 monks and nuns were declared free from their vows if they so wished; and on December 17, weary of waiting for the Patronato that did not come, Congress enacted a law permitting the President to fill vacant curacies by selecting one out of three applicants presented by local bishops or archbishops.38 Later Mora was to mourn that this "ley de curatos" of December 17 aroused such strong reaction to the administration of Gómez Farías that Retroseso found a leader in Santa Anna who once more assumed his role as President, and soon the Reformers were on their way out. "The publication of his law ended the pretended patience of the clergy which since then has been in frank and open rebellion against the government. This was the beginning of the fight."39

37Ibid., cxxvii - cxxviii; cxxxviii.

38Ibid., cxxvii - cxxviii; cxxxviii. The text of the law of October 27 is given in Obras Sueltas, I, 221; that of November 6 on 251 - 252.

39Toro, 113.
Another aspect of Mora's religious tendencies may be seen in his activities with the British and Foreign Bible Society, whose agent in Mexico he was. In an autobiographical sketch, Mora stated that his character had always been independent and he hoped it would be so until death. As a result, he prided himself on never adopting authority as a basis of judgment save in religious matters.\(^4^0\) Nor did he accept authority there either, judging from his correspondence with the members of this English Society, for in 1824, Pope Leo XII had condemned Bible Societies in his encyclical, "Ubi Primum."\(^4^1\) This was surely a religious matter. It may have been during this association that Mora ceased living as a priest, judging at least from his address on letters from Diego Thomson, an official of the Bible Society. As late as September 24, 1830 letters were addressed to Mora at the Colegio of San Ildefonso, but after February 16, 1831 they went to a street address in Mexico City.\(^4^2\)

\(^{40}\)Obras Sueltas, I, ccxciii.

\(^{41}\)"Vous n'ignorez pas, vénérables Frères, qu'une société vulgairement dite Biblique se répand audacieusement par toute la terre et qu'au mépris des traditions des Saints Pères et contre le célèbre décret du concile de Trente, elle tend, de toutes ses forces, et par tous les moyens, à traduire ou plutôt à corrompre les Saintes Écritures, dans les langues vulgaires de toutes les nations. . . ." M. le Chevalier Artaud de Montor, Histoire du Pape Leon XII (Paris, 1843), I, 206.

\(^{42}\)Calle Segunda del Relox, No. 9. Mora Correspondence.
Mora wrote to Thomson offering his assistance in spreading vernacular translations of the Bible in Mexico, pointing out his services might be advantageous to Thomson because of Mora's connections and reputation in Mexico, and promising to use the columns of his periodical, *El Observador*, to spread the Christian benefits and praiseworthy objectives of the Bible Society. In encouraging Mexicans to read this Bible, Mora admitted that it was the work of Anglicans and some of the Bibles printed in England (all that were destined for Mexico seem to have been) omitted books "inserted" in the Bible by the Council of Trent, but this, he was sure, in no way detracted from the Bible. Mora's lack of conformity to authority, or "independence" as he put it, is as obvious here as it is elsewhere. And the British and Foreign Bible Society came to this realization before long.

In an article in *El Observador*, Mora had written, "The [Bible] Society has not wished to insert in any of its editions notes or commentaries which might clarify the holy text; it thought it was better to present to the faithful the divine word as it left the mouth of the Most High." Imagine Thomson's surprise, then, when he received a prospectus for the Bible which the Society was to print from Mora. "It [the Bible] will

---

43 *Mora Documents, 1806 - 1838.*

44 *Obra Suyetas, II, 264 - 265.*

45 *El Observador, October 24, 1827.*
contribute a great deal toward removing Bibles without notes or commentaries, which for lack of explanation and intelligence result in great abuse, from the hands of the people. . . . It is useless to ponder the havoc that such Bibles which have been scattered in the Republic cause in the mass of the people." Thomson continued, "Have the kindness to relieve my doubts in this particular. I cannot present the prospectus to the Society for this discrepancy would be disadvantageous for you."\(^\text{46}\) Such "independence" is a little difficult to do business with!

Again, Mora's Aztec translation of the Gospel of St. Luke for the Society brought an immediate objection from the Reverend Joseph Jewett on the score of an interpolation in Chapter I, verse 28, "Santa Maria e." "Nothing of this kind can be admitted in future works," Jewett warned Mora.\(^\text{47}\) This letter probably wounded Mora's pride on another point, for Jewett took pains to point out several errors or irregularities in translation (\(\text{ilhuan}\) for \(\text{yilhuan}\), for example). "We are tempted," he wrote, "to suspect that either the translator or the copyist has been often guided by his ear, rather than by any fixed standard of orthography; and that it may be expedient to adopt some standard, before the work shall finally go forth under the

\(^{46}\)Thomson to Mora, July 18, 1831. Mora Correspondence.

\(^{47}\)Jewett to Mora, December 11, 1832. Ibid.
sanction of the Society.\textsuperscript{48} One wonders what Mora's reaction was to still another letter from Jowett which assured the Mexican that the members of the Bible Society "were not quite forgetful of your benevolent design on behalf of the poor superstitious natives among whom you dwell."\textsuperscript{49}

Mora, as agent for the Bible Society, was in charge of the sale of Bibles which were shipped from England.\textsuperscript{50} However, the authorities in Veracruz would not release the Bibles for sale or distribution in Mexico, a fact which was probably at least partly the cause of Mora's charge that ecclesiastical prohibition seriously harmed the foreign bookseller.\textsuperscript{51}

Genaro García considered Mora's dealings with the Bible Society a proof of Mora's change to Protestantism.\textsuperscript{52} That Mora himself never considered it so may be seen in a letter from Bernardo Couto to his old friend soon after Mora had fled to Paris. Mora had heard rumors to the effect that in Mexico one of the charges made against him by his enemies was that he had

\begin{footnotes}
\item[48]Ibid. The letter is written in English, but a Spanish translation is also written on the same piece of stationery. This is true of other letters written in English and seems to point out that Mora neither read nor spoke English.
\item[49]Jowett to Mora, March 21, 1833. Ibid.
\item[50]British and Foreign Bible Society to Mora, February 15, 1831, empowering him to claim Bibles from customs at Veracruz. Ibid.
\item[51]Obras Sueltas, I, cix.
\item[52]García, VI, ix.
\end{footnotes}
changed his holy religion, and he had written to Couto to defend
him against such gross libel. Couto's answer assured Mora that
Couto himself had heard no such rumor, and if it were going
around he was sure he would have done so; he soothed Mora with
the promise that if he were to hear such a rumor in the future
he would deal with as he knew Mora himself would wish.53 To the
end, Mora maintained the fiction of his Catholicity to himself
as well as to others. So we read his assurances to Couto54 and
to Benito Gómez Farías, son of his old ally Valentín,55 shortly
before his death which occurred on July 14, 1850 in Paris,
assuring them that he had no worries about the future, having
been at peace with God for many years past. In Mora's termin-
ology and thought processes, that can mean anything -- or nothing.

Mora never turned aside from an admission of the framework
of religious practices, but the recognition of a Divine authority
inspiring and guiding the Church and as a consequence requiring
submission to its religious decrees, is completely lacking in
him. Such a life cannot be called Catholic and the men who
followed such a program regardless of what they said, can
scarcely be regarded as more than nominal Catholics.

53 Couto to Mora, November 17, 1836. Mora Correspondence.
54 Mora to Couto, February 1, 1850. Ibid.
55 Mora to Benito Gómez Farías, May 1, 1850. Gómez Farías
Papers.
CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OF THE LIBERALS

The sixth point of the program Gómez Farías had pledged himself to carry out referred to the Liberals' desire to improve education by destroying the monopoly exercised in it by the clergy.¹ The very month of his inauguration saw Gómez Farías taking the first steps towards fulfillment of this plan through enactment of a law permitting the Colegios to grant degrees, a right which heretofore had belonged solely to the University of Mexico. The University Claustro shrewdly recognized in this step an effort to crush the University, and on April 20 they presented a petition to the Acting President requesting him to reconsider the matter.²

The Claustro pointed out the advantage of having an "academia Matris" in the Federal District, and of using the University as a center of educational unity. Although the Claustro could not believe that the Sovereign Government meant

¹Obras Sueltas, I, xei. Page 46, supra.

²The original of this petition is in the Mora Correspondence, 1820 - 1834, and is signed by José María Pueblot, Rector, and José H. Maniaw, Secretary. The term Claustro refers not only to the faculty but also to the alumni.
by this law to destroy the University, continued the petition, that would inevitably result if degrees could be conferred by lesser institutions. The law could not really mean that the learning given in the University halls constituted a waste of time; such charges had been made before, but never until this time had Congress considered them worthy of attention. The University denied that the lesser degrees of philosophy were only for ceremony but showed them to require rigorous proof and expressed the fear that a degree would differ little from a teacher's certificate of approval were this law to become effective. If the action were taken, degrees would lose their splendor and solemnity and because of their multiplicity, scholars would come to look down on them instead of aspiring to receive them. The charge that education was too expensive the Rector refuted, since the students in philosophy paid only 26 pesos and others only 16, while many of the professors served without pay and some of them received only eight pesos monthly. The Claustro declared itself in complete harmony with the intention of the legislators concerning the improvement of public instruction and the welfare of students, and warned Congress that dangerous books, capable of corrupting mature men, and the choice of a bad author could produce terrible results in youth whose morality the Sovereign Congress wished to improve.

Use of this term morality appears several times in the document, but the Claustro has not the same meaning for it as
the Liberals for whom it bears the utilitarian connotation of happiness.\(^3\) Their is the concept of Bentham who urged a useful education\(^4\) and the "literary" education on which the University prided itself must take an inferior place in such an atmosphere.

The University \textit{Claustro} also suggested positive improvements that might be made. There should be cooperation between the University and the \textit{colégiros} in selecting texts for courses in these institutions; the students of the \textit{colégiros} should be well supervised on their way to and from University classes (a concession to \textit{morality}); the attendance of students from the \textit{colégiros} should be limited to one hour daily for the course; a board of three professors should decide on the merits of the candidates in their field of study; poor students should be graduated free if the rector was satisfied they were unable to pay the fees.

There is no record the petition ever received an answer. The administration was determined to carry out its predesigned course, and the University was in no position to prevent its doing so. The monopoly which the University had in granting degrees had irritated Dr. Mora when he taught at the \textit{Colégio} of San Ildefonso, for he complained of the discourteous treatment


\(^4\) \textit{Chrestomathia} -- study of useful things.
his "disciples" received at the hands of one of the professors and strongly objected to the same professor's refusal to grant degrees to Mora's students after they had followed the course at the University for the stipulated time. This marks the possibility of a personal motive on Mora's part in the subsequent suppression.

On September 20 Dr. Mora received an appointment to draw up a general plan of studies for the Farías government. Named to work with him on the project were Juan José Espinosa de los Monteros, Andrés Quintana Roa, Manuel Eduardo Gorezitisa, Juan Rodríguez Puebla, and Bernardo Couto.

Mora was getting to be an old hand at drawing up educational reforms and plans of studies as each administration was eager to introduce educational improvements. He had worked on a commission named by the Provisional Junta in the first days of independence. Shortly after the fall of the Empire of Iturbide, the ministry of José García Yllueca had commissioned Mora to propose a plan of reform for the Colegio of San Ildefonso which might serve as a model for the new development of like institutions in the Republic. Then Yllueca died, and the succeeding ministry of Lucas Alamán and Pablo de la Llave named a numerous junta to

5 Mora to Perez Tejada, June 27, 1822. Mora Correspondence.
6 Carlos García to Mora, September 20, 1833. Ibid.
consider educational reforms. More than forty persons met at the end of August, 1823 and named a commission to present a general plan of studies to the junta. The commission delayed more than two years and then submitted a plan that was substantially the same as that of the Spanish Cortes which Mora felt was absolutely impractical in a new republic like Mexico. The junta never met again and the plan remained as Mora thought it should -- "en nada." Nothing more was done on the national level toward educational reform until 1830, though individual states worked out changes. Of these the most notable was that of Prisciliano Sánchez, governor of Jalisco and a man of Progreso, who founded the Institute of Jalisco.

In 1830 the next step in educational reform had been taken by Lucas Alamán who proposed a more practical change than that of Llave. Dr. Mora considered the merits of Alamán's plan to be dividing and classifying of teaching according to its branches, introducing branches unknown in colonial days, suppressing some of the numerous chairs of theology, and dedicating each college to an exclusive field of study. The defects were more numerous and more serious than the advantages in Mora's estimation, however. Nothing was said of the fate of the University, no fund to pay for the teaching was provided, and nothing was set up to

7An indication that Mexico, though conscious of English influence, was not forgetful of her Spanish traditions.

8Obras Sueltas, I, cxxi.
teach morality and to awaken in the people sentiments of personal dignity and labor.

Then came the election of 1833 and the inauguration of Gómez Farías as Acting President. The commission named on September 20 became known later as the Dirección General de Instrucción Pública and met frequently under the chairmanship of Farías who came to regard the group as a kind of private council. This "Board of Education" of which Dr. Mora was the head set to work immediately.

For many years there had been a general interest in primary education throughout Mexico and Mora agreed that it was vitally necessary in a republic since popular government was impossible to achieve without it. The Lancasterian system of primary teaching had been put into effect by the Scottish Rite Masons some years before, and the progress, though most imperfect, had been gratifying in its rapid spread. In his zeal to promote "useful" learning, Mora was looking forward to the formation of a middle class from those not fitted for the profession of science or literature. Such people have no use for a classical education and can acquire sanity and good judgment from elementary knowledge and common sense, he argued. Then at the age of thirteen

---

9Santa Anna chose for reasons of his own to remain at his hacienda, Manga de Clavo, and allowed his Vice President to assume office.

10Obras Sueltas, I, cxxi.

11Ibid., clxxxix - cxc.
or fourteen they would be prepared to dedicate themselves to the practical occupations befitting their state of life.\textsuperscript{12} Mora was in complete harmony with this useful education of the masses, but his primary interest was in the reformation of literary and scientific education which must also be useful in its practical results.

Mora's committee, the Directory, considered the colégios under three aspects: education, teaching, and methods. Contemporary education in the colégios Mora regarded as better suited to a monk than to a civilian saying there were too many devotions, too much quiet and solitude incompatible with the active faculties of youth. There was too much corporal punishment;\textsuperscript{13} too much talk of religious duties and imitation of the lives of the saints while nothing was said of devotion to one's country, of civil duties, of the principles of honor and justice; no instruction in secular history, no lectures on the lives of great men. None of this education produced "un hombre positivo," Mora complained, for nothing that was taught in the colégios was of use in ordinary life. Bentham's revolt against classical

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., excv. Note Mora's harmony with Bentham's \textit{Chrestomathia}, a revolt against classical education in favor of useful training which expresses admiration for the monitory system of teaching.

\textsuperscript{13}Mora agreed with Locke on the subject of outdoor recreation and physical punishment. John Locke, \textit{Some Thoughts Concerning Education} (London, 1699).
education in favor of practical training was Mora's revolt, too. Knowledge given in this fashion, protested Mora, adorned the understanding, but was not susceptible of practical result. Youth was ready to rule the world and society according to the principles learned in college, but these principles had nothing in common with actual events. The colégios were weakening instead of improving the state of Mexico.\[4.5\]

Mora's adherence to Utilitarianism is obvious in his condemnation of teaching also. The teaching was no better than the education, he complained; many matters of interest in another era were learned, but they had no application and the interest they inspired was far from general. He put theology and canons in this class and said all other subjects were made to bow to them. All studies were subjected to the design of good theologians and canonists, and since their only object was ecclesiastical service, their method of teaching was disassociated from the common necessities and social progress. There was no constitutional politics, political economy, secular history, commerce, or agriculture taught in the colégios. How could the business of the country be cared for by men who were not convinced of the seriousness of the subject and who treated everything according to scholastic methods? There were some men of honor who were educated in the

14Obres Sueltas, I, cxcix - cci.
colegios, but they were honorable in spite of the colegios rather than because of them. In medicine, Mora saw no study of the auxiliary sciences such as chemistry or botany, nothing of anatomical dissections, only lectures and readings.

In regard to method, Mora deplored the habit of dogmatism which might be proper to religion, but should not be extended to all branches of learning capable of growth and perfection. He would prefer more experimentation in learning, a change from the Aristotelian method. He considered that too much time was wasted on holidays, fiestas, and so on.

Mora fixed three principles to remedy this situation:

1. To destroy what is useless or prejudicial to education and teaching,

2. To establish this in conformity with the determined necessities of the social State,

3. To spread among the masses the most necessary and indispensable means of learning.

These principles were to be carried out by the party of Progreso and it must be understood that Mora meant that this party would determine what was "useless" and what the "necessities of the social state" were. As Mora pointed out, the administration of 1833 was the legal government and Mexicans

---

15 Mora, perhaps?
16 Obras Sueltas, I,cci - cciii.
17 Ibid., I, ccv.
were expected to accept that fait accompli. It will be interesting to note later Mora’s reaction to Santa Anna, the legally elected executive.

The Government asked Congress for the necessary authority to develop public instruction and on October 14 the Colégio de Santa María de Todos Santos was closed because it was not achieving its purpose of superior education. On October 19 the University was suppressed by executive decree; this was followed by a law to the same effect on October 21 which also established a “Dirección General” to head education, and added several provisions for funds for public instruction. A comparison between the charges Mora leveled against the University and the petition the University had made on April 20 is interesting:

The University was declared useless because it taught nothing, because the examinations for lesser degrees were purely formal and major degrees were costly and difficult. Even poorly instructed students from the colégios were well prepared at the University, examinations were meant to prove that a degree was a worthwhile accomplishment, and poor students were graduated free.

18 Dublán y Lozano, II, 563.
19 Obras Sueltas, I, excviii.
20 Cristobal Bernardo de la Plaza y Jaen, Crónica de la Real y Pontificia Universidad de México (México, 1931), 391 – 392.
21 Dublán y Lozano, II, 564 – 566.
The University was declared unrefomorable because all reform supposed the bases of the ancient establishment, but since the University was useless and not conducive to this object, not even the name University would be maintained.

The University was declared pernicious because it caused loss of time on the part of the students from the colegios who were out of their schools too much to attend University classes.

The Claustro had not been wrong in recognizing the attack of April 15, but their petition for reconsideration was ignored.

The Directory was empowered to decide all methods relating to the establishment of teaching; a public fund to finance the project was also under their direction; general inspection of schools and normal schools, a school of bellas artes, a national museum, and library were also the Directory's responsibilities. The Directory had complete charge of directive, economic and teaching activities of education; there was no precedent for this in former systems of education in Mexico. The Directory provided for the establishment, conservation, and perfection of materials of teaching and of teaching methods; they inspected public establishments; they received candidates for academic degrees; they named professors and proposed directors and sub-directors for the establishments of the Government. The Directory did everything that was to be done in the matter of education, with a complete and absolute control that was breathtaking in its
entirety. Even Mora admitted that perhaps later it might be
convenient to change or diminish the extension of the faculties
of the Directory, which might seem excessive, but in the begin­
nning they were necessary.22 It is obvious that such methods
might be expected to crush opposition quickly; after a successful
beginning, the part of Progreso might be able to relax.

Where did the money come from to set up this new system of
education? The Directory had no intention of repeating Alamán's
oversight in the plan he had presented in 1830; this time the
positive aspect was provided for: funds were allotted from the
endowments and income of the old institutions of learning. When
the Colegio de Todos Santos was closed, the Government was em­
powered to take the money, income, and administration of the
Colegio to use "with absolute independence" for public educa­
tion.23 On the same day that the University was suppressed by
law, the Government was authorized to develop public education
in all its branches in the Federal District and Territories, and
for this purpose was granted all the funds of existing schools.24

In addition to the above-mentioned funds, the income from
the estate of the Duke of Monteleone also was given to the

22Obras Suetas, I, ccvii.
23Dublán y Losano, II, 563.
24Ibid., II, 564.
This fund was administered "with great integrity" by Pedro Fernandez del Castillo. In spite of that, the fund was a source of discord even among the members of the Directory and was one of the reasons for the overthrow of the system; but it was necessary for the unity and regularity of the administration, Mora insisted, as well as for economy. Even more important, it guaranteed that the "pretended rights" of the old establishments would disappear in fact, having no means of support.

Mora's intention to crush the opposition of 1833 cannot be mistaken in his repetition of an admission that the powers granted the Directory were great but were "necessary" until his system was established. By that time the opposition presumably would be impoverished and unable to fight back.

On October 26 Establishments of public instruction were erected to replace the University and the colegios. These new Establishments differed from the old institutions because the first object of the administration was to break the monopoly of

25 The Duke of Monteleone was a descendant and heir of Hernando Cortés. Mora considered his right to land in Mexico "scarcely legal" because the Duke was an absentee landlord, living in Italy. Obras Sueltas, I, ccvii. Years later in Paris, absentee-landlord Mora tried desperately to receive the income from his property in Mexico. Mora Correspondence.

26 Obras Sueltas, I, ccvii.

27 Ibid.

28 Dublán y Lozano, II, 571 - 574.
the clergy, not only because it considered monopoly incapable of perfection and advancement, but also because the class which exercised the monopoly was the least prepared to do so in society.\textsuperscript{29} It is a strange fact that the administration did not admit that the system they were setting up was also a monopoly, as can be seen in the methods of appointment and control that existed in the Directory. This kind of monopoly was foreign to University practice, where professorships had been won in open contests and rectors had been elected.

The clergy, said Mora, have and should have religion as their principal study but in religion everything is believed and nothing is invented. He wanted to see the "spirit of investigation and doubt" in place of dogmatism and dispute.\textsuperscript{30} Those educated in the old system, he maintained, disdained teaching in which there was no dispute. Monastic education was not for men of the world, so he concluded it was necessary to excuse the clergy from the work of teaching.\textsuperscript{31} It was the scholastic method Mora was criticizing in his desire for teaching a more modern philosophy. That a "modern philosophy" had been taught, Mora himself acknowledged in acclaiming Dr. Simon de la Garza as the first to teach modern, rather than scholastic, philosophy at

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Obras Sueltas}, I, ccviii.
\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, ccix.
\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, ccix - ccx.
San Ildefonso. Other evidence has made clear that the "new" philosophy had been taught in Mexico as early as 1765, but Mora made no mention of it.

The old colegios and the University taught theology and canon law, Mora charged, but nothing of the indispensable branches of learning of practical application in the State. Mora wanted to see separate institutions set up to teach individual or related branches of learning. The result was the foundation of six Establishments consisting of preparatory studies, ideological studies and humanities, physical sciences and mathematics, medical sciences, jurisprudence, and ecclesiastical science.

Sites were assigned to the Establishments on the day they were created by law: The convent and church of San Camilo; the hospital and church of Jesús; the old and new hospital of Belén; the hospice of Santo Tomás with its garden; the edifice of the Inquisition applied to the Academy of San Carlos; the church of Espíritu Santo with its convent.

The First Establishment (preparatory studies) summarized all means of learning: languages, both old and modern, the idiom of the country and the most notable of the Indian languages, more

---

32Ibid., ccxiv.
33Lanning, Academic Culture, 68.
34Obras Sueltas, I, ccxiii.
35Dublán y Lozano, II, 574.
for instruction than for use in a country where Castilian was spoken by all members of society. This Establishment was not according to Mora's liking for it was not useful as he commented, but it was done as a concession to its director, Juan Rodríguez Puebla. The subdirector was José M. Troncoso. This subject matter presented nothing new since these languages had been studied at both the colégeos and the University.

The Second Establishment was to teach the good use of natural reason or development of the mental faculties of man (ideology), and was to unite metaphysical, moral, economic, literary, and historic studies. The director was Dr. Mora himself; his subdirector was to be Francisco Ortega.

The Third Establishment was to teach scientific studies: physics, natural history, chemistry, cosmography, astronomy, geography, geology, and mineralogy. The old Colégio de Minería served as the basis for this Establishment and few changes were necessary, thanks to the work of Don Joaquin Velázquez de Leon. The director and subdirector named for this Establishment were Ignacio Mora and Manuel Castro.

---

36 It is obvious that Mora is not considering Mexico's large Indian population that did not speak Spanish. Obras Sueltas, I, ccxiii.

37 Directors and subdirectors of this and the following Establishments are taken from a letter from Carlos García to Mora, October 26, 1833. Mora Correspondence.

38 Obras Sueltas, I, ccxiii - ccxiv.

39 Ibid., ccxiv.
The Fourth Establishment of medical sciences was the one that Mora considered the most necessary. Anatomy and pathology, physiology and hygiene, internal and external pathology, operations and obstetrics, legal medicine, and internal and external pharmacy were begun. Teaching here was to be entirely by experimentation and practice, and so the convent of Belen next to the hospital of San Andres was commanded to establish a place for dissection. This Establishment was the only one to survive machinations of the enemy for a few months, but they soon overthrew the school and replaced it with a convent of nuns.\textsuperscript{40} Mora makes no mention of the effort that had been made to gain practical medical experience in Spanish America. Dissections had been carried out in hospitals or cemeteries, and the recipient of the bachelor's degree in medicine could practice his profession only after he had interned with an approved physician for two years.\textsuperscript{41} Dr. Gasimiro Liceaga and Dr. José María Benitez were director and subdirector.

The Fifth Establishment had chairs of natural law of people and maritime, of political constitutional law, of Roman law, of Mexican law, of forensic eloquence.\textsuperscript{42} It was headed by Juan

\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}, ccxiv.

\textsuperscript{41}John Tate Lanning, \textit{The University in the Kingdom of Guatemala} (Ithaca, New York, 1955), 212; \textit{Eighteenth Century}, 270.

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Obras Suetas}, I, ccxiv.
José Espinosa de los Monteros, and Dr. Simon de la Garza, a former professor at both San Ildefonso and the University and greatly admired by Mora as a man of Progreso.

The Sixth Establishment embraced the branches of sacred studies: sacred history of Old and New Testament; theological foundations of religion, Biblical exposition, studies of councils and ecclesiastical writers, of practical theology or Christian moral. This organisation of studying religion, Mora informs us, is more peaceful and instructive, and it has been generally adopted in the Catholic world since religious beliefs have been attacked with subtleties. Mora, true to his conception of Church and State, planned to teach the ecclesiastics how to answer. The director of the Establishment was a priest, José de Jesús Huerta, of the same liberal persuasion as Mora, and the subdirector was Ysidro Guevas.

Mora concluded his summary of the Establishments with an excuse for the redundancy and repetition he had been unable to exclude from the new system. He had made necessary concessions

---

43 Juan José Espinosa de los Monteros was also the leader in Congress, 1833-1834.

44 Obras Sueltas, I, ccxv.

45 Torrel says of both Mora and Huerta that they turned from the priesthood to politics when they did not receive the rich benefices they wanted and saw no way of advancing in the Church.
to the spirit of "cuerpo" since no one was willing to accept
the suppression nor desist from the old ideas of small universi-
ties. Once before, Mora had defined "public opinion" and the
"general will." In the light of the above statement, it is
interesting to revert to his definitions at this time. "Public
opinion," he had stated, "is nothing else than the universal
conviction of a truth owing to its examination and discussion.
When a people has debated a doctrine for a long time, and in the
debate far from losing has gained ground in the conviction of
men until the majority comes to be persuaded, then public opinion
upon it is formed." And in answer to his own question, "What
is the general will?" he answered, "It is the desire to supply
themselves with a good that has been manifested to be public
opinion." He went on at that time to elucidate in regard to
the general will. "Is all the general will desires good?" Yes,
he replied, "If it is founded on a true public opinion, but if
it rests only on popular voice, or determined classes, then it
is essentially unjust." Apparently, the clergy had no claim

46 Obras Sueltas, I, ccxxv.

47 Catecismo Político, 4. Bentham also wrote in the form of
a catechism: Plan of Parliamentary Reform in the Form of a
Catechism (London, 1818).

48 Ibid., 5.

49 Ibid.
to a share in the public opinion, for Mora later stated that all classes of society, except the clergy, approved the change in the educational system, even Alaman.\textsuperscript{50} Alaman certainly did not approve it, however, but considered it one of the worst happenings of 1833-1834 and he approved of none of them.\textsuperscript{51}

Mora "misinterpreted" Alaman's reaction then; how did others or his contemporaries react? The biographer of Gómez Farías claims the Acting President's methods were indispensable "but the majority of the people could not understand them and thus the Reform failed."\textsuperscript{52} When Gómez Farías signed the bill secularizing all the missions of Mexico,\textsuperscript{53} there was a riotous reaction when troops attempted to escort religious from houses that were ordered closed. Many were horrified at Gómez Farías' reforms, feeling that sacrilegious hands had been laid on the sacrosanct University\textsuperscript{54} and soon the Acting President was being referred to as "Gómez Farías." The clergy were blamed for this and were accused of using the confessional and the pulpit to encourage rebellion against the administration.

\textsuperscript{50}Obras Sujetas, I, cxxiv.
\textsuperscript{51}Alaman, V, 861 - 863.
\textsuperscript{52}Fuentes Díaz, 99.
\textsuperscript{53}Dulian y Lozano, II, 689 - 690. He had already secularized those in California. \textit{Ibid.}, 603.
\textsuperscript{54}Toro, 104.
General Mariano Arista, admittedly to be considered as partisan in his own way as was Mora in his, had this to say of the administration:

... Farias and the memorable Congress of that epoch progressed with eyes covered by a bandage, it seemed, accumulating combustibles which would prepare a general conflagration. The ecclesiastical state, land owners, army, and even the men who are only distinguished for their honor or other extraordinary quality, were the target of persecution, and feared being victims of the zeal and black envy of the faction which ruled. Alarm and discontent manifested themselves everywhere and as soon as the spirit of persecution allowed; the general and vehement desire of leaving that deplorable state by whatever means and at cost of whatever sacrifice was perceived everywhere.55

In regard to the methods of teaching, which Mora had criticized in the old institutions,56 he admitted there were not notable variations in the Establishments, partly for lack of time and partly because no one knew how to use the European methods he so admired.57 A greater sense of utility might have counseled delay in changing the system until they knew more surely what they were doing.

Professors were to receive salaries between twelve hundred and fifteen hundred pesos yearly, a munificent salary in comparison with their income from colegios and the University, and

55Arista, 7.
56Obras Sueltas, I, ccxi - ccxiv.
57Ibid., ccxv.
probably an important reason why many were anxious to serve in the new Establishments. The ex-Rector of the University, José María Puchet, had served there without salary and served later in the Fifth Establishment. Dr. Casimiro Liceaga had earned three hundred pesos annually at the University and as director of the Fourth Establishment was to earn two thousand pesos, while José María Benítez, his subdirector, was to receive fifteen hundred instead of his former one hundred pesos.

The most important reason for the change of the educational system was to break the monopoly of the clergy in education, but it did not result in removing the clergy from education. Mora remarked rather sarcastically that he had in his possession thirty-two petitions seeking positions on the faculties for nineteen priests who later condemned the Establishments. At least some priests were accepted for the Establishments, José María Puchet, for example.

Even the Seminary was placed under the jurisdiction of the Directory which had the right to visit it to be sure the wishes of the Council of Trent were being observed.

---

58 *Ibid.*, I, ccxiii. Mora neglected to mention that he himself had sought a professorship in the University of Mexico about which he could find nothing good to say.

59 *Ibid.*, ccxvi. This concern is a little surprising, for Mora's *Dissertacion* on Church ownership asserted that the teachings of the Council of Trent had never been admitted in France, and most of its disciplinary dispositions had never been in effect in Spain. *Ibid.*, I, 201. (See also page 50, supra.)
By December 31, 1833, Gómez Farías could encourage the closing extraordinary session of the Congress with the results of the educational reforms accomplished in the last two months. The Establishments were open, the plan of the Directory had been put into execution, and the people were receiving the knowledge they needed "according to their professions and offices, rather than showing a vain apparatus of learning incompatible with the state of the rising society." 60

But there was trouble brewing within the "private council" of Gómez Farías, largely from a difference of opinion between the directors of the first two Establishments: Juan Rodríguez Puebla and José María Luis Mora. Rodríguez Puebla was a great enthusiast for Aztec culture -- he claimed to be one of the race -- and wanted separate schools for the Indians, but this segregation was not in harmony with Mora's educational concepts. 61 Rodríguez Puebla in addition to being a Progreso was also a Yorkino who stirred up trouble for the Farías administration in the columns of the Fenix de la Libertad and in the Chamber of Deputies with the help of Gómez Pedrasa. From January, 1834, Santa Anna began to receive an increasing volume of letters at Manga de Clave complaining of Gómez Farías and

60 J. M. Puig Casauranc, La Educación Pública en México a través de los mensajes presidenciales desde la consumación de la independencia hasta nuestros días (Mexico, 1926), 7.
61 Obras Sueltas, I, cc1xii - cc1xiii.
inviting the elected President to assume his responsibility. According to Mora, Gómez Farías had the power to seize and imprison Santa Anna at this point, but he lacked the will to do so. This Mora regarded as the greatest of all faults. When such a great social change is undertaken, said Mora, it is necessary to see it through to completion. Gómez Farías could have had the support of a great number of Congressmen and at least eighteen of the twenty states, insisted Mora, and he could have proved Santa Anna's conspiratorial designs by authentic documents. He did not do so, partly because the step would be unconstitutional, and partly because he did not have the ambition to command that some assumed him to have. Mora conceded that in regard to the latter point, Gómez Farías had maintained his reputation on a "very secondary point," but he did not agree with his actions at all. It may have been this event that caused Mora to say of his friend that he was "one of the most independent of the posterity of Adam" and would not be influenced by anyone, even Mora.62

The return of Santa Anna, the "Attila of Mexican civilization," coincided with the publication of the "maladada ley de curates"63 which only made martyrs of many and constituted a campaign weapon for the Church. The Ministers of War, Treasury,

---

62Ibid., I, ccxcvii.

63The law of December 17. See page 48, supra.
and Justice resigned, and only Francisco Lombardo remained in the cabinet "to give the sad example of immorality." The Escoceses insinuated themselves skillfully into Santa Anna's good graces and he accepted them, more from vanity and ostenta-
tion than from conviction. These Masons filled the places left by the Progresos, insisting on the federal form of govern-
ment, maintaining ecclesiastical reforms already in use and desisting from those not yet begun, and, finally, upholding the new arrangement of public instruction. The privileged classes were so sure of triumphing against this Masonic program in the next election that they waited to change these things.

On July 31, 1834, a decree was issued restoring the University, its Claustro, and its funds, and promising a new plan of studies for the colegios within thirty days. The new Establishments, declared the decree, were formed on bases opposed to justice and public convenience. Had the system been so organized that youth could meet in truly scientific colegios where they could receive a virtuous education, the President would have overlooked the manner of providing funds which they had followed, and would have indemnified the corporations which suffered loss. On the contrary, however, the President listened to the general clamor raised by the parents and by the youth against the method of teaching and education which was adopted,

64 Obras Sueltas, I, cclxvii.
and decided to end a method which was not favorable either to
to letters or to virtues. The decree was signed by Francisco
Lombardo.

One wonders if Mora in his Parisian exile harkened back
to his Catecismo and applied it to the administration of 1833.
One cannot make another happy against his will, he had written,
nor free him from evils. "... and this is what happens when
some few wish to make reforms of whose usefulness, although
true, the majority of the nation is not convinced." One can
know if the administration is according to the general will, he
had also taught, for "if after having won they cannot maintain
themselves, without doubt they do not have in their approval the
genereal will; but if they succeed the contrary is certain, that
it favors them."
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The suppression of the University of Mexico was promoted and carried out by Liberals who worked through Masonic organizations. Their goal was the establishment of an educational system which would form a new generation\(^1\) untouched by the traditional educational system of the Catholic Church. Their method was to point up the negative aspects of Mexican education, to criticize the number and quality of existing schools, and finally to establish schools which would form public opinion rather than be formed by it.

Their charge that Spain had purposely kept the Americans in ignorance ignored the facts of Spanish settlement in the New World. The tradition of learning that Spain brought to the Western Hemisphere is one of her greatest achievements. The schools that sprang up all over North and South America from Indian mission schools and gild schools to the Universities cannot be explained away by a stroke of the pen. When the

\(^{1}\)Sierra, 229.
Liberalism in the nineteenth century spoke of schools that would prepare young people for a useful life; they were a long way from being original. Pedro de Gante had begun such schools for the Indians within the first generation of Spanish in the New World, and the missionaries had followed a similar system in the intervening years. The plan that was followed for each mission included a school, workshops where essential trades were taught and practiced, and a farming area to teach the Indians better methods of agriculture. Admittedly, the methods might have been improved upon, but criticism of such methods nearly three hundred years later by those who admitted the imperfections of the Lancasterian system of teaching and who did not know how to use the European methods they had insisted on instituting in the University is hardly to be considered objective reasoning.

From the Grito de Dolores in 1810 to the Santa Anna-Gómez Farias administration in 1833, Mexico had been in the throes of almost constant revolutions. Surely this fact should be given some consideration in discussing possible reasons for lapses in the educational system, particularly on the primary level. If the University were as useless and decrepit as was claimed, it would scarcely have seemed necessary to use such extreme means to crush it, means which engendered resentment of the Liberal regime and hastened its overthrow.\(^3\) Historically, the European

\(^2\)Obras Sueltas, I, ccxv.
\(^3\)Ibid., 104.
Liberals attempted to control the Universities and the Mexican Liberals were no exception.

Politically, these leaders in Mexico wanted and meant to have a liberal government which would provide freedom from all external restraints in speech, thought, press, and religion. In setting up the liberal scheme, they turned towards absolutism and made the State the decisive force in any one of these fields. Inevitably their Masonic liberalism conflicted with the Church whose authority they considered a restraint to be removed. Freemasonry accepted Christianity as an historical fact with no hint of divine revelation, and its members prepared to replace a Christianity they considered decadent. Where Christianity had spoken of spiritual freedom, equality of all before God, of the brotherhood of man, Freemasonry turned to political equality and civil liberty. The field of Christianity had been spiritual; that of Freemasonry would be social. Though Deists might want to kill Christianity, Freemasonry was led by those who treated Christianity with great respect in consideration of its past social achievements and influence on the people, but of respect toward a thing divine it had none. To say this is anticlerical is to misjudge the position of the Church as a supernatural

---

4Herr, 163 - 172.

5Bernard Fay, Revolution and Freemasonry, 1680 - 1800 (Boston, 1935), 307.
force, a point which these Mexican leaders themselves claimed to uphold.

Mora himself says, in more than one place, that the primary aim of the administration of Gómez Farías in education was to break the power of the Church. Again, he claimed the clergy brought all the trouble on themselves because they would not cooperate and were willing to overthrow the established government, but the clergy had been warned before the administration ever came into power that they were to be the target of Liberals and Masons. Included in Gómez Farías' proposed program had been such goals as suppression of the monasteries and destruction of the clerical monopoly in education. Mora had also made known through his prize-winning essay in 1831 as well as in 1833 in the articles of El Indicador de la Federación that Church goods were State property, that the State should provide for the expenses of the Catholic Church and should use its authority to maintain this religion by appointing priests to particular places, by closing churches and schools, by preventing the ordination of more priests, and so on. Much of this was done secretly in the first stages, but long before the election of 1833 this program was no secret in any way. These were the open and avowed intentions of the Liberals, and whatever they may have said of separation of Church and State, they envisaged

6 Obras Sueltas, I, cxxiv.
a Church controlled by the State, her influence in religious and spiritual spheres crushed. Freemasonry staked all on progress and power of the human mind and accepted science as the source of all certitude, even religious belief. It became, therefore, the "apostle of science and progress and the enemy of tradition." 7

That the Mexican Liberals were not surprised by clerical reaction to their program is evident in Mora's statement that the position in 1833 had to end "in the ruin of the federation by the privileged classes, or in the destruction of these classes by the triumphant forces of the federation." 8 To preserve the federation (to which Mora was but a recent convert, having first ardently espoused centralism) they felt they had to destroy the clergy; and destruction of the clergy meant destruction of the Church, no matter what they said to the contrary.

José María Luis Mora played a primary role in this Liberal movement. From his own works it is possible for us to reach an understanding of what not only Dr. Mora, but all Liberals of his era, wanted to accomplish in ending the old

7Fay, 310.
8Obras Sueltas, I, cxxiii. Italics are Mora's.
educational system and introducing a new one. These Liberals felt, as Cassirer stated, that "The mind must abandon itself to the abundance of phenomena and gauge itself constantly by them. For it may be sure that it will not get lost, but that instead it will find here its own real truth and standard." This attitude was so strong in the Liberals that it was tantamount to a faith on which they based all their actions, and in order to achieve its fulfillment they set up their educational program. In the new Establishments "examination and discussion" would prevail, and from this debate would emerge the conviction of the majority and the "public opinion" to which the Liberals adhered with remarkable devotion. But when Mora defined public opinion he specified it was based neither on "popular voice" nor on "determined classes." He referred to the clergy and military, but when the "determined class" was the administration of 1833, the same rules seem not to have applied for it is obvious that the Liberals did not reflect the general will of which Mora spoke. Nor does Mora's attitude towards Santa Anna, who had been elected with Valentín Gómez Farías, reflect his ideal of public opinion and the general will in his impatience with

---

9 Cassirer, 9.
10 *Catecismo Político*, 4.
11 *Fuentes Días*, 99; Toro, 104; Arista, 7.
Gómez Farías' refusal to assume full presidential authority. The Establishments did not reflect the general will but in them a directed public opinion would be formed. The University of Mexico was suppressed because it was "useless" in this project and because, recognizing the bond of tradition and authority, it stood in the way of this kind of Liberal development.
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