UNIVERSITÀ DI TORINO

UNIVERSITA’ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

DIPARTIMENTO DI CULTURE, POLITICA E SOCIETÀ

DOTTORATO DI RICERCA IN
GLOBAL HISTORY OF EMPIRES

CICLO XXXV

TITOLO DELLA TESI
A ‘FRATERNAL CHAIN’. THE WORKING NATION BETWEEN MEXICO AND FRANCE (1829-1867)

TESI PRESENTATA DA
MATIAS XERXES GONZALEZ FIELD
TUTORS:
GIOVANNI BORGOGNONE (UNITO)
FRANCESCO CALLEGARO (UNSAM/EHESS)

COORDINATORE DEL DOTTORATO:
BARBARA CURLI
ANNI ACCADEMICI: 2019-2023
SETTORE SCIENTIFICO-DISCIPLINARE DI AFFERENZA:

SPS/02 STORIA DELLE DOTTRINE POLITICHE

A “fraternal chain”. The working nation between Mexico and France (1829-1867)

Gonzalez, Matias X.

Ph.D. Candidate
Global History of Empires
Dipartimento di Culture, Politica e Società – Università degli Studi di Torino

Tutor
Giovanni Borgognone
Università degli Studi di Torino
Dipartimento di Culture, Politica e Società

Co-tutor
Francesco Callegaro
Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina
École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales - Laboratoire interdisciplinaire d’études sur les réflexivités - Fonds Yan Thomas

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements *8*

Introduction *11*

1. Beyond 1917 and 1848. Uncovering the roots of a historical concept of socialism 12
2. The nation without nationalism. Towards an alternative history of the nation 16
3. Coming to grips with an alternative history of the nation. The working nation 21
4. With and beyond the nation. The Atlantic working nation 25
5. Beyond the idea, the imaginary: Atlantic socialism 27
6. Atlantic socialism after 1848: the institution of worker internationalism 29
7. Structure of the dissertation 32

Part I *35*

An impossible social pact? Building a national politics in Mexico, 1828-1844 *35*

Chapter I *36*

The erratic building of a national politics, or the "consistent interplay" of the nation's groups *36*

1. Introduction 36
2. Beyond the "civil war": the roots of a contested national politics (1830-1841) 38
3. The Nation and its bodies. From the "impossible national pact" toward the "disagreement" on the nation 45
4. Conclusions 59

Chapter II *61*

Building the working nation: The incidence of work in the process of nation-building, or transformation of national politics from within *61*

1. Introduction *61*

2. From the project of "industrialization" to the working groups' constitution of a national industry 63
3. The transformation of industry from within: work and labor according to the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos 74
4. Weaving the imaginary of work. Mutualism, cooperation, and the Mexican working nation 80
5. The imaginary of work, beyond "practical liberalism" 92
6. Conclusions 97

Part II *101*

At the root of an alternative modernity. The Fraternal Chain of Work, from Mexico to France and back *101*

Chapter III *102*

The missing link of the Atlantic working nation: the sociological principle between Mexico, France, and Spain *102*

2. Beyond the explanation of "backwardness". Mexico's "crony capitalism" 103

3. The disagreement on national industry from within 107

4. The missing link of the chain. Sotero Prieto, Joaquín Abreu, and the groups of Cádiz 114

5. The nation in association. The alternative Modernity of the Parisian working organizations 121

5.1. The organization of the nation, with and beyond the juridical principle of the French Revolution. The sociological principle and the Parisian working groups 127

5.2. The institution(s) of the French working nation: The imaginary of work 137

5.3. The institution(s) of the French working nation: the organization of the working groups 143

5.4. The institution of the French working nation: socialism 148

6. Conclusions 154

Chapter IV *159*

Atlantic socialism, there and back. The nation and the republic, beyond the "political divide" *159*

2. The hybrid dimension of the international working nation: in the search for the "social organization" of the nation 160

3. A socialist-republican turn. The working nation between Mexico, Spain, and France 169

4. The Atlantic working nation's "international system", beyond the "political divide" 181

5. Altering modernity from within. The Atlantic working nation's socialism 195

6. Conclusions 197

Part III *201*

The State and the Working Nation. Atlantic Modernity's "intersocial dimension" *201*

Chapter V *202*

The Nation and the State, beyond the Nation-State. The working nation's alteration (1848-1855) *202*

2. Moving the nation. The indigenous working groups, 1848-1853 205

3. Defending the "work of nationals". The socialist re-imagination of the Mexican working nation 214

4. The working nation's Republic of Work. Between Mexico and Paris (1848-1855) 224

5. Between revolutions: 1853 and 1855. Or the plight for the State. 233

6. Conclusions 242

Chapter VI *247*

Empire, Nation, and State. The intersocial dimension in the Age of Empires (1857-1867) *247*

2. Another nation and another State. 1857 with the working nation 248

3. 1857 and its reactions. The working nation and civil society 256

4. Squabbling for the State. The Second French Empire and its groups 266

5. The gaze on the Empire is impoverished? The Atlantic working classes (1863-1867) 271

6. Conclusions. Atlantic worker internationalism. The interconnected nature of the worker labor movement 286

Conclusions *291*

The Atlantic working nation and the intersocial dimension *292*

Bibliography *301*

Archives 301

Newspapers 301

Primary sources 301

Primary sources in edited volumes 303

Secondary sources and bibliography 305

Acknowledgements

My gratefulness goes to a number of people that have been key in the process of drafting, writing, and thinking this dissertation. To my PhD supervisors, Giovanni Borgognone and Francesco Callegaro, for the keen and persistent comments that were crucial in building the dissertation upon solid scientific grounds. The critical perspective of professor Borgognone was sided by an unending scientific and philosophical dialogue with Francesco (who I can consider a mentor as much as an admired friend) that goes back to 2017, when I began my master's degree. Without such exchanges my intellectual maturity would not have had the same progress, and the dissertation would not have come to be what it aspires to be: a contribution to the historical study of past societies, with a reflexive social-scientific background.

My gratitude as well to the members of the PhD Board in Global History of Empires, particularly professors Federica Morelli, Marco Mariano, Alexander Semyonov, Barbara Curli, Javier González Díez, Sofia Venturoli, Jean-Frédéric Schaub, and Tatiana Borisova, who expressed their academic concerns regarding the first drafts of the dissertation. Their availability beyond academic needs was also crucial to carry this research forward, especially during the various lockdowns and COVID-related restrictions. The University of Turin's institutional and financial support, academic possibilities, and mobility grants throughout the process assuredly raised the dissertation's scientific standards.

Having had the immense fortune of travelling from Mexico to Argentina, and then to my current hometown Turin has given me the privilege of establishing a wide network of academic and personal relationships. From my "profe" in Mexico Carlos Illades, to whom I will always be grateful for opening my eyes to nineteenth-century Mexican socialism as I was starting to explore the pages of *Capital*, as well as his continued support and advice ever since; to Francesco, Giuseppe Duso, Sandro Chignola, Lorenzo Rustighi, Agustín Casagrande, Gabriel Entin, Elías Palti, Javier Fernández-Sebastián, and the collective of professors that met in 2017-2018 in Buenos Aires, for digging the intellectual furrow that is conceptual history for my research; to Facundo Rocca and Emmanuel Romero, two dear friends with whom I share the privilege of having woven a fascinating and ongoing discussion on Rancière, the *Proletarian Nights*, and the past lives of workers, their issues and reflections, with the help of their brilliant and gentle philosophical minds; to Ezequiel, Adriano, Laura, Mariano, and the group which collectively discusses on the "working nation" with the characteristic Argentinian intellectual fervency. They are proof that meaningful friendships spark when a shared passion mirrors a human capacity of relating.

Academic and intellectual work, especially since last year as gatherings were slowly renewed, was accompanied by an unexpected amount of significant bonds that crossed the Campus's halls and corridors. It is difficult to put into words the significance of Castre, Anna, Violle, Stea, Morgana, Elena, Sara, Fabio, Matilde, Fra, Claudia, Francesco, for the past couple of years. Shared experiences in and outside the University were crucial to lift me up when I was down, with the obvious consequence of giving this dissertation an ulterior push. The dear friendship built with the inhabitants of the "Bunker" was part of a process of re-inhabiting Turin, with an embracive group of people I have come to consider an extended family: Stella, Fabio, Andre, Sara, Giulio, Ali, Matteo, and Mati. Again, words hardly describe the appreciation and fondness I will never get used to.

It goes without saying that this dissertation would not have had its first vital push without Ele, Pippo, and Michi who without second thoughts welcomed me to their home as a member of the family. An endless gratitude for those years may only partially represent their meaningfulness.

Gratitude, gratefulness, or appreciation do not meet the standards of the unconditional and continued support by my family, particularly my parents Ramón and Nievska. Despite having left Cuernavaca more than 12 years ago, and Mexico 6 years apart, their unyielding capacity to transmit a caring enthusiasm for a plentiful experience wherever I am is a thrust that habit will never consume. This dissertation goes to them, la abuela Nieves, and la Nonna, who did not get the chance to read these lines.

Introduction

1. Beyond 1917 and 1848. Uncovering the roots of a historical concept of socialism

This dissertation was originally intended as a history of "socialism" between nineteenth century Mexico and France. I soon discovered that such history had arguably been written, leaving few if any margins for innovation within this historiographic field. Previous theses seemingly stood on quite solid grounds: there was no such thing as socialism in Mexico before 1848,[1] basically because there was no working-class movement that could sustain it.[2] The thesis seemed to lay on two suppositions. On the one hand, that socialism had to be linked to an industrialized or proto-industrial working class ideology,[3] and on the other that such socialism and the subjects that formulated it had to be "influenced" by a socialism that emerged only after the 1848 revolutions.[4]

There were unmistakable Marxist theoretical suppositions being poured into the experience of Mexican working populations, but also remnants of a strong communist ideology poured into the definition of socialism.[5] In other words, Mexican historians seemed to rely on their twentieth

---

[1] To the disdain of an enriching history of socialism, such thesis still permeates among some of the most important members of Latin American intellectual historiography. See, for example: Carlos Altamirano, "Izquierda(s). Breve ensayo sobre la gestación de una noción del lenguaje político moderno," *Prismas - Revista de historia intelectual* 24, no. 2 (October 1, 2020): 159–69, https://doi.org/10.48160/18520499prismas24.1168. For an admirable example of current historians who have destabilized the Marxist interpretation of Latin American socialist experiences, see the following programmatic article: Horacio Tarcus, "Aportes Para Una Historia Conceptual Del Socialismo En El Espacio Rioplatense (1837-1899)," *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 5 (2018): 122–78. Explicitly and not, he follows efforts such as José Aricó's, whose work still has enormous value. José. Aricó, *La Hipótesis de Justo: Escritos Sobre El Socialismo En América Latina*, Colección Historia y Cultura (Buenos Aires, Argentina) (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1999).

[2] Luis Chávez Orozco, *Prehistoria Del Socialismo En México* (Mexico City: Publicaciones del Departamento de Bibliotecas de la Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1936); Gastón García Cantú, *El socialismo en México, siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Era, 1969); José C. Valadés, "Cartilla Socialista de Plotino C. Rhodakanaty. Noticia Sobre El Socialismo En México Durante El Siglo XIX," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 3 (1970): 9–66; José C. Valadés, *El Socialismo Libertario (Siglo XIX)*, ed. Paco Ignacio Taibo II (Mexico City: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung/Para Leer en Libertad A.C., 2013).

[3] A history that was largely dependent on the British example of the industrial revolution and the transformations it carried for labor. Luis González y González, "La Unión Hace La Huelga (1867-1876)," *El Trimestre Económico* 24, no. 93(1) (1957): 22–32; José C. Valadés, "El Nacimiento de Una Industria Mexicana," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 4, no. 04 (1979): 95–103.

[4] Gastón García Cantú, *Idea de México. El Socialismo*, vol. 2, Vida y Pensamiento de México (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1991).

[5] Some historians difficultly differentiate between one and the other during the nineteenth century, determined by the experiences of the following century. As shall be briefly seen in chapter three, this was one of the structural delimitations that socialism built throughout the 1840's. For the difference between socialism and communism in the nineteenth century, see: Jacques Grandjonc, *Communisme, Kommunismus, Communism: Origine et Développement International de La Terminologie Communautaire Prémarxiste Des Utopistes Aux Néo-Babouvistes : 1785-1842* (Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1989); William H. Sewell, "Beyond 1793: Babeuf, Louis Blanc and the Genealogy of 'Social Revolution,'" in *The Transformation of Political Culture 1789–1848*, ed. François Furet and Mona Ozouf, vol. 3, The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture (Amsterdam: Pergamon, 1989), 509–26; Michel Cordillot, "Socialismo y Comunismo En Francia, 1830-1848," in *Mundos Posibles: El Primer Socialismo En Europa y América Latina*, ed. Carlos Illades and Andrey Schelchkov, Colección "Ambas

century categories of working classes and socialism to define their field of analysis, falling into one of the classic "myths" of the history of ideas.[6] The conclusions were quite aporetic: to the extent that neither the Mexican working population or its ideas fit into the frames established by a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of socialism or the working classes, neither one or the other could exist in a context where industry did not exist, the word socialism did not circulate, or the artisan did not identify himself as a working-class member with revolutionary claims. Therefore, there was nothing to find for the historian of socialism and the working classes in Mexico before 1848; the field was closed before I even started investigating.

This complicated picture for my research did not stand for long. As I set out to investigate the origins of socialism, and its link with the Mexican working classes, theoretical and historiographical presumptions which were hiding pieces of evidence and concealed certain realities of the Mexican "world of labor" emerged. In the sources, categories such as "class" and "ideology" did not appear. How to understand the working classes in such a context then? If they were not "socialist", then what political ideas did they endorse? Or were they merely passive actors in the politics of their time? To what social body did they claim their belonging to? Did they identify with any kind of collectivity that was not the class?

There were two historians that had partially answered such research questions for the Mexican case: Clara Lida and Carlos Illades. With the theoretical and historiographic support of authors like William Sewell and the so-called "British Marxists",[7] the groundbreaking work of Lida clearly showed that the Mexican world of labor had been, perhaps unintentionally, submerged by historiographic categorizations of the past century. To understand it, historians needed to get rid of the Marxist categories used to analyze the British Industrial Revolution, such as the "proletariat", when analyzing the first half of the Mexican nineteenth century world of labor. One cannot understand it with the glasses of a European social historian because there were other social dynamics ruling the local world of labor. To sink the artisan into practices of a capital-reigned, industrialized, world would only avoid a deep understanding of his or her world and the

---

Orillas" (Mexico City: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Cuajimalpa, 2014), 37–61.

[6] Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53, https://doi.org/10.2307/2504188. For an articulated critique of the limits of Skinner's interpretations, see: Elías José Palti, *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*, Metamorfosis (Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores Argentina, 2007); Facundo Rocca, "La modernidad democrática como límite a la historia contextual de las ideas políticas," *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 5 (September 3, 2018): 14–46.

[7] Raymond Williams, "Notes on British Marxism since 1945," *New Left Review*, no. I/100 (December 1, 1976): 81–94; Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Workers: Worlds of Labor* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984); Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); William H. Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Penguin, 2002).

social relations the artisanal world of labor weaved.[8] Illades, in turn, took these working hypotheses and unveiled the categorial inconsistency of a "working class socialism" in Mexico during the first half of the nineteenth century. But this did not mean that there were no working populations nor that they did not have contacts with the socialist world that was developing in Europe.[9] In other words, the problem with previous analyses was that both socialism and the working classes were taken as self-explanatory, if not self-evident categories instead of historical concepts.[10] Unfortunately, neither Lida nor Illades wrote a comprehensive history that unveiled the link between the Mexican working populations and socialism before 1848.

Nonetheless, their studies clearly pointed to the necessity of establishing a study that followed the dialogue between the artisan's world, their global social context, as well as their ideas. We needed to weave a social and conceptual history of the Mexican world of labor to determine if, when and where the concept of socialism emerged. The first approach to Mexican historiography set the need to question, as it had never been done before, the political concepts as originated from the minds of people who expressed, discussed, and contested their ideas mutually.[11] That is, concepts are irreducible to a simple self-enclosed language, as much as society

---

[8] Clara E. Lida, *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888: Textos y Documentos* (Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España, 1973); Clara E. Lida, "Trabajo, Organización y Protesta Artesanal: México, Chile y Cuba En El Siglo XIX," *Historia Social*, no. 31 (1998): 66–75; Clara E. Lida and Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Trabajo, Ocio y Coacción: Trabajadores Urbanos En México y Guatemala En El Siglo XIX* (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2001). Under the supervision of Lida, Sonia Pérez Toledo unveiled like no one before the nature of the Mexico City working populations as artisanal with highly corporative customs and practices in the first half of the nineteenth century. The latter explicitly took E. P. Thompson's classic as a reference to deconstruct some of the abovementioned assumptions. See: Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo: Los Artesanos de La Ciudad de México, 1780-1853* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Históricos/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Iztapalapa, 1996); Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2011).

[9] Carlos Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853," *Historia Social*, no. 8 (1990): 73–87; Carlos Illades, *Las otras ideas: estudio sobre el primer socialismo en México, 1850-1935* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era /Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Cuajimalpa, 2008); Carlos Illades, "El Proceso de Organización de Los Artesanos de Ciudad de México, 1853-1876," *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y Del Caribe / European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, no. 59 (1995): 59–75; Carlos Illades, *Hacia La República Del Trabajo: El Mutualismo Artesanal Del Siglo XIX*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Gedisa/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2016). Carlos Illades and Andrey Schelchkov, eds., *Mundos Posibles: El Primer Socialismo En Europa y América Latina*, Colección "Ambas Orillas" (Mexico City: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Cuajimalpa, 2014).

[10] Javier Fernández Sebastián, "¿Cómo clasificamos a la gente del pasado? Categorías sociales, clases e identidades anacrónicas," *Historia y Grafía*, no. 45 (July 14, 2015): 13–56, https://doi.org/10.48102/hyg.vi45.106.

[11] The reader might notice that this form of conceptual history combines both Skinner's reception of J. Austin's theory of *speech acts* as much as the German school of *Begriffsgeschichte*. Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas"; Melvin Richter, "Reconstructing the History of Political Languages: Pocock, Skinner, and the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe," *History and Theory* 29, no. 1 (1990): 38–70, https://doi.org/10.2307/2505203; Hartmut Lehmann and Melvin Richter, eds., *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte* (Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute,

is all but impermeable to the ideas proposed by its individuals and the languages they consequently form.[12] Given that we had already perceived the intrinsic limits of using a historiography formed from and for European contexts, recurring exclusively to such a conceptual history would have imposed serious limits to our research. Despite its avowed success in treading conceptual history beyond Europe towards Latin America without forgetting the common legacies, *Iberconceptos* barely referred to our subject of study.[13] When analyzed, the working populations were abandoned to the political susceptibility and passivity that placed them under the aegis of the economic and political powers that ruled them. In other words, they followed the common historiographical prejudice that ultimately placed them as mere individuals within the liberal nations. The prejudice was reproduced both by the history of ideas and social history, which continued to see the role of the working populations as subjects of the Nation-States they were part of. Consequently, their language was at best "popularized" or simply rendered the predominant liberal political language "practical".[14]

1996). The latter includes one of the few exchanges between Pocock and Koselleck on their respective theories of ideas. Though we do rely on this frame, we develop it further with other traditions of conceptual history, as shall be seen below.

[12] Reinhart Koselleck, "Begriffsgeschichte Und Sozialgeschichte," in *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik Geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979), 107–29; Reinhart Koselleck, "Begriffsgeschichte and Social History," *Economy and Society* 11, no. 4 (November 1, 1982): 409–27, https://doi.org/10.1080/03085148200000015.

[13] For an account on the gradual abandonment of this regionalized conceptual history, see: Javier Fernández Sebastián and Luis Fernández Torres, "Iberconceptos: un proyecto de investigación en red: cuestiones teórico-metodológicas y organizativas," *Spagna contemporanea*, no. 51 (2017): 153–75; Jan Ifversen, "The Birth of International Conceptual History," *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 16, no. 1 (June 1, 2021): 1–15, https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2020.160101. Unlike the homonym dictionary for Spain, it does not include conservatism or socialism in its analyzed concepts. Only liberalism is included for the Ibero-American dictionary. *Cfr.* Javier Fernández Sebastián and Juan Francisco Fuentes, eds., *Diccionario Político y Social Del Siglo XIX Español*, Alianza Diccionarios (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2002). In the Iberoamerican dictionary, one may find some references to the working populations in: Fátima Sá Melo Ferreira, "Entre Viejos y Nuevos Sentidos: 'Pueblo' y 'Pueblos' En El Mundo Iberoamericano Entre 1750 y 1850," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, ed. Fátima Sá Melo Ferreira and Javier Fernández Sebastián, vol. 1, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 1117–38; Fabio Wasserman, "El Concepto de Nación y Las Transformaciones Del Orden Político En Iberoamérica, 1750-1850," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, vol. 1, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 851–69; Elisa Cárdenas Ayala, "NACIÓN. México," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, ed. Fabio Wasserman, vol. 1, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 929–40; Noemí Goldman, "Soberanía En Iberoamérica. Dimensiones y Dilemas de Un Concepto Político Fundamental, 1780-1870," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Noemí Goldman, vol. 10, 10 vols., Iberconceptos (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 15–41. An outstanding exception to the rule among conceptual historians has been established by some Argentinian historians such as Noemí Goldman and Gabriel Di Meglio. See the volume: Noemí Goldman, ed., *Lenguaje y Revolución: Conceptos Políticos Clave En El Río de La Plata, 1780-1850* (Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros Editorial, 2008). See also: Horacio Tarcus, *El Socialismo Romántico En El Río de La Plata (1837-1852)* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2016).

[14] Charles A. Hale, *El Liberalismo Mexicano En La Época de Mora: 1821-1853* (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1982); Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Entre El Discurso y La Coacción. Las Elites y Las Clases Populares

The sources, however, did not convey a "practical liberalism". The working groups radically discussed the implications such a "practical" approach to the construction of national industry and the State implied. Rather than relying on already constructed categories of analysis, we needed to comprehend which projects, imaginaries, institutions, and, ultimately, what politics were being conveyed by these groups. The representation of a Nation-State pursued by the Centralist Republic (1836-1846) was not reproduced, for instance, in the *Semanario Artístico* or *El Aprendiz*, both periodicals where artisan hands were at least partially present in the drafting process. Between the political language of the republican centralists and that of the working populations, there were undeniable "slippages". But their language was irreducible to republican precepts of citizenship.[15]

As I continued exploring the sources, it became quite evident to me that their political ideas answered to their direct experience as workers. There was a link between their conception of the nation and the concepts of work, labor, and industry to be investigated. And it seemed to me that the exploration of this semantic web was worth pursuing, since it promised more than a variant of the same dominant vision of the nation. In this, I did not find much support from the nation and nationalism field of historical studies. Indeed, though there had been some recent efforts to reconstruct some "alternative" conceptions of nationalism, tracing the popular origins of a vision of the nation which radically contested the views embraced from the elites and the State,[16] the fact is that the category of nationalism is still predominantly tied to a single project of nation. That is, historians analyze the sources regardless how original, subversive, divergent, such popular conceptions may have been: alternative visions thus come closer to being the other side of the same coin, rather than remolding the coin altogether.

2. The nation without nationalism. Towards an alternative history of the nation

Ever since Benedict Anderson's classical study, the nation has been described by historians as a

a Mediados Del Siglo XIX," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política* (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 311–38.

[15] For the concept of slippages, see: Antonio Annino, "Ciudadanía 'versus' Gobernabilidad Republicana En México. Los Orígenes de Un Dilema," in *Ciudadanía Política y Formación de Las Naciones: Perspectivas Históricas de América Latina*, ed. Hilda Sábato (Mexico City: Colegio de México/Fideicomiso Historia de las Américas/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999), 62–93; Antonio Annino, "Pueblos, Liberalismo y Nación En México," in *Inventando La Nación: Iberoamérica Siglo XIX*, ed. François-Xavier Guerra and Antonio Annino, Obras de Historia (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003), 399–430. I discuss this more deeply in: Matias X. Gonzalez, "El socialismo en su lugar. La «organización social» de la nación y los orígenes intersociales del primer socialismo mexicano hacia 1850," *Historia Y Memoria*, no. 24 (2022): 177–224, https://doi.org/10.19053/20275137.n24.2022.13537.

[16] Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

"sociocultural artifact", an "empty" concept as such that is in itself philosophically "poor" and "incoherent", open therefore to an endless series of contextual variations. Contemporary common sense has it that the nation is an "imagined community" to the effect that it would depend on an "abstract" and "unselfconscious" conception of the community. As such, the "significations" of the nation were imperturbable, therefore easily transposable to other contexts, where its basic ideas would simply "merge" with local ideologies, keeping the unshakable certainties of the community that created it.[17]

Yet an evident conceptual inconsistency in Anderson's explanation surfaces in his historical account. He unambiguously exchanges the notion of nation with that of nationality, in the same way as he associates the imaginary dimension of all social reality with fictions that would be the object of a mere subjective belief. Paradoxically, however, we soon discover that his account of this fictionality is built on a quite abstract history of what he names nationalism. His analysis of the origins of nationalism in the Americas presupposes that its nations were the product of the "creole States", formed by people who shared the same language and descendance against their "enemies". It follows, according to Anderson, that the independences "*were* national independence movements".[18] As Latin American historiography has appointed, he falls prey to the redundancy of resorting to a historical conception of a movement that was actually built by an ideal, a nationalist category, *after* the independences. Rather than being informed by the social and political movements of the time, such nationalist histories were accounts constructed according to an ideal rather than an actual description of the movements.[19]

We thus need to reaffirm the necessity of an approach radically different from those forms of intellectual history that reduce social reality to a symbolic construction, under the pretext that it is not natural, thus seeking to examine the "differential features of each particular form of

---

[17] Benedict Richard O'Gorman Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991), 3–5.

[18] Anderson, 49.

[19] Mark Thurner and Andrés Guerrero, eds., *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas* (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003); Tomás Pérez Vejo, "La construcción de las naciones como problema historiográfico: el caso del mundo hispánico," *Historia Mexicana* 53, no. 2 (October 1, 2003): 275–311; Antonio Annino and François-Xavier Guerra, eds., *Inventando La Nación: Iberoamérica Siglo XIX*, Obras de Historia (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003); Alfredo Ávila, "El Triunfo de Los Republicanos," in *Para La Libertad: Los Republicanos En Tiempos Del Imperio 1821 - 1823*, Historia Moderna y Contemporánea (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2004), 213–76; Eric Van Young, "The Limits of Atlantic-World Nationalism in a Revolutionary Age: Imagined Communities and Lived Communities in Mexico, 1810-1821," in *Empire to Nation: Historical Perspectives on the Making of the Modern World*, ed. Joseph Esherick, Hasan Kayalı, and Eric Van Young (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 35–67; Palti, *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*; Javier Fernández-Sebastián, "Tiempos de Transición En El Atlántico Ibérico. Conceptos Políticos En Revolución," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Joao Feres Junior, vol. 1, 10 vols., Iberconceptos (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 25–72; Mark Thurner, ed., *The First Wave of Decolonization* (New York: Routledge, 2019).

discourse" or to refer it to the "subsoil of ideas" from which it emerges.[20] As there is little if any space in this framework for the creative dynamics springing form social reality, I realized that in order to make room for what was emerging from the sources –that is, a socially grounded, alternative, vision of the nation–, I had to revisit the internal link between conceptual and social history to inform my theoretical and methodological perspective with a different vision of society as the horizon in which the individual and especially collective subjects that imagined such concepts live. The history presented here tries to be such a conceptual and social history of the nation, as imagined or, in other words, actually created in practices through institutions, by those working groups that think its concepts and put them into action. Sometimes such actions exceed the subsoil which has been studied, restituting a historical potential to the sources. As expressions of social movements, the unambiguity of the "nationalist" category projected by historians is questioned by the historical concepts collectively used by actors.

Before being the obvious object of a "nationalist" trend, the nation was a concept utterly disagreed upon. As François-Xavier Guerra argued, not all concepts of the nation were *sine qua non* "nationalist". Irreducible to a "culturalist" sense, the nation was above all a socio-political concept that was discussed in the very movements of society.[21] As evidence of the intrinsic limits to the cultural project which sought the union of Indians and Creoles in a single identity, he demonstrates how the idea of a "voluntary community" was conceived by a "radical minority" during the Cadiz period. Once the problem crossed the Atlantic, Americans posed the question on the nation in terms of *which* community was to be "transmuted" into a "modern nation".[22] Rather than an arrival for nationalist discourses to ascertain themselves upon an inert reality, independences expressed a movement that re-elaborated the different concepts of nation that had existed thus far. Indeed, historians have indicated a polysemy that was not present and not necessarily relatable to the problem of nationality in that it historically preceded and politically

[20] Elías José Palti, *La Nación Como Problema: Los Historiadores y La "Cuestión Nacional"* (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003), 26.

[21] In this sense, Palti's text (see note 20) is a privileged example to see the aporias intrinsic to a merely intellectual, "cultural", analysis of the concept of nation. As he illustrates in his study, such approaches, and inevitably also his, fall into the aporia of analyzing a political phenomenon culturally. That is, they fall into the contradiction of politicizing, through their analysis, an object that for the history of ideas is a merely cultural object. As if there were an artificial separation of "culture" from "politics", evident in Palti's constant analysis of scientific discourses when considering the general contextual framework where a political discourse appears. In this dissertation we embrace the hypothesis that if one accepts the political character of the concept, and the political implications that different analyses may have of it ("cultural", "scientific", etc.), one has access to a study that at least accounts for its polyvalence and polysemy, rather than just creating an artificial hierarchy of the sciences over the society they study. Such a focus seems to forget that sciences were actually an integral part of society, by subduing the latter to the former.

[22] François-Xavier Guerra, "La Nation En Amérique Espagnole : Le Problème Des Origines," in *La Nation*, ed. Jean Baechler, La Pensée Politique 3 (Paris: Seuil-Gallimard, 1995), 94, 101–2. I thank Georges Lomné for the reference to this text.

exceeded it.[23] When historically and socially accounted for, the nation appears as a political resource that predated the establishment of any kind of modern State, as the French case itself testifies.[24]

As political and social movements, revolutions in the Atlantic put political identities into play which opposed and were recomposed according to the "political conjunctures of an unpredictable and unprecedented crisis".[25] The *fil rouge* between Mexico and Europe did not end in the Iberian space but amply flowed towards the problematic construction of the French nation as well. The aftermath of the French revolution created an existential crisis for society as a whole, while Mexico was submerged in the impossibility of forming a unified voluntary community according to the abstract will of the State, which was "smuggled in, imported from Spain, where it is celebrated to the detriment of the nation in the legal lexicon".[26] The problem with the "semantic pleonasm"[27] of nationality-nationalism is that it presupposes the existence of the juridical link of the State to the nation as its subject, at a time and place that such a link could hardly be upheld. It thus forecloses the analysis of different concepts of nation beyond a juridically abstract imaginary: "Where the nation is impossible or difficult to impose, the outcome will be to pour it into nationalism".[28] Such a category, we argue, does not give us the tools for analyzing the very historical problem of the nation, the formation of modern, social and political, communities, because it is traversed by the prism of twentieth century nationalisms.[29]

---

[23] Alfredo Ávila, "México: Un Viejo Nombre Para Una Nueva Nación," in *Crear La Nación: Los Nombres de Los Países de América Latina*, ed. José Carlos Chiaramonte and Carlos Marichal (Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 2008), 271–84; Annick Lempérière, *Entre Dios y El Rey: La República: La Ciudad de México de Los Siglo XVI al XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013).
[24] As the French case shows, it was precisely the difficulty of organizing the bipolarity between the nation and the State that complicated, historically, the constitution of the nation according to Sieyès's ideal. In this sense, it should not surprise us that Guerra himself does not hesitate to speak of the "new conceptions" put into action by the "new face" given by the French Revolution to the problem of the nation. See: Lucien Jaume, *L'individu Effacé, Ou, Le Paradoxe Du Libéralisme Français* (Paris: Fayard, 1997); Giuseppe Duso, "Revolución y constitución del poder," in *El poder: para una historia de la filosofía política moderna*, ed. Giuseppe Duso (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2007), 164–71; Sandro Chignola, "Constitución y limitación del poder," in *El poder: para una historia de la filosofía política moderna*, ed. Giuseppe Duso (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2007), 159–62.
[25] Guerra, "La Nation En Amérique Espagnole : Le Problème Des Origines," 95.
[26] Annick Lempérière, "MÉXICO/NUEVA ESPAÑA," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Annick Lempérière, vol. 3: Estado, Iberconceptos, II (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 153.
[27] Pérez Vejo, "La construcción de las naciones como problema historiográfico," 280.
[28] Jean Baechler, "L'universalité de La Nation," in *La Nation*, ed. Jean Baechler, La Pensée Politique 3 (Paris: Seuil-Gallimard, 1995), 26.
[29] For Mexico, this was even more evident given the creation of a "revolutionary nationalism" after the 1910 revolution by the officialism reigned by the PRI. Perhaps the two best examples of such a view are: Jesús Reyes Heroles, *El Liberalismo Mexicano: Los Orígenes* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982); Enrique Krauze, *Mexico: Biography of Power* (New York: HarperCollins, 1998). The extent to which this permeated into society is evident in literature as well. See: Octavio Paz, *El Laberinto de La Soledad: Postdata/Vuelta A "El Laberinto de La Soledad"* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007). On the contrary, I think Eric Hobsbawm's study does have some rescuable aspects, particularly in chapter two

Once we had confronted the theoretical and methodological limits of the predominant historical approaches, implicitly built upon a sociology that goes back to the constructivist principles of Max Weber, we found recourse in the alternative sociological vision developed by Marcel Mauss. Straddling nineteenth and twentieth century conceptions of the nation, Mauss denounced the "sociological negligence" *vis-à-vis* the nation as a new form of society. Written a century ago, *La Nation, ou le sens du social* (1920) still goes against some of our most established elitist stato-centric prejudices by finally tracing the movements "from below" that decisively contributed to the process of establishing morally, economically, and politically "integrated" societies.

Mauss also emphasized the relational life of societies, thus giving us the means of analyzing the formation of nations not only from below, but also from without, or, to put it better, *in-between*. The process at the origins of all nations is an inter-social process, insofar as it involves the "life of relations" between groups, their forces, and ideas, as well as the relations between the societies to which these groups belong.[30] The movement of these groups does not fit within the framework of nationalism because the nation was often assembled and conceived, imagined, by them in and through exchanges *between* societies: in the "intermediate degree of belonging" questioned by the American nations as to the European nations.[31]

The use of Mauss' sociological principles has proved in time to be very useful, in order to come out of the impasses of methodological nationalism and to account for the process of nationalization of the social as it actually took place in Mexico. Indeed , while the creole, nationalist, European inspired "imagined community" does not "explain adequately how the Mexican nation itself came into existence, nor does it help account for the troubled political history of the country well into the nineteenth century",[32] Mauss opened the path to an "alternative

---

where he consistently seeks to "beware of confusing the debates of the literate, [...] with those of the illiterate, and of reading twentieth-century usage anachronistically into the past". The scrupulous study he proposes of languages and the political use of "protonationalism" gives certain tools to see the actual correspondence between a "cultural", social and political process of nation-building that is sometimes historically contrasted with the arbitrary "literate" construction of nationalism. Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 46–79.

[30] Marcel Mauss, *La Nation, Ou Le Sens Du Social*, ed. Jean Terrier and Marcel Fournier, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2018), 84, 120–22.

[31] Guerra, "La Nation En Amérique Espagnole : Le Problème Des Origines," 92.

[32] Van Young, "The Limits of Atlantic-World Nationalism in a Revolutionary Age: Imagined Communities and Lived Communities in Mexico, 1810-1821," 59. This does not mean that nationalist imaginaries did not have consequences. It was the privileged position and the "American" singularity which in many cases gave creole elites an argument for independence. D. A. Brading, "Creole Nationalism and Mexican Liberalism," *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 15, no. 2 (1973): 139–90, https://doi.org/10.2307/174695; Rafael Rojas, *La Escritura de La Independencia: El Surgimiento de La Opinión Pública En México* (Mexico City: Taurus/CIDE, 2003); Antonio Annino and Rafael Rojas, *La Independencia: Los Libros de La Patria*, Herramientas Para La Historia (Mexico City: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2008); Joshua Simon, *The Ideology of*

history" of the nation, both relational and antagonic,[33] one that could explain the nation creatively imagined, and conflictually instituted, by the working groups in the three social spaces that had an inter-connected history: Mexico, Spain, and France.

3. Coming to grips with an alternative history of the nation. The working nation

Since I was discussing the conclusions of previous historians who had linked the politics of the working populations to "practical liberalism",[34] I needed to go back to the sources with the help of a historiography that had not neglected the "actions, language, and ideas of peasants, local intellectuals, and regional political coalitions",[35] as well as how the working populations had become doubly "forgotten"[36] throughout the nineteenth century, historically and politically. Some historians have indicated some places where "alternative" visions of the Mexican nation and their social roots emerged.

As most political and social historians acknowledge, well before the singular "Nation", the "state", or "society", Mexicans reflected in terms of their local realities and how to effectively weave their relationship.[37] As presented throughout the dissertation, cities, villages, towns, *pueblos*, municipalities, local councils such as the *juntas* and the *ayuntamientos*, haciendas, and scattered factories all hosted a wide variety of groups from the rich industrialist, the financial

---

Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought, Problems of International Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316665633.

[33] As an anthropologist, it has been perhaps the work of Lomnitz which has come closer to such an alternative history, albeit without abandoning the analysis of "nationality". Claudio Lomnitz, "Hacia Una Antropología de La Nacionalidad Mexicana," *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 55, no. 2 (1993): 169–95, https://doi.org/10.2307/3541108; Claudio Lomnitz, *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico: An Anthropology of Nationalism* (Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Claudio Lomnitz and Pablo Piccato, "Building the Mexican State: The Notion of Citizenship," *Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 2 (2013): 163–69.

[34] Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos: La Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios, 1843-1844," *Signos Históricos* 5, no. 9 (2003).

[35] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 322.

[36] Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, "Los Años Olvidados," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 5, no. 2 (1989): 313–26, https://doi.org/10.2307/1052093; Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, eds., *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados* (New York: Routledge, 2018).

[37] John Tutino, "The Americas in the Rise of Industrial Capitalism," in *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 26–70; Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, eds., *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016); John Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," *Historia Mexicana*, January 2, 2016, 1119–92, https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v65i3.3181; Eric Van Young, *A Life Together: Lucas Alaman and Mexico, 1792-1853* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021). See also: John Tutino, "The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 3 (1998): 367–418, https://doi.org/10.2307/2518330.

speculators derogatorily named *agiotistas*, to the local journeyman, the associations of artisans and the peasants. The turn from a creole nationalism towards the historical concepts of the nation through a sociohistorical attention to the groups of nineteenth century Mexican society revealed that, much like in European societies after the French Revolution and the disintegration of the Spanish Empire, the crisis that ensued was dealt by these groups, the "internal hierarchies, complexities, or disagreements" that they put into play;[38] in a word, the "life of relations" these groups enacted.

Here we argue that no collective of groups articulated this difference into a new imaginary quite like the working groups because of their capacity to assemble a network of concepts that reflected, from the past into the present and towards the future, their livelihoods and the set of norms that regulated their lives. As most social and labor historians acknowledge, the political expressions of worker organizations were based in their day to day issues rather than their "determination to change the world".[39] Granting immediate, exclusive, and unquestioned "strength" to the institutions that managed to impose their way of governing society's daily life often entails seeing that the worker's "weakness" was mirrored in their incapacity to contest such an imposition through revolutionary activity. Their claims failed to the extent that they did not fulfill the "dictatorship of the proletariat".[40] I wish to avoid such teleological affirmations. Rather than determine such reflections as their "weakness" or "strength", throughout this dissertation we discover that such issues were actually definitive in their efforts to re-substantiate their lives according to new political principles. The fact that not all efforts of reformation led to "revolution" does not mean they were historically and socially ineffective. Daily life experiences, in and outside the workplace, gave meaning to the imaginary these groups articulated. They changed the arrangement of society by channeling their practices and customs into new interrelationship dynamics that were effectively creating new social organizations.[41] We argue that the nation was

---

[38] Peter F. Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996); Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 338. Citation is from the latter.

[39] José A. Piqueras, Javier Paniagua, and Vicent Sanz, eds., *Cultura Social y Política En El Mundo Del Trabajo* (Valencia: Centro Francisco Tomás y Valiente UNED Alzira-Valencia, Fundación Instituto Historia Social, 1999); Marcel Van der Linden, *Workers of the World: Essays toward a Global Labor History* (Leiden: Brill, 2008); Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, "Introduction," in *"Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth": The First International in a Global Perspective*, ed. Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, Studies in Global Social History, Volume 29 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018), 1–20.Lida, Illades, Hofmeester, Van der Linden. The expression is Roger Price's. *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 329.

[40] Etienne Balibar, *Sobre la dictadura del proletariado*, trans. Gabriel Albiac, 2nd ed. (Madrid: Siglo XXI de España Editores, 2015).

[41] Roger Magraw, "El 'Artesano Radical': Nuevas Reflexiones Sobre Esta Categoría de La Historia Social," in *Cultura Social y Política En El Mundo Del Trabajo*, ed. José A. Piqueras and Javier Paniagua (Valencia: Centro Francisco Tomás y Valiente UNED Alzira-Valencia, Fundación Instituto Historia Social, 1999), 125–48.

their centermost locus of reflection, which brings us to the core of the thesis: the nucleus where the *working nation* is disclosed. To grasp its reach, we need to dissect the adjective from the noun.

As mentioned, it had become evident that there were alternative imaginaries of the nation being upheld by the different groups that sought to integrate it. Behind and beneath these imaginaries, however, there were substantial practices, customs, and ideas.[42] In this process, we unveiled the "imaginary of work", instituted by a community of groups which conceived themselves as the working part of the nation: the "working nation", as Mauss more than Marx managed to name this new social form.[43] A pivotal sociological concept that we introduce to mirror and outline the instituting practices of working associations as the bond that may have united the national community through very specific practices, which stemmed from the workplaces and desirably reproduced outside.

Significantly emerging at the beginning of our journey in Mexico, there were some groups that defended the "mutual appreciation" they shared for the *work* of the craftsman within the workshop. There was a noticeable gesture being operated by the sources that spoke in terms of *trabajo*, and only rarely in terms of *labor*, commonly using the latter as a quality, *e.g.* "laborious". Productive processes were described as the capacity of organization according to the cooperation of the workshop members within a wider association. Such imaginaries were the result of complex processes that weaved the subject to his actions and their projection as part of his reality, a *working* reality that was in stark contrast to the labor politics spearheaded by some of the nation's wealthy industrialists.

It became increasingly evident to me that workers conceived their work broadly, determined by a wide network of activities that converged in the workplace, among which their remuneration was certainly included.[44] Through what we call the "idiom of association", enacted by the mutualist

[42] We follow the work of recent sociologists in the definition of "imaginary" not as something abstract but as the representation built by a collectivity, both of subjects and their "moral" practices, customs and norms. Charles Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); Cornelius Castoriadis, *L'institution Imaginaire de La Société*, Points Essais 383 (Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 2006); Vincent Descombes, "L'identité de groupe : identités sociales, identités collectives," *Raisons politiques* 66, no. 2 (2017): 13–28, https://doi.org/10.3917/rai.066.0013.

[43] Institution is here understood as an "organization of collective action that implies the instauration of a system of rules that define the positions occupied by agents within this action, and the roles they will be called to play in it". Vincent Descombes, "L'institution au sens large," Bibliothèque de la pensée juridique (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2021), 19, https://doi.org/10.15122/isbn.978-2-406-10753-8.p.0019. Karl Marx talks of *arbeitenden Nation* in the fifth chapter of the *Eighteenth Brumaire*, while Mauss talks of *nation travailleuse* in the final pages of *La Nation*.

[44] For the conception of work beyond remunerated labor, see: Komlosy, Andrea, "Work and Labor Relations," in *Capitalism: The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*, ed. Jürgen Kocka and Marcel van der Linden (New York/London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016), 33–70; Karin Hofmeester and Marcel van der Linden, *Handbook Global History of Work* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017); Christian G De Vito, Juliane Schiel, and Matthias van Rossum, "From Bondage to Precariousness? New Perspectives on Labor and Social History," *Journal of Social History* 54, no. 2 (November 1, 2020): 644–62, https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shz057.

practices that went from the artisan's collaboration in the workshop to the education of the apprentice, the concept of *work* was descriptive and inscriptive of a comprehensive imaginary of the Mexican worker's reality in the 1840's. Inheriting corporative working practices that were still influenced by a Catholic and religious appeal to the community, workers began transforming such messages through the adoption of mutualism. As chapter two shows, artisans opposed the imaginary of work to the "artificial" construction of an "institutional unity" by the *Dirección Nacional de Industria*.

Our thesis is thus that the imaginary of work carried crucial political consequences for the conception and the organization of the nation. Perhaps most importantly because it was weaved through a vast industrial network where a stark disagreement between the conception of industrial labor was contested by such an imaginary. In the interstices left by the artificialist, nationalist, conception of the nation, the imaginary of work was instituted as the source of an alternative nation. Irreducible to a strict "class" ideology, such an imaginary was radically collective to the effect that it was defended and upheld by workers of different hierarchies (from the privileged workshop master to the precarious journeyman who was often found astray between one labor day and the next), but also by members of this singularly industrial world who did not share the sorts of the *hombres de bien*. The "idiom of association" extended beyond class frontiers along the language of work collaboration and cooperation. At the hands of Estévan Guénot, French *émigré* who established the first silk factory in Michoacán, and Sotero Prieto, Panamanian industrialist close to the high-ranked entrepreneurs in Jalisco, an inter-group imaginary of work appears. Surfacing between chapters two and four, the "fraternal chain" of work instituted by the Mexican working nation was only possible if the "interests of all social classes" were conciliated. Against the "hideous egoism of the monopolists", it was the cooperation of the nation's groups, as both Guénot and working associations established, which constituted the Mexican nation's "true spirit". The evidence that these groups' imaginary was built between societies was irrevocable: through Guénot and Prieto, the communication between the groups of a broadly understood industrial context unraveled.[45] To the extent that the exchange was not "nationalist", the

[45] As some historians argue, the interdependency of "political unruliness and economic backwardness" no longer has economic evidence and has revealed the acontextuality of some sources as well as the lack of scrutiny in differentiating "rhetorical strategy" from "entrepreneurial diagnose" of the time. María Contreras Valdéz and Antonio Ibarra, "El Proceso Económico," in *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880*, ed. Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, vol. 2, América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea (Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012), 193. This has been picked up by recent historians to argue for the possibility of other industrial scenarios to emerge once we read the sources: not industrialized, but industrial. Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845." As shall be discussed, this implies going beyond arguments of "backwardness". See in particular: John H. Coatsworth, *Los Orígenes Del Atraso: Nueve Ensayos de Historia Económica de México En Los Siglos XVIII y XIX* (Mexico City: Alianza Editorial, 1990); Stephen H. Haber, "La economía mexicana, 1830-1940: obstáculos a la industrialización

movement was not bound by nationality. The imaginary of the working nation travelled between nations, connecting the national with the international.

4. With and beyond the nation. The Atlantic working nation

The dissertation takes the emergence of the motive for the construction of a "fraternal chain" of work within the Mexican working nation as a symptom of a wider system of exchange between groups and nations, through workers and intellectuals. Certain currents of intellectual, inter-connected, and global history[46] give us the heuristic tools to study, on the one hand, their personal journey and intellectual biographies, and on the other, how their experiences are less examples of individual histories than two examples of a vast network of international cooperation. Spanish and Mexican historians had already discovered the first traces of this network,[47] but as part two of the dissertation shows, there were certain links in the chain that needed to be studied and unraveled. In the wake of such studies, we could not simply overlook the fact that Sotero Prieto had read Victor Considerant's and Charles Fourier's texts through the hands of Spanish Fourierist groups. Nor should we address such contact as a mere bridge for the circulation of ideas that were "used" in other contexts. The fact that the "communication" between these groups had been constituted through the working nation could not be taken as a casualty. Common, international,[48] experiences were shared and claimed by the Mexican and French working nations.

Emerging American nations were struggling with a crisis shared with the French. A profound sense of trauma, ensued since the French Revolution, invoked well-known Reactions by

---

(II)," *Revista de Historia Económica = Journal of Iberian and Latin American Economic History* 8, no. 2 (1990): 335–62.

[46] Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in between in North American History," *The American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (1999): 814–41, https://doi.org/10.2307/2650990; Elías Jose Palti, "The Problem of 'Misplaced Ideas' Revisited: Beyond the 'History of Ideas' in Latin America," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67, no. 1 (2006): 149–79, https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2006.0009; Margrit Pernau and Luc Wodzicki, "Entanglements, Political Communication, and Shared Temporal Layers," *Cromohs. Cyber Review of Modern Historiography* 21 (2017): 1–17; Christian G De Vito, "History Without Scale: The Micro-Spatial Perspective*," *Past & Present* 242, no. Supplement_14 (November 1, 2019): 348–72, https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz048; Jan de Vries, "Playing with Scales: The Global and the Micro, the Macro and the Nano*," *Past & Present* 242, no. Supplement_14 (November 1, 2019): 23–36, https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz043.

[47] Jorge Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, Temas Hispánicos (Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1977); Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853"; Federico De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant," *Cahiers Charles Fourier*, no. 19 (2008), http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article568.

[48] For the reasons we keep the word "international" instead of global, see below. For communication, see: Pernau and Wodzicki, "Entanglements, Political Communication, and Shared Temporal Layers."

some intellectuals.[49] But there were some that came to grips with this crisis by articulating their political thought not to political theology but to a social science.[50] C. H. de Saint-Simon and Charles Fourier, both relatively of the same age but with contrasting social origins, sought to grapple with their despairing context by formulating two social sciences that would take French society out of its state of disorganization. With different proposals, both conceived social and scientific systems that could withstand the arbitrariness post-revolutionary French society had been submerged into. The project was perhaps most clearly formulated by Saint-Simon, who believed it was necessary to "close" the French revolution by placing the most valuable and most numerous parts of society, the *industriels*, at the head of a new "social State". Contrary to what is commonly believed, his "positive philosophy" was not about ending with the legacy of the Revolution, but fulfilling its political principles by putting the working parts of French society "into motion" (*mettre en mouvement*).[51]

Only a conceptual history able to follow the course opened by such social sciences[52] can uncover how the Parisian former aristocrat and the Besançon son of a cloth-merchant did not formulate vague ideals as much as they wished to systematize what they were observing among the Parisian wards into a *new science*. Saint-Simon and Fourier's social sciences were built as forms of knowledge designed to grasp the experiences and the concepts that the groups of their society were already putting into practice, explicitly reversing the abstract political thought of the conservatives and *doctrinaires*. Through the legacy uplifted by their disciples we can unveil the intimate collaboration that the Saint-Simonian religion and the Phalansterian groups established with the trades and corporations that gave Paris and some other cities its livelihood in the first half of the nineteenth century. The French working nation, itself made up of a hybrid group of *savants*, industrialists, masters, artisans, craftsmen, and some factory workers, was in the process of formulating a principle that took the idiom of organization through (working) association as the backbone for the construction of the French nation.

The broad collective of the French working nation built knowledges that were circulating well before the *doctrinaire*'s science, exceeding their view that sought the formation of civil society

---

[49] Sandro Chignola, *Il Tempo Rovesciato: La Restaurazione e Il Governo Della Democrazia* (Bologna: Il mulino, 2011); Frédéric Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 2016).
[50] Francesco Callegaro, "Une Réaction à La Réaction. Les Sciences Sociales et l'héritage Révolutionnaire," *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 6 (2019): 190–214.
[51] Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, *Considérations Sur Les Mesures à Prendre Pour Terminer La Révolution, Présentées Au Roi, Ainsi Qu'a Messieurs Les Agriculteurs, Négocians, Manufactiers et Autres Industriels Qui Sont Membres de La Chambre Des Députés; Par Henri de Saint-Simon* (Paris: Imprimerie de Vigor Renaudiere, 1820).
[52] Francesco Callegaro and Andrea Lanza, eds., *Le sens du socialisme: histoire et actualité d'un problème sociologique*, vol. 11, Incidence. Philosophie, littérature, sciences humaines et sociales (Paris: Le Félin, 2015).

during the July Monarchy. As chapter four argues, the sociology of the working nation cannot be placed in a scientific continuity with the liberal political philosophy of civil abstraction in that it was imagined as a social philosophy that wished to overcome its theoretical obstructions by reconducting its politics to their groups' social movements. Instead of a "capacitary order" that wished to *extract* from society the principles that ruled it,[53] the working nation built a sociological principle that proposed an organization according to their work association. The singularity of this principle was precisely what would be borrowed for exchange between societies, through the Fourierist papers on both shores of the Atlantic. The French sociological principle, which carried, channeled, and instituted the politics of the working nation, was controversially synthesized in the word "socialism", which would symbolize the radicalization of the worker's collective throughout the 1830's into what I call the "socialist-sociological principle" of association.

5. Beyond the idea, the imaginary: Atlantic socialism

The Fourierist, Saint-Simonian, and republican-socialist groups did not conceive socialism as a mere ideology with targeted functionalities.[54] The working groups built socialism as an imaginary that expressed the practices they enacted in the places they lived and *worked* in. Association in the workshop was most radically practiced in the Saint-Simonian *séances* and in the flow of workers through the network of streets that connected the trades that sustained their labor: in the economic and organizational regulation of their daily activities. Their politics were instituted according to the agreed regulation of such activities, in and outside the workshop. Socialism was thus formed as the politics that best represented their identity as workers, with the potency to organize their common lives.[55]

The imaginary of socialism was built, however, by the interactions between the workers of more than one nation, carried and claimed by the Mexican, Spanish, and French groups which constituted an emerging inter-national society. This Atlantic "fraternal chain" of work had woven the crafts of a set of individuals such as Sotero Prieto, Charles Fourier, Victor Considerant and Joaquín Abreu to the milieu that instituted a collective working nation. Socialism thus constituted

---

[53] *Cfr.* Pierre Rosanvallon, *El Pueblo Inalcanzable. Historia de La Representación Democrática En Francia* (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María'Luis Mora, 2004).

[54] This critical category of ideology is developed in: Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York/London: Harcourt, Brace & Co./Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954); Michael Freeden, *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*, Very Short Introductions 95 (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

[55] We follow Vincent Descombes's concept of identity, built collectively through the transmissibility of certain values or self-representations that refer to, and are modified by, the subjective relationships (individual and social) within existent social groups. See the above quoted article and: Vincent Descombes, *Les Embarras de l'identité* (Paris: Editions Gallimard, 2013).

what Marcel Mauss called an "intersocial milieux", a milieu among other milieux, or the ensemble of "conditions" for the "life of relations between societies" to be possible.[56] Between Mexico City, Paris, Condé-sur-Vesgre, Andalucía, and Jalisco the socialist-sociological principle was both adopted and adapted, according to a radical "accommodation".[57]

In a context that has until now been regarded through the prism of a "political divide" between republicanism and monarchism,[58] such inter-social exchanges drove a wedge into Atlantic politics by seeking the establishment of an "international system" based on the principle of organization of work. Anticipating by almost two decades the imaginary of an international network that took the socialist principle of the working nation as its guiding institution, the project of Prieto and Sabas Sánchez speaks of a radical association between Jalisco and Paris, through Cádiz, which exceeded the fate of the "working class". If Prieto transported the "fraternal chain" of the working nations, Sánchez carried the sociological principle of association to its Atlantic, Mexican-French, institution, constituting an Atlantic socialism.[59]

Maintaining the source's language elicits the whole network of collectives and identities which embedded their imaginaries in the nation and between nations. Paradoxical as it may seem, Sánchez's constitutional project was never actually fulfilled nor drafted. Rather than falling into the teleological presumption that this consequently means that the project "failed", we argue that the imaginary actually permeated and precipitated into society. The confederation he proposed was not constituted, but the "collation" between his fellow socialists helped instituting working associations in Guadalajara which identified with the same imaginary: the one that workers were carrying back and forth in the Atlantic through the intersocial milieux created by their collectives from Mexico and France. A properly inter-national imaginary built by the Atlantic working nations that altered global society from within, *before 1848*. This is what we propose to name Atlantic socialism.

---

[56] Mauss, *La Nation, Ou Le Sens Du Social*, 123.

[57] Palti, "The Problem of 'Misplaced Ideas' Revisited: Beyond the 'History of Ideas' in Latin America."

[58] For the "political divide", see: Edward Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867* (New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018). Although we do not analyze it here, the idea of a republican confederation was not new and actually reappeared later in the century in other Latin American countries. See: Juan Pro, "La utopía de la unidad americana en la época de las revoluciones: territorio y comunidad política," *Ariadna Histórica. Lenguajes, conceptos, metáforas.*, no. 10 (December 16, 2021): 155–94.

[59] In this sense, we discuss with literature that has affirmed the establishment of a "competing modernity" from the Americas. See: James Sanders, "Revolution and the Creation of an Atlantic Counter-Modernity: Popular and Elite Contestations of Republicanism and Progress in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Latin America," in *L'Atlantique Révolutionnaire: Une Perspective Ibéro-Américaine*, ed. Clément Thibaud et al., Le Monde Atlantique (Bécherel: Les Perséides Éditions, 2013), 233–57; James Sanders, "Decolonizing Europe," in *The First Wave of Decolonization*, ed. Mark Thurner, Routledge Studies in Global Latin America (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2019), 95–117.

6. Atlantic socialism after 1848: the institution of worker internationalism

Having deployed the emerging international system which instituted Atlantic socialism as a concrete alternative modernity, the dissertation finally comes back to the analysis of the context where previous historians had seen it rise: after the 1848 European revolutions. In Mexico as in France, the working nation suffered transformations in its relations with the State, upon which most reflections turn upon. If, before 1848, the political reflexivity of the workers was centered mostly in the way in which they could widely build a nation through their institutions, in the 1850s, Mexican groups radicalized their claims in response to the critical situation left behind by the war with the United States. The peasant-indigenous working groups acquired a central role in the challenge they, as *pueblos* (peoples) of the nation, addressed to the State. The defense over their land's resources, claimed by a handful of hacendados, also meant protecting the work that used these resources for the permanence of the pueblos' livelihoods. Following suggestions by "rural historians",[60] in chapter five these claims are directly linked with the history of the Mexican working nation, of which these indigenous, peasant, hacienda laborer, craftsmen's communities were a part.

Reactions to the crisis were not only issued by the working nation. In a context ensued from immediate warfare politicians advocated for order and peace. The newly formed liberal and conservative parties accused the movements of these peasant working groups of their "anarchic" and "socialist" character. *El Universal*'s denouncement of the socialist movements in the Estado de México, formed by local village craftsmen that formed *capítulos* of a *Nueva Sociedad* (New Society), wished to convey the impossibility these movements faced if they wished to "imitate" the character of their French peers. Conservatives were thus responsible for comparing Mexican socialist worker movements with the fresh experience of the 1848 February revolution in Paris. The radical disagreement on the word socialism that appeared in the Mexican press reveals that there were profound discrepancies on the socialist legacy in the Atlantic space. In France, there is also what has been called a "forgotten" revolution:[61] the working nation's revolution of 1848.

The passage from Mexico to France and back reveals that the consequences of the "springtime of the peoples" were felt rather immediately and bilaterally. The "international system" of the Atlantic working nation's experience in the previous decade was decisive to sustain

[60] Antonio Escobar Ohmstede and Matthew Butler, eds., *Mexico in Transition: New Perspectives on Mexican Agrarian History, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries/México y Sus Transiciones: Reconsideraciones Sobre La Historia Agraria Mexicana, Siglos XIX y XX*, 1st ed. (México, D.F.: CIESAS, 2013); Buve and Falcón, *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*; Peter Guardino, "CONNECTED COMMUNITIES: Villagers and Wider Social Systems in the Late Colonial and Early National Periods," in *Beyond Alterity. Destabilizing the Indigenous Other in Mexico*, ed. Paula López Caballero and Ariadna Acevedo-Rodrigo (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 61–83.

[61] Maurizio Gribaudi and Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *1848, La Révolution Oubliée* (Paris: La Découverte, 2008).

exchanges. As soon as 1849, peasants and craftsmen carried out a profound communication with their fellows, posing the socialist-sociological principle at the foundations of the socialist-republican alliance in February 1848. The reverberations were multiple and plural but were in any case accommodated by even the most important peasant and indigenous leaders. The thesis of an Atlantic working nation thus gives us a new perspective on the widely studied Ayutla revolution, hallmarked by Juan Álvarez and his civic militias from "El Sur",[62] which drove liberals to claim authority over the State in 1855. The paradoxical, complex, and contradictory approach of the working nation *vis-à-vis* the liberal State witnesses the metamorphosis of the movement, now self-consciously proclaimed as the movement of "working classes" of "democrat artisans". Their reactions to the liberal and imperial States that connect France and Mexico in the 1860s evince the last transformations of the working nation in our dissertation: the rise of a socialist movement of the working *classes* that vindicated a "worker internationalism".

The process by which a proper, conscious, worker movement appeared in the 1860's in France was thus part of a wider political experience. Negotiations and concessions that were made by the Napoleonic Second Empire were acknowledged by the working groups but were also significantly repurposed. The legitimacy of mutualist societies was the background upon which a movement of the "working classes" formed new kinds of associations such as the "coalitions" and the *chambres syndicales*. Despite such metamorphoses, we discover that the "cooperative association" upheld by the working groups still recurred to claims to govern their labor through their working practices: the emergence of a "capitalist" motive only radicalized the difference between one and the other. In other words, the deep, sociohistorical, connection with the imaginary of work, which relied on the separation from labor, was still constituent of their institutions. The historical connection between the working classes and the worker labor movement of the 1860's through the imaginary of work not only speaks of the singularities that the latter formed, but also the historical strata of social and political experiences that continued to define the institutions of work.[63]

The particular inheritances and transformations that the French and Mexican working groups enacted from the 1848 to 1867 are representative of the nuclear aspects of their imaginary and institutions. The transformation of mutualism between Mexico and France, for instance,

---

[62] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*; Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State*; Leticia Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 5th ed. (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1998).

[63] Schinkel has proposed that the category of imaginary serves as a tensioning third between Koselleck's use of "experience" and "expectation". Anders Schinkel, "Imagination as a Category of History: An Essay Concerning Koselleck's Concepts of Erfahrungsraum and Erwartungshorizont," *History and Theory* 44, no. 1 (2005): 42–54. However, he does not fully appreciate Koselleck's later theory of the layers and sediments of time, which balance his original temporal dichotomy and chimes with his *Historik*. See: Reinhart Koselleck, *Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018).

speaks of particular experiences within imperial regimes that had important contacts with liberal conceptions of the State. But it is perhaps the pervasiveness, on both sides of the Atlantic, of the argument of the working *classes* and their relationship with labor which definitely allows us to reach the final argument of our dissertation. Against conceptions which frame their existence as a single mass, as a single "class", the Atlantic working groups revindicated their place in the formation of nations, as integrated modern societies. Such groups enacted "collective exits"[64] from the labor-shops to the effect of acquiring space of negotiability with the patrons, who were systematically destroying "national work" according to Mexican workers.

The dissertation thus finally uncovers the history of the Atlantic working nations' socialism. In its most nuclear aspect, it was above all an experience formed, instituted, and imagined as an inter-national movement. Exceeding any previous conception of "labor internationalism",[65] here too we follow Mauss by uncovering a radical alternative to the standard opposition between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. What we call worker internationalism was, in effect, an "intersocial" experience that was formed by the exchanges of the working groups that constantly imagined new institutions to regulate their own communities' livelihoods. An international experience that informed, from the 1840's, the political imaginary of socialism, which sought to drive a wedge into other coexistent modern political projects, by altering the government of people's lives according to "national", and not "nationalist", principles. As shall be discussed in the conclusions, this history intends to be a part of a much wider phenomenon, bringing to light some aspects that were constitutive of socialism as a historical experience.

The possibility of arriving at this vision of socialism would have certainly been impossible under the categorical constructions of the past century, mainly inherited from orthodox Marxism. Raising the stakes against such accounts meant binding socialism to the groups and societies that instituted it as their political imaginary: the working nations and their imaginary of work. This history of socialism, in other words, argues that 1848, let alone 1871 or 1917, cannot be understood without the Atlantic working nation's exchanges. The historiographic category of a "working class" cannot be used from the start, if we do not first know which working groups progressively became aware of their social position, imagining an embraceable politics that contested those who sought to "free" the individual. The "realization" of socialism was never a teleologically completed process, but was internally tensioned by the search for an associative regulation of political and

[64] Van der Linden, *Workers of the World*, 197.
[65] Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, eds., *"Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth": The First International in a Global Perspective*, Studies in Global Social History, Volume 29 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018).

economic relations.[66] It takes the historian's acknowledgement that there were repeated revolutions enacted by the working groups in the nineteenth century (1830, 1832, 1844, 1848, 1855, 1868, 1871) to admit and prove that a "real socialism" is as contingent as the social context in which it is created. This dissertation can thus be read as part of a study that, taking socialism as a historically informed concept, could eventually deal with the forgotten legacy and relevance of worker struggles and institutions for the class consciousness that emerged in the twentieth century.

7. Structure of the dissertation

The dissertation is divided into three parts, each of which is subdivided into two chapters. Part one introduces the reader into the Mexican context with which chapters one through three deal with: the years of the Centralist Republic (1830-1846). By gradually abandoning the world of "corridor politics", the chapter integrates other coexistent populations and groups of the time to question whether the latter present a different picture on the supposedly "impossible" national pact. The *pueblos* stringently posed the problem of how to govern their communities. Displaced groups from and within the *pueblos* started contesting the implementation of new government practices, creating new political identities according to their village's customs, and as workers for an industrial project for which they commonly worked for. Chapter two thus briefly reconstructs the industrial process of the 1830s, which substantially favored the so-called *hombres de bien*, privileged and upper-middle class individuals that were close to the centralist regime. Aside official institutions such as the *Dirección General de Industria* and the *Junta de Fomento de Artesanos*, there were artisans that utterly disagreed with the mechanisms of industrialization through increased productivity and consumption. The chapter testifies the appearance of the "working nation" and the "fraternal chain" of work, the imaginary of work, determinant for the rest of the dissertation.

Part two, chapters three and four, follow the travels of Sotero Prieto, the actor through which the international dimension of the Mexican working nation emerges. Piercing the Spanish experience of the Cádiz Phalansterians, the inter-connectivity of his ideas reached the Fourierist groups in France. Chapter three thus enters into the experience issued from 1830 in France to reconstruct the French working nation and its socialist-sociological principle. The imaginary of work bonded different groups of the nation through their political radicalization, enunciated in the word "socialism". Chapter four travels back to Mexico, where Prieto's network of cooperation

[66] In the wake of his uncle's definition, Mauss also believed that the Russian Revolution would not triumph without "a serious worker organization" that gave a "juridic, economic" establishment to their decrees. He thus defined socialism as the "ideas, forces, and groups that tend to rule the ensemble of economic life within a modern nation". Mauss, *La Nation, Ou Le Sens Du Social*, 281, 254.

unveils the key contributions of Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo to the construction of an "international system", what we call Atlantic socialism. The chapter presents it as a vivid contender in the political arrangements –previously conceived as a "political divide" between republicanism and monarchism– during the context of Mexico's war with the United States. Indeed, it argues that Atlantic socialism displaces any previous conceptions of socialism because of the intrinsic link it established between the working nations, even before the "springtime of the peoples".

Chapter five stays in Mexico, before going back to France, to analyze the consequences of the crisis produced by the war. Rebellions leaded by indigenous and peasant groups were soon condemned by authorities as "socialist" and "anarchist", not only because such groups radically accommodated the motives of the working nation, but also because they feared the connections such rebellions might have with the European revolutions, particularly the Paris "forgotten" revolution of 1848. Between France and Mexico the socialist groups claimed with ever more pressure an adequate articulation of their consciousness as part of the nation within the State. The Ayutla movement that drove these populations to claim their authority over the State was thus not only a peasant and indigenous revolution, it also reflected the process by which the working groups sought the institution of a State that could correspond to their interests. Under an imperial regime, the French workers gradually resurfaced to claim their government over their "labor-shops".

Chapter six deals with the contradicting legacy of the liberal States in Mexico and France and how mutualism was a singular engine for both collectives of "working classes". The gaps left by the State's legitimacy were appropriated by these groups, which ultimately speak of the constitution of a "worker internationalism" that strongly relied on the imaginary of work and the political potency of socialism. The conclusions to the dissertation finally offer some balances, weighed through the relevance of Mauss's particular conception of the nation, regarding this concept of socialism and its links to the international dimension of the Atlantic working nation.

Part I
An impossible social pact? Building a national politics in Mexico, 1828-1844

Chapter I

The erratic building of a national politics, or the "consistent interplay" of the nation's groups

1. Introduction

Mexican independence opened more processes than it closed. Arguably the most important of these processes was the search for a national project and with it a national identity. Despite the declaration of independence in September 1821 with the Plan de Iguala, the next couple of years did not cease in seeing the multiplication of internal crises that stemmed from the different views its actors were trying to impose for the building of a nation –or a constitutional monarchy. Agustín de Iturbide painstakingly claimed the title of emperor of Mexico with the approval of a national congress, by which he would try to rule Mexico. The war of independence morphed into new kinds of conflict that the rising independent political sphere had to deal with. As soon as 1823, the fall of Iturbide's "monarchical constitutional liberalism"[1] brought further political claims for autonomy by the provinces. From March to November, the few hundred people that composed a national constituency struggled to find a consensus among the *ayuntamientos* (town council), but finally, a federalist majority constituted a congress that was complemented by a minority of confederalists and centralists in November. A year later, on October 4th, 1824, Mexico was constituted into a Federal Republic.[2]

---

[1] Ludovico Maremonti, *La Monarchia e Il Libertador. Sovranità e Istituzioni Nel Primo Impero Messicano (1821-1823)* (Milan: Mimesis Edizioni, 2021).

[2] There has been discussion on whether the process of independence was promoted by "monarchists" or by the "autonomist republicans". For two examples of this debate, see: Timothy E. Anna, *The Mexican Empire of Iturbide* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990); Timothy E. Anna, "Demystifying Early Nineteenth-Century Mexico," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 9, no. 1 (1993): 119–37, https://doi.org/10.2307/1052103; Jaime E. Rodríguez O., "Las Cortes Mexicanas y El Congreso Constituyente," in *La Independencia de México y El Proceso Autonomista Novohispano, 1808-1824*, ed. Virginia Guedea (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2001), 286–320; Jaime E. Rodríguez O., ed., *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1800-1850*, Publicaciones Del Programa Iberoamérica: 200 Años de Convivencia Independiente 21 (Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, Instituto de Cultura, 2008). There are more moderate opinions that see the first years of independence as the first conflictive negotiations between federalists and monarchists, which ultimately gave way to the Federalist Republic for a national congress to even be possible. Besides Maremonti's book quoted above, see: Alfredo Ávila, "El Triunfo de Los Republicanos," in *Para La Libertad: Los Republicanos En Tiempos Del Imperio 1821 - 1823*, Historia Moderna y Contemporánea 41 (Mexico

The proclamation of a federal republic did not alleviate the tensions between the different political and social groups. Indeed, the definition of these movements was an immediate problem for contemporary politicians. There were too many internal divisions to make sense of their political field. Military, clergy, and, increasingly after 1824, the York and Scottish masonic lodges have been seen as the protagonists of post-independence political disputes. Yet these conflicts were topped by the internal fractures presented by indigenous communities and many local ayuntamiento administrations that wished to be a part of the new national project. In contrast to the rhetoric formed by newspapers of the time, events throughout the Republic incensed popular participation that did not fit into the bipolar conflict between centralists and federalists.[3] Rather difficult to condense within the bipolar political structure presented to the nascent "public sphere", movements such as the riot of *El Parián* remained incomprehensible for the same politicians and representatives they were supporting. Chapter one will analyze how the first decades after the independence Mexican politics were harshly marked by the differences between the groups that wished to tailor Mexico's future destiny.

In the passage from the 1820s to the 1830s, the frame of reference for Mexican national politics was transformed. The "contested" politics that emerged in the post-independence era saw elites and an "insistent popular participation" driven by regional economies, social organizations, and political issues, contend for the control of a national regime.[4] In the 1830s, a new regime was patiently engineered and conceived. Arguably, some of its most contentious policies targeted federalist policies of the precedent years. The first substantial blow to the federalist regime and the 1824 constitution came precisely in the formulation of a "centralization" of authority, imagined by most as a social and economic upgrade of political authority. The first rupture with Vicente Guerrero's federalist tradition came in 1830 when Lucas Alamán and Anastasio Bustamante's

---

City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2004), 213–76; Alfredo Ávila, "El Radicalismo Republicano En Hispanoamérica: Un Balance Historiográfico y Una Propuesta de Estudio," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 41 (June 1, 2011), https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.2011.41.26584.

[3] This rhetoric was fundamentally structured by the rivalry between *El Águila Mexicana* and *El Sol*, representative of federalist and centralist factions respectively. María Eugenia Vázquez Semadeni, "Masonería, Papeles Públicos y Cultura Política En El Primer México Independiente, 1821-1828," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 38 (December 2009): 35–83.

[4] John Tutino, "The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 3 (1998): 367–418, https://doi.org/10.2307/2518330; John Tutino, *The Mexican Heartland: How Communities Shaped Capitalism, a Nation, and World History, 1500-2000* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018). Alongside Tutino, Peter Guardino's studies have marked a breakthrough in the analysis of local interpretations and appropriations of national politics. See Peter Guardino, "Barbarism or Republican Law? Guerrero's Peasants and National Politics, 1820-1846," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 75, no. 2 (May 1995): 185, https://doi.org/10.2307/2517304; Peter Guardino, "CONNECTED COMMUNITIES: Villagers and Wider Social Systems in the Late Colonial and Early National Periods," in *Beyond Alterity. Destabilizing the Indigenous Other in Mexico*, ed. Paula López Caballero and Ariadna Acevedo-Rodrigo (University of Arizona Press, 2018), 61–83, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt20fw7cq.6.

administration set some of the *escoceses'* political milestones. Yet their main pursuit, to transfer power over the State to a "more apt" class such as the *hombres de bien* (the rising, creole, middle classes), did not prove so easy to construe.

The chapter will start by analyzing these processes. After the first section arrives at the problem of authority during the first centralist administration, it will slowly uncover how its inherent instability was actually not so much a problem of State legitimacy, as much as a radical problem of political government. From the second section onwards, the chapter will slowly shift away from an analysis of the "centralist" construction of the Nation to the actual, conflictual, and contested, nature of politics at the time: the political interactions, appropriations, and transformations enacted by different groups of the nation. The complex picture presented by the indigenous communities will help nuance some perspectives on the construction of the Mexican nation during the Centralist Republic (1836-1846). Fundamentally, it will illustrate the displacement of a simple top-down perspective of government, which will in turn unveil the grassroots social dynamics of politics by addressing the livelihoods of such communities.

2. Beyond the "civil war": the roots of a contested national politics (1830-1841)

The 1820s in Mexico came to an end with the imminent collapse of the first republican governments under the presidency of Guadalupe Victoria in 1829, and Vicente Guerrero a few months later. The creole elites had been roused by the popular participation in the mutiny of 1828 on the jail and tribunal of La Acordada[5] and the central market of El Parián in Mexico City. The riot of El Parián, the central market in Mexico City located in the city's main square, summoned around five thousand participants. Though we may never know what role Vicente Guerrero and the *yorkinos*, the "popular party", played in the riot, one of its outcomes was the effective destitution of Manuel Gómez Pedraza from the presidency. Guerrero, the "popular party's" candidate, became the president of Mexico with wide popular support by the end of 1829. What seems to be clearer is that the actions at El Parián and La Acordada were at least indirect factors in the elaboration of a concerted response by the moderados and centralists to control popular participation in politics.[6] Over against the yorkinos, the *escoceses*, another masonic lodge, began

[5] Created in 1719 as a "sort of gendarmery", the *Santa Hermandad de La Acordada* was a political body – indeed, a "police"– that had both a tribunal and a jail in Mexico City where the bandits it persecuted were taken. See Alicia Bazán Alarcón, "El Real Tribunal de La Acordada y La Delincuencia En La Nueva España," *Historia Mexicana* 13, no. 3 (1964): 317–45; Annick Lempérière, *Entre Dios y El Rey: La República: La Ciudad de México de Los Siglo XVI al XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013), 92.

[6] See: Alfredo Ávila, "El Partido Popular En México," *Historia y Política: Ideas, Procesos y Movimientos Sociales*, no. 11 (2004): 35–64; Silvia M. Arrom, "Protesta Popular En La Ciudad de México: El Motín Del Parián En 1828," in *Revuelta En Las Ciudades: Políticas Populares En América Latina*, ed. Servando Ortoll

elaborating an equivalence between the mason lodges and the way radical republicans were governing the country. Criticizing the "leveling" politics enacted by the radical federalists who belonged to the yorkinos, the more moderate wing of federalists, along with the Borbonists, monarchists, and centralists, believed that masonic "sectarianism" caused political anarchy in Mexico. Francisco Ibar, for example, would say that it was this "factionalism" which would lead to the *Political death of the Republic*, for it mined the "bases of the rational and hierarchical order that the State required".[7]

This forecasted collapse did not need but a small push to be enacted. Vicente Guerrero's administration faced instability throughout the second half of 1829. After the assault on the Parián, which saw many Spanish merchant shops subdue to the mutiny, Spain retaliated by invading the port of Veracruz. To defend his regime, Guerrero was granted emergency powers by congress to repel Spanish ships by throwing them off from the San Juan de Ulúa fortress, right off the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. However, his political opponents, guided by Guerrero's vice-president Anastasio Bustamante, seized the virtual vacancy of power and took the presidency from his hands, installing a government of the *hombres de bien* (the rising, creole, middle classes). With the political aid of Lucas Alamán, Bustamante's government started reverting most policies enacted by Guerrero's "popular party" and went in his pursuit. Alamán's centralizing reforms were destined for the disappearance of civic militias as well as for a coherent economic program that reversed the protectionist policies of the Guerrero administration. This administration established the first national development bank, the *Banco de Avío*, that fomented entrepreneurship by including the rising *hombres de bien* as the class that could establish industrial production.[8] This project, however, faced rough conditions.

Inheriting a critical situation in the mining of silver, which had suffered an important setback during the war of independence, the country resorted to British loans as the empire profited stagnantly from the global turn towards the textile industry. Yet these loans would be unpayable in a context where even the local economy could not sustain the costs of the national regime, from its important military expenditures to the wages of its public bureaucrats and officials. New Spain's economic solidity liquified with the wars of independence: "Once the

---

and Silvia M. Arrom, Biblioteca de Signos 27 (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2004), 83–116.

[7] Rafael Rojas, "La frustración del primer republicanismo mexicano," in *El republicanismo en Hispanoamérica : ensayos de historia intelectual y política* (Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas/Fondo de Culture Económica, 2002), 417–20. Quote in the last page. For more on the yorkinos and escoceses: María Eugenia Vázquez Semadeni, "Las obediencias masónicas del rito de York como centros de acción política, México, 1825-1830," *LiminaR* 7, no. 2 (December 2009): 41–55.

[8] Michael P Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846: Hombres de Bien in the Age of Santa Anna* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 16–21.

world's source of money, Mexico became an importer of capital and technology–a debtor with an uncertain future".[9]

The first Bustamante administration fell short of its objective: regressing the politics advanced by the *yorkinos*. Radical yorkino federalists Francisco García from Zacatecas, one of the only provinces that had recovered its mining production after independence, and Valentín Gómez Farías, former president of the Senate, allied with Antonio López de Santa Anna to overturn Bustamante's presidency. In 1833, Santa Anna and Gómez Farías would officially restore a federalist government.[10] By the end of the year, acting vice-president Valentín Gómez Farías and his administration had been accused of being "radical" because of its outstanding capacity of wiping out the presence of opponents at the head of the government, as well as its outright attacks on the proprietary classes, the *hombres de bien*, in support of a more popular agenda. Along with the former, the Church and the army, arguably the two most powerful institutions of the time, orchestrated the fall of the federalist government. The reforms Gómez Farías's administration had proposed, particularly the *ley del caso* which exiled some prominent figures that were against his regime, as well as the military reform that increased civic militias to detriment of the national regular army, were largely unpopular among these corporations.[11] The summer of 1834 had not come to an end when Gómez Farías's government had fallen.

Through the *Plan de Cuernavaca*, a military *pronunciamiento* issued on May 25th calling for the fall of the "liberal program" because it was "unconstitutional",[12] possessing classes profited from general Santa Anna's condition as "absentee president"[13] and successfully rallied him under

---

[9] John Tutino, "The Americas in the Rise of Industrial Capitalism," in *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870*, by John Tutino and Jaymie Patricia Heilman (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 60–61.

[10] Will Fowler, "Valentín Gómez Farías: Perceptions of Radicalism in Independent Mexico, 1821-1847," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 42–44; Ávila, "El Partido Popular En México"; John Tutino and Alfredo Ávila, "Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation," in *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 261. I will briefly come back to the project of the *Banco de Avío* below.

[11] Ever since Anne Staples's article on the topic, this aspect of Gómez Farías's government has been toned down to the real consequences his reforms had. He did not wish to wipe out religion altogether, nor erase property: his view was consequent with that of the liberals' of the time who wished to mobilize the Church assets in favor of the creation of a national market. Anne Staples, "Secularización: Estado e Iglesia en tiempos de Gómez Farías," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 10, no. 10 (June 27, 1986), https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.1986.010.68958.

[12] Ignacio Echeverria, "Acta Del Pronunciamiento de Cuernavaca," The Pronunciamiento in Independent Mexico 1821-1876, May 25, 1834, https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/dates.php?f=y&pid=1004&m=5&y=1834. Hereinafter, all references to the pronunciamientos will lead to this webpage, created with the efforts of Will Fowler and the support of the University of Saint-Andrews in Scotland. For more information on the project, see: https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/aboutproject.php.

[13] The expression is Will Fowler's. Santa Anna was not present for most of the administration of his government, spending time in his *hacienda* in Veracruz. Will Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 133–57.

their belief that a federalist administration was driving Mexico towards ruin. Elections were summoned and radical federalists who had controlled congress during Gómez Farías's vice presidency were effectively displaced.[14] Disappointingly for the centralist majority, however, Santa Anna still conceived himself as a federalist that sympathized with Vicente Guerrero's factions. He was not willing to underpin their project to change the form of government and, with it, the constitution. Elections were held in the first months of 1835 and a centralist Congress successfully replaced federalists. With this relatively stabilized state of affairs, Santa Anna took off once again to Manga de Clavo, his *hacienda* in Veracruz. Centralists quickly seized the opportunity. Along with a centralist majority in congress, interim president Miguel Barragán called for a reform of congress and, one month afterward, a reform of the Constitution. The first steps for the proclamation of a centralist Constitution had been taken.[15]

Coming from a federalist regime, the news did not spark enthusiasm everywhere in the republic. The most relevant sign of rebellion was issued with the pronunciamiento of Zacatecas (March 1835), a proclamation against congress's reform of civic militias that heavily reduced their number. If it was natural for congress to order the dismantlement of the rebellion, which had extended to Guerrero through the pronunciamiento of Texca led by army official Juan Álvarez, the unexpected return of Santa Anna to the presidency shocked his fellow army official and governor of Zacatecas, Francisco García. Virtually betraying his advocacy for a federalist system, Santa Anna returned to Mexico City and summoned the regular army to stop the uprising of civic militias in the country. After all, he was foremost an army general that defended the power of the regular army over civic militias who did not take treason to his forces lightly.[16]

Historians have agreed that this was a decisive moment in the transition to centralism. Santa Anna's actions in Zacatecas would give the centralist congress yet more vehemence in the conviction that Mexico needed a new constitution: if for Santa Anna the federalist uprisings were a threat to the army's structural hierarchies, the centralist congress saw them as a symptom of disobedience and rebellion by the nation's states. Seen as a symptom of the federalist "contempt for the accepted standards of political and personal conduct", the federal uprisings were against the re-establishment of "public morality", which could only come from the hombres de bien. The latter –in essence, property owners and people from the creole upper middle classes– would

[14] It is worthwhile remarking that, despite the fame attributed to his vice-presidency by conservative groups as a "radical" administration, Gómez Farías was much more of a moderate who often saw himself reluctantly signing reforms he did not necessarily agree upon. In this line, Will Fowler has redefined Gómez Farías, from a "radicalist" as he was known at the time, towards a "moderate constitutionalist federalist Liberal" concerned with the rule of the constitution and at times favoring moderate conservatives over moderate liberals. Fowler, "Valentín Gómez Farías."

[15] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 31–38.

[16] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 158–59.

marshal the stabilization of "national affairs" by directly encouraging economic progress. On the precept of "national unity", a new form of government was rendered necessary to guarantee law and order on the one hand, and, on the other, respect for the "nation's once venerated institutions" –the military and the Church.[17]

At the time the federalist constitution was being abolished with the discussion of the new drafts by a centralist congress in October 1835, another rebellion had been going on for a couple of months in the upper-north limits of the Mexican territory. The Texan revolution, which had started with an "(in)famous victory" by Santa Anna in the Alamo,[18] was soon to claim its first results. Samuel Houston's army, who outpowered the resourceless army Santa Anna recruited in the last months of 1835, defeated the Mexican army in San Jacinto. Despite his attempts at tricking the Texas rebels to release him, Santa Anna, the "general of tricks", ordered his troops to retreat when faced with the rebellion led by Houston and Stephen Austin.[19]

Besides Texas's proclamation as an independent Republic, centralists dealt with other internal political bleedings. The government of the hombres de bien faced a controversial relationship with the Church and the army. Rather than concede direct power to either, they moderated their policies in an attempt to make amends with both corporations without giving them too much authority. As part of their effort to centralize power "in their own social class", they would not admit either the creation of a "priestly oligarchy" or an "undue power" of the military.[20] So what did the centralists propose as a solution to this situation that surmounted outward political chaos? According to the evidence quoted here, centralists' main problem was the country's federalist past. Indeed, the 1836 centralist constituents thought the dissolution of the federalist constitution would tone down internal antagonisms. Especially with corporations as significant as the army and the church.[21]

After a heated discussion with the minority federalist legislators, a law drawn by a "special commission" to evaluate the need to change the form of government, led by Francisco Sánchez de

[17] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 46–65. The previous paragraphs are also based on these pages. Costeloe quotes what he sees as a "centralist manifesto" for the synthesis of these proposals, in: *El Sol*, March 16th, 1835.

[18] Tutino and Ávila, "Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation," 265.

[19] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 162–83. He presents a detailed account, including Santa Anna's perspective on the war, of the conflict from its start in June 1835 to its end in April 1836. Santa Anna would not be formally released until January 1837.

[20] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 73–77.

[21] As Brian Connaughton appointed, the Church's position was thus conceived as an indispensable presence in the resolution of regional social conflicts for a good resolution *vis-à-vis* the general government. "In this sense, it is possible to argue that the clergy reflected a curious mixture of more general desires for order and change, for peace through the timely resolution of conflicts, and for a modernization that would not threaten with the collapse of the civic-moral order of society". Brian Connaughton, *Dimensiones de La Identidad Patriótica: Religión, Política y Regiones En México, Siglo XIX*, Biblioteca de Signos (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2001), 17.

Tagle, was approved on September 9th. This gave congress the ability to draw a new constitution. On October 3rd, former state legislators with autonomous office and power were now subject to the centralized, single-chambered, government. Subsequently, states were renamed departments, which would be governed by an elected governor appointed by the executive power, while local *juntas* (local councils or assemblies), would still be popularly elected. A year later, these and other constitutional reforms were presented as the *Seven Laws*, officially ending the rule of the 1824 federalist constitution.[22] Ending the federalist system ensued a new distribution of authority.

The first of the Seven Laws that formed the new constitution defined the rights and obligations of Mexicans *and* citizens. The latter were now defined according to the possession of a minimum annual intake of one hundred pesos –duplicated by the *Bases orgánicas* in 1843– which could proceed from capital or "personal" labor which had to be "honest and useful to society". Only people with these qualifications could vote or be elected to public office.[23] The restrictive policy towards citizenship, in the eyes of Lucas Alamán and his allies, assured that an adequate set of people would be at the head of government: the hombres de bien. Hence, property owners, financiers, entrepreneurs, large retailers, and some successful professionals secured a place in the Centralist Republic.[24] But it was especially the Second law that marked a leap towards a new organization of authority.

With the creation of a "fourth power", a Supreme Conservative Power was conceived that, at the request of one or more of the three branches of power, could annulate or, in the event of rebellion, restore any order that came from the legislative, executive or the Supreme Court. Inspired by Benjamin Constant's vision of a "neutral power", the Second law was the practical means through which Sánchez de Tagle and Alamán (the actual brains behind this law) ended a federalist distribution of power by implementing some elements of what they had called a "monarchist republic" a decade earlier.[25] Yet the new institutions did not quite imprint immediate order to the republic. Instead of solving the problem of authority and its exercise, the absence of an actual monarch or, for that matter, an actual monarchist legislature, created a paradoxical void of authority. According to later testimony by Francisco de Paula Arrangoiz, himself a monarchist, as soon as it was put into effect, the fourth power was ridiculed. Soon enough, it proved no more

---

[22] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 97–104; Catherine Andrews, "El Legado de Las Siete Leyes: Una Reevaluación de Las Aportaciones Del Constitucionalismo Centralista a La Historia Constitucional Mexicana," *Historia Mexicana* 68, no. 4 (April 1, 2019): 1550–52, https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v68i4.3855.

[23] José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 3 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 230–57.

[24] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 107–9.

[25] Edward Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867* (New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018), 94–95.

supreme than the other current factual powers: it was a "power that did not have the physical means to enforce obedience".[26] For obvious reasons, the Church and army were the first to react against this "search for order".

Historians have compared the centralist project's hardships to the seventeenth-century strife about the "*imperii in imperio*".[27] In the context of the English civil war, when corporations such as the Church disputed authority with the state, theologians and political thinkers akin to Thomas Hobbes submitted the former to the undividable natural law ordered by the sovereign state.[28] The comparison is illustrative as to how the creation of a centralist state has been studied: as a context of civil war analogous to the English revolution. Nonetheless, as shall be seen, in some ways, this comparison falls short of the actual internal conflicts the creation of a centralist regime inherited. Concretely, concerning other powerful corporations such as the regular army and the Church, the centralist state was constrained to deal with their *fueros*, a series of privileges that gave them the ability to maintain their laws and organization, independently from the State's laws. For obvious reasons, this presented a practical problem for the unifying legislative project of the centralists, aggravated by the presence of a fourth power that further divided this already fragmented scenario of state authority. Yet unlike the debate on the *imperii in imperio*, this state was not in the condition to divide authority for the State to claim; the tendency was rather the opposite. Indeed, we may affirm that there was an ulterior paradox, eventually even a limit, to its claims: restricting the Church and army's authority would also mine the State's government capacity. To limit the Church and army's power would mean curtailing two effective mechanisms of government centralists were using to install their regime. Ultimately, it faced limits that were not necessarily a problem of authority but of the social and political contestability to it in the Mexican context. This contestability is hardly understandable as stemming from a "civil war".[29] As social historians have established, if we look beyond the institutional frame of centralism and observe the actual groups

---

[26] Francisco de Paula de Arrangoiz, *México Desde 1808 Hasta 1867. Relación de Los Principales Acontecimientos Políticos Que Han Tenido Lugar Desde La Prisión Del Virey Iturrigaray Hasta La Caída Del Segundo Imperio. Tomo Segundo*, vol. 2 (Madrid: Imprenta a cargo de A. Pérez Dubrull, 1871), 237.
[27] Elías José Palti, *La Invención de Una Legitimidad: Razón y Retórica En El Pensamiento Mexicano Del Siglo XIX ; (Un Estudio Sobre Las Formas Del Discurso Político)*, 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007), 139.
[28] The original expression is from Louis Du Moulin, a protestant theologian that advocated for parliamentarism during the English revolution. Together with Hobbes, he conceived that "two sovereign powers" cannot stand together in a State: "you can no more conceive a parity of powers then two Gods in the world". There could be no *imperium* in the State's *imperio*. Jeffrey R. Collins, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 224–26.
[29] For another example of analysis that follow the presumption of an extended internal civil war, see: Donald Stevens, *Origins of Instability in Early Republican Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991).

that subsisted in the conflictive search that characterized Mexico's nation-building process, rather than a war we may observe a political, albeit conflictual, interaction.[30]

3. The Nation and its bodies. From the "impossible national pact" toward the "disagreement" on the nation

As historians have since long established, along with their apparently untouchable authority, these "privileged" institutions had an important grassroots presence in almost every community in the country. Local parishes and militias were an undeniable source of authority that any national institution had to deal with since they were a fundamental stronghold for municipal control.[31] Conceivably, one could not strap these institutions with presence in almost every Mexican municipality from their formal authority without causing an avalanche that would eventually bury the regime's policies. Despite the immediate ridicule, the Seven Laws enacted this attack. And unlike English seventeenth-century parliamentarians, centralists faced a very different ensemble of political bodies in the installation of their state: within the actual operativity of corporations such as the Church and regular army, there were other groups, such as local ayuntamientos, that guided its movements.[32] With more presence in local councils, and parishes closer to many communities' daily lives, federalists took advantage of their presence in civic militias to assemble a defense of regional authorities by the members of the communities. Centralists thus faced not only the privileged corporations but also and, one might say, increasingly, other communities that were scattered throughout the territory and were initially shocked by the arrival of the centralist legislation.

In 1835, José María Lafragua, a young lawyer living in Puebla, reported that Valentín Gómez Farías had been organizing a "Junta Anfictiónica", a secret society of federalist filiation that sought the restoration of the federation.[33] However, to the demise of centralists who carried

---

[30] Raymond Buve, "Political Patronage and Politics at the Village Level in Central Mexico: Continuity and Change in Patterns from the Late Colonial Period to the End of the French Intervention (1867)," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 11, no. 1 (1992): 1–28, https://doi.org/10.2307/3338597.

[31] François Chevalier, "La Libertad Municipal, Antigua y Permanente Reivindicación Mexicana," trans. Marta Pou, *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 51, no. 2 (1989): 433–49, https://doi.org/10.2307/3540696; Abisai Pérez Zamarripa, "De Monarquía de Vecinos a Nación de Ciudadanos: La Definición de La Ciudadanía En El México Borbónico e Independiente, 1780-1825," *Relaciones Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* 40, no. 159 (March 11, 2020): 219–45, https://doi.org/10.24901/rehs.v40i159.348.

[32] As Brian Connaughton shows, the problems the centralist state faced became conflictive even for the higher ranks of the Church which saw "discord" rise in its parishes. Connaughton, *Dimensiones de La Identidad Patriótica: Religión, Política y Regiones En México, Siglo XIX*; Brian Connaughton, "Los Curas y La Feligresía Ciudadana En México, Siglo XIX," in *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1800-1850*, ed. Jaime E. Rodríguez O., Publicaciones Del Programa Iberoamérica: 200 Años de Convivencia Independiente (Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, Instituto de Cultura, 2008), 241–72.

[33] The motive of the Amphictyonic leagues reappeared in the context of the Greek independence war. It referred to the ancient Greek political model that saw the organization of the different peoples into a

an outward criticism of "yorkist-federalists", the anfictiones did not have a yorkino leader. Instead of these *exaltados*, as yorkinos were now referred to, the moderate *hombres de progreso* (men of progress), led by Gómez Pedraza, had taken possession of this secret society. The latter saw it as an opportunity for federalism's political redemption after the messy affairs between Vicente Guerrero and the moderate federalists in the 1828 elections.[34] Indeed, Gómez Pedraza had been a longstanding moderado that arrived twice to a high-standing office. Yet both in 1828 and 1833 he was promptly dispossessed from his authority and replaced by representatives of the more radical federalists: Guerrero and Gómez Farías.[35]

However, by 1836, the situation had changed, and a new window had opened in his strife for the presidency. With the Seven Laws in place, elections for a new president were held. Gómez Pedraza presented himself as a candidate. Quite unexpectedly, his political aspirations were once again curtailed. An unexpected allegiance between Anastasio Bustamante, the formerly exiled, moderate federalist, ex-president (1830-1832), and the centralist congress virtually installed him as president in January 1837. Clearly, many centralists had their reserves on this pact. After all, Bustamante was a former yorkino and, despite returning to Mexico at the hands of a centralist regime, he never openly or fully endorsed its political agenda. Although centralists brought him as an army general that could stabilize power and authority through the alliances he was capable of drawing, his federalist past would haunt his government. On a practical level, his presence meant centralist politics were executed by an army general whose aim was to finally stabilize political authority in the Republic, but with a more than open ear to other co-existent political agendas. This openness would bring immediate problems to his administration.[36]

However, his experience as an army general did not play out particularly well. Bustamante's administration saw a rapid deterioration of its relationships with France. Ever since the 1828

---

confederation. In the 1820s, it was adopted by some Hispanic American politicians who sought the formation of a confederate republic. This is briefly further discussed in chapter four. See: Juan Pro, "La utopía de la unidad americana en la época de las revoluciones: territorio y comunidad política," *Ariadna Histórica. Lenguajes, conceptos, metáforas.*, no. 10 (December 16, 2021): 184–86.

[34] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 114–15; Ricardo Valero, "José María Lafragua En La Construcción Del Estado-Nación," in *La Cultura y El Derecho En México: Ciclo Juristas Académicos Mexicanos*, ed. Adriana Berrueco García, Primera edición, Serie Estudios Jurídicos, núm. 245 (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2014), 92.

[35] Will Fowler, "Dreams of Stability: Mexican Political Thought during the 'Forgotten Years'. An Analysis of the Beliefs of the Creole Intelligentsia (1821-1853)," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14, no. 3 (1995): 287–312.

[36] Catherine Andrews, *Entre La Espada y La Constitución: El General Anastasio Bustamante, 1780-1853* (Tamaulipas: Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas/H. Congreso del Estado de Tamaulipas, LX Legislatura, 2008); Catherine Andrews, "La Actitud de La Administración de Anastasio Bustamante Hacia Los Partidos y La Oposición Política (1830-1832)," in *Partidos, Facciones y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX*, ed. Alfredo Ávila and Alicia Salmerón Castro, Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012), 51–75.

Parián riot, Frenchmen had demanded retribution due to all their material losses, from merchandise to shops destroyed during the events. These demands became every day more stringent. French citizens faced "abuses" by local authorities who denied them any kind of ownership of commercial or industrial property.[37] In return, France now demanded privileged treatment in Mexico's commercial matters, and equality of conditions for their citizens living in Mexico. Furthermore, it requested a six hundred-thousand peso compensation for all the damages and losses it had suffered at the hands of Mexico. Failed negotiations and Mexico's frail financial situation due to ongoing internal crises inevitably led to a French invasion of the port of Veracruz. In December 1838, with rebellions sparking across the country, Santa Anna was ordered to defend the port. Despite having lost his leg to a crossfire cannonball shot, he came victorious out of the conflict, successfully repelling the French army and thereby reaffirming his popularity and glorification as a *benemérito de la patria*.[38]

Facing a virtual abandonment by his fellow centralist figures, in 1838 Bustamante met with Gómez Pedraza and Francisco Rodríguez Puebla, both important moderados. In December, Gómez Pedraza proposed a reformation of the constitution that annulled the fourth power while retaining a centralized authority that limited the departments' power: a moderate reform of the 1824 constitution that nonetheless strapped centralist institutions from their authority. Congress did not accept to discuss this reform since its chair deemed the matter exceeded the chamber's authority. The decision was left to Bustamante, who on the one hand faced the pressure of the Supreme Conservative Power (SCP), which cautiously appealed to Santa Anna in case the constitution had to be reinstated. Yet on the other hand, Bustamante also faced popular pressure to call for elections and reform the constitution: radical federalists were particularly keen to pursue the reformation. Finding himself between a rock and hard place, Bustamante was quick to assess the potential risks and dismissed any reform. Gómez Pedraza and Rodríguez Puebla's was thus a "three-day" ministry with a short-lived "moral revolution".[39] In an unorthodox manner, Bustamante was able to keep his presidency at the expense of federalists' claims of treason and centralists' increasing mistrust.

Having pulled through the risk of losing his presidency from Veracruz (at the hands of Santa Anna or the hands of the French) or Mexico City (at the hands of the moderado reforms),

---

[37] Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México (AHCM), Ayuntamiento, Historia, Revoluciones, vol. 2279, exps. 4-8.

[38] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 136–38; Palti, *La Invención de Una Legitimidad*, 171–72; Andrews, *Entre La Espada y La Constitución*, 253; Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico.*

[39] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 141–44; Andrews, *Entre La Espada y La Constitución*, 244–48; Gerardo Palomo González, "La Inestabilidad Político-Militar Durante La Primera República Central, 1835-1839. La Lógica Del Pronunciamiento En La Figura Del General José Urrea," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 36 (December 2008): 95.

Bustamante was further pressured by José Urrea. The federalist army general from Sonora claimed the department's adhesion to federalism and its independence from the centralist authority.[40] The president in turn requested extraordinary powers to crush the federalist rebellion in the north. Although the SCP granted him his leave from the presidential chair to suppress revolts that extended from Sonora to Tamaulipas –virtually all of today's Mexican border with the United States–, Santa Anna would come back to haunt his wish for stability: in March 1839, the "fourth power" designated him as interim president while Bustamante was busy with the radical federalists. In the little over three months period he acted as interim president, Santa Anna managed to capture and defeat the federalist revolt that had escaped the attack of Bustamante in Tamaulipas. Adhering to his federalist military past, he managed to reintroduce doubt as to the functionality of the Seven Laws to rule the Republic. Paradoxically, the army general that had been summoned by the SCP in case the restoration of the Centralist Republic was needed, ended up supporting the motions orchestrated by the moderados against that same regime. So when Bustamante finally returned to office in July 1840, Santa Anna had set forth measures that unbalanced his already weak executive power. Among other things, he managed to appeal reforms to the 1836 constitution, he sought to silence the radical press, and, most significantly, he also imposed economic hardship on national finances by unilaterally deciding to pay off the six hundred thousand pesos French debt. Historians generally agree that Santa Anna managed to attack the government from within by setting a legislative, public, and economic imbalance. With this came a natural conflict of interests between the governing bodies. As mentioned, the strongest and paradoxically weakest link of the centralist chain of command was the Supreme Conservative Power. In January 1841, Bustamante and Congress "openly called for reform, if not abolition, of the neutral or moderating power as an intolerable restriction on effective government".[41]

The internal bleeding of the regime was not accompanied by a peaceful economic situation. Indeed, despite the constant efforts by the hombres de bien that sided with the regime, the economy had not recovered. As shall be analyzed in the following chapters, taxes, and loans became, from the mid-1830s, a resource the government assiduously attended to solve their internal deficit. With the scarce levels of silver production and the overwhelming raise of copper coinage, the liquidity of national finances, now mainly handled in copper money, began to create unbalances for the property-owning classes all the way to the local butchers who began

[40] José Marcos Medina Bustos and Iván Aarón Torres Chon, "José Urrea: trayectoria política y bases de poder territorial en Durango y Sonora. 1821-1849," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 53 (January 1, 2017): 1–20, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehmcm.2016.10.001.
[41] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 147–58; Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 184–98. I quote Costeloe, p. 158.

dangerously speculating with the value and authenticity of the copper coin.[42] As taxes were to be paid in silver, many were forced to bypass their payments, forcing yet another lack of income by the government. By 1835, levies were introduced on property owners, rural and urban, aside from the already existing levies on trade and the new taxes on business owners. Bustamante's administration would pass further bills that raised taxes on the property-owning classes. In 1838, this was extended to commerce, professions, trades, wages, and salaries.[43] There seems to have been a widely shared impression that the country was in a profound economic and social crisis. A famous newspaper stated that, as a "consequence of copper",

> The people [*El pueblo*] suffer from hunger. The price of foodstuffs is very high, and the dawn of each day is always met with some novelty in the trade which fills the meals with bitterness and distress. Bread is sold at the watch of sentinels, coal is scarce, corn is not to be found, candles are reduced to half their former weight, and the merchants continue to dictate laws at their whim and speculate on the misery of consumers.[44]

The 1837 copper amortization was not taken well by the hombres de bien who were supposedly the social and economic backbone of this political project. However, the richest sectors of these rising middle classes were presented with an opportunity: centralists began acquiring immense loans that could solve the problems linked with the lack of liquidity. The *agiotistas*, as these financial speculators were known, took the chances of granting these loans with enormous interest rates. As shall be seen in chapter three, historians have commonly considered that agiotistas "were not philanthropists, they wanted not only a high return in interest but also some firm assurance that their money would be returned".[45]

As can be seen, the centralist regime was still subject to influence by the hombres de bien and the hombres de progreso, but its institutions were also increasingly destabilized by popular political pressure. According to some historians, the tax reforms of 1837 had most significantly hit the working sectors of the country. Besides the "personal tax" of up to two pesos imposed on all males over eighteen and capable of work, the *derecho de consumo* (consumption right) was raised to a staggering 49.5 percent as a levy on all imports sold in the national territory. With internal crises ravaging the government, the cotton and tobacco industries were faced with harsh setbacks. Since 1832, Lucas Alamán had consistently sought the establishment of "entrepreneurial societies [*sociedades empresariales*]" with prominent hombres de bien and industrialists to recover the tobacco industry. They took over its *estanco* (monopoly) through the State's concession of certain

---

[42] José Enrique Covarrubias, *La Moneda de Cobre En México, 1760-1842: Un Problema Administrativo* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México-Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas/Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2000), 133–74.

[43] José C. Valadés, "El Nacimiento de Una Industria Mexicana," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 4, no. 04 (1979): 99; Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 150–51.

[44] *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, December 15th, 1841, p. 4.

[45] Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846*, 78–84. The quotation is from the last page.

privileges such as the express prohibition of planting tobacco without the authorization of the sociedades, which became the sole purchaser of the tobacco it authorized. In return, these sociedades had to deliver an annual rate of six hundred thousand pesos to the Amortization Bank,[46] while most profits flowed in their favor. Although there were some limitations to the expansion of these industries because of the tariffs on importations established in 1837, those who were most disfavored were the working populations that flowed from their villages, towns, and nearby cities to the newly established industries. Workers, in an already precarious situation due to the effects of migration, were increasingly disfavored by their labor conditions. The tobacco industrialists, for instance, were given the freedom to hire and establish internal privileges between different workers at the industries distributed throughout the territory, while increasing the workload on the tobacco rollers.[47]

As can be seen, the centralist institutions were hanging from a frail legitimacy and authority. With a moderate president who preferred to construct pacts with the ruling groups of Mexico instead of simply constructing a centralist regime that sidestepped such political realities,[48] the principle of order defended by centralists was hardly achievable if the situation of political contestability continued. Increasingly, as we enter into the political world of the Centralist Republic, problems were formulated in terms of the political authority the regime could exercise *vis-à-vis* the populations it wished to control. A swift sway of pronunciamientos, from August to September 1841, would crown the ensuing political instability with the army's contempt for the regime.

What started as a popular demonstration in Guadalajara against the government's heavy tax policies and restrictive measures on local commerce was soon capitulated by local army general Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga. He was not alone: Gabriel Valencia, an army general who defeated the federalist revolts in 1839, set a military siege on the Ciudadela, only a few blocks away from Palacio Nacional in Mexico City where the government's offices were located. "Triangulating" the revolt, Santa Anna entered from his hacienda in Perote, Veracruz. On September 26th, the three army generals reunited in Tacubaya, where the *Bases de Tacubaya* were issued, asking for the surrender of Bustamante and the formation of a new constitution that replaced the department representatives. Santa Anna would retain executive power while the constitution was reformed,

[46] Arturo Obregón, *Las Obreras Tabacaleras de La Ciudad de México, 1764-1925* (Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1982), 55–58.
[47] Obregón, 45; Carlos Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853," *Historia Social*, no. 8 (1990): 80; Walter Bernecker, "Manufacturas y Artesanos En México a Finales de La Época Colonial y a Principios de La Independencia," in *Estudios Sobre La Historia Económica de México: Desde La Época de La Independencia Hasta La Primera Globalización*, ed. Sandra Kuntz Ficker and Reinhard Liehr, Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana, vol. 154 (Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2013), 30–32.
[48] Andrews, *Entre La Espada y La Constitución*.

which implied the dissolution of the SCP. Bustamante tried to reject the armed forces in a series of battles in Mexico City and its surroundings until October 5th, when the Palacio Nacional was stormed by Valencia's troops. On October 10th, Bustamante met with Santa Anna who offered him a peaceful rendition through the Treaties of La Estanzuela, giving the latter the seat to the interim presidency.[49]

The impression that the 1836 Constitution faced more hardships than facilities to rule the country was issued by Santa Anna. In a letter he addressed to the government before his entrance into Mexico City, he accused Bustamante and the SCP of giving the former illegal "dictatorial power" as the representative of the executive power. Arguably justifying his role in the ongoing "revolution" against the centralist regime, Santa Anna denounced Bustamante's use of authority. The latter had betrayed the "public vote", the "clamor of reason and justice", but also the "national will" represented in the SCP: "that nobody dominates it [the nation] despotically, without appealing to the laws that it gave itself [...] and without having received its authority precisely from these laws".[50]

Santa Anna wittingly used the concept of the hierarchy of powers as a motive to reorder authority within the Mexican State by appealing to the legitimacy of the nation. He claimed the revolution that had started in 1841 was legitimate because the national will had not been respected: the revolt of the army and the *pueblos* was legitimate to the extent that the bases for their "public acts" were "misfired". In other words, he disavowed the centralist state in that it had never actually been legitimate. Santa Anna seemingly invoked the nation to prove the centralist State's illegitimacy because it step-sided the convention between nation and State expressed in the transferal of authority. The argument for the dissolution of authority was not exclusive to Santa Anna or those who stood against the centralist regime.

But can this conflict, these internal divisions of authority and the capacity of government, be understood only as a burgeoning disorder that was a result of the reaction against the centralist State's policy? Is this concept descriptive of the logic of political relationships on the eve of the 1840s? Does it in any way inform the logics of nation-building, without necessarily recurring to the concept of State to imprint a political dimension to the process? In other words, does this

---

[49] José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 4, 34 vols. (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876); Michael P. Costeloe, "The Triangular Revolt in Mexico and the Fall of Anastasio Bustamante, August-October 1841," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 20, no. 2 (1988): 337–60; Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, "Political Plans and Collaboration between Civilians and the Military, 1821-1846," trans. Caroline Fowler, *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 19–38.

[50] *Comunicación del escmo. Sr. General, benemérito de la patria, D. Antonio López de Santa Anna, en que desconoce al poder dictatorial que se ha abrogado el Escmo. Sr. General D. Anastasio Bustamante*, Mexico, Imprenta de Luis Heredia, 1841. (Biblioteca Nacional (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF) 396/14).

interpretative framework in any way give us a further understanding of the nation's role in its own conception and construction? Is this construction in any way related to the logics of the construction of authority adopted by the centralist state and those most immediate to this process? A possible answer to these questions may lie in a civil servant's diagnosis of this catastrophic situation.

Luis Gonzaga Vieyra, who presided over the department of Mexico City in 1840, was atoned by the "insubordination and contempt" the *cuerpo municipal* (municipal body) of Mexico had shown against the "superior authority", the SCP. Yet the problem, he argued, was not the ayuntamiento as such.

> The Ayuntamientos are the conduit through which the protective action of the Government extends and approaches the most unfortunate and ignorant classes of the people, to make them know their obligations and their rights, and the way and terms in which they can and should enjoy the benefits of society, by the fulfillment of the laws, and by the submission, respect, and obedience to the constituted authorities.[51]

It was the ayuntamiento's task to maintain "common order" and to be the "model for subordination" by maintaining the harmony and the *justo equilibrio* between the citizenry and the authorities. To this extent, these councils were the bodies that could avoid all "alteration of quietude and public health" for they should be the first to obey the "order of hierarchies" and the respectability of the "superior magistrates in relation to the inferior". Indeed, with Gonzaga Vieyra we distance ourselves from the body of evidence analyzed in the first section and enter into the much more complex history of the groups of the nation, rather than the Nation's outstanding individuals. As he argues, the problem with nation-building was not so much the "legitimacy" of the Supreme Conservative Power, representative in more than one way of the centralist arrangement of the State. For local governors, it was outlined in the conflictive process through which this arrangement was met with contempt by already existing corporate loyalties.[52]

The conflict arose when this new authority was proclaimed and, as a consequence, called for a rearrangement of hierarchies and authorities that used to or continued to rule the ensemble of bodies that composed the Mexican nation. As José Ugarte, governor of Michoacán, put it a few years later: Mexico was facing internal division as a product of the "simultaneous action of all individual opinions". The problem was that none of these individuals, none of these bodies,

---

[51] Luis Gonzaga Vieyra, *El C. Luis Gonzaga Vieyra, Coronel retirado, y Gobernador Constitucional del Departamento de México*, 1/8/1840. (AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Historia, Revoluciones, vol. 2279, exp. 10, f. 68).

[52] For this complicated process, see: Manuel Chust and José Antonio Serrano, "Adiós a Cádiz: El Liberalismo, El Doceañismo y La Revolución En México, 1820-1835," in *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1800-1850*, ed. Jaime E. Rodríguez O., Publicaciones Del Programa Iberoamérica: 200 Años de Convivencia Independiente (Madrid: Fundación Mapfre/Instituto de Cultura, 2008), 191–225.

managed to acquire authority over the other.[53] If this was true for the institutional leaders of the departments and the army, did the other bodies of the nation share the same opinion? Did the municipal bodies and ayuntamientos believe the problem of the arrangement of a nation was deposited in the quarrel over authority? Was the rebellious attitude of the Mexico City ayuntamiento responsive solely to the question of authority? Through Santa Anna and Vieyra we open a set of questions that change the view on national politics by penetrating the groups that substance its conflicts: the Church, the army, the hombres de bien, the working populations, the ayuntamientos, and the municipios. As was mentioned, some possible answers may lie in the relationship between the political bodies and the burgeoning national authority pursued by the centralist regime. In other words, rather than direct our attention to the conflict of centralist personalities, we need to unveil the conflictive search for a national project as appropriated by the local administrative, political, and economic groups that composed the nation.

Indeed, approaching the question of the nation from the perspective of its groups is not new. A copious amount of historiography has been written on the topic, especially in the last thirty years. Since then, we might affirm that the Mexican nation has no longer been analyzed as a consolidated certainty, but at least as a questionable political institution.[54] Antonio Annino's work is symbolic of the direction the studies of the nation during the centralist regime have followed. His groundbreaking interpretation framed the question of the construction of authority not so much from the legitimization of the State and the SCP, but from the perspective of the "slippages" of the concept of citizenship acquired in the process of State and nation-building in the 1820s and 1830s.[55] In this sense, his analysis reveals two key matters for our research. On the one hand, it reveals why analyzing the matter of authority from the perspective of the centralist State is

---

[53] Brian Connaughton, "El Difícil Juego de 'Tres Dados: La Ley, La Opinión y Las Armas' En La Construcción Del Estado Mexicano, 1835-1850," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política*, ed. Brian Connaughton (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 339–78.

[54] See: Anna, "Demystifying Early Nineteenth-Century Mexico," 120–21; Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Antonio Annino, "Cádiz y la revolución territorial en los pueblos mexicanos, 1812-1821," in *Historia de las elecciones en Iberoamérica, siglo XIX: de la formación del espacio político nacional* (Mexico City/Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1995), 177–266; Peter Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996); Tutino, "The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855"; Antonio Annino, "Pueblos, Liberalismo y Nación En México," in *Inventando La Nación: Iberoamérica Siglo XIX*, ed. François-Xavier Guerra and Antonio Annino, Obras de Historia (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003), 399–430; Mark Wasserman, "All Politics Are Local: Nineteenth-Century Mexico Revisited," *Latin American Research Review* 52, no. 5 (December 12, 2017): 901–9, https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.265.

[55] Antonio Annino, "Ciudadanía 'versus' Gobernabilidad Republicana En México. Los Orígenes de Un Dilema," in *Ciudadanía Política y Formación de Las Naciones: Perspectivas Históricas de América Latina*, ed. Hilda Sábato (Mexico City: Colegio de México/Fideicomiso Historia de las Américas/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999), 62–93.

inherently self-explanatory of its weaknesses and internal dynamics, and therefore insufficient to analyze the question of the nation. The quick review of political historiography on the presidency of Bustamante included above should testify to this limit. On the other hand, his study also reveals the centrality of the nation in any analysis of the seeming "impossibility" to build a social pact in the first half of the nineteenth century. The problem was, and one could argue that it has been ever since, how to explain the role of these bodies that historically composed the nation in the process of the construction of a "modern" State. In what follows, it shall become evident that the problem is best explained once we abandon the institutional frames of the former and see their political, and local, contestability.

Annino's study seeks to explain how, after the constitutional period that followed the Cádiz constitution and independence process, local communities triggered the multiplication of the senses of citizenship through its appropriation, ultimately also redefining the goals and conditions for a "republican governance" in the first half of the nineteenth century. He shows specifically that "the most noticeable institutional change" since the 1824 Constitution was the "conquest" of liberal citizenship by the *pueblos*, in a process of adaptation and confrontation with "the [*la*] 'political Modernity'", concretely with the "State's claim of an apparent institutional unity".[56] He seeks to explain the "power relations between groups amongst each other and between groups and the State".[57] According to Annino, complaints on their land, citizenship, and justice structured the pueblos'[58] defense of local cultures and interests.

Scholars that study these communities more closely have suggested that the problem was not so much property, as the changes that were implemented in the new institutional distribution of these ayuntamientos and municipalities. The formal change of the *repúblicas de indios* into *ayuntamientos* was not so much the issue at stake as much as it was the displacement of the communities behind these institutions.[59] With the displacement of locals over the control of their land and institutions came a change in the practices of government. The government of their properties, with all the customs this practice supposed according to each *pueblo*'s tradition, was

---

[56] Annino, "Ciudadanía 'versus' gobernabilidad…", 65–66.
[57] Annino, "Ciudadanía 'versus' gobernabilidad…", 92–93.
[58] The concept *pueblo* cannot be literally translated with "peoples", for it can refer to different kinds of groups of people as well as the space they inhabited, from urban, rural villages, towns, indigenous villages, to a group of different indigenous societies. In any case, it is a clear example of the plurality that tensions the concept of *pueblo* (people), particularly in the Latin American context. See Melo Ferreira and Fátima Sá, "Entre Viejos y Nuevos Sentidos: 'Pueblo' y 'Pueblos' En El Mundo Iberoamericano Entre 1750 y 1850," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, ed. Melo Ferreira and Fátima Sá, vol. 1, 1 vols., Iberconceptos 1 (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 1117–38.
[59] Peter Guardino, "Barbarism or Republican Law? Guerrero's Peasants and National Politics, 1820-1846," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 75, no. 2 (May 1995): 185–213; Peter Guardino, "'Me ha cabido en la fatalidad'. Gobierno indígena y gobierno republicano en los pueblos indígenas: Oaxaca,1750-1850," *Desacatos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, no. 5 (2000): 119–30.

being strapped from the hands of these indigenous communities and being put in the hands of government functionaries.[60]

Recent studies have nuanced this position. It was not so much a displacement as much as an "appropriation" of citizenship within the Central Republics by these communities, which carried different degrees of internal transformations. Indigenous communities "adapted" to the new political conditions. Though the process of municipalization that started with the Cadiz Constitution sought to suppress "indigenous government" by dispossessing local elites from their previous roles, subordinating the partition of justice for instance as a "State concession", not all pueblos accepted the criteria of administrative centralization. Take the case of Oaxaca: if creoles managed to access the municipal government in central ayuntamientos, in Juchitán the Zapotec communities were reluctant in accepting exclusively creole governments and retained political duties. The more territorially segregated Mixes and Huaves hosted preponderantly indigenous municipal leaders. The political appropriation of citizenship by these communities led to the creation of new practices that combined modern with "traditional" mechanisms. Elections, for instance, were practiced according to the juridical representativity of the centralist State only in case there were no "problems with representativity". If problems with the municipal leader appeared, the community recurred to elections through assembly, rotating elections among different pueblos, or deliberation by the "*tatas mandones*" (commanding elders).[61] Similarly, indigenous communities often repurposed institutions that dated at least from the colony to maintain an "indigenous government" over their territories, such as the *condueñazgos* (literally, co-propriety) and the *arrendamiento* (leasing) of their lands.[62]

To a large extent, what the pueblos enacted was a slippage that was not limited to the problem of citizenship in the frame of the centralist regime and its Constitution. The slippage dealt with the political imaginaries at stake: *república* was not only a matter of the government of a "body of equal citizens"; for the pueblos it was also a matter of dealing with a "set of rights and duties" that were related to their *república de indios* –precedingly in contrast with the *república de españoles*. There were historical ambiguities that the communities dealt with in the process of

---

[60] Guardino, "CONNECTED COMMUNITIES: Villagers and Wider Social Systems in the Late Colonial and Early National Periods," 72.
[61] Leticia Reina, "Construcción de La Ciudadanía a Través Del Municipio Indígena. Oaxaca En El Siglo XIX," in *Nación y Municipio En México, Siglos XIX y XX*, ed. Sergio Miranda Pacheco, Serie Historia Moderna y Contemporanea 59 (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012), 55–74.
[62] On the figure of *condueñazgos* throughout nineteenth-century Mexico, see: Juan Carlos Pérez Castañeda, "Los condueñazgos en México durante el siglo XIX," *Signos Históricos* 20, no. 40 (December 13, 2018): 178–231.

reacting against, or allying with, people of other social groups.[63] Indeed, when defending their land, indigenous communities argued that they wanted to be independent "at the same level as the rest of the citizens", but their most dire wish was not to be "livestock led by shepherds that always turn into tyrants".[64] The double tension that was lived as an attack on their previous indigenous government institutions by the municipalization and then the dissolution of ayuntamientos under the centralist administration created a contradictory position that sometimes benefited the communities' contestability over the centralist administrations.[65]

As Reina discusses, what this elucidates is not so much a "slippage" of the concept of citizenship, as much as the creation of new concepts of citizenship, and with it, new ways of imagining the community's belonging to a national community: two coexistent systems which were all but mutually exclusive. Protection of their land was directly dependent on their ability to protect their self-government in that the administration of justice according to their customs was essential to withhold the community from its dissolution into simple administrative centers of the Nation. If they "appropriated" practices of representativity it was to keep autonomy while not denying their inclusion into the nation.[66] In other words, when the "nation" imagined by the creole elites was confronted by the municipalities, ayuntamientos, and pueblos, it confronted "local constructions of the nation in terms of identity, autonomy, and even sovereignty". That is, the "liberal-republican" concept of the Nation defended by the centralists was confronted with *other* concepts of the nation which were issued by local communities and groups, as the case of the inner divisions in Tlaxcala further bears witness.[67]

[63] Guardino, "Barbarism or Republican Law? Guerrero's Peasants and National Politics, 1820-1846," 204; Alfredo Ávila, "República (México)," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, ed. Georges Lomné, vol. 1, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 1332–41.

[64] Natalia Silva Prada, "Las Manifestaciones Políticas Indígenas Ante El Proceso de Control y Privatización de Tierras: México, 1786-1856," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política*, ed. Brian Connaughton (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 104 and 109, respectively.

[65] Excepting some of the mentioned studies, historians have not shed much light on this problem in the decades before 1850, probably because of the importance of the discussion of mortmain property during the "Reforma" in the 1850s and 1860s. See a brief discussion on the historiography in: Antonio Escobar Ohmstede and Matthew Butler, eds., *Mexico in Transition: New Perspectives on Mexican Agrarian History, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries/México y Sus Transiciones : Reconsideraciones Sobre La Historia Agraria Mexicana, Siglos XIX y XX*, 1st ed. (México, D.F.: CIESAS, 2013), 33–76. Chapter five of this dissertation briefly considers this problem.

[66] Reina, "Construcción de La Ciudadanía a Través Del Municipio Indígena. Oaxaca En El Siglo XIX," 73–74.

[67] Raymond Buve, "Los Municipios y El Difícil Proceso de Formación de La Nación En El Siglo XIX. Algunas Reflexiones Sobre Tlaxcala," in *Nación y Municipio En México, Siglos XIX y XX*, ed. Sergio Miranda Pacheco, Serie Historia Moderna y Contemporanea 59 (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012), 24–25.

The problem that was presented to the "traditionalist liberals" and conservatives in the 1840s was precisely what to do with all the interests, identities, and the groups or "corporations" that sustained the "two systems", indigenous and creole, of the nascent nation.[68] For the elites, it was commonly a matter of ruling the "division of interests" that reigned among the "mass of the nation".[69] What has emerged here is that such a mass did not exist in that its division was foremost social: there was a myriad of groups that revendicated their position as nations. The conflict between these nations, rather than simply preventing the construction of a Nation, allowed different sets of communities, from local families to entire pueblos, to reorganize their livelihoods. Most commonly, this implied dealing with old loyalties to richer villages to settle new regional pacts. The richer parts of Tlaxcala, for instance, were divided by the western creole elites that wanted to annex the department to Puebla, and the eastern commercial, industrial, and peasant elites that claimed ancestral autonomy from Puebla and Mexico City.[70]

Framing the research question in terms of this conflict is thus essential. Instead of conceiving the process of nation-building in terms of how the conflict was "solved", the question has to be directed toward what the conflict and problems by and between the nation's groups produced. Out of the unresolvable conflict for centralists, there emerged new notions of sociability that helped some groups of the nation reconfigure their politics: it created the "contested politics"[71] that characterized nation-building in the first half of the century. In this sense, what surfaces in such analyses is more easily understood as a "disagreement"[72] between two socio-historical and political systems than as the creation of a national unity according to creole aspirations. The core of this disagreement, as was seen, was not necessarily the administrative and juridical transformation of the pueblos –both as territories and the community's claim over it– as much as the transformation of their political livelihoods, the different appropriations of

---

[68] This is clearly in tension with the hypothesis that something like a "Leviathan State" already existed in the 1830s. See: Chust and Serrano, "Adiós a Cádiz: El Liberalismo, El Doceañismo y La Revolución En México, 1820-1835," 192.

[69] José María Luis Mora, *Obras Sueltas de Jose Maria Luis Mora, Ciudadano Mejicano: Revista Politica, Credito Publico.* (Paris: Libreria de Rosa, 1837), 100–101.

[70] Buve, "Los Municipios y El Difícil Proceso de Formación de La Nación En El Siglo XIX. Algunas Reflexiones Sobre Tlaxcala," 19–41; Blanca Santibáñez, "Condiciones de Vida y Trabajo En Los Pueblos de Tlaxcala Entre 1840 y 1867," in *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 123–42.

[71] Tutino, "The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855," 370.

[72] I follow Jacques Rancière's concept of disagreement, in French *mésentente*, that is not to be confused with misunderstanding or misconstruction. It is, as Rancière puts it, "the conflict between one who says white and another one who also says white but does not understand the same thing by it or does not understand that the other is saying the same thing in the name of whiteness". Indeed, the "structures proper to disagreement are those in which discussion of an argument comes down to a dispute over the object of the discussion and over the capacity of those who are making an object of it". Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1999), x, xii.

administrative mechanisms that created a coexistent and some might argue "hybrid"[73] system of government of the nation's groups.

The existence of these systems speaks of a complex national reality that more accurately mirrors the difficult process of nation-building in the first decades after independence. There is, however, one tendency that has only recently started to be reflected upon among historians: the fact that most of these communities were continuously displacing themselves to find subsistence. Since the economic crises of the eighteenth century, the pueblos increasingly displaced themselves towards the cities in search of temporary and "free" labor. Historians have argued that they were thus also clue actors in the reconfiguration of labor organization, for the vast majority of the country's population subsisted through the labor and daily wage they were able to find.[74] The disagreement on the nation untangles in the different concepts of government presented to and by its groups: for some, it was a matter of authority and its consolidation at the hands of the State and the institutions that sided with it, namely the army, the Church, or the institutions created by the hombres de bien such as the Banco de Avío. For others, it was a matter of control over their territory as a means of autonomous government of the land, as well as the local, traditional, institutions, among which work became crucial. But who were these groups specifically?

Over seventy percent of Mexico's population was indigenous at the time, and they slowly began being offered better working conditions. The displacement from mining centers towards the main cities in search of security and labor was significant, with some mining centers as important as Real del Monte being left, by 1824, with only 500 of the 20,000 inhabitants it had in 1810.[75] In contrast, Mexico City grew exponentially in this period, reaching a population of over 120,000, of which around 50,000 were occupied in a trade, half of which were either artisans or service workers (porters, water carriers, coachmen, etc.). Commerce occupied around fifteen percent of the city's population,[76] while in the near regions of Tlaxcala and Puebla, commerce was central in the continuous displacement of people to supply labor and products for the pulque

---

[73] Leticia Reina suggests the use of this anthropological category of analysis to describe the mode in which indigenous communities lived "between the new modern institutions and the proper institutions of social organization", with "two non-exclusive identities". Leticia Reina, "Romana Falcón, *El jefe político. Un dominio negociado en el mundo rural del Estado de México, 1856-1911*, México, El Colegio México, Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Sociales en Antropología Social, El Colegio de Michoacán, 2015, 744 pp. ISBN 978-607-462-738-1," *Historia mexicana* 66, no. 3 (March 2017): 1634.

[74] Manuel Miño Grijalva, "Sistemas de Trabajo y Transculturación En Hispanoamérica, 1640-1814," in *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*, ed. Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores (Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012), 60.

[75] María Eugenia Romero Sotelo and Luis Jáuregui, "México 1821-1867. Población y crecimiento económico," *Iberoamericana* 3, no. 12 (2003): 30, https://doi.org/10.18441/ibam.3.2003.12.25-52.

[76] Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2011), 60.

production.[77] Some historians have argued that at the core of all of these movements were the incipient factories, *obrajes* (small households that commonly manufactured wool), large workshops, and business owners who commonly linked their enterprises to estate ownership.[78] In the context of a conflictive tendency of liberalization, while the centralist administrations sought to protect national industry through the imposition of tariffs and taxes, there was a more marked shift of repurposing labor from a productive activity towards a "commercial and service" activity with the aid of a very slow process of mechanization.[79]

As we have discovered in this chapter, the nation's groups were thus not only appropriating the practices they could administer, regulate, and govern their communities' lives according to "traditional" practices such as direct elections that followed the customs of the pueblo, they were also in constant movement to find subsistence. In chapter two, we will discover how these movements were key in other processes of political appropriation by these same groups, who were not only indigenous, creole, or mestizos, but had different occupations. In other words, they were working groups. This aspect will be key to grasp the particularity the groups of the nation unveil regarding the industrial projects that existed in the 1830s and 1840s, which the next chapters will analyze.

4. Conclusions

Demographic and economic transformations had social and political consequences that are commonly misinterpreted as a simple product of the political and economic crisis Mexico was born with. As has been seen in this chapter, this is an issue that has been extended to Mexican historiography. Although there are few noticeable exceptions, the political and military crisis that pierced the 1830s has been analyzed from the point of view of the groups that were behind the project of the formation of a Nation-State, to the extent that considering that in nineteenth-century Mexico the concept of the nation may not have the same semantic sense with the former is generally neglected.

---

[77] Pulque is a fermented beverage made out of agave sap. Buve, "Los Municipios y El Difícil Proceso de Formación de La Nación En El Siglo XIX. Algunas Reflexiones Sobre Tlaxcala"; Hugo G. Nutini and Barry L. Isaac, *Social Stratification in Central Mexico, 1500-2000* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009), 85–93.

[78] Guy P. C. Thomson, "Traditional and Modern Manufacturing in Mexico, 1821-1850," in *América Latina En La Época de Simón Bolívar : La Formación de Las Economías Nacionales y Los Intereses Económicos Europeos, 1800-1850*, ed. Reinhard Liehr, Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana 33 (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1989), 63. Bernecker, "Manufacturas y Artesanos En México a Finales de La Época Colonial y a Principios de La Independencia," 25–42.

[79] Sotelo and Jáuregui, "México 1821-1867. Población y crecimiento económico," 43.

As this chapter has begun to evidence, the process of nation-building was more complex than the simple construction of a Nation-State, precisely because the latter did not even exist, at least not until the 1850s. When quickly glancing at other political bodies that coexisted with the centralist state, no longer immediately synonymic with the nation, new logics of social, administrative, and even geographical assemblage appear which redefine the notion of the "contested politics" that characterized the process of nation-building. The crisis with which Mexican society and its politics were born is not a sign of the "impossibility" of the cohesion of a national project. More precisely, it is symptomatic of the conflictive process through which the groups that wished to build the nation encountered themselves. Despite the irresolvable nature the conflict acquired for some sectors, it was also a process of social, economic, and political transformation for others. As Mark Wasserman stated recently: "Nineteenth-century Mexican politics were not a jumble of erratic personalities, dominated by chronically disgruntled military, but a rather consistent interplay between proponents of different visions of what their nation should be".[80] Ultimately, it is not that the nation was an impossible project, as much as that there was a profound disagreement as to what that project should be. Analyzing this disagreement from the point of view of the working groups shall be the task of the next chapter.

[80] Wasserman, "All Politics Are Local: Nineteenth-Century Mexico Revisited," 907.

Chapter II

Building the working nation: The incidence of work in the process of nation-building, or transformation of national politics from within

1. Introduction

The passage through the disagreement between the pueblos and the centralist regime presented in chapter one opens a new perspective on the previously mentioned demographic, economic, and social displacements. Confronting these movements of society with the critical situation Mexico's economy was born into involves entering another dimension of the conflictive process of nation-building. If the disagreement between the pueblos and the centralist regime may appear as a dispersed conflict that faced various regions of the country with a centralizing project from Mexico City, the demographic tendency of some of these populations to move into the cities and, more generally, to the productive and industrial centers, pins down some of the problems and disagreements these groups faced. The motley crisis analyzed in the previous chapter was seen differently by the working groups that found themselves in the middle of military reforms, political and institutional arrangements, and different economic projects asserted by the hombres de bien and the centralist regime. The groups that moved into or passed by urban areas commonly became working subjects, either in the city's artisan workshops or in factory-like complexes. As shall be seen, it was as *working* groups, and not only labor-related activities, that these populations were subject to a new set of economic and political reforms set forward by the 1840s centralist administrations. Furthermore, it was as such that they began contesting these projects.

This chapter thus presents the case made by groups that did not identify themselves as a *class*, but as working groups, organizations, associations, or even corporations. In the middle of an aggressive policy for industrialization, put forward by central actors of the centralist administrations such as Lucas Alamán, these groups presented a series of arguments that contested

the conception of a "national industry". Against the former's effort to create employment, productivity, and an industrial system that favored consumption, the working groups composed of textile workers, hatters, lawyers, tobacco workers, craftsmen, and artisans, as well as some prominent industrialists, marked the importance of their associations' values. Transforming their corporative languages into a mutualist imaginary,[1] which combined both guild and "free labor" practices,[2] some of the societies enacted by the working groups contested the "artificial" construction of an "institutional unity" under the *Dirección Nacional de Industria*. As shall emerge from the sources, if they did not yet see themselves as "working classes", it was precisely because, on the one hand, they were in the process of establishing an imaginary that pierced divisions between classes, from the journeyman to the rich industrialist. On the other, their ideas did not only refer to their "labor", conceived as a wage-earning activity. As the urban artisan corporations testify, their language directly referred to practices such as education, both as a workshop apprentice and as a citizen. Labor, that is, was only a part of their daily activities, while work was the very practice that pierced their livelihoods, from the workshop to the streets they inhabited.

The study of their "industrial", working, practices through some of the regulations they published thus clearly advances an innovative conception of work altogether. These groups understood work –in contrast to labor– as the series of institutions through which they could claim their subjective and objective organization. It was the common practice that organized production but also projected their mutualist practices into their daily lives within the Republic. In essence, this is why their projects did not hinge on wage or "employment" by their masters, but rather sought the "elevation" of the institutions of industry over employment. Education and mutual care, imbued with the practices of work, thus appear as the *reseaux* that put these groups into relation. As the sources convey, for these working groups the establishment of a national industry was not about establishing an "institutional unity" as much as it was a progressive search for the "fraternal chain" of work.

[1] As established in the introduction to the dissertation, we follow the definition of imaginary not as an ensemble of ideas that remained abstract and with no inference within a given context, but as the acting representations that were built by collectivities, through the interaction of their subjects, which were structured according to their practices and customs. Charles Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004); Cornelius Castoriadis, *L'institution Imaginaire de La Société*, Points Essais 383 (Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 2006); Vincent Descombes, "L'identité de groupe : identités sociales, identités collectives," *Raisons politiques* 66, no. 2 (2017): 13–28, https://doi.org/10.3917/rai.066.0013.

[2] For an updated discussion on the relevance of the categorical separation between free and unfree labor, see: Tom Brass, "(Re-)Defining Labour Coercion?," *Critical Sociology* 44, no. 4–5 (July 1, 2018): 793–803, https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920517712368.

2. From the project of "industrialization" to the working groups' constitution of a national industry

On October 16th, 1830, the administration of Lucas Alamán and Anastasio Bustamante created the Banco de Avío, the "world's first national development bank".[3] With the idea of generally fomenting the consolidation of Mexico's national economy, Alamán had established this project to help with the establishment of factories that "produce the articles of general consumption", principally the textile industries that help "the most numerous part of the population to cover itself" with products of "moderate prices".[4] To unblock the economic situation inherited by the protectionist policies endorsed by federalists, Alamán and Bustamante established a six-month decree that opened the importation of cloths to foment commerce and allow the government to finance the fomentation of the textile industry. The bank was conceived as a support for industrial entrepreneurs and capitalists who wished to acquire machinery and financial subventions by the state so they could produce as many commodities as possible for the general population to consume. As some historians have noted, this industrial project was in perfect consonance with the transformation of labor from a productive activity into a commercial and consumption-driven activity.[5] The working groups that witnessed these policies, however, were more negligent towards this liberalizing tendency.

In particular, the textile manufacturers did not manifest much zeal toward these policies. As a special commission of the ministries of treasury, commerce, agriculture, and the "arts" registered in 1829: when presented with governmental policies that wished to implement heavier taxes on internal commerce and increase the productivity of textile workshops, the local artisans, a "significant multitude" which convened to Mexico City's congress, raised an "outcry of indignation". The commission conveyed the artisans' plea for protection in the following terms:

> Is it not enough that we see all kinds of manufactured goods being expended very cheaply, while we who used to manufacture them for food, hear our tender children weeping, who all around us ask us for bread that we do not have? Is the painful experience of not having obtained any of the advantages that were bestowed to obtain free trade, and the ruinous loans, not enough for our beloved *patria*?[6]

---

[3] John Tutino and Alfredo Ávila, "Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation," in *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 262.

[4] *Memoria de la Secretaría de Estado y del Despacho de Relaciones Interiores y Exteriores*, Mexico, 1830, p. 29, in: Robert Potash, "La Fundación Del Banco de Avío," in *La Economía Mexicana (Siglos XIX y XX)*, ed. Carlos Marichal, Lecturas de "Historia Mexicana" 4 (Mexico: Colegio de México, 1992), 41.

[5] John Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," *Historia Mexicana*, January 2, 2016, 1119–92, https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v65i3.3181.

[6] *Sesión extraordinaria celebrada en la tarde del 26 de febrero de 1829*, in: Luis Chávez Orozco, ed., *El Comercio Exterior y El Artesano Mexicano (1825-1830)* (Mexico City: Publicaciones del Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior, 1965), 174. The concept of patria was used throughout this period to pronounce the difference and rejection toward tyranny, progressively building links with the image of a national construction. Of all the political concepts we deal with, patria is perhaps the concept that deals the most

Since independence, and especially since Guerrero's protectionist economic policies sought to balance the national economy in the face of the British textile industry's power in the territory,[7] the country faced a decade-long debate on the matter. Facing the transformative tendency of commercialization implemented by Alamán and Bustamante, defenders of protectionism that wished to prohibit certain foreign commodities, like Francisco García Salinas, showed an awareness that the nation was composed of both consumers and producers. He argued that if the national treasury destroyed the fabricant's industry, the manufacturer's capacity for agricultural and commercial production would not be able to balance or counter any exchange for a "destroyed product". Utilities of both producer and consumer would be damaged to the effect that the consumer would not have the means of profit that came from the producer who, in turn, would not sell enough "effects" to uphold the losses in profit because of the presence of cheaper, foreign, products. "In fewer words: It is of no use to provide us with necessary effects at a lower cost if, in the same proportion, the means of acquiring them are taken away from us".[8] Within a wider debate that reflected on the means of implementing the science of political economy in Mexico, García Salinas expressed a structural disagreement on how to construct an industrial policy in 1830s Mexico. Tensioned between a protectionist and a free-trade policy, the principles for the establishment of a national industry would be henceforth divided between those who protected the production *and the producer*, the worker, and those who wished to protect the production and the commercial network that would guarantee its consumption.

Despite the efforts presented by protectionists, artisans, and federalist policymakers to oppose these liberalizing measures, in the short term Alamán and Bustamante succeeded in advancing this industrial project's first policies. Indeed, Alamán did not hide his open criticism of the protectionist policies. His agenda openly welcomed capitalists who should be preferably local, although he did not discard the idea of accepting "foreigners that could operate in Mexico". Although he deposited a great amount of faith in the mining economy's recovery, he soon shifted his attention toward manufacturing industries.[9] Favoring proprietors and the hombres de bien

---

with an emotional and affective register. See: Georges Lomné, ed., "El Feliz Momento de La Patria," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano. Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, vol. 8: Patria, 10 vols., Iberconceptos, II (Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales-Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 15–36.

[7] Alfredo Ávila, "El Partido Popular En México," *Historia y Política: Ideas, Procesos y Movimientos Sociales*, no. 11 (2004): 36.

[8] Francisco García Salinas, *Exposición sobre el dictamen en que la Comisión Ordinaria de Hacienda consulta la prohibición de ciertas manufacturas y efectos extranjeros*, Mexico, Imprenta de don Mariano Ontiveros, quoted in: Rafael Carrillo Azpéitia, *Ensayo Sobre La Historia Del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1823-1912* (Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1981), 115.

[9] Eric Van Young, *A Life Together: Lucas Alaman and Mexico, 1792-1853* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), 454–57.

that elected Bustamante as president, his goals were to increase population, introduce capital, and import "proper machinery" to the country to "make factories bloom". There is little doubt the economy's main goal should be the "commercialization in search of lucre".[10]

Yet all of this was happening in a context where there were "no institutionalized, impersonal mechanisms" that could serve for the "allotment of capital in response to market forces, no space for the flexing of the invisible hand". Rather than establish a liberal capitalist economy molded to the standards of European economies, what Alamán and his peers were building was what historians have named "crony capitalism". A particular form of capitalism that embraces "political connections to gain access to factors of production, such as capital or cheap credit, that would normally be priced higher by the market".[11] These mechanisms of "cronyism" would mold the experience of the search for the construction of a local capitalist economy in consonance with the hombres de bien's wishes to invest and receive investments. As Van Young suggests, instead of thinking of this process as the construction of a corrupt system, it was yet another response, clearly defined by internal conditions of economic, social, protection among the rising middle and higher classes, namely the hombres de bien, to local conditions.

This warning may well be extended to the way we may conceive industry at the time. As shall be detailed below, far from a mechanized, commercialized, capitalist, industrialized network of production, what we are dealing with is an industry that was mainly established in rural contexts; with scarce, if any machinery; poor internal commercial communication; based on the workforce of a floating population that accordingly floated between trades, occupations, places, and working contexts; where artisan or trade-related activities were normally urban, and most were manufactures; rooted in rural activities that linked their activities (such as textile production) to their domestic activities; and overwhelmingly linked to peasant or rural spaces and activities.[12]

---

[10] Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," 1129–30. See also Will Fowler, *Mexico in the Age of Proposals, 1821-1853* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998), 57–59, and 94 (note 104).

[11] Van Young, *A Life Together*, 454–57.

[12] Guy P. C. Thomson, "Traditional and Modern Manufacturing in Mexico, 1821-1850," in *América Latina En La Época de Simón Bolívar : La Formación de Las Economías Nacionales y Los Intereses Económicos Europeos, 1800-1850*, ed. Reinhard Liehr, Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana 33 (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1989), 55–87; Sonia Pérez Toledo and Carlos Illades, "El artesanado textil de la ciudad de México durante el siglo XIX," *Historia Social*, no. 31 (1998): 77–88; Mario Trujillo Bolio, *Empresariado y manufactura textil en la Ciudad de México y su periferia: siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social-UNAM, 2000); María Eugenia Romero Sotelo and Luis Jáuregui, "México 1821-1867. Población y crecimiento económico," *Iberoamericana* 3, no. 12 (2003): 25–52, https://doi.org/10.18441/ibam.3.2003.12.25-52; Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2011); Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores, eds., *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales* (Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012); Walter Bernecker, "Manufacturas y Artesanos En México a Finales de La Época Colonial y a Principios de La Independencia," in *Estudios Sobre La Historia Económica de México:*

Many of the industries that managed to flourish in Bustamante's first presidency (1830-1832) managed to build their own capital, independently from official institutions that may have had their backs in certain situations. The independence of the hombres de bien, who more or less coalesced with the official industrial project, warranted a constancy of industrial growth that was sometimes not achieved by the irregular and unstable governments that succeeded. In Jalisco, for example, many industrials managed to set the Department as one of the heads of national textile production at the time. The regional networks weaved by these "well-known families" were based on mutual transactions and common projects. Some of the most prominent figures of the time, like Manuel Escandón, Manuel Jesús Olasgarre, Jesús Palomar, Sotero Prieto, Vicente Ortigosa, among others, were common shareholders in a vast network of industries in the outskirts of Jalisco's capital, Guadalajara. In case one of these industrialists fell off the chain of financial growth, enough capital had been raised for some of the other members to buy shares of the businesses.[13]

The networks they were able to establish occasionally managed to acquire institutional forms. Such was the case for the *Junta de Industria* (industry council) created in Guadalajara on September 6th, 1840. Its creation was an effort to offer mediation between the industrialists who were the head of local companies and factories and the department's government, on the one hand. On the other, it offered mediation with the national, centralized, government. Its success quickly incentivized other industrial entrepreneurs near Guadalajara to create industrial Juntas. Historians have shown that the creation of the local Juntas was an important incentive for local companies and factories to emerge in the near outskirts of the main cities such as Veracruz, Orizaba, Puebla, Mexico City, and Guadalajara, which constituted Mexico's "commercial and economic axis".[14] An axis that combined urban landscapes with rural harvesting grounds and some industrial hubs that concentrated factories with domestic production activities.

In 1840, one of the most important textile-producing factories in Puebla, *La Constancia Mexicana*, had reached its peak production with over seven thousand spindles that occupied over six hundred people. During that same year, in a canton near Guadalajara, the *Compañía del Sur de Jalisco* followed. Only two months later and a couple kilometers away, the *Compañía Industrial*

Desde La Época de La Independencia Hasta La Primera Globalización, ed. Sandra Kuntz Ficker and Reinhard Liehr, Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana (Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2013), 21–48; Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845." It is the latter who convincingly presents the case to continue calling this scenario an "industrial" world, to the effect of abandoning its Eurocentric depictions.

[13] Jorge Durand, "La Industria Textil En El Siglo XIX," in *Industria y Comercio*, ed. José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara 5 (Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1993), 26.

[14] Walther L. Bernecker, *De Agiotistas y Empresarios: En Torno de La Temprana Industrialización Mexicana (Siglo Xix)* (Mexico City: Universidad Iberoamericana, 1992).

de Atemajac, best known as *La Prosperidad Jalisciense*, was erected: a factory that concentrated the manufacturing processing of paper and cotton fabrics with partially mechanized spinning and weaving. Later that year, a very important figure for the second part of this dissertation, Sotero Prieto Olasgarre and his cousin Manuel Jesús Olasgarre, started building a spinning and weaving mill named *La Escoba*.[15] Despite the adverse context detailed in the previous chapter, national industry soon began to organize according to the interests of the industrial entrepreneurs who were closest to the centralist administration and the hombres de bien.

What had started as an open integration of the hombres de bien in the 1830 administration's agenda was moderated according to other, perhaps more urgent, necessities by Bustamante's second administration (1837-1841). Internal warfare still needed to be attended to and financed, many times at the hands and riches of the hombres de bien. The loans and credits they could issue because of their industries' success were a life-saving addition to the injection of foreign capital into the State's arks.[16] For the centralist administration, it was now clear that economic stability would be guaranteed foremost by the aid of industry and the aid of its finances. Even for the minister of war and marine in 1840, Juan Almonte, it was evident that the administration had to establish "military colonies with Mexican families" that "will progress and bear abundant benefits" for the country. An "arranged army" was no longer the only way of conserving "harmony and peace". Such colonies would "occupy with utility many people in the commercial turn, in farming and the arts" –indeed, all the activities which underlay the industrial landscape in this context–, in turn protecting the territories they occupied for the benefit of the "conservation of national territory" from foreign threats.[17] But they were especially commendable because those "profitable occupations" would not allow any entry to the "revolutionary spirit or the devouring war".[18] As the decade turned, it became ever more evident that the centralist

[15] Carlos Illades, "La Empresa Industrial de Estevan de Antuñano (1831-1847)," *Secuencia*, no. 15 (January 1, 1989): 028, https://doi.org/10.18234/secuencia.v0i15.269; Federico De la Torre, *El Patrimonio Industrial Jalisciense Del Siglo XIX: Entre Fábricas de Textiles, de Papel, y de Fierro* (Guadalajara: Secretaría de Cultura, Gobierno de Jalisco, 2007), 25–73; Carlos Alberto Murgueitio, "La industria textil del centro de México, un proyecto inconcluso de modernización económica (1830 – 1845)" 7, no. 13 (2015): 43–75; Lilia Carbajal Arenas, "Los Pioneros de La Industria Textil : El Caso de Cayetano Rubio," *Tiempo y Escritura*, no. 28 (July 2015): 37–51.

[16] Mexico had doubled its debts to the British from little over twenty million pesos in 1835 to forty six million in 1840. Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," 1170.

[17] This statement clearly referred to the threat suffered to "national territory" by the conflicts in 1836-1838, with the secession of Texas and the French blockade of the port of Veracruz. See Jaime E. Rodríguez O. and Kathryn Vincent Lepp, eds., *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*, Latin American Silhouettes (Wilmington, Del: SR Books, 1997), 17–95; Will Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 186–94; Tutino and Ávila, "Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation," 2016, 264–66.

[18] Juan M. Almonte, *Memoria del Ministro de Guerra y Marina, presentada a las Cámaras del Congreso General Mexicano, en Enero de 1840*, Mexico, Imprenta del Águila, 1840, p. 49. (Archivo General de la

administrations began to favor the industrial agenda proposed by Alamán, the hombres de bien, and the collegiate bodies such as the Juntas Industriales, to the extent that policies related to the construction of a national industry began to be issued even by the ministry of war.[19]

By the time Santa Anna and his interim president Nicolás Bravo succeeded Bustamante in 1842, industrialists, agiotistas and the hombres de bien had proven their capacity for self-organization. With the change of government came a shift in policy that sought an open integration of industry and governance at the hands of the centralist government. A central *Junta General de Industria* with a directive organ, the *Dirección General de Agricultura e Industria*, was created. At the head of both institutions, Lucas Alamán would henceforth control the rest of the Juntas that had been created throughout the Republic.[20] During his short and interrupted period in the presidency, Bravo conveyed that the Junta General's purpose was to constitute a "particular corporation with all the means necessary [so that national industry could] be in contact with the superior authorities", and thus give this "branch" a "convenient organization".[21]

With Santa Anna back in power in 1843 after yet another retreat in his estate in Manga de Clavo, he dissolved congress and installed a *Junta de notables* (council of notables) that would oversee the draft of the *Bases orgánicas*, conceived as a juridical replacement of the Seven Laws. The Bases would legitimize the purposes Bravo had conveyed as interim president. Wishing to summon financial aid for the retrieval of Texas, Santa Anna's first measures included a reduction of salaries, the raise of taxes on imported and exported products, as well as the re-introduction of a levy on all commercial establishments. As historians have argued, what may look like protectionist policies towards industry were actually part of the redistribution of funds towards the ministry of war Santa Anna, as an army general, clearly favored his efforts to reconquer Texas.[22] There were, nonetheless, other reforms which directly influenced the march of national industry.

Nación (AGN), Instituciones Gubernamentales: época moderna y contemporánea, Folletería siglo XIX y XX, caja 8, folio 217).

[19] Luis Júaregui makes an interesting case to show how the displacements of budget between the ministries of treasury, war and navy, and internal and external relations were part of internal re-organizations to solve the problem with financial and economic fluency in a time of great debt as well as great expenditure. Luis Jáuregui, "Los Ministros, Las Memorias de Hacienda y El Presupuesto En México, 1825-1855 Una Visión Desde El Gasto Público," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 48 (July 1, 2014): 3–38, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0185-2620(14)71426-4.

[20] Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo: Los Artesanos de La Ciudad de México, 1780-1853*, 1st ed. (El Colegio de Mexico/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, 2005), 117, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3dnpmb.

[21] José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 4 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 338.

[22] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 225–27; Jáuregui, "Los Ministros, Las Memorias de Hacienda y El Presupuesto En México, 1825-1855 Una Visión Desde El Gasto Público."

The minister of treasury and economy Ignacio Trigueros had conceived reforms that sought an integral reformation of labor and industry. The "moral" reforms would be trusted to an active education of the industrial and agricultural worker in the *Escuelas de agricultura y de artes* (Schools of agriculture and arts), under the supervision of the Dirección General de Industria.[23] The conjoint effect of policymaking for the interests of a wide range of groups involved in the construction of national industry was unprecedented for independent Mexico. A few years later, Alamán did not hesitate in showing his enthusiasm *vis-à-vis* the Dirección nacional's policies.

> This concurrence of lights, this commonality [*mancomunidad*] of interests, of mutual support that some branches lend to others, being all represented in this respectable reunion, give the most satisfactory assurances [*seguridades*] that Mexican industry, which from such short beginnings has risen to such a high point of importance, will increase ever more.[24]

We could consider that the institutional centralization pursued by the new centralist administration was responding to the development of local conditions of industry and production. To the extent of our knowledge, for the very first time, craftsmen and workers were being explicitly incorporated into the industrial system promoted by the administration's different branches. Schools were to be built to incentivize their "civic" formation, as potential citizens. The Juntas de industria furthermore enabled them to have an "enlightened representation" within the Junta General de Industria through the commissions they would locally elect among the department's artisans. A selected amount of artisans, that is, would be able to participate in the Junta General's commissions. One of their tasks would be the institution of a *Junta de Fomento de Artesanos*,[25] the first institution of its kind that would be successfully founded in December 1843 –unlike the *Escuela de Artes y Oficios* proposed by Gómez Farías's government in 1833.[26] Despite Santa Anna's fierce taxation policy, which accompanied a tax raise with further prohibitions on more than 180 imported products,[27] the proprietary artisans who were included in these commissions began expressing a certain sense of relief with the creation of the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos which gave them the means for protecting their work, their labor, and its conditions.[28] Evidently, the organization of the singular industrial landscape needed to precipitate through the existent

---

[23] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 4:610–14.
[24] Lucas Alamán, "Lucas Alamán: Estado y Posibilidades de La Industria. 1842," in *México En El Siglo XIX. Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas, 4a. Ed.*, by Álvaro Matute (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, 1994), 140. Although the report was published in 1844, it referred to the year of 1842.
[25] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 4:613–14.
[26] María Estela Eguiarte Sakar, ed., *Hacer Ciudadanos. Educación Para El Trabajo Manufacturero En El s. XIX En México. Antología* (Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, Departamento de Arte, 1989). The only result would be the establishment of nocturnal schools in the Hospital de Jesús and the ex-convent of the Bethlehemites. Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo*, 130.
[27] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 222–28.
[28] Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos: La Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios, 1843-1844," *Signos Históricos* 5, no. 9 (2003).

groups and bodies that drove such activities: the working groups that moved and inhabited the working places (be they rural or urban). Access to such organizations was easiest through the most privileged groups of workers.

As historians have registered, most of the proprietary artisans that composed the commission of the Junta lived near the center of Mexico City. Despite severe reformations of the city's main square (*zócalo*) with the demolition of the ancient market of El Parián,[29] their workshops occupied the same spaces inhabited by a series of commercial and manufactural activities that brought life to the daily trade of their merchandise and products. In fact, the city center was proportionally the least inhabited by journeymen and craftsmen, while artisan masters and workshop proprietaries seem to have concentrated in the areas that were closest to the zócalo. Nearly sixty percent of the over 1,500 workshops in the city were in the center, while only thirty-five percent of the 48,000 artisans in Mexico City lived in the same perimeter.[30] As mentioned, however, the flow of activities seems to have concentrated most of the worker's life in the most centric neighborhoods, where commercial activity was an important companion to the local workshops. This was particularly so for the textile workshops, where merchants would buy the materials from the *hilanderas* (seamstresses) necessary for the craftsmen, journeymen, apprentices, and masters to work.[31] As a labor historian vividly described the city:

> it had the characteristics of a pre-industrial city: a multitude of small stores, outlets, and workshops; agricultural spaces and communal lands in the peripheral areas; a huge floating and unoccupied population; a large number of peddlers and an incredible number of people occupied [*ocupadas*] in domestic services. [...] Numerous artisans were in charge of manufacturing production. Craftsmen were scattered throughout the city in small workshops; a considerable number of them worked in their houses, under the orders of merchants, or tried to sell their goods themselves: there were only a few small industries.[32]

Within the seemingly fluctuant life conditions of the different working groups that inhabited the city, they unraveled their lives in intimate contact with the conditions of a series of other groups such as the merchants and *reboceras* (shawl weavers). Artisanal production, craftsmanship, and commercial links with local merchants seem to have gone hand in hand for local artisans. Small, domestic, workshop, manufacturing production, despite the efforts of establishing a grand-scale

---

[29] See Silvia M. Arrom, "Protesta Popular En La Ciudad de México: El Motín Del Parián En 1828," in *Revuelta En Las Ciudades: Políticas Populares En América Latina*, ed. Servando Ortoll and Silvia M. Arrom, Biblioteca de Signos 27 (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2004), 83–116; María Dolores Lorenzo, "Negociaciones Para La Modernización Urbana: La Demolición Del Mercado Del Parián En La Ciudad de México, 1843," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 38 (December 2009): 85–109.

[30] Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867*, 69.

[31] Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo*, 138–40, 164–68.

[32] María Gayón Córdova, *Condiciones de Vida y de Trabajo En La Ciudad de México En El Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Dirección de Estudios Históricos-Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1988), 102–3.

production, had not been left behind in this process of industrialization. As historians have shown, this was not only the case for Mexico City.

As mentioned, in contexts that were farther away from the city centers, some factories were installed. They soon began to behave as magnetic poles that gathered workers from nearby villages, cities, and towns.[33] A significant example is the textile factory that was founded in 1836 by Lucas Alamán and later transferred to the agiotista Cayetano Rubio in Cocolapan, Veracruz.[34] There, shoemakers, millers, and soap makers associated with the over a thousand weavers that were employed in the factory in its most thriving years (1837-1840). Much like in *La Escoba* at the outskirts of Guadalajara, this particularly outstanding collective of craftsmen and artisans soon established their own workshops in the factory's surrounding areas. Indeed, workers had not only displaced themselves from the neighboring pueblos and villages but also managed to build a whole new community around their new dwellings. The concentration of demand for the products they crafted in the new industrial context was so significant they managed to overcome the boundaries of the factory to establish their own industries in its surroundings.[35] A singular, Mexican, industrial landscape.

In other industrial poles which drew the attention of prominent industrialists, the establishment of factories suffered a much more delicate process. As mentioned in chapter one, the tobacco-producing working communities of Veracruz, for instance, did not take it lightly when prominent industrialists and agiotistas like Manuel Escandón and Benito Maqua were conceded the monopoly over their industry. Not only did local authorities pressure the centralist administration to withdraw such a privilege. The peasant workers that harvested and processed the tobacco leaves did not refrain from contesting the hombres de bien's changes in the production chain. When Escandón and Maqua dissolved their harvester commons (*común de cosecheros*) with the establishment of the new Tobacco Enterprise (*Empresa del tabaco*), they did not refrain from organizing their resistance against this "industrializing" process.[36]

---

[33] A particularly poignant example of these new industrial areas was Puebla. See Guy P. C. Thomson, *Puebla de Los Angeles: Industria y Sociedad de Una Ciudad Mexicana, 1700-1850* (Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Dirección General de Fomento Editorial, 2002).

[34] Lilia Carbajal Arenas, "Los Pioneros de La Industria Textil : El Caso de Cayetano Rubio," *Tiempo y Escritura*, no. 28 (July 2015): 37–51; Van Young, *A Life Together*, 545.

[35] Carlos Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853," *Historia Social*, no. 8 (1990): 80.

[36] The común de cosecheros was an organization of harvesters who elected two "deputies" to mediate relations with the viceroyalty's *Real Renta de Tabaco* from 1765 onwards. Arturo Obregón, *Las Obreras Tabacaleras de La Ciudad de México, 1764-1925* (Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1982), 54–58; David W. Walker, "Business As Usual: The Empresa Del Tabaco in Mexico, 1837-44," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 64, no. 4 (November 1, 1984): 676, https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1215/00182168-64.4.675; Michael P. Costeloe, "The Triangular Revolt in Mexico and the Fall of Anastasio Bustamante, August-October 1841," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 20, no. 2 (1988): 341.

In effect, the centralist administrations faced difficult circumstances when establishing their project of industrialization within the vast network of industries that subsisted at the hands of the numerous working groups spread across the country. As was seen in the previous chapter, the political interaction between the groups that lived in the Centralist Republic was governed by a profound disagreement. Not only did the pueblos contest the logic of citizen centralization, but the working groups also apparently posed problems, from their own traditions of work to the project of centralized industrialization. There were albeit degrees and differences to these groups' contestations. Indeed, the complexities posed by tobacco harvesters were not necessarily received in the same way by the communities of craftsmen and artisans that more directly benefited, privileged, from the industrial activities of these new structures.

This appears to have been the case in other industrial centers like Guadalajara. Spinning and weaving mills, hatters, and leather tanning were the main occupations of the tradesmen and women who lived there. The production of relatively cheap silk rebozos was an important craft in the nearby town of Zamora. Vicente Munguía's workshop, for instance, quite immediately gained importance given his ability to transform a luxury item into a commodity that could be bought by the upper middle classes.[37] As Isidore Löwenstern, an Austrian traveler, described the city:

> Guadalajara is not only distinguished by the manufacture of these objects of gastronomy and luxury; but also by its numerous manufactures of rebozos (common shawls) and other fabrics, and above all by leather articles, such as cowboy boots; leather articles adorned with drawings or embroidery that one wraps around one's feet when traveling. [...] This city seemed to me to be the most industrious in Mexico. There, each trade occupies its own particular street, as in the East.[38]

The uniqueness narrated by Löwenstern was not casual. The above-mentioned industries in the outskirts of Guadalajara would become paradigm-shifting in their ingenious ways to revolutionize the local economy through unforeseen cooperation between the elites that founded them and the workers that sustained the factories.[39] For instance, La Escoba's founders, Sotero Prieto, and Manuel Olasgarre, adopted the transformations of the industrial chain of production adopted by nearby factories. Located on the outskirts of the city, the textile factory was built in 1841 on the remains of an old paddock, which was replaced with the factory. Two dams assured the continuous production of yarn through a complex hydraulic system that would never allow the flow of water, the machine's engine energy source, to stop. The factory, much like in Cocolapan, soon attracted workers who lived in the vicinity. The community of workers grew to

[37] Jaime Olveda, "El Monopolio Rebocero Guadalajara-Zamora," in *Industria y Comercio*, ed. José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, 1. ed, Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara 5 (México, D.F: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1993), 33–36.
[38] Isidore Löwenstern, "Oficios y Costumbres," in *Sociedad y Costumbres*, ed. José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara 2 (Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1991), 278.
[39] This shall become more evident in chapter four.

such an extent that their families began traveling with them. Establishments were soon set up in the nearby hacienda of El Cedral. The new industrial community, composed of a variety of working groups, did not only attract more than two thousand craftsmen but also housed around a thousand people directly linked to productive activities.[40]

As the evidence seems to indicate, the conception of an industrialization agenda was also a contested process that involved a wide range of groups. Precipitating this project into the construction of a national industry that ranged from the "crony" capitalism garnered by Lucas Alamán and the hombres de bien to the groups of workers who not only sought wage labor but also a general means for their communities' livelihoods and survival, the establishment of these industries managed to transform the dynamics with which these groups interacted. Indeed, in describing them we cannot comprehend their activities only according to their labor-related practices. Despite the Cocolapan and La Escoba industries being singular examples, these poles may help prove that factories, or industry in general, attracted activities that corresponded to a more general sense of work as common subsistence, irreducible to the senses imbued into labor. As shall be seen, the Mexico City craftsmen that interacted with the city's merchants depicted another singular industrial landscape where working activities stretched far beyond the limits of their labor spaces. In this sense, the fact that the craftsman labor space was called a *workshop* may not be whimsical at all. To a certain extent, the dynamics that the industrialists and the hombres de bien established during the first years of the 1840s are also far more comprehensible as a virtual project of industrialization rather than the creation of a national industry. As historians have recently discussed, it would seem that the former's industrial project was only but a fraction of the ensemble that composed "national industry" in Mexico.[41] In the next section we will analyze to what extent the working groups managed to drive a wedge into a supposedly centralized process of industrialization projects which have, until recently, been widely considered to be "backward".[42]

By evidencing the profound disagreement posed by the working groups in relation to the industrial project of the hombres de bien, we will be able to see that behind the transformations of industry, there were also profound transformations that reverberated throughout Mexican

[40] Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades," 83; De la Torre, *El Patrimonio Industrial Jalisciense Del Siglo XIX*, 71–81; Carbajal Arenas, "Los Pioneros de La Industria Textil."
[41] A similar point is made in: Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845"; John Tutino and Alfredo Ávila, "Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation," in *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 233–77.
[42] John H. Coatsworth, *Los Orígenes Del Atraso: Nueve Ensayos de Historia Económica de México En Los Siglos XVIII y XIX* (Mexico City: Alianza Editorial, 1990); *cfr.* Van Young, *A Life Together*.

society. To what extent these transformations were related to the problem of the organization of the nation is also a question profoundly linked with these contestations.

3. The transformation of industry from within: work and labor according to the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos

Until not so long ago, the world of labor had been "minimized" over against the scholarship on other social groups that have been admittedly included in the study of social transformations of Mexican society before 1850. As Clara Lida observed, the subsumption of the historiographic category of "artisan" to that of "worker" or "laborer" was correlated with the effective "social destitution" they collectively suffered through the processes of "proletarianization", the crescent control of capital over the means of production, and the circulation of products by "fabricants-merchants". All of which were processes that started happening more substantially until the 1850s.[43] As will be argued, it was the coincidence of the transformation of labor practices with the traditional customs of artisanal production and craftsmanship, linked to the customs of the guilds, which turned out to carry most of the industrial progress, as much as its innermost contradictions and complexities. Some of the most intricate contradictions emerged without much mediation as soon as the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos was founded in 1843.

As already mentioned, the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos was responsive to the Junta General de Industria created in 1841, in turn under the auspices of the Dirección General de Agricultura e Industria. More generally, the Juntas de Fomento, which were established by an official decree in 1841, were administrative corporations distributed along the territory which worked along local courtrooms in the "administration of justice". Every merchant with domicile in a locality with a *tribunal mercantil* (commercial court) had to be registered, whereas fabricants and hacienda owners had the right but not the obligation to enroll under his court. Members acquired an "active and passive" function in the elections of the representatives of the local junta. It was the junta's duty to wake for the "prosperity and advancement of commerce" through the "most profitable and opportune measures and orders"; to propagate useful knowledge on commerce and arts, through the establishment of schools and the publication of writings on these subjects; to prepare the commercial balance of their locality; as well as draft the "economic regulation" of the local junta and of its tribunal, which would then be authorized by the Junta Departamental.[44] It should not bewilder the reader to notice that the artisans and craftsmen involved in the creation of the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos (hereinafter, Junta) were appealed

[43] Clara E. Lida, "Trabajo, Organización y Protesta Artesanal: México, Chile y Cuba En El Siglo XIX," *Historia Social*, no. 31 (1998): 68–70.
[44] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 4:51–58.

by their convocation to participate. It was, undoubtedly, an opportunity for them to reach administrative instances which could transform the conditions of their daily, working, and labor, activities. Indeed, they were involved in the project of constructing a national industry.

Among the few known organs that ushered the ideas of these craftsmen and tradesmen was the *Semanario Artístico* (hereinafter *Semanario*), the Junta's publishing organ. In its first number, the commission of artisans in charge of the periodical noted that the "only arbitration" that had to be remedied was the inconvenience suffered by the whole Republic: idleness and "*empleomanía*" (employment craze). To solve these inconveniences, the government needed to establish "special schools for the practice of agriculture and the arts". With the establishment of the *Colegio Artístico* and guided by the Junta, "popular education" would no longer abandon the means of establishing "productive work and the independent existence of Mexican citizens". In fact,

> The improvement of national customs and democratic influence must necessarily aspire to elevate industry over employment and to hasten the fortunate era in which, more than to honors and positions, one aspires to the title of a useful and industrious citizen who through industry increases the productive classes and foments public wealth most effectively and permanently.[45]

Quite immediately, the Junta's work was widely praised. Its "worthy founder", president Antonio López de Santa Anna, "dignified" the directors of the Junta with a "valuable", "brave" and "satisfactory" message, encouraging them to continue working in the promotion of "agriculture, the arts, and industry", for they were "more valuable for a *pueblo* than any mine of precious metals".[46] Not only authorities appreciated the efforts of the Junta. Mariano Gálvez, a member of the prestigious *Ateneo Mexicano*, also supported the Junta. He avowed the efforts it made for the survival of Mexican industry by driving foreign industry out of the country. For Gálvez, the Junta made it clear that "the power of authority is insufficient" for the "protection of national interests". The national industry was more in need of a "national spirit" and the "cooperation of citizens". There was thus little doubt that the Junta of Santa Anna's government had to "form associations" throughout the republic, for only these associations, which should be named *Sociedades del Voto Nacional*, could control its members from consuming foreign products.[47] As a literary athenaeum with some of the most prominent figures in Mexico's cultural world, its praise was well received by the Junta and the *Semanario Artístico* as a message that portrayed the necessity of protecting national industry. When read attentively, however, certain ideas exceed the sense of industrial protectionism as presented by Gálvez.

---

[45] "Educación Moral," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/2/1844.

[46] "Aviso," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 2/3/1844.

[47] *Voto*, in this case, is not directly translatable by vote in today's sense of the term. In this case, it rather denotes the sense of interest, as in *vow*. Mariano Gálvez, "Fomento de Las Artes," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/3/1844.

The Junta's artisans were presenting a new sense of protectionism that was not hinged by their protection against the dangers posed by the circulation of foreign merchandise. They aspired to improve "national customs and democratic influence" through the work of craftsmen and women, "elevating industry over employment", and elevating laboriousness over "honors and position". We see how the principle of nation-building presented by the craftsmen of the Junta was irreducible to the principle of nationality that underlay the privileged, creole, groups' projects represented in the *Ateneo Mexicano*.[48] In this case, it was not so much about creating a project of industrialization for the republic's citizens, as Gálvez conveyed. The task of the Junta General de Industria was to organize local juntas to attend to the requests and needs of artisans. However, the local juntas, such as the Junta de Fomento de Artesanos, were not only used and appropriated by the working groups as forums for the protection of their productive activities and the assets they produced. It meant protecting their customs and their "industry", irreducible to the activity linked to wage labor and employment. By becoming "completely popular",[49] by hearing what the "productive classes" wished and aspired for while industriousness was implemented through education, "public wealth" was fomented in the "most efficient and permanent" way possible.[50]

Contrary to what some assume, the artisanal discourse of the Junta did not conceive industry as a result of government policies that enabled legal working associations to set their priorities in the promotion of national over international consumption.[51] On the contrary, they seem to have contested the project of the industrialization of the Nation by affirming industry in the nation's groups. This did not rule out the possibility of "elevating" industry: on the contrary, industry had to be elevated beyond employment to reach its true goal, which was creating wealth for the "productive classes". In an editorial that talked about "moral education", they recommended building industry over employment, for industry was the "wealth of the *patria*". They consequently remarked:

> There is not anything to be undervalued when it is a question of inspiring the taste for arts in men, and there is nothing that can be omitted to persuade them to be useful to artisans. It is not necessary to personally practice a craft, it is sufficient to know them well enough to feel their usefulness, protect them, and honor them.[52]

---

[48] Recent literature has insisted in the crystallization of this nationalism in institutions such as the Ateneo Mexicano. Besides the discussion included in the introduction, see: Erika Madrigal Hernández, "El Ateneo Mexicano (1840-1850): una constelación cultural intergeneracional," *Connotas. Revista de crítica y teoría literarias*, no. 24 (June 2022): 158–200, https://doi.org/10.36798/critlit.v0i24.401.
[49] "Comisión de La Junta de Fomento de Artesanos," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/3/1844.
[50] "Educación Moral," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/2/1844.
[51] Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo: Los Artesanos de La Ciudad de México, 1780-1853* (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, 2005); Vanesa E. Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización: Honor, Trabajo y Solidaridades Artesanales En La Ciudad de México a Mediados Del Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2008).
[52] "Instrucción General de Las Artes," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/2/1844.

There seems to be a tightly knit array of senses to the artisans' conception of industry, art, its practice, and the person who developed that practice: the artisan himself. Craft and art, as it emerges from the previous citation, were worthy of protection. The artisan's craft was his principal source of pleasure, for it was undeniably his most "active occupation". "Work" (*trabajo*) was a "charm" and "distraction" of its own, especially when linked with the "flattering idea" of its "results". Combining craft with skills, elaborating a "sound plan", assembling the means of its feasibility and gradually realizing it, had the reward of conquering its difficulties and "harvesting the fruits of *artistic industry*" for the satisfaction of the "honorable artisan's heart".[53]

One might notice that there are some key movements and displacements to be observed in this particular piece. Within the tightly condensed imaginary of these artisans, it is not so much *labor* as *work* which appears in a vocabulary that upholds the value of industry and craft.[54] The difference between *trabajo* and *labor*, suggested in the previous translation of trabajo with work, might denote a central distinction that the Junta wished to convey. It was not so much wage labor, employment, as much as the artisanal activities of work, which comprehended the whole process of elaborating an idea up until its "harvest", which constituted "artistic industry". An activity so satisfying that surpassing its difficulties meant treasuring the artisan's heart. This discursive turn fostered by the Junta's artisan commission inflicts a turn in our vocabulary that must also differentiate between work and labor. In a *quasi*-hermeneutic exercise of approximation to the source's language, from this point forward we will only translate the word labor only when the sources utter the voice. Work, on the other hand, will appear as an idiom that articulates the former ensemble of voices that may have constituted an "imaginary of work".

Predictably, however, this very particular imaginary of work did not appear throughout the *Semanario.* As noted, the Junta was not only composed by the commission of artisans who drafted the columns and editorials mentioned above. The document that established the general "*bases*" for the ruling of the Junta speaks quite well of the contradictions that inhabited this collegiate body of artisans and officials. In the Junta's regulation, its authorities established that the council served as a body that ensured the "fomentation [*fomento*] and perfection of all artistic productions that are fabricated in the country, [...] generally spreading [*generalizando*] the best methods that

[53] "Educación Moral: La Felicidad," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 15/6/1844.
[54] For a discussion on the relation between labor and work, and the irreducibility of the latter to the former: Andrea Komlosy, "Work and Labor Relations," in *Capitalism: The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*, ed. Jürgen Kocka and Marcel van der Linden (New York/London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016), 33–70; Christian G De Vito, Juliane Schiel, and Matthias van Rossum, "From Bondage to Precariousness? New Perspectives on Labor and Social History," *Journal of Social History* 54, no. 2 (November 1, 2020): 644–62, https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shz057.

should be adopted for the former objective".[55] Although Juan Montero, the president of the Junta, commended the "protection of artisans", he also claimed that it was not the Junta's responsibility to "assemble the artisans, to persuade, encourage and convince them". A "limitless mistrust", a "profound uncertainty", and little commitment "to produce inside and to take advantage of what comes from the outside" were the distinctive feature of the majority of "our artisans", due to the little "civil education" and the "very imperfect" artistic education given by the "so-called" masters. The junta's directive commission was "hesitant to dictate on such a serious matter": the deeper it delved, the further it "stumbled upon pitfalls". Whatever its resolutions, they should be "so certain and effective" that they should not be nullified by the "thousand devastations" caused by ignorance.[56] There was an evident disagreement as to the consequences and reach of artisanal education according to the directive board of the Junta and the commission of artisans. A disagreement where the sense of work and industry itself was put into play.

There were evident discordances between the discourses portrayed by the different groups that composed the Junta in Mexico City. Despite its formal internal structure as an official dependency with a president and vice-president that were elected by the enrolled participants, the political principles that were its very foundation were conceived by a group of property-owning workshop masters, and workers, while the actual bases that regulated its functioning were decided by another series of representatives (most of whom were not artisans or workers of any sort). Yet the contradictions between its members' mindsets were not exclusive to the Junta from Mexico City. The local juntas that appeared in these years throughout the country were in many cases headed by government officials that wished to establish the fomentation of industry as a way of guaranteeing an adequate design of the worker as a citizen of the Centralist Republic.[57] In practice, however, the national juntas forcedly dealt with manufacturers, craftsmen, and artisans that did not passively wait for the government's objectives and tutelage to cover their everyday problems.[58]

As the example of the Junta de Fomento shows, the groups of artisans that had a direct relationship with its directive board did not necessarily conceive themselves first most as citizens

---

[55] "Bases Generales Para La Formación de Los Estatutos de La Junta de Fomento de Artesanos, Que En Cumplimiento de Lo Dispuesto En El Art. 3 Del Decreto de 2 de Octuber Último, Ha Formado La Preparatoria de Aquella y Presenta al Ecsmo. Sr. Gobernador Para Su Aprobacion," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/2/1844.
[56] *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/2/1844.
[57] The 1843 *Bases* defined citizens as people who were at least 18, married, and had an annual income of "at least" two hundred pesos, proceeding from "physical capital, industry or personal honest work [labor?]". Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 4:430. Considering that the average annual income per capita in 1845 was fifty-six pesos in contrast with the two hundred required to opt for citizenship, we could presume that the amount of "Mexican citizens" was very reduced. Jaime E. Rodríguez O., "La crisis de México en el siglo XIX," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 10, no. 10 (June 27, 1986): 93, https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.1986.010.68957.
[58] Carlos Illades, "De los gremios a las sociedades de socorros mutuos: el artesanado mexicano. 1814-1853", *Historia Social*, n° 8 (1990): 81.

as much as workers, who in any case "aspired" to the title of "useful citizen". In this sense, we could say that they established a difference between the "industrious" and the "useful" citizen, the latter obeying the parameters that defined the citizen of the 1843 Centralist Republic. Furthermore, we should not deny the fact that privileged, proprietary, artisans like the members of the commission were in clear advantage to articulate such imaginaries, beginning with their access to literacy. Yet historians have found some examples of other, less privileged, worker collectives who managed to articulate work discourses that also exceeded the government's program and ideas.

At the Junta's inauguration ceremony, painter Santiago Villanueva and other craftsmen presented the regulation of their own organization: the *Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios* (hereinafter, Sociedad). The idea of the director Juan Montero was to adopt such regulation for "mutual benefit" of the Junta and the Sociedad. Among Villanueva's companions was Luis Aguilar, the lawyer and secretary of the Sociedad, who openly opposed the idea of opening cooperation between both organizations, especially when discussing the idea of sharing fragments of the regulation he had drafted and conceived. Presumably, the regulation included ideals he was not willing to share with a governmental institution. Was Montero's directive commission not entirely misguided when talking about the artisans' "mistrust" toward centralist institutions? The evident disagreement between these corporations over their regulations, and the willingness or not to base their activities upon the same set of norms, has induced historians to think of the Sociedad as an "alternative" kind of labor organization in Mexico City, to the extent that such a disagreement seems to reflect underlying differences between the presidency of the Junta and other artisan corporations of the time.[59]

According to Sonia Pérez Toledo and those who have followed her interpretation,[60] the Sociedad's innovation, and the reason for conceiving it as an alternative organization, is its "incorporation of a modern language". Concretely, the "liberal imprint" that is present in its regulation. The latter was based on a distinct type of "discourse" for contemporary Mexican labor associations: one of a "mutualist" nature that was unprecedented in two different degrees. Not only was it the first to appear on Mexican soil, but the Sociedad was also the first labor organization that clearly cut with the "forms of association and solidarity" practiced by old regime corporations. In other words, the underlying thesis shared by historians is that its discourse was modern because

[59] Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos: La Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios, 1843-1844," *Signos Históricos* 5, no. 9 (2003).

[60] See, for example: Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización*; René Amaro Peñaflores, "La Artesanía En Zacatecas En El Siglo XIX. De La Cultura Oral a La Instrucción Elemental y Técnica," in *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*, ed. Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores (Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012), 167–202.

it adopted a mutualist language, yet the definitory "modern" aspect is the "liberal imprint" that was linked to their rupture with corporative language and customs.[61] In what follows, we will go back to the sources available to discuss the troubling assumptions that inform this conclusion. Ushered by the difference between the imaginary of work and the language of labor that arose above, in what follows we will analyze the discordances between the Sociedad and some of the Junta's groups to see what this tells us about the construction of national industry.

4. Weaving the imaginary of work. Mutualism, cooperation, and the Mexican working nation

When analyzed more closely, the Sociedad's regulation[62] has undeniable similarities with the imaginary conveyed by the Junta's artisan commission. Much like their craftsmen peers that garnered a "moral education", the Sociedad also advocated a message with a "moral character". The artisan of their association was a subject of the organization he was willingly subscribing to. As a member of this craftsmen organization, the worker was "positively necessary and useful" for the nation. It was his reformation into a "useful" member, through his "applied industriousness", that made the Sociedad's worker an honest and virtuous person.[63] It was industry, work, and craftsmanship in the name of the organization which linked the relatively autonomous artisan to the Sociedad. Autonomy was realized through work to the extent that the artisan was able to establish "cooperation for the benefit of the association" (art. 7). The artisan was useful and had a moral character to the extent that he, as an individual, was linked to a community of work to which he collaborated, cooperated, with his craft, his art.

Impenetrable for conventional conceptions of the nineteenth-century Mexican world of labor which end up, perhaps unintentionally, artificially polarizing "tradition" and "modernity" as two separate and unmixable temporal thresholds,[64] corporate traditions and customs in the

[61] Pérez Toledo, "Una organización alternativa de artesanos…", 84-85. The author highlights some of the articles of its regulation as an example of the "liberal" language. Noticeably, she quotes article XI, which incorporated direct elections by majority of votes for its officers. See *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 17/1/1844.
[62] References to the Sociedad's regulation will be henceforth quoted in the text with a parenthesis that refers to the article, in *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 17/1/1844.
[63] "Ingratitud y Merecimientos", *El Aprendiz*, México, July 10 1844, in: Pérez Toledo, "Una organización alternativa de artesanos…", 95.
[64] For a discussion on the tropes of tradition and modernity within Latin American nineteenth century historiography, see: Elías José Palti, *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*, Metamorfosis (Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores Argentina, 2007); Elías José Palti, "¿De La *Tradición* a La *Modernidad*? Revisionismo e Historia Político-Conceptual de Las Revoluciones de Independencia," in *Independencia y Revolución: Pasado, Presente y Futuro*, ed. Gustavo Leyva et al. (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2010), 174–90; Javier Fernández-Sebastián, "Tiempos de Transición En El Atlántico Ibérico. Conceptos Políticos En Revolución," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Joao Feres Junior, vol. 1, 10 vols., Iberconceptos (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 25–72; Javier

1830s and 1840s were being imprinted with practices which precipitated into an unprecedented political vocabulary. For reasons that will be discussed below, the Sociedad's imaginary may complicate current interpretations of the "modernity" of its language. Indeed, the latter does not seem to derive from its contact with "liberalism". If its imaginary may be considered to be "modern" at all, we should first untangle the core of its imaginary that was very much in tension between a corporative language inherited from the guilds' traditions, and a mutualist idiom that communicated with aspects of their contemporary society. Only then can we assess the evidence in the light of contemporary categories of "modernity", and the inherent limitations of such categories. Perhaps a privileged window into the tensioned core of the Sociedad's imaginary is their conception of "cooperation".

In fact, before establishing the aforementioned cooperation within the workspace, artisans had to meet certain obligations to access the status of members of the Sociedad. Craftsmen who wished to enter the worker organization had to make a weekly contribution. The sum was not previously fixed: each artisan would give to the Sociedad the amount of their "philanthropic" desire according to their industrial capacities (articles 7-9). As mentioned, each individual had to cooperate with their work for the Sociedad's existence, as well as a "pecuniary" contribution in proportion to the artisan's capacity. For this craftsmen's association, however, cooperation was rooted in other practices as well. More precisely, if the practice of cooperation was set according to the artisan's contributions within the workspace, its origins were not enclosed within this space. Cooperation was learned both inside and outside of the workshop. In fact, in the rare amount of copies available of *El Aprendiz*, instruction was no longer strictly linked to the professional formation of workers.[65]

Assimilating the transformations of the 1820s and 1830s, when education slowly began detaching from its traditional locus (mainly the Church's confraternities and guilds), the Sociedad carried education into their artisanal tradition of instruction. Just as in the long journey every artisan had to pass through in their formative process as apprentices, where they gradually mastered their craft, learning the use of certain tools as well as when to recur to other members of the workshop for assistance,[66] instruction for the Sociedad became the vehicle by which "every class of society" was transmitted the capacity to "tighten" their relations. Education and artisanal

---

Fernández Sebastián, *Historia Conceptual En El Atlántico Ibérico: Lenguajes, Tiempos, Revoluciones*, Sección de Obras de Historia (Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2021).

[65] Although the notice of this artisan journal was given by Pérez Toledo, the research period in the AGN was unfortunately not enough to find the few available original documents. All citations are thus taken from references from contemporary newspapers and the quoted article of Pérez Toledo.

[66] A fascinating account of the life within the workshop is included in: Antonio Santoni Rugiu, *Breve Storia Dell'educazione Artigiana* (Roma: Carocci, 2008); with a similar perspective for Mexico, see: Amaro Peñaflores, "La Artesanía En Zacatecas En El Siglo XIX. De La Cultura Oral a La Instrucción Elemental y Técnica"; Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867.*

instruction were thus understood as the organ where the "spirit of cooperation" between the individuals of society and, as a part of the former, the Sociedad, expressed itself.[67] Such an organ, however, could not rely on the workplace as its space of expression and fulfillment. Since 1814, corporations had been formally abolished. Hence, legally, artisanal instruction could not rely on any kind of formal corporation that resembled a guild. Perhaps both by need and will then, the Sociedad proposed the establishment of a *Colegio artístico*[68] which could effectively link the "aspirations" of the nation to that of the arts.[69] Far from an exclusively artisanal instruction, the education that would be granted in this institution would assure the possibility to link the progress of the arts with the "needs of the social branches [*ramas sociales*]".[70] As the artisans and workers of the Sociedad stated elsewhere, the *Colegio* would further enable the craftsman's need to be "at reach" of the statesmen that were conducting the nation, just like the master was necessarily in touch with his apprentice's learning process.

The official decree that established the creation of "two schools, one of agriculture and one of arts" acknowledged the "solicitation" made by "several artisans" to create the *Colegio artístico*. The *Escuela de Artes y Oficios* would teach the "knowledges that are the base for the exercise of diverse arts and trades [*oficios*]".[71] Historians have consequently argued that these official institutions followed the "cosmovision of the world of labor", especially with the "formative nucleus" that came with the corporative process of apprenticeship that pointed towards the "comprehension of the craft's secrets". Yet they also note that instruction and apprenticeship, which depended greatly on the apprentice's capacity to relate and closely observe the daily and labor practices of the master, wished to be transformed from a "practical pedagogy" into a technical-industrial qualification of the worker following a "new formative professional ideology".[72]

As stated above, there seems to be an inherent tension that leads historians to contradict themselves when they discuss to what degree the centralist reforms transformed the artisans'

---

[67] "Instrucción Artística," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 7/9/1844.
[68] "Instrucción Artística," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 7/9/1844. Not to be confused with the project of an *Escuelas de arte y agricultura* proposed by Alamán from the Dirección General de Industria.
[69] *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 25/6/1844.
[70] "Instrucción Artística," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 7/9/1844; for a different approach, see: Pérez Toledo, "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos," 93 and 98; Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867*, 223–44.
[71] *Decreto sobre establecimiento de dos escuelas, una de agricultura y una de artes*, Mexico City, Imprenta del Águila, 1843. (AGN, Instituciones Gubernamentales: época moderna y contemporánea, Folletería siglo XIX, box 8, folio 240).
[72] Amaro Peñaflores, "La Artesanía En Zacatecas En El Siglo XIX. De La Cultura Oral a La Instrucción Elemental y Técnica," 190–95.

institutions.[73] Such institutions, which we could name the institutions of work, however, prove to be more complex insofar as they integrated both the comprehension of the "trade's secrets", as much as they also projected a reformed "practical pedagogy", which was possibly in line with the hombres de bien's industrialization projects. Nonetheless, some historians have managed to shed some light on the fact that there seem to have been some radical differences between one and the other, despite the evident conjunctions. To use an aphorism coined by a leading historian, both institutions sought to "*make* the worker".[74] The accent which ultimately allows us to discern the educational projects of the institutions of work from the centralist *Escuelas* is the fact that while one wanted to make the worker altogether, the latter put the accent into making *a citizen* out of the worker. We could affirm that the question lay in the extent to which the institutions of work and the centralist administrations wished to "incorporate" the worker into their community.[75] Was it a simple incorporation into the citizenry of the Centralist Republic, or was education an institution that allowed the worker to integrate their craft instruction into their "civic" education?

The complexity in understanding what education meant for these working groups is determined by its position in a network of institutions that found themselves at the crossroads of the profound transformation of the "corporative" reality throughout the first decades of the nineteenth century. Although there are some important gaps to be filled by further research, there is little doubt that the establishment of the Lancaster school in 1822 was an important watershed. Manuel Codorniu y Ferreras, its president and founding member in 1823, upheld the legacy of "mutual instruction" (*enseñanza mutua*) and its "synonymity" with the Lancaster system, which was created between France, England, and Spain. The 71 schools the system established appropriated the practice of mutuality through which moral education, with strong Catholic roots, was provided. Yet the accent put on education conceived as an opportunity to "soak in the waters of the vast knowledge of the sciences" that would transform its students into "good Christians *and* good citizens" was also appealing to contemporary authorities.[76] The school was successful enough to nearly double the number of students by 1845 and embrace further projects throughout the

---

[73] Despite the undeniable resourcefulness of her explanation of the phenomenon, Dorothy Tanck de Estrada's book is also a testament to the inner contradictions in this kind of analysis. Dorothy Tanck Estrada, *La Educación Ilustrada, 1786-1836: Educación Primaria En La Ciudad de México*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Colegio de Mexico, 1984), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv233nzb.

[74] María Estela Eguiarte Sakar, ed., *Hacer Ciudadanos. Educación Para El Trabajo Manufacturero En El s. XIX En México. Antología* (Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, Departamento de Arte, 1989), 7–10.

[75] I take this term from Annick Lempérière's work on 16th to 18th century Mexico. She uses the term to designate the process by which an individual is admitted into a corporation, be it a guild, the Church, or an administrative role of the "republic" they belonged to. Annick Lempérière, *Entre Dios y El Rey: La República: La Ciudad de México de Los Siglo XVI al XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013).

[76] Manuel Codorniu y Ferreras, *Discurso inaugural que en la abertura de las escuelas mutuas de la filantropía, establecidas por la Compañía Lancasteriana de México en el que fue convento de los Belemitas*, Mexico, Imprenta de Martín Rivera, 1823, pp. 7-31. (BN, LAF 431/8). My italics.

first half of the century. In 1835, for instance, Eduardo Turreau de Liniers established his *Compañía Mexicana Científico-Industrial*, albeit after more than a decade of requests to the different administrations in turn.[77]

In a context where the importance of the principle of order and ethics was widely discussed, the Lancaster system managed to establish an important precedent by affirming the need for a mutualist education. Hardly conceivable as either Catholic, liberal, or republican, Codorniu's or Linier's language put the accent in the formation of citizens which were formed through "continuous work", from which they would "drink the healthy waters of wisdom".[78] The echoes of the system which was initially conceived to provide elementary education reverberated throughout the century. In 1835, for example, important "additions" were made to the *Cartilla de enseñanza mutua* by José Francisco Zapata. If the original document had established that

> morality [*la moral*] was the most appropriate means to moderate the customs that laws only compress; instruction is the safe garment [*prenda segura*] of mutual benevolence men owe each other: it will make them respect the lives, the properties, and honors of their fellow citizens [*conciudadanos*], and make them aid [*auxilian*] each other in their conflicts [...]

Zapata would then add that "to the precept, it is necessary to add its practice" by engraving the "most healthy opinions" in the children's hearts and "carrying out its execution" inside and outside the school. They would not forget "fairness and honesty [*lo justo y honesto*]" if the school "fortified them in virtue".[79] The Lancaster system was thus aspiring to form citizens through the practice of mutualism, hence defining the concept itself in nineteenth-century Mexico. As such, we may consider it as the system that enabled the institution of mutualism in independent Mexico.

For obvious reasons, this statement has strong implications for our work. Especially because we are analyzing a period when, as Liniers and Zapata confirm, the Lancaster schools were not the only institutions providing and establishing mutualist instruction or education. As mentioned, historians have noted that the Sociedad was openly embracing mutualist practices beyond its educational projects and have admitted that other coexistent artisan societies were also influenced

---

[77] Eduardo Enrique Teodoro de Turreau Liniers, *Plan de los Establecimientos Estatutos Generales de la Compañía Mexicana Científico-Industrial, que aprobó el Supremo Gobierno*, Mexico, Imprenta de Ignacio Cumplido, 1835. (AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Instrucción pública en general, vol. 2478, exp. 325). *Cfr.* AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Instrucción pública (Compañía lancasteriana), vol. 2444, exp. 2. See also: Eguiarte Sakar, *Hacer Ciudadanos*; Alfredo Ávila, "El Radicalismo Republicano En Hispanoamérica: Un Balance Historiográfico y Una Propuesta de Estudio," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 41 (June 1, 2011), https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.2011.41.26584; Jesús Ávila Galinzoga, ed., *La Educación Técnica En México Desde La Independencia, 1810-2010*, vol. I: De la enseñanza de arte y oficios a la educación técnica, 1810-1909, 3 vols. (Mexico: Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Presidencia del Decanato, 2011).

[78] Codorniu y Ferreras, *Discurso*, p. 30.

[79] *Adiciones á la Cartilla de enseñanza mutua publicada por la Compañía Lancasteriana, propuestas por el C. José Francisco Zapata*, 1835. (AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Instrucción pública en general, vol. 2478, exp. 330).

by the Lancaster educational system.[80] Another implication is precisely related to the thesis that the Sociedad is considered a "modern" worker association to the extent that it incorporated mutualist practices. However, there were strong remnants as to what the categorical division refers to as "traditional" customs, traceable to the Catholic and corporative practices. Earlier we noted that there was an evident mixture of corporative customs and practices of work in the Sociedad's institution of education as members of their association *and* the nation. The new conception of education was impregnated with a morality that corresponded with the Lancaster mutual instruction as it did with the pecuniary and moral cooperation of this labor organization.

As such, the mutualistic language Pérez Toledo deems to be an aspect of its alternativity as an effect of its innovation as the first mutualistic "labor organization" in Mexico, was actually not so "alternative". Despite their transformations of previous mutualist language, the Sociedad was in continuity with previous institutions such as the Lancaster system, but also with coexistent work organizations that recurred to mutualism as a cohesive language for their societies.[81] In what follows, we will see that mutualism might be considered as the institution that enables an explication of the contradictory character of the Sociedad as a corporation within a society of free individuals or citizens, which ultimately underlies the category of "modernity" used by such historians. We shall discover, beyond such divisive categories, that rather than a contradiction, it was the expression of a new community whose precepts were structured according to the institutions and imaginary of work: the working nation.

Indeed, the Sociedad was also aspiring to instruct and educate the members of their organization, artisans, journeymen, apprentices, and masters, as citizens of the Mexican nation. Firmly established in their workshop activities and labor practices, instruction gave the "classes of the nation" the possibility to establish a dialectic knowledge of each other's needs and aspirations through their cooperation. This also meant creating a link with "statesmen" and with the State itself. As the artisans of the Sociedad further elaborated, education was the "legitimate mother of universal progress of the states"[82] to the extent that it was the effective means through which to separate the "groups" of the nation from "aged [*añejo*] concerns" and unite them under the progress of the "patria".[83] In this piece, the imaginary of collaboration and cooperation established by worker associations transcended directly to the progress of the state and the nation's *groups*. But should this necessarily mean that their imaginary and the institutions of work were simply

---

[80] See, for example: Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo: Los Artesanos de La Ciudad de México, 1780-1853*, 131–32, 230.

[81] See, for example: "Varios profesores del Arte de la Música piden se les permita formar una asociación para auxiliarse mutuamente". (AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Asociaciones, vol. 388, f. 31).

[82] "Instrucción Artística," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 7/9/1844.

[83] "PROSPECTO de un nuevo periódico titulado: El Aprendiz", *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 25/6/1844.

conveying, transforming, the liberal discourse behind the Centralist Republic into a sort of "popular liberalism"? [84] Should we not, as conceptual historians have taught us, be more cautious when using the term "liberalism" in such a complex context?[85] Perhaps this republican aspiration of the Sociedad is better understood if we analyze its disagreements with the hombres de bien's Centralist Republic. That is, if we return to the disagreement between the nation's groups.

There is little doubt that the Sociedad was quite contrary to the conditions of citizenship posed by the Bases orgánicas of 1843, which raised the annual income from one hundred to two hundred pesos.[86] In one of the first instances where *El Aprendiz* talked about the practice of fomentation, it did not leave out a denouncement of the "petty and shy politics" their society of artisans had suffered in the first months of 1844. The newspaper article openly denounced the taxation imposed by Santa Anna's administration, qualifying them as "harmful customs" implemented by the "stubborn" and the "enemies of Mexico". Contrary to the supposed fomentation of artisans the government pursued, the Sociedad contended that artisans needed to dedicate themselves to their own fomentation: "we need to *fomentarnos*". They later established: "To foment, a master teaches, is more than to govern, it is to create, and the creative virtue must take care that no obstacle comes between the ingenuity of man and his arm, between the conception of a good idea and its execution".[87]

Through the fomentation of work, these artisans were in their way appropriating the practices that buttressed government during the Centralist Republic. As with the pueblos, there were discursive remnants of previous customs and practices: master, virtue, government, man's arm, and his brain working together. But does the combination of these terms evince a guild's conceptual network, or is it rather the effect of the imaginary of work of these artisanal societies? The fundamental and quite unprecedented twist seems to lie in the succession of fomentation,

---

[84] See, for example: Pérez Toledo, "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos," 93 and 98.

[85] It is not irrelevant that other historians have insisted that the use of "liberal" for this context tends to be quite anachronistic, for it arbitrarily encloses a set of political practices to a doctrine that was not consistent and outwardly defended as a way of performing politics. At the time, liberal was a much more fluid concept for historians to talk so loosely of the term, let alone define a series of actors with it. See Javier Fernández-Sebastián, "Liberalismos Nacientes En El Atlántico Iberoamericano: 'Liberal' Como Concepto y Como Identidad Política, 1750-1850," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, ed. Javier Fernández-Sebastián, vol. 1, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 727–28; Roberto Breña, "LIBERALISMO. México," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, ed. Javier Fernández-Sebastián, vol. 1, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009), 797–805.; other intelligent solutions to an ideological and historical reductionism are: Fowler, *Mexico in the Age of Proposals, 1821-1853*; Alfredo Ávila, "Liberalismos Decimonónicos: De La Historia de Las Ideas a La Historia Cultural e Intelectual," in *Ensayos Sobre La Nueva Historia Política de América Latina*, ed. Guillermo Palacios, 1st ed., Siglo XIX (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2007), 111–46, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47w53q.10.

[86] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 4:430.

[87] "Las cosas y las personas", *El Aprendiz*, in *Semanario artístico*, 30/8/1844, also in Pérez Toledo, "Una organización alternativa de artesanos", 93.

(more than) government, creation, and virtuous creation, which speaks of a singular imaginary being weaved. The key to our question thus lies in the way in which the Sociedad appropriates the official agenda of fomentation of the arts by stating that such a practice was *more than* a matter of government: it was more than the consecution of industrialization according to the official agenda.

Presumably mirroring the rejection to absorb their regulation into the Junta de Fomento's, the Sociedad staged a watershed between the latter's policy of industry fomentation and their regulation, their administration, of their institutions of work. Accordingly, the imaginary of work that they embraced and projected did not respond to the search for increased production. Work, through their artisanal crafts and trades, revolved around "virtuous creation". As such, the "progress" of art and industry was not the cause but an effect of increasing production.[88] In a word, the creativity of work was irreducible to the industrialization of labor. Further, creativity was a matter of a fruitful combination between man's ingenuity and his able execution; industry's fomentation was more than a matter of rule of law and policymaking, it was a matter of ingenious creation that amounted to the standards of artisanal work. One might argue that this displacement speaks of an appropriation of the official industrial discourse on fomentation to a corporative idiom of sorts. But should we reduce these workers' appropriation of a State agenda to a simple re-elaboration of a policy within the practices of work? What was their purpose in contesting such a policy with a vocabulary that outwardly proposed their practices were "more than" government?

Following the Sociedad's regulation, government does not appear to have been about the execution of orders, as much as it was about the rightful organization of labor. That is, a process that involved the working groups of the nation, as they named themselves, in the course of "claiming their 'citizen rights'"[89] as artisans. As such, regulating and "governing" their work may be considered correlative to the appropriation of those republican rights. If they were in the process of claiming such republican rights, one might claim that they were involved in litigations that were formally closer to the jurisprudential tradition.[90] Indeed, as might be recalled, the rightful organization of work implied every craftsman contribute with their work to the construction of the Sociedad, just as they contributed to the construction of the nation. But it also implied the artisan's "pecuniary" contribution as an asset of the cooperation, the mutualism, that allowed both

---

[88] "Instrucción Artística," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 7/9/1844.
[89] Clara E. Lida, "Trabajo, Organización y Protesta Artesanal: México, Chile y Cuba En El Siglo XIX," *Historia Social*, no. 31 (1998): 66–75.
[90] As Annick Lempérière explains, the friction created by the reforms of the late 18th century between the administration of the republics and the administration of the "bien común" were correlative to the friction between a tradition of sovereignty that wished to determine the means and goals of the community, and a jurisprudential tradition that maintained a prudential, discussable, nature that allowed the political community to put the effective "exercise of power" in debate. This friction did not simply disappear but was inherited into the 19th century through the "corporative spirit" that endured in local communities. Lempérière, *Entre Dios y El Rey*, 168–72, 372.

societies to exist. Such collaboration, the craftsmen further explained, was a rightful practice because those funds were used for aid in case a member fell ill or, in case of proven innocence, were falsely presumed guilty of a crime. The funds that were retrieved by the Sociedad were used to help its artisans in cases of necessity, of *mutual aid* (arts. 53-54). Moreover, contributions allowed its members to sustain the education of its youngest apprentices: a field where labor instruction was mixed with other topics such as literature, geometry, and "principles of economy and duties of man in society" (art. 69). In a word, its rightful organization, the government of the Sociedad, depended on a mutualism that was structural from the standpoint of each of its members and their active participation in the association's life through their work and labor.

The specific practice of this mutualism was materialized in internal cooperation between its members, which was a Janus-faced, two-headed action: built by the practice of instruction-education and sustained by the organization's collection of the contributions made by the *socios* (members). Ultimately, when we see that fomentation was "more than government", it was because the rightful organization of work was constructed as the coordination or cooperation of the Sociedad's moral and economic practices; as how they managed to organize their communities. Fomentation was thus offered as the synthesis of this coordination together with the artisanal production put into motion by that "creative virtue" irreducible to labor. Fomentation was more than government to the extent that it portrayed the artisan's capacity of production, which in turn organized and structured the Sociedad's functioning as much as it organized the artisan's civic livelihood. Indeed, the government could not be conceived as the activity of ordering the nation from the state, through what Annino named the "institutional unity" of the state. The practice and institution of government were not defined by the state, and neither was representativity conceived from the perspective of a process of legitimization.[91]

Admittedly, the Sociedad's establishment of direct elections may be taken as proof of its proclivity for "liberal" practices, neighboring the Junta's regulation that was set by the Dirección General de Industria. The equivalency between such practices, however, does not stand if we analyze the Sociedad's regulation carefully.[92] Precisely because, unlike the Junta, the Sociedad incorporated the active role of the juntas and their artisan member's participation in the elections. The presence of a president and vice-president (art. 76) should not distract the reader from the actual horizontality pursued by the Sociedad. In practice, the president's and vice-president's roles were as important as the juntas, assemblies where each artisan was free to share his views (art. 11),

---

[91] For more on the weak validity an equivalency between government and state, government and power, and representation and legitimization may have for a historical study in that these were concepts created by and for a very limited space and time of modernity, see: Giuseppe Duso, *La representación política: génesis y crisis de un concepto* (San Martin: UNSAM EDITA, 2016), 59–125.
[92] Pérez Toledo, "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos."

excluding any "political" matter (art. 7) that may contaminate the group's organization. In these places of collective deliberation, the work and capacity of each artisan were thus directly connected to the needs of the rest of the associates: they depended upon each other to have mutual aid to finance the contingencies of an otherwise unprotected life. The government, the vertical aspect inherent in the coordination of their association, depended on their precept of cooperation rooted in the institutions of mutualism they inherited. It was the organization of each of the worker's labor capacities so they could "cooperate with the association's beneficial purposes" (art. 7). While it may be true that they did not wish to extrapolate their politics to the rest of society, they nonetheless thought that the "secret of modern peoples" was "intellectual superiority and love of work [*trabajo*]". The crucial element in the formation of their society, a nation of workers, a *working nation*,[93] was the adequate coordination of virtuous labor: "true independence", "national independence", could only be the result of the cultivation of the arts and its artisans.[94]

As the reader can observe, it seems quite clear that the disagreement on the concept of fomentation, which was the bone marrow of the projects for the construction of national industry, lies in how workers presented "cooperation" as an exceedance of "government". We should be cautious with overstating the degree of the disagreement. In effect, exceedance does not entail denial. Especially when we consider that craftsmanship through cooperation is complementary rather than contradictory with their concept of government, that is, with the organization of labor in relation to their lives outside the workshop. In this sense, the Sociedad clearly affirmed artisans were bound to artisanal apprenticeship while receiving education in "urbanity", "principles of economy and duties of man in society", as well as math and geometry (art. 69). However autonomous the worker could be through his industrious capacities, the Sociedad's associates could be so on the condition of being "a good man in society", with his corresponding virtues and morality (art. 3): the artisan's place within the Sociedad had to be corresponsive to his place in society. In other words, the worker's incorporation into the mutualist system that governed their workspaces was not conceived as a separate organ of their society. They did not fail to imagine themselves as part of a wider, national, community to which they should retribute the same values

---

[93] Clearly inspired in Sewell's formulation of the concept in reference to the *abbé* Sieyès's famous pamphlet, as well as Marcel Mauss's use of *nation travailleuse* in *La Nation*, this concept has been the subject of a two-year long seminar that completely reassessed and refurbished the category. Its historical and social roots were discovered to be an underlying thread that weaved a common discourse between Europe and the Americas. The seminar was organized by a series of colleagues from the UNSAM, the Facultad Libre (Rosario), and the EHESS. It is also one of the results derived from the creation of the Laboratorio de Investigación en Movimiento, Estado y Sociedad (LIMES), coordinated by Francesco Callegaro and Alexandre Roig. See Sewell's *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution : The Abbe Sieyes and* What Is the Third Estate*?*, Bicentennial Reflections on the French Revolution (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 1994).

[94] *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 25/6/1844.

as they did to and within their particular, working, groups. But to what extent was their imaginary of the nation, what we have here called the working nation, actually *a part* of the nation's groups? In what measure were the working groups part of the network of industries that the hombres de bien wished to industrialize?

When the Sociedad received notice of other educational projects directed at the "mass of the population", that is, the "working" and "poor classes", they could not do anything but praise them. In one significant message published in the *Semanario*, instruction, and industry appear meaningfully united. The piece claimed that their "idea of instruction" was certainly "worthy of attention". "In the face of philanthropy, it deserves praise, in the face of the political world it deserves protection. To give a productive industry to the impoverished class [*clase menesterosa*] is a purpose the governments should not lose sight of".[95] There is an evident change in the vocabulary of this source. Specifically, this celebration of the Sociedad's project apparently reversed the logic by which it wished to establish its industrial project and openly compared it to the stance adopted by the Santa Anna administration. Not surprisingly, the change in position mirrors another significant difference: this message was published by Stéphane Guénot, rechristened Estévan Guénot.

Although this character's importance will be more deeply analyzed in the subsequent chapters, a synthetic mention of his biography might be useful to frame the message he published in the *Semanario*. Of French provenience, Estévan born Stéphane Guénot, a former imperial army official, arrived in Mexico in 1828. Throughout the 1830s, when he had an active role in Lancastrian education in Mexico City, and then established a "Mexican phalanstery" in Xicaltepec, Veracruz, and the Franco-Mexican Company in France in 1833, he would slowly involve himself in many economic and industrial projects in Mexico. Most relevantly, he was the brains behind the *Compañía Michoacana para el Fomento de la Seda*, founded after a conflictive negotiation with the Mexico City Junta General in 1844.[96] It may have been this conflictive negotiation that helped him spell the antagonism between the fomentation policy of the Santa Anna regime and the institution of work's mutualist organization. Unlike the Sociedad, who talks of the divisiveness of the nation's *groups*, Guénot speaks in terms of a *class* conflict. His message implied that the Dirección Nacional was not corresponding with the "protection" projects such

[95] "Colegio Artístico," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 16/11/1844.

[96] Javier Pérez Siller, "Una Contribución a La Modernidad. La Comunidad Francesa En La Ciudad de México," in *Babel, Ciudad de México*, ed. Instituto de Cultura de la Ciudad de México, 1. ed (México, D.F: Gobierno del Distrito Federal/Ciudad de México Cultura, 1999); Fernando Winfield Capitaine, "Les Paysans d'origine Française à Jicaltepec et San Rafael," *Villes En Parallèle* 47, no. 1 (2013): 247–49, https://doi.org/10.3406/vilpa.2013.1515; José Alfredo Uribe Salas, "La industrialización de la seda en Michoacán: Un proyecto nacional," *Tzintzun. Revista de Estudios Históricos*, no. 9 (February 24, 2015): 239–77.

as the Sociedad's "deserved", nor was the government of the hombres de bien retributing a "productive industry" to the "impoverished classes". Not only did he not remain silent facing the fierce attacks of the official institutions *vis-à-vis* the working groups, but he may also be considered as one of the few, together with the cousins Sotero Prieto and Manuel Olasgarre, who proactively sought to "better" (*mejora*) the condition of such classes with the establishment of his Compañía. In effect, his discourse of work sought to bring solutions to the working groups he praised.

Once again reversing common senses, he proposed another interpretation of idleness. Contrary to the vision, often reproduced by historiography, that saw the worker's lack of occupation and labor as a consequence of his vices and moral incorrectness,[97] he adduced other causes to the attitudes which were commonly perceived as "immoral" by contemporary society. Under his pen, Guénot presented idleness as much as a consequence of vice as it was the opulent man's lack of solidarity with the idle, for the real distinction between the virtuous and the idle was yielded by access to labor: there were those that "affectionately embraced idleness", and those that were idle merely because of "lack of work" due to the "current state of affairs". Indeed, the former's idleness was disguised by a "false brightness and deceitful rest" to which the artisan, the "natural-born child of work", should not succumb. Guénot warned the artisans to be aware of this distinction, for the opulent confusingly "blames you for their shortcomings". Although they continuously lamented about the idle, they did not "employ their riches to occupy you and thus remedy the ills they complain about". For the Frenchman, idleness was not the worker's responsibility. What may come as even more striking in his message was that the solution to this problem was in the hands of the opulent industrial. An idea that was appallingly against most conceptions of idleness, labor, industry, or work altogether for the time.

In an amusing discursive turn, he continued by stating that if the rich industrial were to employ those in lack of labor, his class would alleviate the worker's luck. Perhaps wishing to engage the attention of the "opulent", he argued that giving labor to the working classes would simultaneously increase "their own wealth". He reasoned in terms of the mutual increase of labor and productivity as the possibility for the industrial to receive a greater income. Ultimately, he added, this was the means of enacting the transformation of the "idle by vice" into "useful and virtuous workers". In substance, Guénot thought that this class antagonism between the workers and the opulent was a result of the lack of economic cooperation between the classes of society. It

---

[97] Torcuato S. Di Tella, "The Dangerous Classes in Early Nineteenth Century Mexico," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 5, no. 1 (1973): 79–105; Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Entre El Discurso y La Coacción. Las Elites y Las Clases Populares a Mediados Del Siglo XIX," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política* (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 311–38; Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización*; Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867*.

was a lack of redistribution, as much as it was the product of a very specific form of negligence: the man who knew that "his duty was to provide well-being to himself as well as to his like" and did not do so was nothing more than a "criminal".[98]

As we shall see in the last section of the chapter, Guénot was actually criticizing a very specific member of the opulent classes, the hombres de bien, and the centralist administration. By tracing the contestation he sketched in the *Semanario* and other personal texts to Lucas Alamán's *Memoria* for the Dirección Nacional de Industria, we will be finally able to assess the ultimate consequences of the imaginary of work and how it instituted a unique language that pierced the working groups of the nation. How, in other words, the disagreement on the construction of a national industry sheds light on the contested nature of the Mexican *nations*, the role the institutions of work had in formulating a project that was irreducible even to the most "radical" and "popular" liberal conceptions of the nation which sought the creation of a working population. Guénot's pivotal role in the process of shedding light on the imaginary of work, as shall be seen, might be due to his outstanding critical attitude towards the considerably most important functionary in the Santa Anna presidency: Lucas Alamán.

5. The imaginary of work, beyond "practical liberalism"

Estévan Guénot thus has a singular place in our journey. A fact that will be ascertained in the following chapters as well. Together with the discourses of the Sociedad and the Junta's artisan commission analyzed here, his case is a turning point between the discourse of the nation portrayed by the centralist administration, analyzed in the first chapter, and the institutions of work that begin to emerge from this chapter onwards. Here, we will discuss to what degree this turning point can be considered the symptom of a whole new imaginary of national industry, or if it was rather an alteration induced from the innermost core of its groups. In fact, as Rancière warns, it would be pretty naïve to think the process of nation-building that produced a disagreement between its groups –to the effect that new imaginaries of the nation such as the working nation were formulated– was only characterized by a conflict between them, producing "misunderstandings" between them. The concept of nation is not unabridged or unbridgeable. On the contrary, notorious bridges were being built for such a language and imaginary to be formulated, many times put in play by certain slippages. Slippages that, as was seen in the previous chapter, are productive as conceptual and political appropriations that may set a difference or, at least, put the other's political presumption into discussion. The appropriations explain the differences and aid

[98] Estévan Guénot, "El Ocioso y El Virtuoso," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 2/11/1844.

in understanding why there were common aspects to both discourses. Official discourses may be useful to put things in perspective.[99]

As was seen at the beginning of the chapter, Lucas Alamán, head of Dirección General de Agricultura e Industria Nacional, was also of the idea that the establishment of a national industry would foment the arts "in a thousand ways",[100] communicating his fervent enthusiasm for the project's achievements. In fact, the decree that wished to arrange "factory and agricultural industry" in 1842 established in its article twenty that it would incentivize primary education among "factory operators [*operarios*]". It would promote the establishment of mutual aid and beneficence corporations, "and everything that can improve the morality and civilization of the artisan class".[101] The reader should note how the minister of justice and public instruction Pedro Vélez and the interim president Nicolás Bravo's vocabulary already offer a quite immediate contrast to the idiom of the craftsmen analyzed until now. However significant this contrast may be, the discourse of Lucas Alamán on the creation of a national industry provides a clearer outlook on the centralist background of these ideas.

As head of the Dirección, Alamán left a powerful testimony of his idea and the project he wished to establish. Industry, he argued, should be considered as a "producer of public wealth" with enough "powerful means for the improvement of the mass of the population's customs", ending the perpetual state of "backwardness" national industry was sunken in due to the prevailing unproductivity.[102] In 1845, he affirmed that such a situation was remediable as long as industry

---

[99] A synthetic, and perhaps more accessible version of the following pages was published in the Journal of the History of Ideas Blog. Matias X. Gonzalez, "Altering the Nation from Within: The Mexican 'Working Nation' in the 1840s," *JHI Blog* (blog), August 19, 2022, https://jhiblog.org/2022/08/19/altering-the-nation-from-within-the-mexican-working-nation-in-the-1840s/.

[100] Lucas Alamán, *Memoria Sobre El Estado de La Agricultura é Industria de La República En El Año de 1845, Que La Dirección General de Estos Ramos Presenta al Gobierno Supremo, En El Actual, de 1846, En Cumplimiento Del Art. 26 Del Decreto Orgánico de 2 de Diciembre de 1842* (Mexico City: José Mariano Lara, 1846), 9. (BN, Colección general).

[101] *Decreto orgánico para el arreglo de la industria agrícola y fabril de la República*, Mexico, Imprenta de José María Lara 1842, p. 10. (AGN, Instituciones Gubernamentales: época moderna y contemporánea, Folletería siglo XIX y XX, box 8, folio 233).

[102] As María Estela Eguiarte Sakar rightly states in the compilation, the school would remain a project of Alamán's, for the instability of the Mexican economic and political scene would only come to worse terms by 1846 with the conflict with the United States. Lucas Alamán, "Escuela de Agricultura y Artes," in *Hacer Ciudadanos: Educación Para El Trabajo Manufacturero En México En El s. XIX: Antología*, by María Estela Eguiarte Sakar (Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, Departamento de Arte, 1989), 116–17. This view of the need of a protectionist policy is evidenced in every *Memoria* Alamán presents to the government in turn. See "El presidente de la junta mexicana de fomento [Alamán] remite ejemplares del programa para los trabajos del Instituto", AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Comercios e industrias, vol. 522, fol. 12. Eric Van Young, his latest biographer, characterized him as a man whose "psychological necessities" as heir to one of the wealthiest families of New Spain and, therefore, who dreamt of the positive orderliness of the colony, were often in stark contrast with his "more pragmatical ideas on modernization": an underlying personal tension that would be accentuated with his progressive support of conservative and monarchist ideals. Eric Van Young, "Vidas Privadas y Mitos Públicos: Lucas Alamán y La Independencia Mexicana," *20/10 Memoria de Las Revoluciones En México*, no. 9 (2010): 53. As Tutino stated, Alamán was protectionist of national

started producing enough merchandise that was consumed on the other end of the industrial chain. The introduction of more comfortable "costumes"[103] for the "general mass of the population" would, on the one hand, inspire the "taste for certain necessities and conveniences" for these populations. The "improvement" of their customs would, on the other hand, ensure the commercial insertion of these products into the circuit that destined their production for consumption. Just like the moral improvement of the "mass of the population" would be ensured once everyone started using the more comfortable costumes available, domestic industry would acquire value as soon as its products began being consumed, for "social order is a chain in which every shackle is interlinked".[104]

As a renowned historian recently described Alamán's preoccupations, the problem with Mexican industry and agriculture was the "abundance [of products] without utilities" or profit. Mexico's economy was "backward" because it had not procured the insertion of this product surplus into a commercial economy. It was thus an economy that had focused on production to the point that the relative value of its expenditures was weakened in the demise of Mexico's capitalist insertion. Accordingly, for Alamán, production for consumption was the solution to the problem Mexican industry faced. Indeed, the core of the proposal of "industrialization" was followed by the centralist administration. The new cycle of industrial and agricultural production would enhance the cheapened commodities and land through the increasing availability of products and, therefore, consumption. This would increase the demand for workforce which would in turn benefit from better payloads that would drive the population to sustain a consumption-driven, commercial economy.[105] As a first-hand witness of the limits of the mining economy, for Alamán this could only come from the industry that linked agriculture, factory production, and manufacture: the burgeoning textile industry.

To foment the spinning and weaving mills that sustained this industry, a greater number of "habits" was needed to provide "more consumers for [the manufacturer's, the artisan's] production". As mentioned, these clothes would also serve as moral correctors for the working populations, which would forcibly present themselves in the public sphere with the clothes that had been put at the disposal of the market and the public. In fact, Alamán's discourse also had moral implications for the introduction of "habits of greater comfort", for the "general mass of

---

industry to the extent that he was protecting a nation he conceived for industrial entrepreneurs and landowners. Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," 1167. Van Young goes in the same direction in his biography of Alamán. Van Young, *A Life Together*.

[103] I maintain the play with the Spanish word "hábito", which means both habit, as in custom, and costume as in clothing.

[104] Alamán, *Memoria Sobre El Estado de La Agricultura é Industria*, 9–10.

[105] Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," 1152, 1166, 1183.

the population" also inspired "the taste for certain necessities and conveniences". By "always appearing dressed in public", the "operators" would install "civilization" through the promotion of consumption and, therefore, of the demand for a product: a prerequisite for increased productivity.[106] With Alamán, we notice that industry was defined, and arguably therefore limited to, the cycle of production that was closed on its opposite end by the consumption of the produced merchandise. The transformation of national industry, the project of industrialization, was intentionally directed to a commodity and commercial-driven transformation of the nation's populations into useful operators of the machines and "costumes" they would use as vehicles of Mexico's new "civilization".

The metaphor of habit or costume as a piece of clothing utilized and capitalized to reform the "mass" of the working populations' morality illustrates with outstanding clarity how the Dirección General wished to correct "public morality". Within a limited space where such "costumes" could be consumed, the correction of their customs was only consequential to the public display such populations would allow of the pieces of clothing they wore, reproducing a system of moral correction. In contrast to the Sociedad's imaginary of work, the materiality of this moral reform touched the production of the artisan's industry insofar as it was useful to reproduce an industrial mechanism where he remained peripherical to the purpose of the hombres de bien's commercial project. It was not much inspired in the manufacturer's work as it wished to extract control over his labor to appropriate the usefulness of their industries. As Alamán himself affirmed, the government's policies "must have a purpose, which can be none other than the progress of the country, which will put it in a position to compete with foreign industry in the economy and the perfection of its products".[107] It was, as referred earlier, precisely the process by which Alamán and the hombres de bien of the Centralist Republic sought the creation of a very particular form of "crony capitalism".[108]

In the complex process that characterized the construction of a national industry, Guénot intervened precisely in this context to contest the project advanced by Alamán. The political economy behind the Junta and Dirección General de Industria, he argued, was installing a system of competition between the productive groups of the nation without the slightest consideration that "not all are what they resemble because of the humble suit that covers them". Such "criminals" were the "opulent" he denounced as the cause for the lack of work suffered by the

---

[106] Alamán, *Memoria Sobre El Estado de La Agricultura é Industria*, 9–10, 74.
[107] Lucas Alamán, "Escuela de Agricultura y Artes," in *Hacer Ciudadanos: Educación Para El Trabajo Manufacturero En México En El s. XIX : Antología*, by María Estela Eguiarte Sakar (Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, Departamento de Arte, 1989), 116–17
[108] Van Young, *A Life Together*.

"impoverished classes".[109] For Guénot the development of national industry would only come from "conciliating the interests of all social classes". Contrary to what we might assume when reading a critical stance against a project, Guénot did not wish to radicalize the already existent class antagonism but avoid it altogether. The conciliation of the nation's *groups*, to use the voice introduced by the Sociedad, was carried out as long as the "vast majority of the population", the "impoverished classes", were active participants in the benefits produced by "material work", which would, in turn, avoid the "hideous egoism of the monopolists".[110] Such a conciliation of the nation's classes, the cooperation of the nation's groups, was illustratively named by the artisans of the Junta the "fraternal chain", created through the "mutual appreciation" of their "crafts".[111] As a foreign observer that had been incorporated into the Mexican working nation, Guénot thought this mirrored the nation's "true spirit".

> Very different from other peoples who are animated only by the spirit of egotism, Mexicans today only manifest so much disposition to cultivate the arts because they consider them the most effective means of achieving common happiness, banishing ignorance and the misery that is its consequence, and extending the benefits of education and the comforts of life to all classes of society. [...] Courage, therefore, dear fellow citizens [*conciudadanos*], follow the generous impulse of your hearts; [...] show yourselves inaccessible to the evil influence of egotism that agitates the other nations and prepares their ruin.[112]

As anticipated, Guénot is a privileged window into the institutions of work and the working groups' imaginary precisely because his thought displays the polemic background that has been often concealed when presenting the industrial projects of the Centralist Republic. Despite his pivotal role in shedding light on these underlying tensions, however, it was foremost the artisans of the Junta and the Sociedad, which were here offered as two particularly eloquent examples of a much wider social universe, who grasped the disagreement between the centralist industrialization and the construction of national industry, through which they proposed their own institutions and imaginaries. To conclude the chapter, we will briefly analyze why the imaginary of work weaved by the working nation's groups does not fit into the category of "practical liberalism" which hinges upon the category of modernity, as followed by some historians.

---

[109] Estévan Guénot, "El Ocioso y El Virtuoso," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 2/11/1844.

[110] Estévan Guénot and Socios, *Sociedad Benéfico-Industrial Del Estado de México, Aprobada Por El Superior Gobierno Del Mismo. Prospecto*. Mexico City: Imprenta del católico, dirigida por Mariano Arévalo, 1847, 8. (Biblioteca Nacional (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF) 299 31).

[111] "Instrucción General de Las Artes," *Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos*, 9/2/1844.

[112] Estévan Guénot, "PROYECTO de Una Sociedad Protectora de La Industria de La Seda, En La República Mexicana", Morelia, Imprenta de Ignacio Arango, 1844, p. 2. (BN LAF 455 20).

6. Conclusions

Guénot's appreciation of the working groups of artisans and craftsmen was domestically echoed in the regulations and association prospectuses which were part of a mutualist system built on the practices of work *and* labor. The "mutual appreciation" and the construction of a "fraternal chain" through which the craftsmen appreciated both their work and their craft was mirrored in an imaginary that would eventually serve as a direct contestation to the industrial project of the hombres de bien. Instituting work cooperation over labor productivity for consumption, the workers and artisans of Mexico City convey an economic and political language that is ungraspable within the conceptual limits of "pragmatic liberalism" as a result of their explicit disagreement with the projects of the actors who supposedly bore such an "economic ideology".[113] If the disagreement is evident, why have historians insisted on framing their languages and imaginaries within such a frame?

As recent scholarship has raised awareness of the limits implicit in perspectives such as Hale's, it has become ever more difficult to defend that liberalism was an "ideology that actively and vigorously covers all Mexican history". Such visions tend to simplify the political history of ideas which, as was seen here, normally follow a far more complex path before even being conceived as an "ideology". Perhaps more importantly, historiography that blindly follows his explanation of political ideas may overshadow contemporary discussions that may have been relatable to "liberalism", but whose principles do not correspond to the latter's practices.[114] As Javier Fernández Sebastián ascertained: "We are so used to seeing 'liberals' and 'conservatives' playing the leading role in the political histories of our countries that it may come as a surprise when a historical-conceptual investigation brings to light that the subjects thus labeled historiographically would not always be recognized under these denominations".[115]

As historians have established in the past decades, to explain modern history in Hispanic America in general, we should avoid artificially linking certain political projects to modernity itself.

---

[113] Pérez Toledo, when analyzing the Sociedad and the artisans of the Junta, argues that they "might" have embraced the doctrine of "pragmatic liberalism" Charles Hale attributed to Estévan de Antuñano and Lucas Alamán, "businessmen" who advocated for the political and economic interests linked to their own enterprises. Charles A. Hale, *El Liberalismo Mexicano En La Época de Mora: 1821-1853* (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1982), 265, 269–97; Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Entre El Discurso y La Coacción. Las Elites y Las Clases Populares a Mediados Del Siglo XIX," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política*, by Brian Connaughton (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 311–38. Other historians have named it "traditional liberalism". Fowler, *Mexico in the Age of Proposals, 1821-1853*, 59–68.

[114] Roberto Breña, "Charles A. Hale, *El Pensamiento Político En México y Latinoamérica (Artículos y Escritos Breves)*, Gabriel Torres Puga y Josefina Zoraida Vázquez (Eds.), México, El Colegio de México, 2010, 515 p.," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 43 (June 2012): 184.

[115] Fernández-Sebastián, "Liberalismos Nacientes En El Atlántico Iberoamericano: 'Liberal' Como Concepto y Como Identidad Política, 1750-1850," 727.

In doing so, we run the risk of categorizing social and political dynamics that were not historically interdependent. This is the case with establishing, or at least inferring, that *because* the Sociedad's language was mutualist *and* modern, *then* it was "liberal". As was seen here, this falls in open contradiction with its contestation of the "practical liberalism" endorsed by the hombres de bien, unveiling the artificiality of the category of modernity to which such studies subscribe. Following the rationale that because such associations emerged after independence they were liberal and modern is reductive of the concept since it reduces modernity to a single phenomenon determined by the flow of western revolutions toward America.[116] Ultimately, Modernity can only be European and exported therefrom.[117] Conceptual history, on the contrary, has taught us that it is best to think in terms of the connectivity between revolutions and independences to historically inform the concept of modernity.[118] Should we take for granted that American societies, complex as they were, were liberal because their constitutions followed "liberal" precepts? The Mexican working nation is an ulterior testimony of the fact that not all groups, along with the associations and societies they formed, followed the liberal precept of representation-legitimation as their cohesive political relation. The Sociedad's mutualism, in effect, was in utter disagreement with such a precept and was formulated to imagine dynamics that would avoid the commercialization of the activity that kept its individuals associated: work.

---

[116] Hale, *El Liberalismo Mexicano En La Época de Mora*; Charles A. Hale, "Political and Social Ideas in Latin America, 1870–1930," in *The Cambridge History of Latin America: Volume 4: C.1870 to 1930*, ed. Leslie Bethell, vol. 4, The Cambridge History of Latin America (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 367–442, https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521232258.011. Despite big steps being made to avoid such "outcomeisms", labor historians continue to analyze "modernity" as a European category that is simply implanted in Mexico. See, for example: Miguel Orduña Carson, "Los Artesanos En La Prensa Decimonónica de La Ciudad de México. Liberalismo, Opinión Pública e Identidad Nacional," *El Taller de La Historia* 6, no. 6 (2014): 217–45. More generally, social historians have been able to avoid such teleological explanations. For outcomeism and a critique of troubling explanations of modernity from Mexico, see: Eric Van Young, "The Limits of Atlantic-World Nationalism in a Revolutionary Age: Imagined Communities and Lived Communities in Mexico, 1810-1821," in *Empire to Nation: Historical Perspectives on the Making of the Modern World*, ed. Joseph Esherick, Hasan Kayalı, and Eric Van Young (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 35–67; Eric Van Young, *Writing Mexican History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012).

[117] Despite his undiscussable contributions to historiography on the period, Guerra's studies are symbolical of the contradictions of linking modernities without abandoning a "tradition/modernity" explanation. See, for example: François-Xavier Guerra, *Modernidad e independencias: ensayos sobre las revoluciones hispánicas* (Madrid: Editorial MAPFRE, 1992); Antonio Annino and François-Xavier Guerra, eds., *Inventando La Nación: Iberoamérica Siglo XIX*, Obras de Historia (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003).

[118] Mark Thurner, "After Spanish Rule. Writing Another After," in *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas*, ed. Mark Thurner and Andrés Guerrero (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003), 12–57; Palti, *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*; Francisco A. Ortega, "The Conceptual History of Independence and the Colonial Question in Spanish America," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 79, no. 1 (2018): 89–103, https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2018.0005; James Sanders, "Decolonizing Europe," in *The First Wave of Decolonization*, ed. Mark Thurner, Routledge Studies in Global Latin America (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2019), 95–117; Fernández Sebastián, *Historia Conceptual En El Atlántico Ibérico: Lenguajes, Tiempos, Revoluciones*.

In this sense, the working groups clearly impose the necessity to understand ideas not as abstract entities that "entered" into a given society's life, but as concrete political and economic ideas that, as they began to be uttered by the same actors of society, altered the context in which they began playing with other coexistent idioms, languages, and imaginaries. This is why we contend that they need to be understood as imaginaries that were irreducible to a conception of modernity that is informed by the installment of such "liberal", abstract, concepts of citizenship and industry.[119] Conceiving such an imaginary in terms of an "imaginary of work" –not of labor– is also crucial to render the profound roots of the institutions, norms, and subjects it mobilized: it was not in consecution of wage labor, but of a cooperative imaginary of work, as the dynamics that built their communities, that artisans managed to reverse the logics of industrialization from within. Furthermore, it is in the proposition of a working nation by the artisans of Mexico City and some industrialists like Estévan Guénot and, as shall be seen in the next chapter, other groups in Mexico, that such imaginaries are concreted and very much perceptible to the rest of the nation's groups.[120]

To conclude, we might say that it is precisely the "disagreement" with the hombres de bien and the centralist nation that saw the working nation emerge which allows us to grasp the true "alternativity" they proposed. It was not only about a mutualist system of production that was diametrically different from the production system for consumption which allowed us to glimpse the radical difference between both national industrial projects. The institutions of work were socially grounded on practices of cooperation that gave the new mutualist organizations the capacity to regulate their production and labor, but also conceive an instruction that was not conceived as a "technical" training like the Escuela proposed by Alamán and Bravo. Instruction and education meant setting the same principles of mutualism and cooperation in the workspace as in the "public" spaces. If they aspired to be among the privileged citizens of the second Centralist Republic (1841-1846), it was as the working individuals that also lived in the craftsman's workshop. By extension, this could mean that not all citizens of that Republic could be incorporated into the working nation's institutions. And it is there that we might argue that the working nation was "more than modern", as it embraced but also rejected the principles which sought to constitute the nation in the mid-1840s: in the creation of a new national community that internally altered previous and coexistent ideas of the Mexican nation.

---

[119] For a particularly poignant criticism towards historiography that irreflexively assumes the equivalency between modernity and liberalism, see: Sandro Chignola and Giuseppe Duso, *Historia de los conceptos y filosofía política*, ed. José Luis Villacañas (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2009).
[120] See, in this regard, Palti's criticism to the history of ideas: Palti, *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*, 43.

Part II
At the root of an alternative modernity. The Fraternal Chain of Work, from Mexico to France and back

Chapter III

The missing link of the Atlantic working nation: the sociological principle between Mexico, France, and Spain

1. Introduction

Part one of the dissertation insisted on the construction of group identities in the 1830s and 1840s. The disagreements between the nation's groups and the centralist republican project led to the emergence of new political imaginaries. Towards the end of the second chapter, however, the working groups displayed an openness that was influential towards the individuals that adopted their ideas and, like Guénot, took them to their ultimate consequences. The conception of a politics of work cooperation entailed formulating a new national politics at the interstice of what many considered its central motor: industry and labor. This chapter will further delve into those interstices, the inter-group communications that allowed Guénot and Sotero Prieto, among others, to create a dialogue with the working groups. The dialogue was not always direct but, on some occasions, would eventually create bridges between these groups, configured by the knowledges that circulated between such groups. By tracing back their steps through Mexico to France, these links will no longer seem so extraordinary in that they were a central aspect in the formation of a dialogue between the working groups and the nation, further explaining the roots of the working nation. The centrality of the concept of work rather than labor will re-emerge as the result of disagreements that determined the development of nation-building in Mexico and France. More specifically, this chapter will analyze the emergence of a "sociological principle" as the conceptual core that structured the disagreement in France and was later appropriated between the groups of the Spanish and Mexican working nations.

This is why it will be fundamental to closely analyze the experience of the working groups with which Prieto and Guénot established contact –either directly or indirectly. Only with the passage through the experiences of the Spanish and French working groups and, eventually, also

their working nations, will the radical communication established with the Mexican experience be comprehensible. Furthermore, it will allow the rest of the dissertation to reflect on the working nation not only as a national, but an international problem posited by the worker's reality, who found himself in the middle of transcendental political, social, and economic transformations. An interconnected, international, conceptual history will finally unveil both the material and intellectual sources of such exchanges.

2. Beyond the explanation of "backwardness". Mexico's "crony capitalism"

As anticipated, in the Mexican process of contesting the process of industrialization through the precipitation of alternative conceptions of the nation in the network of industries, there were not only workers, manufacturers, artisans –workshop proprietors and not–, and peasants. There were also more privileged groups of industrialists, such as the agiotistas and industrial entrepreneurs, who gave impulse to the official programs of industrialization. Some allied with centralist administrations to create an industry under the logics of "crony capitalism" conceived according to local demands. In between these efforts, however, some characters moved between physical and intellectual borders more easily than others. These movements would prove essential in their inter-group communications, and later for international communications as well.

As mentioned in part I, Mexico's industrial project was given substantial support by the groups of industrialists Lucas Alamán surrounded himself with since the last years of the 1820s. Since Guadalupe Victoria's presidency, and specifically with the London financial crash of 1825-1826 which directly impacted economies that depended on British financial stability like the Mexican, the government had recurred to new, internal, credit owners which could lend money to the national government. Such moneylenders were famously called *agiotistas*, people that speculated with public finances and commonly benefited from money exchanges and loans. Both of Mexican and foreign origins, these individuals were "united in the pursuit of profit through speculation".[1] Despite the exorbitant percentages the agiotistas recovered through the interests of their loans, republican administrations had little choice but to increment their debt to the agiotistas in search of liquidity for public finances. Their fortune prospered for many reasons, but the weak budget of the national treasury, strained by the often unattained economic stability, was assuredly among the first. With the highly asymmetrical negotiating power acquired by the agiotistas in the first two decades after independence, many infrastructural activities like internal transport of

---

[1] Barbara Tenenbaum, "Mexico's Money Market and the International Debt, 1821-1855," in *La Deuda Pública En América Latina En Perspectiva Histórica: The Public Debt in Latin America in Historical Perspective*, ed. Reinhard Liehr (Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 1995), 269.

merchandise and the construction of roads were loaded off to these groups of wealthy loaners. In turn, they would use the extraordinary profits to purchase, acquire, or invest in factories and industries, typically mining and textile, that had barely endured the economic stress of the 1830s.[2]

These profiteering individuals have been reassessed in the eyes of recent historians. Rather than see the agiotistas only as profit vampires to the detriment of national finances, there have been informed inquiries as to what role they undertook in the administrations that continuously suffered from internal substitutions in the 1830s. Previous historiography presumed that the agiotistas were "apolitical" because their role was purely financial and "economic". Recently, it has become evident that they had important political consequences due to their intimate connections with the political world of the Centralist Republic (1836-1846). It is not inconceivable to see how the few hundred richest people in Mexico "rubbed shoulders with each other and continually dealt with each other in business and political matters if not in terms of interpersonal intimacy".[3] Instead of defining such personal, political, and economic relations in terms of corruption or according to the logic of a simple "social networking", Eric Van Young has intelligently adopted the term "crony capitalism" to explain how these relationships, rather than simply favor a small number of money investors, were also forms of "extramarket lubricant to grease the wheels of economic development".[4] He argues that without institutions such as the Banco de Avío and the money funneled by the agiotistas through public finances back to textile and tobacco industries, the enterprises that survived foreign interventions and separatist wars in the 1830s and 1840s would have probably collapsed. Even if they failed, enterprises were commonly picked up by the networked riches of the agiotistas: it was not uncommon to see one industrialist purchase the actions of the declining industry of another. He thus makes a compelling case to turn the "story of failure" of the Mexican economy, forced to recur to the entrepreneurial capital and money liquidity of the agiotistas, on its head. The survival of some factories and national finances were in effect an indication of "unlikely success against the headwinds of an inauspicious economic climate".[5]

This interpretation might seem to have the intention of explaining the hardships endured during the establishment of a successful economy in difficult circumstances, perhaps even redeeming the importance of these elites in the survival of projects that barely came through.

---

[2] Barbara Tenenbaum, *México en la época de los agiotistas, 1821-1857*, Sección de obras de historia (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1985), 203–4.
[3] Eric Van Young, *A Life Together: Lucas Alaman and Mexico, 1792-1853* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), 449.
[4] Van Young, 457.
[5] Though the citation is taken from Van Young, John Tutino has also advanced in this direction. See: Van Young, 462–63; John Tutino, "El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845," *Historia Mexicana*, January 2, 2016, 1119–92, https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v65i3.3181.

However, when taking its framework seriously it may give historians the tools to get out of success-bound rhetoric that only mildly explain the internal dynamics of nineteenth-century Mexican economy and society. This is not to say that explaining the "backwardness" of Mexico in relation to other international markets has not given some valuable information, but the underlying argument used by historians that follow such interpretation still recurs to factors tied to the "restrictive" possibilities of its economy to explain how it was conceived and built, often implying a "successful" economy was not achieved until the last quarter of the century. As affirmed, this does not do much to explain how the Mexican economy and its industry were built, for the presumption is that its development was a result of a "betterment" of national enterprises about the international market, which has conducted to a rather historically simplistic, teleological, and flat explanation of the "origins of the backwardness".[6] The idea of comparing internal markets and their success has very limited heuristic use when trying to understand the mechanisms these economies functioned with.[7] In other words, this focus may curtail attention to the dynamics that were structuring the nation's economy and industry, much like attention to the "civil war" situation at the time curtails attention to the building of the nation by its groups. In both cases, focusing on "success" by explaining each project's "failure", of the nation or its economy, may be a sign of the little attention wide reflections on the Mexican nation and its economy have put on the actual and internal works of the nation's economy.

As was shown in the previous chapter, these complex processes were neither unidirectional nor unilateral. When seen from the standpoint of these politically and economically high-ranked groups, many of the projects of economic "advancement" were, as Van Young explains, an effort to solve immediate crises by recurring to the capital and resources at their disposal. In many senses, the way the Mexican economy was managed in the 1830s and 1840s answered the efforts of these few hundred people who were at the head of projects and enterprises that innovated national industry. While most of them sought to integrate their industries into a capitalist market, carrying the burden of their local markets' conditions like the characteristically unnavigable Mexican internal rivers, at least a part of this group was also interested in the aspiration of national

[6] See for example: Jaime E. Rodríguez O., "La crisis de México en el siglo XIX," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 10, no. 10 (June 27, 1986), https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.1986.010.68957; John H. Coatsworth, *Los Orígenes Del Atraso: Nueve Ensayos de Historia Económica de México En Los Siglos XVIII y XIX* (Mexico City: Alianza Editorial, 1990); Enrique Cárdenas, *Cuando Se Originó El Atraso Económico de México: La Economía Mexicana En El Largo Siglo XIX, 1780-1920* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2003); Richard J. Salvucci, "Algunas consideraciones económicas (1836). Análisis mexicano de la depresión a principios del siglo XIX," *Historia Mexicana* 55, no. 1 (July 1, 2005): 67–97.
[7] Mark Thurner, "After Spanish Rule. Writing Another After," in *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas*, ed. Mark Thurner and Andrés Guerrero (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003), 12–57.

"conservation".[8] Such were, for example, the ideas of Estevan de Antuñano, one of the most prominent figures in Mexico's first industrial impulse in the mid-1830s, who was under many aspects the leader of industrialization projects in Puebla, establishing the first weaving factories in the region, like the famous La Constancia Mexicana.

In 1840, he addressed the national government regarding the prohibition of the importation of cotton. His arguments may seem to be in an outright contradiction between each other. In the letter, he defended the protectionist policies pursued by Bustamante's administration. But he immediately contends that the protectionist policies should be temporarily relaxed, at least in one particular branch: he wished to convey the idea that importing seeded raw cotton would "*increase the wealth of Mexicans*", whilst defending a protectionist policy towards other products. Raw cotton, he argued, had the particularity of easily multiplying "its forms and values" through "artistic elaboration": it was a "seed for the manufacturing arts" that would therefore protect the "true wealth of a people". To import manufactured cotton, on the other hand, would deprive this "useful occupation" from the Mexican worker's hands, causing poverty and its fatal consequences. Although he promoted the importation of primary material, Antuñano wished to prevent the administration from opening commerce to foreign commodities, for if the circulation of this merchandise was allowed, how would "the canoeists, the muleteers, the merchants, the workers of all the factories" avoid the "deficit of their utilities"? In other words, how could local labor survive when competing with cheaper, foreign, products? It was thus up to the "paternal benevolence and wisdom of the great legislative body of Mexico" to entitle the executive to issue "permits to the factory owners of cotton filatures" to introduce, to their convenience, the amount of raw cotton that they can prove to be necessary for a year's supply. The petition, as can be seen, was a perfect mixture of internal industrial protectionism, laid on the concept of wealth through the "multiplication and reproduction" of the value and form of raw material through its conversion into a utility or product, with the importation of the raw material needed to create those utilities.[9]

Although he cannot be strictly considered an agiotista, he was undoubtedly part of the industrialist class that "rubbed shoulders" in the process of establishing a national industry. His

---

[8] As historians have argued, this does not mean supposing that these groups were strictly or necessarily conservative. Will Fowler, *Mexico in the Age of Proposals, 1821-1853* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998), 43; Alfredo Ávila and Alicia Salmerón Castro, eds., *Partidos, Facciones y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX*, 1st ed., Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012).

[9] Estevan de Antuñano, *Exposición que el que suscribe dirige al Soberano Congreso Nacional, probando el prócsimo peligro que amenaza el ramo de algodón, por la subsistencia de la Ley que prohibe la importacion de algodon extranjero en rama, y proponiendo respetuosamente medios para evitar de pronto, y prevenir para lo futuro, este fatal acontecimiento*, Puebla, 1840. (Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), Folletería siglos XIX y XX, Caja 8, f. 214). The italics are in the original.

request for the "benevolent" help of the government was not unprecedented: since 1832, he requested funds from the Banco de Avío to help build La Constancia Mexicana and then keep it up and running.[10] There were, in other words, different mechanisms to insert one's capital into the economic system of Mexico's industry. Profiteering, cronyism, capitalist productivism, and industrial protectionism appear as four of such mechanisms the agiotistas, hombres de bien, and industrial leaders used to engage the Mexican economy they were struggling to conserve through a measured politics of industrial fomentation. Such conservation and fomentation of capital, by the nature of the economic system they were building, often inclined the balance of revenue and profit in their favor, either by virtue of their direct intervention or at the hands of legislative changes.

In their view, this unequal balance was not a threat to the working groups' objectives, for they were also part of the hombres de bien's establishment of a "productive" industry for the "progress of the nation". As is evident in Antuñano's message and Alamán's *Memorias* analyzed in chapter two, progress was a natural consequence of the industrialization project they were implementing, for it would bring wealth to the "mass of the population" as Alamán conveyed. It could be said that messages of wide social cohesion among the industrial –productive and non-productive– groups emerge in these sources as well. But to what extent were these messages "homogeneous"? If in the last chapter the disagreement between the working nation and the hombres de bien showed different projects being enacted, what happens when the latter's economic projects are analyzed? Did these privileged groups enact a certain form of cohesion? Or do internal asymmetries between them emerge as well?

3. The disagreement on national industry from within

In Puebla, certain leading industrial groups were not quite convinced the introduction of raw cotton was of "public convenience", even if it could slightly solve the ongoing supply crisis the weaving industry was submerged in since 1838.[11] The *Junta de Industria de Puebla* openly reassessed the meaning of what "public" meant. Indeed, for this group of *fabricantes*,[12] the

[10] Carlos Illades, "La Empresa Industrial de Estevan de Antuñano (1831-1847)," *Secuencia*, no. 15 (January 1, 1989): 32, https://doi.org/10.18234/secuencia.v0i15.269.
[11] Carlos Alberto Murgueitio, "La industria textil del centro de México, un proyecto inconcluso de modernización económica (1830 – 1845)" 7, no. 13 (2015): 63.
[12] Normally, the translation of *fabricante* would be manufacturer, but given the context and the sense with which the word is used in the *Representación*, fabricante here is closer to meaning factory owner, who may have been a producer, nonetheless. It could be one of the ambivalences of a context in which industry was not yet fully industrialized, so the language still refers to roles that do not adapt to our modern, industrialized, segmented, conception of the factory. I maintain the original term to convey the ambivalent meaning as factory proprietor and manufacturer.

importation of seeded cotton was convenient only "at the most personal level", that is, at the level of the factory owners. The financial convenience of importing cheaper cotton wool was supposed to be public by virtue of its introduction into the cycle of production for consumption Antuñano and Alamán were protecting, but the junta contradicted this conception of "public" convenience –even if industrial leaders claimed to have a "goodwill". If the presence of foreign feedstock produced benefits for industry, they were not general but admittedly particular as they acquired the form of profit poured into the factory owners' gain by incremented production and consumption. Nevertheless, the Junta claimed there were matters of public knowledge that had to be attended to; matters which exceeded the fate of some factories and interested national industry as a whole. Recurring to the fidelity of their employees, and the "decisive protection of the government in favor of industry", the *representación* (appeal) they were sending sought to denounce the "infamous" act of smuggling cotton into the country, "the biggest scandal of the world", perpetrated by the true "enemies of industry". People were "killing" national industry by creating an "unevenness and inequality" between the smuggler and the honest fabricante.[13] Even within the leading industrial groups, different messages were being conveyed regarding the construction of a national economy.

Under the same banner of industrial and national preservation and protection, some disagreements arose in the use and distribution of the wealth these industries produced, not only in the accent on production as labor or consumption. Even when there was an acceptance of the presence of foreign raw materials to increment production for the benefit of industry, the junta's representación discloses the fact that the principle of relaxing protectionist policies for the benefit of productivity did not entail the system worked for all. In other words, the inherent adaptability that was built into the crony system of Mexican industrialism did not mean it was built to adapt to or be accepted by, the interests of wider social and economic circles included in the world of labor and its producing, working, groups. Antuñano's and the Junta's proposal were probably aimed at recovering the levels of productivity Puebla industries had before the downfall of local cotton production from thirty-six thousand quintals in 1841 to half the amount two years later,[14] but the latter were aware that this recovery did not necessarily bring about the reestablishment of public wealth. In other words, it was quite evident that the distribution of profit went and was

[13] "Representación Dirigida al Excmo. Sr. Presidente de La República, Por La Junta de Industria de Puebla, á Fin de Que Se Queme El Algodon Introducido Clandestinamente," in *El Estandarte Nacional. Periódico Político, Literario, Artístico, Científico, Industrial, Defensor de Las Doctrinas y de Los Intereses Sociales*, 18/2/1843. (Hemeroteca Nacional de México (HNM)).

[14] Murgueitio, "La industria textil del centro de México, un proyecto inconcluso de modernización económica (1830 – 1845)," 62.

kept in an upward tendency through a network of mechanisms such as the Banco de Avío and the Dirección Nacional de Industria that substituted it in 1842.[15]

As was seen in the previous chapter, such aspirations for a moderate, interest-protected, liberalization of raw commodities like wool cotton were effectively opposed by the protection of industry advocated by the working groups. However, as is seen with the Junta Industrial de Puebla, other intermediary interests were being put into play in the disagreement on how to build national industry. Despite being part of the group of fabricantes, presumably wealthier and closer to the logics of wealth production than work cooperation, they also manage to convey contradictory messages as to the protection of Mexican industries, while defending the upward tendency with which centralists were building industrialization. It is precisely in this context that figures such as Estévan Guénot and Sotero Prieto play a fundamental role in explaining the disagreement on national industry insofar as neither fully endorsed the language of labor productivity for the creation of wealth and consumption, nor could be considered absolutely integral to the groups of workers. As strangers to both social systems, they managed to carve out their particular contributions to both. This can only be understood by explaining their particular role as social foreigners to both groups, while singularly seeking the integration of the working groups.

In a letter presumably[16] sent to Manuel Escandón (a rich industrial entrepreneur with investments in factories around the country who is commonly considered an agiotista),[17] Sotero Prieto sought to avoid being called "loco" by exposing his ideas clearly, for destiny had put him in the path of "influential people".[18] Of Panamanian birth, Sotero Prieto Olasgarre was a prodigious student at one of the most prestigious schools in Mexico City: the *Real Seminario de Minería*. As a renowned student of mathematics, he would come to be considered one of the most prominent figures in Guadalajara, where together with his cousin Manuel Olasgarre, he would

---

[15] José C. Valadés, "El Nacimiento de Una Industria Mexicana," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 4, no. 04 (1979): 101.

[16] Presumably for two reasons: one, after the "querido…", the handwriting is hardly decipherable. Yet, secondly, in the presence of an "Ma", what appears to be a poorly written "n" in the middle, and an "l" at the end, it is possible the name addressed is Manuel. As an associate of his, Sotero Prieto was probably addressing Manuel Escandón.

[17] Barbara Tenenbaum, "Formación y Desarrollo de La Burguesía En México, Siglo XIX," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 61, no. 2 (May 1, 1981): 321–22, https://doi.org/10.1215/00182168-61.2.321; Illades, "La Empresa Industrial de Estevan de Antuñano (1831-1847)"; Tenenbaum, "Mexico's Money Market and the International Debt, 1821-1855"; Murgueitio, "La industria textil del centro de México, un proyecto inconcluso de modernización económica (1830 – 1845)"; Lilia Carbajal Arenas, "Los Pioneros de La Industria Textil : El Caso de Cayetano Rubio," *Tiempo y Escritura*, no. 28 (July 2015): 37–51.

[18] Sotero Prieto a Manuel Escandón, 21/7/1841. (Archives Nationales de France, Pierrefitte sur Seine (AN), 10AS41 (15)//681 MI 73). As it is a manuscript with the consequent abbreviations, the spelling is slightly modified to be more readable. Until footnote 22, and unless otherwise noted, all citations are from this document.

establish a series of industrial activities in the 1840s.[19] In his 1841 letter, he openly attacked the idea that tobacco could still be monopolized in the wealth of a handful of people[20] as availed by the centralist government's decree. Prieto thought that this could not be the principle with which Mexican society was governed. Reverberating a familiar message from the previous chapter, he sentenced that "governments, whatever the organization that is given to them, are completely inefficient to produce social wellness" (*bien social*). The idea that any political principle should be "applied" to society was *a fortiori* "subversive, is anarchic, and will not produce well-being" (*bienestar*). Reforming society in this way amounted to organizing a "military staff" that "imposed order" and "commanded evolution" to a million men that did not receive any form of subsistence or education: only confusion and disorder would emerge from such a reform. Though this military reform was susceptible to being modified, the causes of ill it would unchain would still be attributable to its military organization enacted by its "staff". Even if an official managed to assemble men in small groups, forming and instructing "harmonic and unitary movements", which would then gather into greater unities, he would probably be called a "schmo" (*gaznápiro*).

> Thus nations should be organized in the opposite direction from what has been done up to now. A partition [*partido*] of the government is given to the peoples, from the center to the circumference, when it should work from the pueblos to the government, from the circumference to the center. It is indispensable to organize the first group, then to organize the nation in similar groups, and to unite them successively on a hierarchical scale.

Instead of acknowledging the military reformation of society sought by both the Bustamante and Santa Anna administrations, Sotero Prieto considered that this organization, from the *pueblos* to the government, could only be done by establishing a series of principles on how work (*trabajo*) was organized. There could not be any kind of forced slavery, the poor could not "sell" themselves to the rich out of famine, and the poor could not suffer from famine: hence the need to increase production, but also to "establish a fixed and equitable rule of distribution". To increase production, there would be a need for "more ~~concurrence~~ cooperation of man to work, to achieve more ~~concurrence~~ from man to work, work must not be repugnant, it must not be slavery, pain,

[19] Jaime Olveda, *La Oligarquía de Guadalajara : De Las Reformas Borbónicas a La Reforma Liberal* (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1991); Federico De la Torre, *El Patrimonio Industrial Jalisciense Del Siglo XIX: Entre Fábricas de Textiles, de Papel, y de Fierro* (Guadalajara: Secretaría de Cultura, Gobierno de Jalisco, 2007); María del Socorro Guzmán Muñoz, "Sotero Prieto Olasagarre. Un Visionario Decimonónico," *Relaciones. Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* XXlX, no. 116 (2008): 117–32.

[20] The monopoly was only briefly dissolved during the government of Gómez Farías in 1833, and later reestablished in 1838. A year later it was abolished. Arturo Obregón, *Las Obreras Tabacaleras de La Ciudad de México, 1764-1925* (Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1982); María Amparo Ros, "El tabaco: del monopolio colonial a la manufactura porfiriana," *Historias*, no. 29 (March 31, 1993): 57–70; Francisco Iván Hipólito Estrada, "Contrabando y rebelión: la pugna por el control de tabaco durante la primera mitad del siglo XIX en México y sus repercusiones en la Sierra Gorda," *Oficio. Revista de historia e interdisciplina*, June 30, 2018, 79–92, https://doi.org/10.15174/orhi.v0i7.65.

martyrdom; to achieve that work is not pain, it is necessary to organize it".[21] There are a series of annotations to be made from this segment.

The most decisive aspect is probably the words that were struck out and replaced. Perhaps the biggest advantage of having manuscript letters is precisely the possibility of registering conceptual displacements. In this case, Prieto distinctively wanted to replace the principle of competition or concurrence with the principle of cooperation. Man did not concur to or concur in labor, he cooperated with or worked to avoid its repugnancy; to avoid it being a sufferance, "it needs to be organized". By disagreeing with the principle of increasing production as a means of organizing national industry, he warned his contemporaries not to fix their attention on the "government". To "remedy" its wrongs, they should "think in the organization of labor, […] reducing to practice the results of science" in a short period of time, instead of waiting for the goodwill of the centralist administrations.

Sotero Prieto's disagreement with the centralist regime and the hombres de bien introduces an unprecedented dimension to the disagreement produced by the working nation and Guénot, reviewed in the second chapter. As with the latter, the organization of labor was a matter of "affection" towards the ills of the working groups, it was something that could be taught through the values of working cooperation. Yet Prieto linked this organization with a "scientific work", a "rational procedure". With the "results of science", which would seek the reformation of society in the element of "social unity", the "pacific and scientific" work of establishing "social wellness" would come "irremediably". Organization had thus the status of a scientific matter which had to be studied through a "conscientious exam", not "blind faith".[22]

As we can notice, Sotero Prieto introduces a new level of reflexivity to the imaginary of work analyzed in chapter two. It will be the work of the second part of the dissertation to dissect the intimate link his reflection established between a "scientific" work and its political implications, which conduct the imaginary of work to the instances of a social reform. What is relevant to emphasize at this point is the fact that such a scientific work was intimately related to the problem of the organization of labor according to the practices of work. To this extent, Prieto conceived the organization of work, which included labor, as a proxy of a wider social reform.

As mentioned, however, Prieto's position in society and the process of construction of a national industry was singular. He was not deprived of social relations, as is proven by other similar proposals by other industrial groups. The Puebla junta and Prieto help evidence that there were

[21] The original is *concurrencia*. It is interesting to think that because of the polysemy of concurrence as both competition and attendance to something, Prieto decided to strike it out and replace it with cooperation. We shall see below that this was not a whimsical decision.
[22] AN 10AS41 (15)//681 MI 73.

internal social cohesions, and collective identities,[23] which were formed within the context of crony industrial capitalism but did not adhere to the latter. As was mentioned in chapter two, Prieto had invested in La Escoba, a spinning and weaving factory on the outskirts of Guadalajara, together with Escandón, his cousin Manuel Olasgarre, Francisco Vallejo, and the Frenchman Jules Moyssard.[24] There is further evidence Escandón sold part of his capital in the tobacco industry to Prieto. As an agiotista, Escandón loaded the sale with interest rates that prevented Prieto from "subsisting decently".[25] Much like Guénot, then, the singularity of Prieto's position was his externality regarding the crony spheres of Mexican industrialism. With one foot in and one foot outside the process of industrialization, their capacity of formulating independent, even contradicting, ideas with such circles may have been easier. The fact that they were marginal actors in an intricated system of political, social, and economic hierarchies distanced them from the profiteering activities of the agiotistas and the search for surplus by large factory owners such as Antuñano or Cayetano Rubio.[26] The fact that Prieto and Guénot witnessed the flip side of the coin of profit could help us explain why they distanced themselves from the crony practices of other industrialists, on the one hand, and how this distance drove them to observe, from the threshold between both worlds, the working groups that played a central role in the centralist program of "public wealth" creation, on the other. As we shall discover, the particular social position shared by Guénot and Prieto created a common, albeit singular, outlook on the Mexican industrial scenario that was profoundly inspired by the imaginary of work. The inspirations, however, were not only domestic.

As was previously mentioned, Guénot was a former member of the imperial French army that arrived to Mexico and eventually bought a patch of land off the river Nautla, near Jicaltepec, Veracruz in the 1830s. He then traveled between France and Mexico, bringing fellow Frenchmen from Haute-Saône to Jicaltepec to establish a Fourierist "phalanstery",[27] while also seeking to foment the creation of a silk industry in the country, especially as the 1840s approached. In the process of establishing the *Compañía Michoacana para el Fomento de la Seda* (1841), he forcefully

[23] Vincent Descombes, "The Problem Of Collective Identity: The Instituting We And The Instituted We," in *Recognition and Social Ontology*, ed. Arto Laitinen and Heikki Ikaheimo (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 373–89.
[24] De la Torre, *El Patrimonio Industrial Jalisciense Del Siglo XIX: Entre Fábricas de Textiles, de Papel, y de Fierro*, 71–73.
[25] AN 10AS41 (15).
[26] As annotated in the second chapter, Rubio was an important agiotista that took up Alamán's failed factories in the 1840s, besides participating in numerous loans to the government and being a shareholder in a number of industries throughout the country. See Carbajal Arenas, "Los Pioneros de La Industria Textil : El Caso de Cayetano Rubio."
[27] Javier Pérez Siller, "Radiografía de Franceses En Las Urbes Mexicanas: Tránsito Del Modelo Virreinal al Nacional," in *México Francia: Memoria de Una Sensibilidad Común Siglos XIX-XX*, ed. Javier Pérez Siller and David Skerrit, vol. III–IV (Mexico City: Centro de estudios mexicanos y centroamericanos, 2008), 6. See below for details on "phalanstery".

interacted with the juntas industriales, dispersed throughout the territory, in search of collaborators. Once he managed to establish the company and secure its fate through constant negotiations with the regional and local juntas, he planned to bring weaving machinery and silk workers from England and France to Mexico to foment, after its establishment, the industry of silk in Mexico. For the next couple of years, he traveled to Europe in search of such incentives.[28] His return to Mexico in 1843 coincides with the publication of the project analyzed in the previous chapter, where he calls for the "conciliation" of all classes by following the principle of cooperation present in Mexico's "true" national spirit.[29] His condition as a foreigner, not only as an industrialist but also as a Frenchman, could be therefore considered as a valid account of his capacity to displace the common places on the construction of national industry. In chapter two his ideas and vocabulary were directly traced to his dialogue with the working nation, with which he probably shared experiences in the establishment of the Compañía and the negotiations with the regional industrial juntas and the Junta General. But perhaps his passage through some of the industrial centers in Europe may also explain why, for example, he talked in terms of "classes" rather than groups, or why he criticized the opulent men in Mexico for not giving labor to the working groups. Such an observation is not understood unless we recur to the experience of his fellow national foreigner Sotero Prieto.

As was mentioned, in the letter he sent to Escandón, he implied that the idea of the organization of work as a means for the organization of the nation was not known in Mexico. Where then did he get such an idea from? Who inspired him? In a letter he sent to Alamán a couple of years later, he even states that "none of the ideas that I have annotated here are mine, no image is mine". He consequently admits that they were all originally Charles Fourier's ideas. He saw himself as a transmitter of what his memory allowed him to remember from Fourier's works.[30] Behind the singular position of both Prieto and Guénot lay a common intellectual inspiration in Fourier's works, which as shall be seen below directly influenced their disagreement on industrialization channeled through the imaginary of work. Before briefly outlining which aspects of Fourier's thought inspired Prieto and Guénot, we should first trace the roots of this contact. That is, how did both build a link with this Frenchman's ideas? Where did this bond spring from?[31] Why did such ideas inspire both industrialists to aspire to the organization of the

---

[28] José Alfredo Uribe Salas, "La industrialización de la seda en Michoacán: Un proyecto nacional," *Tzintzun. Revista de Estudios Históricos*, no. 9 (February 24, 2015): 239–77.

[29] Estévan Guénot, *PROYECTO de Una Sociedad Protectora de La Industria de La Seda, En La República Mexicana.* Morelia, Imprenta de Ignacio Arango, 1844, p. 2. (Biblioteca Nacional (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF) 455 20).

[30] Carta de Sotero Prieto a Lucas Alamán, 28/6/1845. (AN 10AS41 (15)//681 MI 73).

[31] Prieto first explicitly mentions Fourier in a letter in 1845. As shall be seen below, however, his references to Fourier were much more dated than 1845. For Guénot's Fourierist inspiration, see: Pérez Siller, "Radiografía de Franceses En Las Urbes Mexicanas: Tránsito Del Modelo Virreinal al Nacional"; Fernando

nation as an organization of the nation's work, labor, and industry? The scant availability of sources determines some limits of our research on Guénot but is utterly complemented by the place where one finds some of Prieto's correspondence: in the Victor Considerant and Charles Fourier *Fonds* in the Parisian National Archives.

The rest of the chapter will thus trace some of the reasons why Prieto –at the crossroads of individual and collective trajectories, material and intellectual– is stored among some of the principal French socialists of the 1830s and 1840s in the National Archives of France. His trajectory will take the dissertation from Mexico to France, a movement that necessarily draws the ideas of the working nation to an international dimension. The individual and collective experiences will be crucial to start explaining the profound commonalities that bind the experience of both collectives of working nations in the Atlantic space. Furthermore, as shall be seen, their international experiences pose important consequences for the way national relations between groups were in some cases formed by the construction of inter-group communications that dissolve previous conceptions on class formation in nineteenth-century Mexico. Just as the crony spheres of Mexican capitalism in the mid-nineteenth century pursued their very own logic of how to build a national industry through practices such as profiteering and industrial protectionism, other rogue social realities engaged with protectionism and drove it towards more "public" interests, at times formulating a radically alternative way of organizing work and labor according to a social reform that allowed the construction of the "bien social".

4. The missing link of the chain. Sotero Prieto, Joaquín Abreu, and the groups of Cádiz

What has been called the "material turn" in intellectual history has received considerable attention from Latin American historians in the last couple of years.[32] In the attempt to trace intellectual trajectories, at the crossroads of material exchanges that spanned from commercial transactions to the sale of journals, and intellectual dialogues and communications between the people that exchanged these valued pieces, other studies of intellectual history have the merit of signaling the irreducibility of the travel of ideas to a mere logic of their "influence" in a specific context. Rather than trace how ideas were "misplaced" when transferred from one context to another, the

---

Winfield Capitaine, "Les Paysans d'origine Française à Jicaltepec et San Rafael," *Villes En Parallèle* 47, no. 1 (2013): 247–49, https://doi.org/10.3406/vilpa.2013.1515; Uribe Salas, "La industrialización de la seda en Michoacán: Un proyecto nacional."

[32] Noticeably, Horacio Tarcus, "Aportes Para Una Historia Conceptual Del Socialismo En El Espacio Rioplatense (1837-1899)," *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 5 (2018): 122–78; Gabriel Di Meglio, Tomás Guzmán, and Mariana Katz, "Artesanos Hispanoamericanos Del Siglo XIX: Identidades, Organizaciones y Acción Política," *Almanack*, no. 23 (December 2019): 275–315.

interaction of the actors –either as individuals or groups– with the ideas is the key to their mutual transformation. As *Begriffsgeschichte* warned, ideas may indicate the transformation of society as much as society is the factor that transforms ideas. They are thus "appropriated" and reworked by individuals and groups that, in this case, move *with* them and, when the actors remain in a fixed spot, seek to attract the material means for their dispersal, such as journals or newspapers. When displaced, ideas remain "partially disjointed", to the extent that they suffer transformations in the movement from one place to another.[33]

What I argue is still missing in this branch of intellectual history, however, is the actual "return" to society the actors and ideas effected. We deal with such operation through the arms of Sotero Prieto and his "appropriation" of the working nation's imaginaries. He offers a valuable example of how the latter was not exclusively local. In other words, he nuances a meaning of the nation which cannot be confined to its "territorial" connotation, virtuously linked to the notion of nationality,[34] and is therefore susceptible to becoming an imaginary where different collectivities, unbound by the conception of nation in terms of the former, interplay.[35]

Panama-born Sotero Prieto (1805-1869) did not migrate exclusively to Mexico. Shortly after he concluded his studies at the *Colegio de Minería* in Mexico City, he moved to Spain with his Spanish father and mother. Aged at least twenty-five when they arrived, Sotero traveled independently between Madrid, Cádiz, and Córdoba before finally establishing in the latter. In Andalusia, Sotero Prieto got to know a singular figure in the Spanish political life of the 1830s: Joaquín Abreu. It is briefly before the return of Sotero Prieto and his family to Mexico in 1838, that he is introduced to Abreu and his followers who were groups of workers that explicitly adhered to the ideas of Charles Fourier.[36] Unfortunately, there is not much information on this period of Prieto's life. Although we did not find evidence of direct contact between Prieto and

---

[33] Elías José Palti, "The Problem of 'Misplaced Ideas' Revisited: Beyond the 'History of Ideas' in Latin America," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67, no. 1 (2006): 149–79, https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2006.0009.
[34] See the discussion of this topic in the introduction and conclusions, and: Claudio Lomnitz, "Hacia Una Antropología de La Nacionalidad Mexicana," *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 55, no. 2 (1993): 169–95, https://doi.org/10.2307/3541108; Jeremy Adelman and Stephen Aron, "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in between in North American History," *The American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (1999): 814–41, https://doi.org/10.2307/2650990; Claudio Lomnitz and Pablo Piccato, "Building the Mexican State: The Notion of Citizenship," *Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 2 (2013): 163–69; Hilda Sábato, *Republics of the New World: The Revolutionary Political Experiment in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Princeton/Oxford: Princeton Unversity Press, 2018), 33–41.
[35] In this sense, an informed invitation to consider polities beyond territoriality in the context of "imperial revolutions" is Jeremy Adelman, "An Age of Imperial Revolutions," *The American Historical Review* 113, no. 2 (2008): 319–40.
[36] Jorge Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, Temas Hispánicos 19 (Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1977), 167–68; Carlos Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853," *Historia Social*, no. 8 (1990): 73–87; Federico De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant," *Cahiers Charles Fourier*, no. 19 (2008), http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article568.

Abreu, there is evidence that Prieto wrote letters to Victor Considerant since August 1837. He only received an answer from the latter on his third letter, sent on January 21st, 1838, shortly before he returned to Mexico.[37] The following reconstruction, then, is made out of the few puzzle pieces which could be assembled, through the experience and correspondence of Joaquín Abreu and the Fourierist circles in Paris and Condé-sur-Vesgre.

Before the 1830s, Fourier's thought, to which we will briefly return below,[38] was relatively unknown in Spain, and it was thanks to Abreu that it began to be widely spread in the southern province of Andalusia as well as Madrid.[39] Joaquín Abreu (1782-1851), former royal army official in Spain, was driven into exile due to his friction with Ferdinand VII in 1823. After seven years in Belgium, he was offered asylum in France, where he first lived in Marseille. It is possible that he first contacted Fourier's ideas and some members of the Fourierist *Phalange*,[40] such as François Devay. He consequently moved to Condé-sur-Vesgre, the Fourierist headquarters of the Phalange where he met and befriended Alexandre Baudet-Dulary, its director. As this rural community was in the relative vicinity of Paris, he would move back and forth between the Fourierist setting and its urban circles to better know the doctrine. By 1834, he returned to Spain a "proletarian", as a follower of Fourier's ideas and as an impoverished army official.[41] Upon his return, he founded the journal *El Grito de Carteya*, which served as the first platform for the diffusion of Fourier's ideas in Andalusia. Alongside Étienne Cabet's communist doctrine and Saint-Simon's ideas of a

---

[37] All available information is located in the same role of microfilm referred to above: AN 10AS41 (15)//681 MI 73.

[38] As mentioned, it is not the intention of the dissertation to summarize the ideas of Fourier or the rest of the thinkers that appear in the path followed here, as a traditional history of ideas would tend to do. I rather take the ideas that appear in this path, and consequently, contextually, explain them. Jonathan Beecher is probably the scholar who has studied Charles Fourier most consistently in the past decades. For a general intellectual biography, see Jonathan Beecher, *Charles Fourier: The Visionary and His World* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986). Further studies will be cited below.

[39] Clara E. Lida, *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888: Textos y Documentos* (Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España, 1973), 3.

[40] Fourier imagined the Phalange –a community where distinctions in wealth and status were affirmed in the principle of conciliation of interests of the rich and poor– in a rural setting, with the capacity of cultivating crops of a wide variety. Ideally, it should be established in a place within a day's ride from big cities. The central structure, the Phalanstery, would be recognizable from afar due to its "sumptuous" and palace-like structure. The edifice would host workshops, a large reception, dining rooms, libraries, and the member's apartments. In the effort of establishing architectural designs that multiplied the "bonds between the members of a community", the Phalanstery included large meeting rooms that disobeyed the logics of "dwelling units". Based on the principle of Harmony between groups, the "elementary form of social relations", the Phalange would host people from the rich, middle, and poor classes. The organization of the community's groups would follow the "*série passionelle*", a gathering of individuals according to their common passions, which would allow them to forget the divisiveness of their social status and bring them together in passion. Authority would be organized into a complex hierarchy of "titles and offices". Beecher, *Charles Fourier*, 234–58.

[41] Antonio Cabral Chamorro, *Socialismo Utópico y Revolución Burguesa: El Fourierismo Gaditano, 1834-1848* (Cádiz: Diputacion Provincial de Cádiz, 1990); Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, 132–35.

"Christian socialization", which had more success in the northeastern provinces of Catalonia and Barcelona in particular,[42] Tarifa and Cádiz placed themselves as two stalemates in the formation of Fourierist groups in Spain.[43] Cádiz and Barcelona seem to have been the two main cities where worker associations sprouted. There, a "radical culture" took root in which "solidarity among equals had replaced the complex guild corporativism that used to integrate, at the same time, community, and hierarchy of interests". Such a culture was hosted by artisans and manufacturers "in accordance with certain experiences and limitations, beliefs, values, and distinct expectations of existence".[44]

The influence of this radical culture was not only internal to the Spanish working groups. Historians have registered how these associations of workers were an important social catalyst in the decadence of the government of Spanish progressists (1835-1857) and the rise of this radical culture. The concept of association at the time reinforced the "social and corporative component" of society. Worker societies served as "an organizational catalyst for the socioeconomic interests of a social class or a certain productive sector" within the framework of what historians characterize as an "incipient liberal society".[45] The "independence" of these working groups from the "political" world, commonly attributed to their contrasting views with the liberal society being constructed, was not only a matter of their making. As in the process of nation-building in Mexico, there were evident disagreements as to who and what composed this political body. Significant mechanisms were being put into effect as authorities tried to address the issue of the presence of monarchical courts in the context of a liberal polity.

A renowned historian has recently characterized 1820 to the mid-1830s as a process of transition "from the government of the monarchy to the government of society". In these years, the liberal party sought to rally its will without seeing the new "monarchical sense" as a loose thread. By renewing the attributes of their "*politico-governative* administration",[46] they

---

[42] Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo, "Saint-Simonianism and Economic Thought in Spain (1834-1838)," *History of Economic Ideas* 17, no. 2 (2009): 121–54.
[43] See the entries "Comunismo" and "Socialismo", written by María Antonia Fernández, in: Javier Fernández Sebastián and Juan Francisco Fuentes, eds., *Diccionario Político y Social Del Siglo XIX Español*, Alianza Diccionarios (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2002), 179–83 and 653–58. Surprisingly, there is no mention of Abreu or the group that surrounded him in the cities near Cádiz. She briefly refers to the latter through Fernando Garrido's definition of socialism and his foundation of the newspaper *La organización del trabajo* in 1848. An articulate mention and description of the latter can be found in: Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, 97–130.
[44] José A. Piqueras, "Cultura Radical y Socialismo En España, 1868-1914," *Signos Históricos*, no. 9 (2003): 44.
[45] See the entry "Asociación" written by Juan Francisco Fuentes and María Antonia Fernández in: Fernández Sebastián and Fuentes, *Diccionario Político y Social Del Siglo XIX Español*, 105.
[46] The *Proyecto de código civil que presenta la comisión especial de las Cortes nombrada en 22 de agosto de 1820* defined it as follows: "A la administración *político-gubernativa* pertenecen todas las leyes económicas que regulan los impuestos, así generales como tópicos o locales; las leyes que determinan las atribuciones del poder ejecutivo y sus agentes y las de aquellos poderes que son de nombramiento popular,

transferred the symbol of government from the tutor-prince, as a personified representative of sovereignty, to the crown. Creating a void of authority between the crown and the monarch, liberals were able to incrust national sovereignty as the real *instrumentum regni*, personified in the liberal administration of the government and the monarch's ministers.[47] In the eyes of Spanish liberals, national sovereignty did not necessarily entail a reference to the sovereignty of society, but rather a sovereignty over society. Not only was the king separated from his sovereignty over the monarchy, but the nation was also separated from the composite sovereignty of which it was a part until 1820.[48] Rather than "independent", the nation's groups were being clearly separated from any political authority that could issue a government upon their lives.

"El proletario" Abreu and the working groups he surrounded himself with had a considerably opposite idea of the nation. In an article published in *El grito de Carteya*, he denounced:

> If we count ourselves, we find ourselves to compose the great majority of the population, *the Nation itself*, since the name is owed to the majority of any assembly. With all this, the Cortes appointed without our intervention are called national representation; but we would pay little attention to the words and even to the things themselves if the laws enacted were dictated for our benefit, which cannot be the case if they are formed by opposing interests.[49]

In a time when national sovereignty was being transformed from the courts to abandon its "national" aspect, Abreu underpinned the fact that if the nation was actually composed of the majority of the population, there was little doubt that the nation was mainly formed by the working groups. Once again, the sources communicate the conception of a working nation as confronted with the liberal sense of the nation. It was the working sectors who should conduct Spain's "national interest" so this working majority could effectively have "secure means of living comfortably instead of the meager salary they receive today". Contrary to the political ideas that sustained the creation of the ayuntamientos by the 1837 constitution as a means of further dispersing the crown's sovereignty throughout the territory –note the striking similarity with the Mexican centralist project–, Abreu thought it was absurd to conceive of the government as the

con arreglo a la Constitución; las leyes, en fin, paternales, cuyo objeto es proporcionar la instrucción, dar el impulso a la riqueza, establecer la paz de los pueblos, ahogar los crímenes en su cuna, hacer efectiva la beneficencia para con el desgraciado y promover todo género de prosperidad pública", quoted in: José M. Portillo, "Del Gobierno de La Monarquía al Gobierno de La Sociedad," *Revista de História Das Ideias* 37 (May 14, 2019): 177–78, https://doi.org/10.14195/2183-8925_37_7.

[47] Portillo, 182.

[48] Noemí Goldman, "Soberanía En Iberoamérica. Dimensiones y Dilemas de Un Concepto Político Fundamental, 1780-1870," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Noemí Goldman, vol. 10, 10 vols., Iberconceptos (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 15–41; Carlos Garriga, "Orden Jurídico y Poder Político En El Antiguo Régimen," *Istor: Revista de Historia Internacional* IV, no. 16 (2004): 1–21.

[49] *El Grito de Carteya*, 15/10/1835, in: Lida, *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888*, 59. The italics are mine.

unification of interests and political wills. Instead of confronting the "truth" of the "struggle" of interests and seeking its solution, the creation of ayuntamientos only accentuated the "elements of destruction" through the pretention of the unification of wills in the crown when they were actually divided according to the social division of crafts.[50] The echo of his publications would be registered by many groups, principally in Andalusia. *El aldeano*, two years afterward, would clearly transmit the message portrayed by Abreu and the group he led:

> It is necessary that we at once disabuse ourselves of the error in which we live; that we convince ourselves that *it is the genius of industry that gives life to nations*; that if we wish to see ours prosperous and happy we must imitate the conduct of others, which, thanks to the laboriousness [*laboriosidad*] of their inhabitants, to their constancy in the most difficult undertakings, and to that spirit of progress which constantly dominates them, have succeeded in reaching the height from which we observe them with envy.[51]

As is visible, Abreu and the first circles of Fourierists in Spain did not simply adopt his thought but rather "diluted the master's utopian ambitions and ended up seeking social reform through political action".[52] Recent studies have spelled out the importance of Abreu and, afterward, the Spanish working nation in their creative transformation of Fourierism as the ability to form hybrids that did not match Fourier's original ideas. Such forms gave an unprecedented impulse to the essential political nucleus it shared with other French socialist movements. In the creation of "hybrid forms of Spanish Fourierism", the circles that adopted the French socialist's ideas managed to give life to his thought outside France but also arranged to give life to his thought beyond some scholars' "obsession with gauging the intellectual level of the texts studied or their ability to contribute original ideas to the history of thought".[53]

In the wake of such research, we should no longer insist on the transmission of the doctrine from one place to another, but rather see how Abreu and the Spanish working groups appropriated Fourier's social science, which was developed in the "most advanced nations of the continent",[54] and sought to give life to their nation through the "genius of industry", thus avoiding the destructive division of society through the association of the working groups. Indeed, they did not adopt the idea promoted by the Fourierist leaders in different times and contexts: either Fourier's idea of only establishing Phalanges, Considerant's idea that the establishment of a political party should be the privileged means to establish the doctrine or Jan Czynski's idea that

[50] Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, 322–24. For more on the topic, see: Juan Antonio Vila Martínez, "El asociacionismo en la ciudad de Cádiz (1800-1874)" (PhD Thesis, Cádiz, Universidad de Cádiz, 2007), 194–200.
[51] *El Aldeano*, Puerto Real, num 7, April 23rd, 1837, pp. 1, in: Lida, *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888*, 65. Italics are mine.
[52] Juan Pro, "Thinking of a Utopian Future: Fourierism in Nineteenth-Century Spain," *Utopian Studies* 26, no. 2 (2015): 330.
[53] Pro, 342 and 330.
[54] In Lida, *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888*, 54.

promoted direct political action by creating small communities.[55] As Abreu himself insists, it was necessary to "imitate" the spirit of progress that guided other nations: the spirit of industry and its "genius". Indeed, he upheld the need to get rid of domestic "errors" by establishing communication with other experiences that had guided the working groups to "give life" to their nations. Both industry and labor had to be organized according to the nation's "majority". Most importantly, such an effort could not follow the principle of exclusiveness imprinted into the concept of nationality: if such progress was to be brought to the nation's working groups, it had to be international in the strict sense of the term.

We must not neglect the fact that we arrived at this point through the international voyages of Sotero Prieto and Joaquín Abreu. If the former establishes the need to travel from Mexico to Spain, the latter links the former's efforts of disagreeing with the centralist project of industrialization with ideas and imaginaries that emerged among the working groups in France and Spain. Following their travels helps us explain, on the level of an exchange of ideas, why Prieto insisted on a social organization of work as part of a scientific project impulse. Through Prieto's contact with the groups that surrounded Abreu in Andalusia, he eventually addressed the French Fourierist groups requesting copies of *La Phalange*, the Fourierist journal.[56] Hence, it was his direct contact with Abreu, a direct disciple of Fourier and Devay, which explains why one must go to Paris's suburbs to find his letters to Escandón and Alamán. The mention of Fourier's science is the result of an exchange of ideas between the Mexican industrialist and the Spanish Fourierist: an exchange that was precisely mediated by Abreu's material concern for the "majority of the nation", encrypted into an international appropriation of Fourierist ideas. If the link between Spain and Mexico is clearer, we should ask for the links with France. The hybrid essence of Abreu's appropriation of the Fourierist ideas for a Spanish context pushed the doctrine to come out of its preconceived boundaries, and traverse landscapes that have been very scarcely explored. The application of an altered Fourierist social science, the separation of the working groups from the regime's political agenda, and above all the importance of the organization of the nation through the works of national industry, were all central components of an imaginary that was shared between nations. Now, however, we must go to the roots of this international exchange which was not only intellectual but also material insofar as it linked the history of at least three nations, and no less than two working nations: the Spanish and the Mexican.

To understand the hybrid dimension of these working nations and how they operated an appropriation of Fourier's social science, there is an evident need to determine what was to be appropriated in the first place. In other words, what was the motive for three different people,

[55] Pro, "Thinking of a Utopian Future," 333–35.
[56] See the letters included in: AN 10AS36//681Mi/59-60; AN 10AS41//681Mi/71-73.

with different degrees of connection with France, to see an outcome to problems certain groups of their nations were suffering in Charles Fourier's ideas? Was it, in effect, Fourier to which these outsiders of the highest ranks of their own societies appealed? Or were there other instances aside, below, or above Fourier that were simply transmitted into his ideas? To start answering some of these queries, we must be mindful of the "hybrid form" adopted by the Spanish working group's "imitation" of Fourierism. Quite soon we shall discover that such hybridity was not exclusive of the international appropriation of Fourierism but was actually imprinted into the scientific and industrial character it was born with, and from which it emerged.

5. The nation in association. The alternative Modernity of the Parisian working organizations

In his classic *Work and revolution in France*, and later in *A rhetoric of bourgeois revolution*, William Sewell outlined with fascinating clarity what has been probably the most important trope for discussions on the origins of the modern nation, as it originated in France in the late eighteenth century: the mutually informing logics of the bourgeois revolution and the creation of the nation as it emerged from the ink of the *abbé* Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès. If Marxist historians and thinkers have reflected on the concept of a bourgeois revolution, and seen in Sieyès its proper "incarnation", it may be because the concept itself was engineered in *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers-État?* For Sewell, the term's ambivalence, conceived by the engineer of the revolution, is illustrated in the inconsistent position Marxists adopted in its respect. They systematically criticized the abbot's ideas while constantly appealing to the concept of bourgeois revolution to build their own concept of revolution. The ambiguity albeit was not only Marxist. Sewell contends that the ambiguity of the whole network of concepts used by Sieyès, such as nation, aristocrat, or idleness, was imprinted with a "revolutionary potentiality" that prevented each of these terms to have a "fixed relation" between them and with their social referents.[57]

Though it might seem this criticism to classic Marxist historians has a veiled rescue of Sieyès's importance in later revolutionary rhetoric, what comes out is a rather precise register of which group it was impossible to fix in his reference to the concept of revolution and nation. As shall be seen in this section, Sewell's interpretation might have remained a step shy from distinguishing that it was not so much Sieyès's reference to the construction of a "bourgeoisie in

[57] William H. Sewell, *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution : The Abbe Sieyes and* What Is the Third Estate*?*, Bicentennial Reflections on the French Revolution (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 1994), 203–4; William H. Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 78–86. See also William H. Sewell, "Beyond 1793: Babeuf, Louis Blanc and the Genealogy of 'Social Revolution,'" in *The Transformation of Political Culture 1789–1848*, ed. François Furet and Mona Ozouf, vol. 3, The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture (Amsterdam: Pergamon, 1989), 509–26.

power" who impersonated the "uncontrollable" group of his revolutionary mechanism, as much as it was the "working nation" the historian refers to.[58] Although the abbot wished to absorb the latter within the sphere of civil society, reading the available sources seems to yield the notion that the revolutionary mechanism was not so much uncontrollable as much as it was *appropriated* by the working nation. As shall be seen, the *abbé*'s concepts seem to have been accommodated by the "social revolution" enacted by the groups he famously refers to in the opening lines of his pamphlet: the groups that were "everything" and "nothing" composing the Third Estate; those spheres of society who performed the "private" and "public" activities which sustained society.[59] Therefore, the transformation did not only happen at the level of the political language, the political and abstract notions and concepts, Sieyès introduced into the revolutionary scene.

Used to register the "excesses" committed by the people during the revolutionary conflicts, historians tended to forget how "the people prefigured the political reality of tomorrow" as a "heterogeneous ensemble that never stops moving".[60] Setting a distance from previous Marxist scholarship, the previously unregistered consequences of the "uncontrollable" revolutionary inheritances have been progressively linked to the inevitable problems related to "social and political management" faced by post-revolutionary regimes. Scholars have uncovered how "social conflictuality" was institutionally and politically radicalized, unsettling the correspondence between Sieyès's stabilization of national citizenship upon a "homogeneous plane" and its actual conflictive creation.[61] Addressing the problems formulated by the groups of disincorporated artisans, former guild members, incipient factory workers, merchants, and workshop masters and apprentices, the French working groups' specific role in the process of nation-building will become clearer. In turn, this will unveil the material aspect that was imitated in the intellectual exchanges between France, Spain, and Mexico.

It should not be surprising to see that historians who study the French Revolution and the role the working groups had in this tension between the nation's political form and its effective social expression are focusing on the gaps left by the regime in labor legislation, like the famous Le Chapelier law. Corporations, scholars argue, were not simply "wiped out". In the immediate aftermath of the Revolution, it had become evident that erasing guilds and corporations, "as if a

[58] Sewell conceives the working nation precisely as the correspondent of the Third Estate. Though we can find the nearest familiarity of the term, as used in this dissertation, in his work, we do not completely follow his interpretation, which at times recurs to Marx's use of *Arbeitende Nation*. Sewell, *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution : The Abbe Sieyes and* What Is the Third Estate*?*, 155.
[59] Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès, *El Tercer Estado y Otros Escritos de 1789* (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1991).Sieyès.
[60] Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *Le Procès de La Liberté: Une Histoire Souterraine Du XIXe Siècle* (La Découverte, 2016), 215.
[61] Social conflictuality is translated from the Italian "conflittualità sociale", meaning a situation of potential social conflict. Sandro Chignola, "Sul Paradosso Del Liberalismo Francese," *Filosofia Politica*, no. 3 (1999): 476, 479, https://doi.org/10.1416/11018.

doctrinal proclamation could dispose of historical reality in the same way that a judicial sentence disposes of legal reality", was not an operation the First Republic could so happily pursue. The juridical contradictions faced institutional formulations by the workers themselves. Aside from the reforms placed by d'Allarde and Le Chapelier, there were "actual subaltern jurisprudential practices" that register the real "political ruptures", as well as the "place of law in the social bond [*lien*]". Despite "meaningful failures" and "antidemocratic reactions", citizens had nonetheless succeeded in gaining a new place in the political arrangement conceived since 1789.[62] From this newly acquired position in the revolutionary configuration of the nation, they started re-imagining their role as citizens, but also more generally as workers who were now potentially part of the Republic.

A significant example of the places where these subaltern practices were institutionalized is the *conseils de prud'hommes* (from the Latin *probi viri*, honorable men), conceived and used as an institution for the "industrial justice of peace". Rather than judges, the subjects that administered these spaces of justice were elected workers and patrons. Conceived as a "face-to-face system of reconciliation", the prud'hommes did not strive to annul or liquidate conflicts. They intended to reconcile the parties in litigation to safeguard and adjust the *arts et métiers* regulations that continued to rule the common spaces where workers and masters interacted: the workshops. The councils of prud'hommes were thus imagined and enacted as spaces that had an evident "collective reach" where, besides the disputing parties, an audience typically composed of fellow craft and workshop members participated. Craftsmen were interested in the fate of the litigation because the process would commonly entail decisions on how their workplace would function from that point on. Trials set important precedents for the ruling and daily dynamics of workshops. They carried out an essential role in the "jurisprudential functioning" of the prud'hommes, where the affairs were only solved once they received the sanction of the "concerned milieux". In more than one sense, these spaces of social and worker justice were a milieu of mediation between the working groups' exigencies of "human justice", as much as they were a place where the "proper functioning" of their professions could be, at least, collectively discussed.[63] This may explain why Alain Cottereau summed up their "internal regulation of the

[62] Alain Cottereau, "Droit et bon droit. Un droit des ouvriers instauré, puis évincé par le droit du travail (France, XIX e siècle)," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 57, no. 6 (December 2002): 1527; 1545, https://doi.org/10.3406/ahess.2002.280123.
[63] Alain Cottereau, "La Désincorporation Des Métiers et Leur Transformation En Publics Intermédiaires : Lyon et Elbeuf, 1790-1815," in *La France, Malade Du Corporatisme? XVIIIe-XXe Siècles*, ed. Steven L. Kaplan and Philippe Minard, Socio-Histoires (Paris: Belin, 2004), 59–60, http://cems.ehess.fr/docannexe/file/3362/cottereau_la_de_sincorporation_des_me_tiers_.pdf. When quoting this text, I refer to its longer and more complete version, published in 2014 by the author in his website (http://cems.ehess.fr/docannexe/file/3362/cottereau_la_de_sincorporation_des_me_tiers_.pdf, accessed: September 21, 2021).

just and unjust" into the following maxim: "not to let injustice be done, not to let iniquity pass [*ne pas laisser faire l'injustice, ne pas laisser passer l'iniquité*]".[64] The conciliative role these councils performed was thus not limited to these spaces of oral contention for justice. It would seem as though workers, craftsmen, artisans, and workshop masters took their litigations for justice to the workshops and, conceivably, to the recently created "public sphere". The working collectives were, in this sense, taking their practices and customs to the new spaces created after the conception of a national scenario filled by the new collection of citizen subjects.

The jurisprudential practices of the prud'hommes are only one example of the institutions organized by the working groups of the nation. As shall be seen below, in the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, there were working organizations such as the mutual-aid societies that inherited and transformed the practices and symbolism of previous corporations, confraternities, and *compagnonnages*. With these internal and formal transformations came a redistribution of the workers into new kinds of labor societies. Artisans and craftsmen migrated with their "artisan traditions and customs", such as the occasional banquets in name of the corporation's patron saint, from one organization to the other, embodying somewhat literally "fundamental principles of social organization and social action".[65] Of the very few registers and documents available to document the postrevolutionary scene, a particularly relevant practice that was instituted by the working groups was the *goguette*. As Vinçard aîné remembered in his *Memoires* of an "old singer", the goguettes were reunions where workers would turn up to sing. These spontaneous associations occurred with no other authorization than the police commissioner's tacit consent:

> What is positive about this is that the greatest independence was left to these meetings, all of which were made up of workers; all kinds of poetry, serious or critical, were sung and recited there, and, among the latter, there was no lack of attacks on the government and the Church. [...] It is in these gatherings that the workers of Paris were going to draw love for our national glories and public liberties.[66]

---

[64] Cottereau, "Droit et bon droit," 1549.

[65] William Sewell's is still perhaps the most coherent explanation of the grayscales of this transition. See William H. Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 162–87. The quotation is from p. 171. For Ancient Regime corporations, see chapter 3. See also Steven L. Kaplan and Philippe Minard, eds., *La France, Malade Du Corporatisme?: XVIIIe-XXe Siècles* (Paris: Belin, 2004).

[66] Jules Vinçard, *Mémoires Épisodiques d'un Vieux Chansonnier Saint-Simonien / Par Vinçard Aîné* (Paris: E. Dentu Libraire/Grassart Libraire, 1878), 24, 26. For more on the goguette, see: Jacques Rougerie, "Le mouvement associatif populaire comme facteur d'acculturation politique à Paris de la révolution aux années 1840 : continuité, discontinuités," *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 297, no. 1 (1994): 493–516, https://doi.org/10.3406/ahrf.1994.1855; Romain Benini, "Approche historique de la chanson populaire au début du xixe siècle," in *Filles du peuple ? : Pour une stylistique de la chanson au XIXe siècle*, Signes (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2021), 53–95, https://doi.org/10.4000/books.enseditions.17237.

National glory and public liberties were articulated by the workers themselves in the collective practices they conducted in the streets of Paris. As Vinçard reminisces, these chanting reunions of workers that characteristically "functioned freely", and which gave the workers a "means of freedom [*moyen de liberté*]", provided its subjects the sense of having the capacity to better "know the political spirit of the multitude". Indeed, these reunions soon configured themselves as "potent schools of patriotic education".[67] When they did not meet in the streets of Paris, the cabaret as well as the *guinguette* –more peripheral taverns where workers could drink cheaper wine by virtue of lower taxation policies–[68] served as spaces of congregation where the "first step of the progressive march of popular intelligence" was treaded.[69] "Incalculable" in number for contemporaries, historians have counted around three hundred of these worker associations in the streets of Paris alone by 1818.[70]

It is hardly deniable that Jules Vinçard's experience was part of a "mass" movement that spontaneously swarmed some of the streets of Paris. In these gatherings or reunions, it seems as though the worker's subjective experience delineated how the nation could be imagined. The "homogeneity" of the public sphere seemingly faded as these reunions and gatherings proceeded through the Parisian wards. The very practice of coming together to sing, as some historians have registered, was easily malleable by the subjects who chanted. In the heat of associative effervescence, a song could be easily transformed into an articulated choir that complained about their daily condition as underpaid laborers or exploited apprentices of a workshop master. These metamorphoses configured what has been labeled the worker's rise toward politics (*montée vers la politique*).[71] In contrast to previous conceptions that negatively appraised the Parisian street as "being that which belongs to no one but is frequented by everyone", the *rue* was transformed by the goguette, which allowed the musician and the worker to associate under the "major ambition" of moving "without limit" in the streets of Paris and imagining the future as a "common good [*bien commun*]".[72]

---

[67] Vinçard, *Mémoires Épisodiques d'un Vieux Chansonnier Saint-Simonien / Par Vinçard Aîné*, 26.
[68] Thomas Brennan, "Beyond the Barriers: Popular Culture and Parisian Guinguettes," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 18, no. 2 (1984): 153–69, https://doi.org/10.2307/2738534; John M. Merriman, "Marginal People, Peripheral Spaces, Fearsome Faubourgs," in *The Margins of City Life: Explorations of the French Urban Frontier, 1815–1851*, ed. John M. Merriman (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 59–83, https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195064384.003.0003.
[69] Vinçard, *Mémoires Épisodiques d'un Vieux Chansonnier Saint-Simonien / Par Vinçard Aîné*, 27.
[70] Jacques Rougerie, "Le mouvement associatif populaire comme facteur d'acculturation politique à Paris de la révolution aux années 1840 : continuité, discontinuités," *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 297, no. 1 (1994): 498, https://doi.org/10.3406/ahrf.1994.1855.
[71] Rougerie, 501, 506; Riot-Sarcey, *Le Procès de La Liberté*, 216.
[72] Romain Benini, "La chanson, voix publique (Paris, 1816-1881)," *Romantisme* 171, no. 1 (2016): 40–52, https://doi.org/10.3917/rom.171.0040; Benini, "Approche historique de la chanson populaire au début du xixe siècle."

Such instances of popular feast seem to have uncovered some of the previous juridical gaps left by the revolutionary and imperial legislation, upon which the July Monarch sought to act upon immediately. In 1816, for instance, the goguettiers –the musicians– were obligated to register in their corresponding *Préfecture*. This law, however, did not restrain the "amusement" and "good times" that were intrinsic to the goguette, configured as a "space where one sings".[73] As a consequence, in 1834 Louis-Philippe's administration obligated these musicians to carry an official leather medal (*médaille*) to further testify their "good life and customs [*bonnes vie et moeurs*]". In 1831, legislation reduced the hours in which singing was allowed to 9 p.m. In 1834 it was further curtailed by an hour.[74]

As can be seen, there was an irreducible problem in the establishment of this kind of legislation. There was something "uncontrollable" of the "excesses" enacted by the new political reality where the working groups lived and carried their customs in practices like these. This was not limited to the "sporadic" movements like the goguettes: restrictions on internal mobility were systematically imposed through the *livret d'ouvriers*, a sort of passport that controlled the individual's displacements. Historians have recently noted that rather than see such control imposition as the "persistence of ancient restrictions", what these institutions show is the "reformulation of the strongly disputed politics" connected to labor and the evolvement of the market's needs. Beyond the "formal equality among citizens", different kinds of "labor dependence" were engineered to correspond to individual "free labor". The idealized freedom, on the contrary, was met with "collective bargaining"[75] that moved the borders of such freedom. What I would like to argue is that these problems were strictly related to the development of certain political ideas.

French liberalism was historically tensioned between the institution of a "subjective right" of the individual and the assurance these rights were not used by the individual as a defense against the State's authority. The problem was how to administer the nation in the wake of constitutional continuity. Conceptual historians have noted that since the Revolution, individuals were convened to the new "social unity" in which differences would be synthesized into the mechanism of a formal society that dissolved the prior corporative divisions through their constitution into a single, homogeneous, nation. An operation that would be conciliated with the conjunct operation of Sieyès and Napoleon in 18 Brumaire: the creation of a representative government that reconstituted the power of the State through the establishment of a political continuity between

[73] Benini, "Approche historique de la chanson populaire au début du xixe siècle."
[74] Benini, "La chanson, voix publique (Paris, 1816-1881)," 43–44.
[75] Martino Sacchi Landriani, "Rethinking the *Livret d'ouvriers*: Time, Space and 'Free' Labor in Nineteenth Century France," *Labor History* 60, no. 6 (November 2, 2019): 854–64, https://doi.org/10.1080/0023656X.2019.1645318.

its representants and its representatives, that is, a "circular mechanism" of authorization/legitimization.[76] Sieyès imagined three modalities of realizing this unity, to be pursued by the Constituent Assembly. In his political thought, "adunation", "regeneration" and "representation" would buttress the Nation as a political mechanism. As a result, however, French society was torn between a unity produced by its government's representative system and the "practical diversity" of the social body.[77] In this process, we discover that the working groups were perhaps the collectivity that most destabilized this mechanism because they were at the threshold between the liberal individual and the corporation's dependence. We could say they animated liberalism's "historical problem": the constitution of the Nation.

5.1. The organization of the nation, with and beyond the juridical principle of the French Revolution. The sociological principle and the Parisian working groups

Pierre Rosanvallon stands out among the scholars who have most proficiently studied the roots of this trenchant conflict between the project of national unity and the practical heterogeneity of the nation. Like few others, he was able to retrieve the central displacement the irruption of the working classes caused within the whole arrangement of the mechanism of the Nation-state. It is in their plight for their rights as workers and citizens that a conflict between the "liberal juridical principle" and a "sociological principle" emerged. But their contestation, according to Rosanvallon, reached its limits when the worker citizen, who visibly irrupted into the political scene in 1830, did not devise a "general philosophical questioning about the modern individual-citizen" of liberal-republican inheritance. Although the workers managed to identify themselves as a social group because of the common sufferance of being excluded from the scheme of republican citizen rights, they did not hazard beyond an idea of "social inclusion" into the Republican framework of 1789, reproduced with slight modifications in 1830.[78] In following the commonplace interpretation that the 1830 revolution was of liberal inspiration, an interpretation

---

[76] Luca Scuccimarra, *La Sciabola Di Sieyès : Le Giornate Di Brumaio e La Genesi Del Regime Bonapartista* (Bologna: Il mulino, 2002), 140–62. As Scuccimarra also registers a few pages earlier, this operation could not have been possible without the Directory's creation of a new "paradigm of citizenship" that openly excluded the working population of the cities as well as the agricultural journeymen. See p. 73. For the process of authorization-legitimization of the State through the French Revolution, see: Chignola, "Sul Paradosso Del Liberalismo Francese"; Sandro Chignola, "Constitución y limitación del poder," in *El poder: para una historia de la filosofía política moderna*, ed. Giuseppe Duso (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2007), 159–62; Giuseppe Duso, "Revolución y constitución del poder," in *El poder: para una historia de la filosofía política moderna*, ed. Giuseppe Duso (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2007), 164–71.
[77] Pierre Rosanvallon, *El Pueblo Inalcanzable. Historia de La Representación Democrática En Francia* (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María'Luis Mora, 2004), 31–37.
[78] Pierre Rosanvallon, *La consagración del ciudadano: historia del sufragio universal en Francia* (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María'Luis Mora, 1999), 240.

which is dictated by the liberal-monarchical outcome of the revolution rather than an actual analysis of the subjective worker experience upon which it was embedded,[79] the French philosopher wipes out the working groups from the picture, hence any possibility for a material, social, aspect of the nation to have developed. As we can perceive, his interpretation does not distinguish the actual social conflictuality that was being created by popular and worker institutions –like the prud'hommes or the goguettes– for the creation of abstract freedom and social unity.

Other historians have approached this space of conflict and have given a more precise image of the conflict borne into the transformation of society in the first half of the nineteenth century. The process has been described as a transition "from the defense of the nation to the necessity of collective emancipation, according to the resolutions and issues of the moment". The "peuple" that arose in the first three decades of the century defended the power to act in accordance with their rights, but also with increasing knowledge of their identity and the duties, individual and collective, it comes with.[80] Historians and philosophers have referred to the existence of a peuple that was "ungraspable" under the sociological principle built by Sieyès himself[81] and reproduced by Rosanvallon: a principle that counterweighs social movements with the political culture conducted by an abstract political universalism.[82] It would seem that the customs of the working groups were elusive not only for the principles developed by the republican project of 1791. Recent scholarship has convincingly established they were even more puzzling for the counter-revolutionary heritage, in which society was "lost" somewhere in the chain of command that wished to link God, the Church, and the monarchic State to the "great family" of the Nation, composed of a "plurality of families".[83] Indeed, the conflict between the sociological and juridical

---

[79] To a great extent, this interpretation was sustained by Maurice Agulhon and those who followed his interpretations. See for example: Maurice Agulhon, "1830 dans l'histoire du XIXème siècle français," *Romantisme* 10, no. 28 (1980): 15–27, https://doi.org/10.3406/roman.1980.5340. More recent scholarship has nuanced his analysis by breaking with his analysis of "bourgeois" society. Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *Le Réel de l'utopie: Essai Sur Le Politique Au XIXe Siècle* (Paris: A. Michel, 1998); Maurizio Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848* (Paris: La Découverte, 2014); Riot-Sarcey, *Le Procès de La Liberté*.

[80] Riot-Sarcey, *Le Procès de La Liberté*, 216; Frédéric Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 2016), 138–45.

[81] Sonia Branca-Rosoff and Jacques Guilhaumou, "De 'Société' à 'Socialisme' : L'invention Néologique et Son Contexte Discursif. Essai de Colinguisme Appliqué," *Langage & Société* 83, no. 1 (1998): 39–77, https://doi.org/10.3406/lsoc.1998.2813; Jacques Guilhaumou, "El Lenguaje Político y La Revolución Francesa: El Universo Discursivo de Las Nociones-Concepto," in *El Mundo En Movimiento: El Concepto de Revolución En Iberoamérica y El Atlántico Norte (Siglos XVII-XX)*, by Fabio Wasserman (Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila, 2019), 71–102.

[82] Rosanvallon, *La consagración del ciudadano*, 258.

[83] Francesco Callegaro, "Une Réaction à La Réaction. Les Sciences Sociales et l'héritage Révolutionnaire," *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 6 (2019): 190–214. This thesis was formulated as a precision of previous efforts that have seen the emergence of the "intelligence of society" in the counter-revolution's effort to think customs from their own "prejudice". It was the basis of such "democratic customs" which served the

principles which actually constituted the above-mentioned historical problem was not placed in either the liberal or reactionary political principles, but in the customs and norms that tensioned the lives of French society's groups and individuals. There was an unequivocal disagreement between the revolutionary heritage and the latter's situation.

As Jacques Rancière established, the "revolutionary scene" that was born in 1830 was not so much the inheritance of a republican disappointment by the working groups, but of a generalized "frustration" the "forms and techniques of politics" had produced, dismantling their "republican hopes".[84] The working groups' need for collective emancipation was thus linked to a process by which the working groups sought to "unfold" the republican project according to their own customs. Spaces such as the joyful reunion in the goguettes, the cabarets, and the guinguettes which so much troubled authorities because of the characteristic lack of sobriety, were attended by the same workers that discussed their rights as worker-citizens in the prud'hommes.[85] As places where these individuals aggregated and associated to chant or discuss, the artisan, journeyman, factory worker, and merchant transformed the central streets of Paris from places of simple "popular assembling" into places of "general instruction" and "political education". As Alexandre Guérin, a famous goguettier, sang:

Hurry up, come to the goguette,
Instruct the people, teach them their rights;
Sing with art, especially without label
And the bravos will answer your voice.
Do you really want to show yourself popular,
Don't listen to vain advice;
At the crossroads, good guardian angel,
Morning and evening will make people happy[86]

However, as Rosanvallon rightly notes, the phenomenon of a popular "montée vers la politique", from which a sociological principle seems to have emerged, cannot be issued exclusively from the social movement, the "order of reality", the political language is referring to; the latter must also have a political principle to which it refers to.[87] Admittedly, the limited amount of sources, as well as the oral nature of the working group's political culture, have been valid reasons for historians to encounter difficulties in measuring the nature and importance of the

---

progressist search for the tradition and prejudice that were "convenient for the world issued from the Revolution". See: Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)*, 2016, 180–91.

[84] Jacques Rancière, "La Escena Revolucionaria y El Obrero Emancipado (1830-1848)," trans. E. Verger, *Historia Social*, no. 2 (Autumn 1988): 3–18.

[85] Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière*, 258.

[86] "La Chanson du peuple", in *Poésies diverses par Alexandre Guérin (de Troyes), extrait de ses différentes publications et de son Répertoire inédit. Deuxième volume*, Paris, 1851, p. 58-60, quoted in: Benini, "Approche historique de la chanson populaire au début du xixe siècle."

[87] Rosanvallon, *El Pueblo Inalcanzable. Historia de La Representación Democrática En Francia*, 27.

"political dimension" in the exchanges between the working groups and the emergent Parisian "popular horizon".[88] There are, nonetheless, some sources that refer directly to the intercrossing between the popular horizon and the working groups, and how this communication may have produced a political dimension. Through them, one discovers that along the accommodated bourgeois observer that condemned the *moeurs* of the populace, their habits of drinking, and their unsober and inadequate attitudes, there were other observers of this reality, likewise bourgeois and even former privileged nobility members, that still distanced themselves from such condemnations. Such "national foreigners", as Prieto and Guénot were in Mexico, unveil the core of what Rosanvallon deems as an unbridgeable link between the sociological principle and the order of reality, thereby elucidating its political principle.

It is above all due to historical, temporal, and social, reasons that we trace the emergence of such communication to Saint-Simon and not to Fourier. As shall be discussed below, when we read their work carefully, we discover, among other things, that Saint-Simon did not "write little"; that his followers were not only "fanatical dreamers";[89] and that he or his followers were, contrary to Friedrich Hayek's opinion, "original and profound".[90] Though this is not the place to discuss each of these hypotheses, what follows will present a brief reconstruction of the places and practices where Saint-Simon and the Saint-Simonians ensued a communication with the working groups, their customs and practices, and the relation they had with the individualistic world built by the juridical principle. This points to the emergence of a new political principle that thoroughly discusses the commonplace ideas which still structure some analysis on the potency of their doctrine. A more attentive reading of the Saint-Simonian sources seems to unveil the places where the popular horizon intercrossed with these more than chimerical *fils de bourgeois*, pointing to the concrete "order of reality" that informed the institution of a sociological principle that was later shared by Fourier and his followers.

Three years after the *maître*'s death in 1825, his three main disciples Bazard, Enfantin, and Rodrigues summoned the reunion of a new organization.[91] In this appeal, they renewed their master's vows who perceived society was trapped in an impasse produced by "incomplete scientific ideas" that had only created a society divided into "two fields". On the one hand, the "double

[88] Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière*, 277, note 71.
[89] Vilfredo Pareto, *Les Systèmes Socialistes: Cours Professé à l'Université de Lausanne* (Paris: Droz, 1978), 188, 195.
[90] Friedrich August Hayek, *The Counter-Revolution of Science: Studies on the Abuse of Reason* (Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 1979), 195.
[91] Prosper-Barthelemy Enfantin was a "highly intelligent" former student at the École Polytechnique; Saint-Amand Bazard was a former Freemason and founder of the French Carbonari; and Olinde Rodrigues, the son of a wealthy banking family who was also a former student of the École, was one of the closest assistants of Saint-Simon himself when he was in his death bed. Richard Wittman, "Space, Networks, and the Saint-Simonians," *Grey Room*, no. 40 (2010): 30.

organization", political and religious, of the Middle Ages; on the other, those who "improperly" call themselves the "*partisans of new ideas*" only because they overturned the "old building", the Ancient Regime. In between these two "armies", the Saint-Simonians wanted to institute peace. They wished to "scare off" the "permanent anarchy" created by this state of contradictory affairs hauled since the Revolution. It was thus time to "abandon the banners of an irreflexive and disordered liberalism" and enter "with love in a state of peace and happiness".[92]

They considered it an impossible feat to enter this state under present conditions, where the "exploitation of man by man" was perpetrated and positioned the man who was supposed to be a free citizen, the worker, as a "direct descendant of the slave and serf". In a "state of legal emancipation", his only means of subsistence depended on the conditions imposed on him by a "small class", invested by the law with the monopoly of "wealth" (*richesses*) which give him control over the "instruments of work [*travail*]". The worker was thus exploited "*materially, intellectually* and MORALLY". Indeed, when the privileged "extol" the regime of equality as the "last term of civilization", they were but recurring to "cruel irony, if we were to suppose that those who employ this language have seriously examined the society that surrounds them". All of which pointed to the fact that the "political speculators" of the time ignored the situation of the "majority of the workers, who compose in every society the immense majority of the population".[93]

We find in the Saint-Simonian language, once again, the underlying international motive that appeared in Joaquín Abreu. In France, it was not only Fourier but foremost Saint-Simonians who effectively started contesting the juridical principle defended by liberals, and reversing the language of conservatives who simply conjured the "ignorance" that lived in the populace and attributed it to the profound "antagonism" that reigned society and confronted its sectors and classes.[94] Like the working groups, Saint-Simonians established that neither liberalism nor a Reaction to its principles was enough to overcome the critical situation inherited by the Revolution.

For this very reason, to avoid further antagonism at the hands of the "war machines" that were created by a state of "opposition" and "competition", Saint-Simon's disciples evoked the "need for a new social doctrine". Following the steps of their master, who pursued the formulation of a "positive science",[95] they were aware that this doctrine would have to be sustained by a science that abandoned the vice of closing itself within the task of "perfecting the theory" and, instead,

---

[92] Saint Armand Bazard et al., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon : Exposition. Première Année 1828-1829*, 3rd ed. revised and augmented (Paris: Au Bureau du Globe et de L'Organisateur, 1831), 76–77, 107.
[93] Bazard et al., 176-177.
[94] Bazard et al., 76.
[95] This program appeared since his first known publication in 1802: Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, *Lettres d'un Habitant de Genève à Ses Contemporains* (Geneva: Barbier, 1802).

open itself to its application. They regrettably observed that, much like society, science too was disorganized. Its organization would follow from the creation of a "laborious association [*association laborieuse*]" between the active principle of science, the *savant* who methodically sought the application of science, and the active principle of society, industry. They thus attained a diagnosis of the ills of society: both its brains and its body, their intellectual and material activity, were disorganized by virtue of the lack of "harmony" between the personal interest of society's individuals, and their "general interest". Following the misguiding principles of "economists", science had become the "source of disorder". Their doctrine, on the contrary, strived to unite industry and science, which would be "harmonized" and "regularized in the interest of all", revealing the "feeling of enthusiasm of a life in *common*".[96]

They argued that a "new way of contemplating" society was in order, a "new science" which gave value to the evidence gathered to support "our dreams of the future". As a science that was conceived as a direct corollary of the state society found itself in, its "first application" through their doctrine was also a corollary of human beings' tendency towards "*universal association*", which was a logical result of the decline of antagonism in human society.[97] Their science would serve to reorganize society not only in its activity but also in the way society conceived and imagined itself; in the way society became conscious of itself in the organization of its work and labor. We believe that it is here that the commonly neglected political dimension of their social science emerged.

If we follow the evidence with which we have worked thus far, the crucial revolutionary aspect of this science may rest in the Saint-Simonian proposal of a new form of "contemplating" society. It was *against* the notion of abstraction promulgated since the Revolution that the Saint-Simonians advocated for the contemplation of society.[98] The sociological principle of the Saint-Simonians, put into practice even before the invention of a "capacitary order" by Guizot and the doctrinaires, did not wish to "guarantee order" by radicalizing the "regulatory mechanisms" invented by the Revolution. Though we may concede the fact that both Saint-Simon's and Guizot's sciences could be identified with the operation of getting "out of the anarchy linked to the advent of the individual" by "dissipating" the inherent contradictions of the revolutionary political

[96] Bazard et al., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon: Exposition. Première Année 1828-1829*, 84–90, 104. Italics in the original.
[97] Bazard et al., 36–37.
[98] Bruno Karsenti, "Introduction: radicalité du socialisme," in *Le sens du socialisme: histoire et actualité d'un problème sociologique*, ed. Francesco Callegaro and Andrea Lanza, vol. 11, Incidence. Philosophie, littérature, sciences humaines et sociales (Paris: Le Félin, 2015), 9–27; Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)*, 2016; Callegaro, "Une Réaction à La Réaction. Les Sciences Sociales et l'héritage Révolutionnaire."

culture,[99] this should not distract the reader's attention to the foundational differences of one and the other.

The capacitary order of Guizot and the doctrinaires was founded on the operation of *extracting* "from society all that it possesses of reason, justice, truth, to apply them to its government".[100] Instead of extracting the principles of society to apply them as "regulatory mechanisms", the Saint-Simonians sought the cure for the ills suffered by society in the principle of association. Indeed, since 1821 Saint-Simon himself had –not without some note of mockery– referred to Guizot as a *vulgarisateur* of his ideas, only "popularizing" what he had published since 1817 in the *Organisateur*.[101] Radicalizing this statement, we could affirm that the capacitary order was not conceived to publicize his positive philosophy, but was a contradiction to its most structural, sociological, principles. In effect, the Saint-Simonians' sociological principle was definitely not about the extraction of the guiding principle of society for its "application" into a separate sphere.

The role of Saint-Simonians in the creation of the sociological principle was thus affirmed in their theoretical anticipation and political contestation of the doctrinaire's operation. They did not seek to "dissipate" as much as to radically challenge the contradictions created by the revolutionary political heritage, which the capacitary order only radicalized through the installment of a monarchical regime. It might be therefore useful to conceive the Saint-Simonian doctrine as a "progressive reversal", to paraphrase Frédéric Brahami,[102] rather than an outright reaction to the revolution's political principles. Indeed, their science did not "descend from the theory to the practice",[103] but was on the contrary conceived as an experience of mutual apprenticeship between the working groups and the doctrine's leaders.[104] A new pedagogy that

[99] Pierre Rosanvallon, *La Démocratie Inachevée Histoire de La Souveraineté Du Peuple En France* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000), 110.
[100] François Guizot, *Histoire Des Origines Du Gouvernement Représentatif et Des Institutions Politiques de l'Europe : Depuis La Chute de l'Empire Romain Jusqu'au XIVe Siècle.*, vol. 1 (Paris: Didier et Cie, libraires-éditeurs, 1880), 98.
[101] Saint-Simon himself acknowledged that those who "provided a great service to the inventors and the public" were above all the *vulgarisateurs*: if Voltaire popularized Bayle's "critical ideas", "M. Guizot has just popularized the observations I published in the *Organisateur*". Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, *Du Système Industriel* (Paris: Antoine-Augustin Renouard, 1821), 153. As historians have noted, the popularization of his ideas was a necessary step Saint-Simon acknowledged in the establishment of his scientific and social organization of the nation's majority. See: Christophe Prochasson, *Saint-Simon Ou l'anti-Marx: Figures Du Saint-Simonisme Français, XIX-XXe Siècles* (Paris: Perrin, 2004).
[102] Frédéric Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 2016), 191.
[103] Bazard et al., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon : Exposition. Première Année 1828-1829*, 87.
[104] Admittedly, such a thesis has been increasingly discussed by scholars who have reflected on Saint-Simonianism for the past couple of decades. Prochasson, *Saint-Simon Ou l'anti-Marx*; Hormigo, "Saint-Simonianism and Economic Thought in Spain (1834-1838)"; Ludovic Frobert, "French Utopian Socialists as the First Pioneers in Development," *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 35, no. 4 (2011): 729–49; Jacques Rancière, *Proletarian Nights: The Workers' Dream in Nineteenth-Century France* (Verso Books, 2012);

was conceived as a contemplation as much as a scenic reunion in the streets of Paris in the spaces carved out by the goguettes and the prud'hommes.

As mentioned above, the "revolutionary scene" of the 1830 July Revolution gave the workers visibility in the public sphere as much as it gave them the tools to recognize themselves as groups that acted together in reaction to common afflictions. The revolutionary movement staged the working groups in the streets of Paris with more permanency than before, giving them the consciousness of their "co-belonging" in the workshop and the public sphere –on the threshold of a subjective existence as workers and citizens.

Stonemasons, locksmiths, foundry workers, cabinetmakers, wheelwrights, hairdressers, and coppersmiths predominated the "massively working-class and popular event" which spanned through four days at the end of July 1830. Over sixty percent of the "peuple" involved in the July Revolution were either craftsmen, tradesmen, artisans, small-factory workers, or merchants. As recent historians argue, their protagonism in the July revolts, coalitions, and strikes was transformed into a lasting experience of emancipation that would survive vividly at least for the next four years.[105] The irruption of this scene, as much as the development of group consciousness by the working groups, was all but coherent. But this should not prevent us from presuming that such an uneven, plural, and heterogeneous situation may have been crucial to determining the groups of workers, together with those who were "contemplating" their customs and practices, to learn from the scene they created, and make sense of their experience.[106] That is, to make sense of the potency of the transformative capacity they had acquired with the revolutionary moment of 1830. It might have been the complexity of their experience that shaped the questions they asked themselves. Yet these questions met with previous efforts that wished to organize society according to the principle of "laborious association".

The Saint-Simonian apostles, Bazard, Enfantin, and Rodrigues, did not fall behind in the efforts of scientifically synthesizing the worker experience briefly mentioned above. They sought to re-work their doctrine from the 1830 experience, taken as an experience from which their science should learn. At the turn of the decade, their language acquires new significant tones. The necessity to develop a doctrine was no longer exclusively of their bearing, for the workers had manifested important aspects of their lives which should be considered for the constitution of a

---

Luca Scuccimarra, "A Constitution for Europe. Saint-Simon and the *Réorganisation de La Société Européenne*," in *Pensiero Critico Ed Economia Politica Nel XIX Secolo: Da Saint-Simon a Proudhon*, ed. Vitantonio Gioia, Sergio Noto, and Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo (Bologna: Società editrice Il mulino, 2015), 83–102.

[105] Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière*, 287–93.

[106] See, in this sense: Jacques Rancière, "La Représentation de l'ouvrier Ou La Classe Introuvable," in *Le Retrait Du Politique: Travaux Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique*, ed. Jacob Rogozinski and Jean-Luc Nancy, Cahiers Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique (Paris: Galilée, 1983), 89–111.

"social science". This new social science depended on the "*verification* of the *moral*, *intellectual*, and *physical* development of humankind, that is, its constantly increasing progress towards the unity of *affection*, of *doctrine*, and of *activity*".[107] They could all agree that if in 1828 this was yet a chimera, in 1831 it was no longer so. As such, the Saint-Simonian *séances* in the Parisian wards were transformed into the *Enseignement des ouvriers* which collected the messages conveyed by, as well as the participants' responses to, the Saint-Simonian "priests". The latter argued that the working group's experience was to be elevated to the form of a doctrine at the hands of the "chief of the cult" (Rodrigues) and the "directors of the workers" (Stéphane Flachat and Holstein).[108] The revolutionary scenery was discussed in the sessions where the worker and the Saint-Simonian "cult leaders" met and discussed ways to dissolve the former's daily exploitation in the workshop, their modern "captivity".[109] Indeed, they were discussing the "historical problem" of the working groups through the social sciences Saint-Simonians and workers were in the process of building.

We thus arrive at a central point in the journey of the dissertation: where the link between the sociological principle, the organization of the nation, the activity of the working groups, and a new political form was being imagined. As such, it would seem that the sociological principle was born from the intersection of worker and *savant* in the goguettes, the cabarets, the prud'hommes, and the guinguettes, as much as the Saint-Simonian *séances*. In other words, worker association was both embodied in theory and practice by these dynamics and movements, from the practice of collectively strolling the streets of Paris to gather and drink, chant or the defiant practice of approaching a new doctrine to "understand that we [workers] present ourselves to the world to emancipate [*affranchir*] it from the pains that burden it".[110] Communal songs and chants engendered the sensation of a popular feast, while artisans met in and outside of the workshops, in court, and in the streets, where they could discuss their working conditions. Workers were gathering under a "common link" produced by the occasions of mutual apprenticeship, like Guérin evoked in the song quoted above. Another worker, Efrahem, a local shoemaker, would register this association as follows:

---

[107] Bazard et al., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon : Exposition. Première Année 1828-1829*, 112.

[108] *Enseignement Des Ouvriers : Séance Du Dimanche 18 Décembre 1831 ; Enseignement Des Ouvriers : Séance Du Dimanche 25 Décembre 1831* (Paris: Bureau du Globe, 1831). The first name of Holstein is missing in the document.

[109] These were the reports written by each Saint-Simonian director of their assigned *arrondissement*. Given the outstanding presence of Olinde Rodrigues –the "cult leader" of the church– in the reports, we could suppose that their disappearance after the "schism" between him, Bazard and Enfantin in November-December 1831 trace their existence to his initiative. Indeed, the Saint-Simonian *séances* after the "schism" did not happen in the streets of Paris but in the temple built in Ménilmontant under Enfantin's new direction of the doctrine's "family". On the topic, see: Jules Lechevalier, *Lettre Sur La Division Survenue Dans l'association Saint-Simonienne : Aux Saint-Simoniens* (Paris: Imprimerie d'Éverat, 1831), 14–16.

[110] *Enseignement Des Ouvriers : Séance Du Dimanche 18 Décembre 1831 ; Enseignement Des Ouvriers : Séance Du Dimanche 25 Décembre 1831* (Paris: Bureau du Globe, 1831), 21.

> As we can see every day when all the workers of the same *état* come together, they form a *corps* that gives itself a small government; it is a first step while waiting for the *association*. Just as the workers of the same *état* have united to make a *corps*, so these different *corps* can be united by a common bond.[111]

Association thus appeared as the practice that could drive a wedge into the problem of the constitution of the nation of workers, as individuals, and their groups, the transformed bodies of the new states. The dynamicity of such an association was widely lived: Flachat, the doctrine's director of workers, admitted that the Saint-Simonian séances had become "so new, so lively" because of the way workers participated in them. It was their availability and willingness to participate in these contexts of doctrinal apprenticeship and the sharing of their daily experiences that enacted reciprocity between the workers, as well as between them and the Saint-Simonian doctrine leaders. The "words with which you answer our words", he stated, gave life to both. The Saint-Simonian séances were the "new path" that defines the "era *of word and action*, a RELIGIOUS era", where the "principal idea", the "RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATION OF WORKERS" was both heard and understood. "Industrial association" was being constantly enacted by workers, such as the tailors and seamstresses who had recently created their own labor societies, which followed the idiom of association.[112] The "material" aspect, however, was accompanied by their "moral work", embodied in their association in the workshop. The practices Saint-Simonians observed and heard about convinced them that the "instrument of progress" was none other than the "pacific potency" workers enacted in their labor associations.[113]

As established by these documents, the workers were teaching Saint-Simonians the material aspect of association through the industrial and material practices they pursued in their workspaces, while Saint-Simonians sought to take these principles to the level of a new religion through the practice of contemplation inherent in their social science. As a prominent philosopher remarked:

---

[111] Zael Efrahem, "De l'association Des Ouvriers de Tous Les Corps d'état," in *Les Révolutions Du XIXe Siècle*, ed. Pierre Marie Sébastien Bigot de Morogues, vol. 4: Naissance du mouvement ouvrier : 1830-1834 (Paris: EDHIS, 1974), 3. Italics in association are mine. I maintain *état* and *corps* in French because of the difficulty of translating both concepts. As Sewell established, in the Ancient Regime "'Corps' implied unity, organization, activity, and solidarity, and 'état' implied stability and distinctness. A corps d'etat, therefore, was a solidary body, organized and capable of acting as a unit, composed of permanent members of a distinct trade". Into the nineteenth century, it is difficult to translate *état* either with status, condition, or trade –as well as *corps* with body– without missing the central distinction of such a language: it designated both the stability and the activity of a collection of groups united by their work and labor. Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 192.

[112] They were probably referring to the organization of a *Société philanthropique des ouvriers tailleurs* (Philantropic Society of Tailor Workers) in 1831. *Cfr.* Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 204.

[113] "Séance du Dimanche 25 Décembre", *Enseignement Des Ouvriers*, 3–6.

> Painter Laurent Ortion and his colleagues have no need for Latin to grasp the great principle of Saint-Simonian philology: a *new religion*, that is, a new *tie* or *link* (Latin *re-ligare*) between human beings. The organization of work is really the institution of the family of workers. The word that attracts these men to the Doctrine, far more than the words *work* and *association*, is the word *love*.[114]

Indeed, it would be an exaggeration to reduce the Saint-Simonian religion to its enactment and defense of moral associationism. The irreducibility of the working groups' social science, weaved together with the religious, associative, doctrine coordinated by Rodrigues and later Enfantin, lies precisely in the unique, at times incoherent, link between the worker movement and the doctrine's apostles and leaders, who were commonly "well-educated *fils de bourgeois*".[115] The association these groups enacted embodied the contradictions of a time of fluctuating political and social hierarchies, which they sought to organize according to their status as groups and individuals.

As is well known, Saint-Simon and his followers proposed a new organization of society, the construction of a new hierarchy, according to a principle of capacity. Saint-Simon had proposed a "positive capacity" through which society could be re-organized, following the principle that "each person obtains benefits from society that are in exact proportion to his or her social contribution [*mise sociale*]".[116] The reorganization of society, as conceived by Saint-Simon and reclaimed as the doctrine's maxim –to each according to his ability; to each according to his works–,[117] was not about applying order to society, but about redistributing the hierarchies that structured society according to the actual social principles that governed it: the economic principles that organized industry and labor. As we shall discover, he was specifically interceding in the "disputed politics" of his time by reconfiguring labor dependencies according to the forms of association enacted by the working groups he was "contemplating".

5.2. The institution(s) of the French working nation: The imaginary of work

As some historians have argued, the Parisian and Lyonese industrial landscapes were dented with a collective dimension that was virtually inescapable for its participants. Such dynamics accentuated the construction of what has been called a "collective manufacture" in the biggest

---

[114] Rancière, *Proletarian Nights*, 159.
[115] Frobert, "French Utopian Socialists as the First Pioneers in Development," 258.
[116] Saint-Simon, *Du Système Industriel*, 206.
[117] Rarely reproduced in its entirety, I quote the whole paragraph where the doctrine reproduces Saint-Simon's idea of capacity: "L'homme a jusqu'ici exploité l'homme. Maîtres, esclaves ; patricien, plébéien ; seigneurs, serfs ; propriétaires, fermiers ; oisifs et travailleurs, voilà la l'histoire progressive de l'humanité jusqu'à nos jours ; ASSOCIATION UNIVERSELLE, voilà notre avenir ; *à chacun suivant sa capacité, à chaque capacité suivant ses oeuvres*, voilà le DROIT nouveau, qui remplace celui de la *conquête* et de la *naissance* : l'homme n'exploite plus l'homme; mais l'homme, associé à l'homme, exploite le monde livré à sa puissance". Bazard et al., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon*, 38.

cities of France, constituted by a network of workshops and small factories where the predominant manufacturing industries combined a "localized ensemble of production systems that are linked by the use to which the merchandise they produce is put".[118] The network of industrial cooperation created by this system did not escape the nineteenth-century reality that labor, work, productive activities, and the relationship between the manufacturer and the workshop master were still highly hierarchical. Still, as historians precise, "this was not the authoritarian hierarchy of the nineteenth century that we imagine in retrospect". The hierarchy at play in this network of industrial manufacture existed in a context of "shifting organization" where a "*mobile hierarchy negotiated*" was put into practice. Contrary to the static hierarchy imprinted into guild traditions, in the nineteenth century the relationship between workshops and manufacturers created "*shifting hierarchical connections*" that regulated and administered their relationship.[119] Other authors have likewise identified that such shifts in productive relationships led to the imposition of mutual and binding regulations between the workshop master and the craftsman. In this sense, the *tarif* served as a regulation of the worker's salaries, though it was conceived as an "extralegal collective agreement".[120] By setting prices on the workers' operations in the workshop, craftsmen and journeymen protected their trade from practices such as subcontracting, division of labor, and the fracture of trades "into a congeries of separate workshops". Most importantly, it was a means of protecting their labor from the tendency of advantaging the production of "easy-to-make" articles which were seen as a threat to the skilled artisan or manufacturer.[121]

As shall be seen below, the emergence of this collective instance was not arbitrary nor coincidental. The collective nature of this industrial world was an answer to the inner transformations trade corporations had suffered after the French Revolution. Indeed, it is important to place these labor reforms in the context of shifting privileges that abandoned their corporative, highly structured, form. Privileges, as historians have insisted for decades, were

---

[118] Alain Cottereau, "The fate of collective manufactures in the industrial world: the silk industries of Lyons and London, 1800-1850," in *World of possibilities : flexibility and mass production in Western industrialization*, ed. Charles F. Sabel and Jonathan. Zeitlin (Paris; Cambridge: Maison des sciences de l'homme ; Cambridge University Press, 1997), 82.

[119] Cottereau, 85. For a wider reflection on the reinvention of the commercial relations of merchants –"qu'il s'agisse de négociants, d'industriels, de transporteurs ou de boutiquiers"– in nineteenth-century France, see: Arnaud Bartolomei et al., "L'encastrement Des Relations Entre Marchands En France, 1750-1850: Une Révolution Dans Le Monde Du Commerce ?," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 72, no. 2 (June 2017): 425–60, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0395264917000592. For the creation of new roles which systematically reconfigured authority in the workplace: François Jarrige and Cécile Chalmin, "The Emergence of the Foreman. The Ambivalence of an Authority under Construction in the French Textile Industry (1800–1860)," *Le Mouvement Social* 224, no. 3 (September 10, 2008): 47–60.

[120] Andrea Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, Studi e Ricerche Storiche 387 (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010), 175.

[121] William Sewell's description of the *tarif* and its transformations in these years still has enormous validity. See Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France*, 179–83, 248. See also Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, 2010; Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière*.

transformed and embedded into exploitative practices carried out in the workshop: long working hours, low wages, and overall abusive practices by their superiors.[122] But the tariff, as other institutions mentioned above, also talks about how changes in inner labor organization speak of new collectivities being formed: no longer corporative nor absolutely estranged from the hierarchies of the working places. Indeed, the collective character of industrial[123] and trade reorganization performed by the working groups did not only materialize in institutions such as the prud'hommes, but it also pushed the workers to change the terms upon which they reflected on their livelihood, in many aspects determined by their work as a means of production and reproduction.

Jules Leroux, brother of Pierre Leroux and a central figure in the collective of Parisian typographers, offers a synthetic appraisal of where this common principle stems from, thereby also yielding a synthetical account of its political core developed by the working groups. In 1833, the typographer claimed it would be reductive to conceive the workers' actions as a simple demand to rise their salaries, for this demand concerned matters of the "highest interest": "it touches the *organization of the industry*; it touches the *emancipation of the workers*; it *carries in itself the association* and the more or less active cooperation of each one of us in the public affairs".[124] A demand like the rise of their salary entailed the coordination of the workers to ground that aspiration; it required their organization and cooperation to set a common aspiration. Their labor, the typographer's salaried activity, was only a part of a more complex concept of work, which seems to have encompassed activities that were irreducible to those carried out in the workshop.

What Leroux seems to be proposing is a wider conception of work: what we have here named an imaginary of work. In this case, it embedded labor and productive activities while including political experiences, such as the emancipation of the worker and the organization of their industry. In consonance with the *Junta de Fomento de Artesanos* and the *Sociedad Mexicana*

[122] In this sense, recent discussions of labor historians who have insisted on overcoming the categorical distinction between free/unfree labor has allowed to unveil the inner logics of coercion inherent in the practice of labor contract-formation. See: Tom Brass, "(Re-)Defining Labour Coercion?," *Critical Sociology* 44, no. 4–5 (July 1, 2018): 793–803, https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920517712368. For the specific French case, though concentrating on the transformations of coerced work principally in the colonies, see some of the chapters included in: Alessandro Stanziani, *Les métamorphoses du travail contraint. Une histoire globale (xviiie-xixe siècles)* (Paris: Sciences Po Presses, 2020). It is noteworthy that in the introduction the author includes a discussion on the artificiality of the transition from one schematic definition of labor relations to another as part of the myths which permeate the "transition" to modernity. See pp. 10-19.

[123] The presence or not of "industry" in Paris seems to be a matter of discussion among social historians. For a detailed discussion with relevant information on the topic, see: Alain Faure, "L'industriel et Le Politique. Qui a Peur de l'industrie à Paris Au XIXe Siècle ?," *Revue Dhistoire Moderne Contemporaine* 65, no. 1 (2018): 29–69. In substance, he discusses the thesis proposed by Gribaudi of an industrial milieux in mid-century Paris, and therefore also the thesis of Alain Cottereau of a collective manufacture.

[124] Jules Leroux, "Aux Ouvriers Typographes (1833)," in *La Parole Ouvrière: 1830-1851: Textes Rassemblés et Présentés*, ed. Alain Faure and Jacques Rancière (Paris: Union générale d'éditions, 1976), 91. Italics are mine.

Protectora de Artes y Oficios, Leroux points towards the importance of shifting our attention towards a wider economic, social, and political phenomenon that integrated different dimensions of the craftsman's life, beyond labor: *work* itself. Wages, as he contends, were only a part of the craftsman's work, which was highly more complex and integrated a diversity of other activities that led to productive and reproductive activities. Work, and not only wage labor, was the real socket upon which to ground the organization of their lives.[125] Hence, the worker's consciousness of self-organization and ultimately of emancipation were a consequence of his daily activities, not only of "sterile coalitions". Leroux draws on examples around him to illustrate this process of industrial association and organization. The Parisian tailors had given the rest of the working groups a valuable example by associating and establishing their own workshop, competing with their "ancient masters" at their own risk and danger.

In contrast, Leroux thought his trade was all but a "class" because it had been dissolved into a set of "individuals". The word "freedom" had been "desecrated" in the name of "isolation" and "absolute solitude" to rule the relations of these working individuals. Yet actual freedom could not consist of "this way of living". It was better to call this new "passion" by its name: "egoism". It "reigned among our masters; it reigns among us". Egoism, he explained, caused "hate" and "disputes" between typographers out of the most basic motives such as the lack of pieces and the completion of a typographic layout. Egoism had "poisoned" even the "most organized" activities of human nature[126] to the point that typographers, as much as other workers in other trades, had not realized that their cause, the cause of raising their salary, was the cause of "all working classes".[127] The internal disputes and hatred deviated the attention of the worker from the real problem for which they called upon to form a coalition and cooperate. In effect, the raise of their salaries was but a part of the process of *affranchissement*, which would only happen once "our industry is ours [*notre industrie soit à nous*]". Such a task had been achieved by the tailors, who, at their own risk, appropriated their industry for themselves as the groups that composed the trade created associations. To place the typographers on the same path of emancipation and "well-being", the way was thus clear: "let's form a vast association".[128]

[125] The distinction between work and labor as two separate –albeit contingently mutually informative– conceptions of the productive processes as part of a wider system of social, political, and economic relations has been highlighted by recent social historians. See, for example: Andrea Komlosy, "Work and Labor Relations," in *Capitalism: The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*, ed. Jürgen Kocka and Marcel van der Linden (New York/London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016), 33–70; Karin Hofmeester and Marcel van der Linden, *Handbook Global History of Work* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017); Christian G De Vito, Juliane Schiel, and Matthias van Rossum, "From Bondage to Precariousness? New Perspectives on Labor and Social History," *Journal of Social History* 54, no. 2 (November 1, 2020): 644–62, https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shz057.
[126] Leroux, "Aux Ouvriers Typographes (1833)," 94.
[127] Leroux, 92.
[128] Leroux, 100.

The association that was being proposed in 1833 by the typographers –Leroux always talks in plural– was an association directly consequential to the organization of work, as opposed to the principle that sought to organize their society: egoism. Exceeding the religious association proposed by the Saint-Simonians, this trade was precipitating the principle of association directly into their daily, working, activities. Association, in other words, was the social threshold that gave Leroux and the working groups the capacity of transforming the forms of previous labor dependencies, while avoiding any reductions to abstract freedoms. The terms in which Leroux places his pamphlet reflect the fact that workers were seeking association through vast industrial cooperation: a vast, organized, "collective manufacture". The organization of work, understood as an appropriation of their industry, of their tools and even the new machines, as well as the control over the product of their labor, was a means of attaining emancipation. But it also meant recovering the object of desecration and profanation caused by their isolation as individuals: the possibility of being a collectivity, a cooperative class of workers.

As mentioned, typographers were not the only trade that denounced this prevailing egotism as the "poison" that prevented the worker from associating and, therefore, organizing their industry. Efrahem, the shoemaker, would warn his fellow tradesmen of letting their corporations fall into the "abyss of individualism and the egotism of isolation",[129] while Auguste Colin denounced the "scourges of the nation", egotists "by education" or by means of their "capital", for reducing the working groups to the status of an "instrument that everyone must use to attain honors, dignities, fortune".[130] Association, as an imaginary of work, was the way in which workers seem to have collectively embraced a critical stance *vis-à-vis* their global society's organization. The organization of their groups gave them the means to oppose the "profaned" state of their industry and their work created by the economic, political, and social system founded on the principles of egotism and individualism which upheld a contrasting system of labor dependencies[131] that dissolved the former's principle of association.

As is well known, it was mainly Benjamin Constant who developed the idea of individualism as a system that allowed the free development of individual faculties, which would lead to "public order" and help develop "political independence". Constant summarized individualism's programs according to the very concept of freedom Leroux criticized. It was a system that was created as a way of contrasting the ideas developed by Saint-Simon and the Saint-Simonians,

---

[129] Efrahem, "De l'association Des Ouvriers de Tous Les Corps d'état," 3.

[130] Auguste Colin, "Le Cri Du Peuple," in *Les Révolutions Du XIXe Siècle*, ed. Pierre Marie Sébastien Bigot de Morogues, vol. 4: Naissance du mouvement ouvrier : 1830-1834 (Paris: EDHIS, 1974), 5.

[131] For the concept of "dependency" and the "asymmetrical" component historically imbued into labor relations, see: Julia Winnebeck, Ove Sutter, Adrian Hermann, Christoph Antweiler, and Stephan Conermann. "The Analytical Concept of Asymmetrical Dependency", *Journal of Global Slavery* 8, 1 (2023): 1-59, doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/2405836X-00801002.

among which one could find Jules's brother Pierre. Constant proclaimed "'freedom in all things, in religion, in philosophy, in literature, in industry, in politics: and by freedom, I mean the triumph of individuality'".[132] Individualism tied freedom and individuality as the condition of the possibility of civil society itself. As another contemporary stated, it had emerged as a "radical opposition" to the "systems that subordinate individual rights to the rights of society [*droits de la société*]".[133]

As a fruit of opposition and debate, historians have traced the emergence of individualism not so much as a self-standing concept, but rather a word with "negative value" that designated the sole system "favorable to the improvement of the human species",[134] in contrast to the system conceived by the Saint-Simonians. Their stigmatization of individual freedom was consequential in their denouncement of the dissolution of "social bonds" (*liens sociaux*) since the Revolution. Since the 1820s, individualism was denounced as a "disordered liberalism", a systematic defense of the individual, and a "violent way of being" because it countered and attacked the "spirit of peace and mutual assistance". In short, it countered their most valued principle: association.[135] Association and individualism were thus two systems which, although interdependent, formulated a tensioned "disagreement"[136] as to the process of the French nation-building. Since society had been dissolved into a collection of individuals, association arose, through the minds and organization of the collective manufacture, as the principle that could re-compose a cohered collectivity. Contrary to the abstract juridical principle of individualism, however, the working groups precipitated their association from and into the milieux of working practices that sustained their everyday lives.

It would seem that workers engaged more profoundly with the principle of association through the mutual-aid societies, with their practices of "mutual assistance", for they saw their organization as "a means for their task". *L'Atelier*, a worker newspaper whose authors were famously anonymous, perceived how the practices imbued into mutualist societies were "penetrated" with the "ideas of solidarity and union" that animate "all the parts" of the working

---

[132] "Préface (1829)", Mélanges de littérature et de politique, in Benjamin Constant, Ecrits politiques. Ed. Marcel Gauchet, Paris, Gallimard, 1997, pp. 623–624 Marie-France Piguet, "Individualisme: Origine et Réception Initiale Du Mot," *Oeuvres et Critiques* XXXIII, no. 1 (2008): 50.
[133] "Préface (1829)", *Mélanges de littérature et de politique*, in Benjamin Constant, *Ecrits politiques*. Ed. Marcel Gauchet (Paris: Gallimard, 1997), pp. 623–624, in: Piguet, "Individualisme: Origine et Réception Initiale Du Mot," 43.
[134] Piguet, 47.
[135] See Piguet, 51.
[136] Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

population. These societies were the place where the worker could "practically teach" society how men "should assist each other".[137]

5.3. The institution(s) of the French working nation: the organization of the working groups

Most coincide that mutual-aid societies were a nineteenth-century inheritance of previous forms of corporative trade organizations such as the confraternities and the *compagnonnage*. The latter were old regime labor corporations, constituted throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, composed of young artisans or journeymen that formed a sort of federation that included many trades throughout France. Besides the *tour de France*, in which the *compagnons* were offered training in their crafts and generally cared for in the hosting workshops, journeymen were also provided with care in case of sickness and were granted funerals that followed the norms and rituals established by their specific trades. Corporate control over the journeymen gave compagnonnages regulative power over life in the workshops, as well as the power of dispute with the master's corporations: it was the compagnonnage's *rôleur*, in charge of distributing the compagnons throughout the country according to local workforce demands, who decided whether or not a journeyman could join a master's workshop. Marked by a rigid hierarchy regarding workers, compagnonnage was paradoxically "more egalitarian in tone" than the master's corporations, for they gave compagnons the possibility of rank ascent through seniority. Offices were commonly occupied by members who rotated annually or by majority-elected compagnons in the frequent assemblies.[138] Penetrating the hierarchical structure with such egalitarian practices, compagnonnage and confraternities were transformed from within when Catholic charity began to be secularized in eighteenth-century France: from philanthropic Catholic assistance, there emerged a solidarity among the corporation's members. With the emergence of these new kinds of practices, new kinds of organizations were being created: mutual aid societies.[139]

From the 1780s, when they were created, it would take around three decades for mutual aid societies to effectively sprout: the one hundred and eighty societies that existed during the Empire would multiply to around thirteen hundred by the time of the July Monarchy. In Paris alone, they gathered around eleven thousand workers of the approximately seventy thousand workers living

[137] *L'Atelier*, June 1845, p. 142, in Rougerie, "Le mouvement associatif populaire comme facteur d'acculturation politique à Paris de la révolution aux années 1840," 507–8.
[138] Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France*, 42–49.
[139] Michel Dreyfus, *Liberté, Égalité, Mutualité: Mutualisme et Syndicalisme, 1852-1967* (Paris: Editions de l'Atelier, 2001), 17–38.

in the *ville* at the time.[140] As historians have since long established, such societies were mainly composed of skilled journeymen and were, therefore, more appealing to well-established artisans and craftsmen who could afford the monthly due deposited in the society's fund, which could be used in case a member fell sick or retired, as well as to pay the deceased's funeral, a practice inherited from compagnonnage. Unlike confraternities and traditional trade corporations, mutual-aid societies successfully molded the ritualistic conditions of their organization to their surrounding society, conveying greater adaptability to their nineteenth-century context. Significantly, the hierarchical control of job placement practiced by compagnonnage had slowly faded behind the journeymen's capacity of discussing the rate of tariffs with their masters. When discussions were not resolved, workers could recur to the establishment of their own working organizations. In this sense, mutualist societies implemented the practice of "voluntary association", instead of the brotherhood-stringent practices perpetrated by compagnonnage which obligated new members to pass through an intricated ritualistic apprenticeship process.[141]

An example of such a society was the *Société de secours mutuels des Vrais Amis*, whose existence was authorized by the police prefecture in 1820. In its first "reunion", twenty of the forty-five people who could pay the hundred franc admission fee were immediately admitted. Soon after, however, some members of the *Vrais Amis*, a society of butchers who were mainly shopkeepers, started demanding the abolition of certain privileges that ruled the purchase of meat in exclusive markets that could only sell meat to butchers with an "administrative authorization". As a result, the "garçon bouchers", who were soon met with the contestation of their "patrons", formed a *Société de prévoyance et de secours mutuels des ouvriers et employés de la Boucherie de Paris* (Mutual aid and preventative society for workers and employees of the Paris butcher's trade) as a way of demanding the erasure of the privileges upheld by their master's mutualist society. Consequently, their organization only asked for a ten franc admission fee in contrast to the elevated fee requested by their "patrons". Although this clearly set back their financial capacity, the worker society of butchers managed to maintain relative autonomy from the patron's society until the 1848 Revolution, when the society fell into a pronounced deficit that enabled the patrons to acquire the society in 1851.[142] Other experiences of mutual-aid societies, like the Marseille shoemakers, followed a similar fate. Organized in 1816, the shoemakers successfully organized a strike in 1833 for higher wages. Their victory was soon eroded by the master's self-

---

[140] Dreyfus, 24–25. For more information on these societies, see: Michael David Sibalis, "The Mutual Aid Societies of Paris, 1789–1848," *French History* 3, no. 1 (1989): 8, https://doi.org/10.1093/fh/3.1.1.
[141] Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 184–86.
[142] Sylvain Leteux, "La Société de Secours Mutuels Des Vrais Amis (1820-1898) : Comment Les Bouchers Parisiens Ont-Ils Organisé Leur Protection Sociale Au XIXe Siècle ?," *Revue d'histoire de La Protection Sociale* 3, no. 1 (2010): 9, https://doi.org/10.3917/rhps.003.0009.

organization which forced the shoemakers to strike again in 1845. This time they were met by police forces which arrested their leaders for "illegal coalition".[143]

Despite the setbacks the precept of voluntary association carried for both worker and master, mutualist societies could be considered the first experiences through which workers could unite the experience of work association with a political capacity for emancipation: their very own way of transforming labor dependencies through their system of association. As with any social relation, they were contestable and determined by specific economic, political, and social norms. In effect, the young butchers' society shows these associative projects did not always end in the ideal of "universal association" the Saint-Simonians pursued. For many, their failed experiences were only a testimony of the reproduction of the system of exploitation and isolation. Arguably, this experience of defeat, as lived by worker societies as well as other collectivities, was a powerful call for awareness. In this sense, the Saint-Simonian church's demise, after the 1831 "schism" and the internal divisions created between Enfatin and the rest of the doctrine's leaders (noticeably Rodrigues and then Michel Chevalier), was a sign of its inherent problems and of the changing impulses that were driving the working groups towards a "collective identity".[144] Transformations from within not only led to the Saint-Simonian church's demise by 1834, with its new leaders increasingly gravitating toward the legitimist defense of the July Monarchy's institutions.[145] Workers consequently seem to have pulled away from the sessions of religious association and started to institute an outright reform of work intended not only in terms of the imaginary of work but also of the institutions of work, such as the mutual-aid societies.

The working groups that left the Saint-Simonian Temple were not left astray, however. Fourierism was a powerful shelter that helped them reflect on the materiality of their practices. Invoking a different arrangement of the materiality of work, Fourier presented compelling arguments to abandon their industrial society altogether by building new communities in rural settings. As a former merchant in the Lyon area, the Revolution of 1789 prompted him to reflect on the matter of an economic reform of society, particularly on the way to create autonomous communities or production associations, the aforementioned Phalanges, that could survive, within the capitalist system, as a "veridic commerce". Following the logic of "passional attraction", he established his own organizational plan by which workers would be attracted to work not by

---

[143] Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 176–77.
[144] Descombes, "The Problem Of Collective Identity: The Instituting We And The Instituted We."
[145] Frobert, "French Utopian Socialists as the First Pioneers in Development," 732; Annie Smart, "The 'École Saint-Simonienne''s Outrage to Public Morals," *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 33, no. 3/4 (2005): 258–72. Rancière illustratively named this process of separation as the period in which the "holes of the temple", referring to the Saint-Simonian church in Ménilmontant, appeared. See Jacques Rancière, *Proletarian Nights: The Workers' Dream in Nineteenth-Century France* (London/New York: Verso Books, 2012), 230–54.

necessity but by "emulation, self-love, and other vehicles compatible with that of interest". With enough fame to gather disciples, in the 1830s he finally built a community in Condé-sur-Vesgre, which demonstrated the efficacy of the theory of social organization according to Fourier.[146] This agricultural community linked his social theory "with a concrete and local enterprise of association", that was conducted according to the principle of Harmony. Through this system, unlike that of Saint-Simonian associationism, Fourier believed society, using its vast communication of phalansteries and Phalanges, could build a "harmonious whole" and contest the imperative individualism by which poverty and famine reigned in society.[147]

Fourier's theory was thus a solid support for workers who wished to transfer their dreams of creating a new humanity into a material project, which actively reformed society through a new organization of work. The dreams of association were, in his theory, directly linked to the material and economic organization of work,[148] more appealing to the emancipatory projects of the organization of work ensued from the ranks of different kinds of associations like mutual-aid societies, and the less prevalent compagnonnages and brotherhoods. His revindication of work as the tool for the "gratification of man's deepest needs and the fullest expression of his powers" was particularly relevant for the working populations he contacted was. As his main biographer established, he viewed work not as a desire but as a need. Setting work as an "attraction", his reforms sought the compensation of work by dividends rather than wages; the division of work was based on capacity according to the "suitable tasks" for each sex and age in a system where workers could choose their tasks –with the ability to move between "series" or groups formed by the common attraction to such tasks– with freedom; and with the utmost guarantee of "well-being" ensured by an income that assured "present and future needs".[149] Much like the case of Saint-Simon and his followers, Fourier was also deeply inspired by the context in which he grew.

Personally linked to the experience of the silk industry, Fourier paid special attention to the developments of the *canut* revolts in Lyon in 1833.[150] Before the last series of revolts happened in

[146] Jonathan Beecher, "Le Fouriérisme Des Canuts," in *L'Écho de La Fabrique: Naissance de La Presse Ouvrière à Lyon*, ed. Ludovic Frobert (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2010), 113.
[147] The Phalanstery was the central building of the whole rural setting, the Phalange. Beecher, *Charles Fourier*, 243; Olivier Chaïbi, "Le Réalisme d'un Imaginaire Social Passionné. *La Réforme Industrielle Ou Le Phalanstère*," in *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, ed. Thomas Bouchet (Paris: La Découverte, 2015), 97–102.
[148] See in particular his work Charles Fourier, *Le Nouveau Monde Industriel et Sociétaire, Ou Invention Du Procédé d'industrie Attrayante et Naturelle Distribuée En Séries Passionnées* (Paris: Bossange Père/P. Mongie Ainé, 1829). On the topic, see the illustrative study of Frobert and Jarrige: "The Economy of Work," in *A Cultural History of Work in the Age of Empire*, ed. Victoria E. Thompson (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020), 15–30.
[149] Beecher, *Charles Fourier*, 274–78.
[150] The origin of the word *canut* is debated upon. But it would seem that it is morphologically derived from the Latin *canūtus*, which refers to the bright white of the silk (*canus* is white), and semantically referred to

1834, he foreshadowed how the coalitions of workers, constituted into *syndicats* "would very soon add political claims to their industrial demands". It was not until after these movements and the demise of the Saint-Simonian church that his ideas started being appropriated by the French working groups.[151] Indeed, Fourierism's first significant steps in Paris were made with Fourier's effort to ally with Lechevalier and other Saint-Simonians who made the former's ideas "accessible", "intellectually respectable" and worthy of the attention of new readers who were disappointed with the Saint-Simonian schism.[152] For the canuts, and mutual-aid societies in general, it was Fourierism more than Saint-Simonianism which led "workers of all trades", whose "associations did not have another goal than to aid themselves in case of need", to establish their organizations on "work and economy" for them to be "certain and durable". As the canut newspaper, *L'Écho de la fabrique*, further affirmed:

> Associations lead to equality, to democracy [...] that is their main fault in the eyes of the rulers; in ours, it is their main merit, and they really do, the association of the Mutualists proves it. The workshop manager is no longer isolated; strengthened by the support of his brothers, he makes his character as a man respected; without worrying about a future that he knows is no longer at the mercy of the trader, he deals with him as an equal, as a power to power; he knows that he can be denied materials to work with, but he also knows that he can deny his workforce; and, in both cases, he has the support of his associates, who would not suffer misery to show its threatening face, even from a distance. [...] More intimate relations, more friendly relations are established between them, and the alliance of the worker and the factory owner [*fabricant*] finally succeeds the hideous despotism with which one crushed the other.[153]

The Fourierist materiality regarding the betterment of working conditions was adopted by these working groups and combined with what we named the idiom of association, the imaginary of work, they had been developing. The radicality of the canuts springs from their capacity to take the principle of association to its ultimate consequences by seeking a Fourierist equality –over a Saint-Simonian capacity– which could avoid problems in the workshop even among the master and the craftsman. By establishing the imaginary of work in the institutions of work such as mutual aid societies, they were able to imagine that the terms of work relations were affirmed in the reciprocity, and eventually, the equality, the worker and the *fabricant* shared of labor conditions. In other words, as the butchers, the shoemakers, or the silk workers in Lyon may prove, the mutual organization of work instituted the mutualist imaginary of work.

---

the *canette* or bobbin used by weavers. A combination of both origins could explain the suffix -*ut*. Information retrieved from www.cntrl.fr.

[151] Fourier, "Dangers du rôle passif des Gouvernements contre le Faux Progrès", *La Réforme Industrielle*, 16 novembre 1833, pp. 391, in Beecher, "Le Fouriérisme Des Canuts," 115. See chapter six for a discussion on coalitions and syndicates.

[152] See Beecher, *Charles Fourier*, 421–29.

[153] Extract of *L'Écho de la fabrique*, quoted in Simon Hupfel and George Sheridan, "À La Recherche d'une Démocratie d'ateliers. *L'Écho de La Fabrique* Des Canuts," in *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, ed. Thomas Bouchet (Paris: La Découverte, 2015), 121.

In dialogue with the precepts exposed by *L'Écho de la fabrique*, another newspaper in Paris explicitly affirmed that mutual-aid societies, the mutualist organization of work (*travail*) and industry, was the *ouvrier*'s process of "apprenticeship of the political", for they were now aware that they "took part in the administration of society".[154] Worker journals and pamphlets are an important testimony that mutual assistance in case of need, mutual aid to the worker society's old or sick, was a practice that tradesmen enacted in their workplace through their self-organization. Self-organization, however, was not only labor-related but also impacted the organization of work as the production-reproduction activities these societies put into action. The reformation of society was induced by changing the dependencies conducted through labor into a working organization that was a radical alternative to "hideous despotism".

This process, as it has repeatedly emerged in the dissertation, was conceived by these groups as part of a path of political apprenticeship, materialized in their capacity to shift hierarchies to reorganize the economic and social functioning of the collective manufacturers. Perhaps the political dimension of association is difficult to comprehend because it does not follow our commonplace definitions of politics and the representative institutions we are accustomed to study. In effect, association through working organization, as presented by the sources we analyzed, was all but a uniform mechanism. This does not mean that it did not have institutions through which it was practiced. The complexity of its intellectual and material origins, mixed between the Saint-Simonians and Fourierists, the mutual-aid societies, the goguettes, guinguettes, the Parisian typographers, and silk factories near Lyon, speak of the drastic political and social alternatives with and through which it was conceived. It may be relevant to remark that these groups' organization was posed in terms of a "political apprenticeship" when mutualism was appraised by the collectivity of the working groups. The "ascent", as seen by historians, was marked by the organization of work. Once we have seen some of its key institutions, we can analyze how the working groups instituted the French working nation. As shall be seen below, the process was marked by the groups' conception of a wider community of work: a national community.

5.4. The institution of the French working nation: socialism

The organization of work thus went beyond the simple fact of the creation of workshops and commercial networks. Albert de Laponneraye, a republican who was imprisoned shortly after he participated in the July Revolution, goes to the very core of the matter. From his imprisonment in Sainte-Pélagie, he requested the annulment of article 291 of the Penal code which prohibited

[154] *L'Atelier*, June 1845, p. 142 in Rougerie, "Le mouvement associatif populaire comme facteur d'acculturation politique à Paris de la révolution aux années 1840," 507–8.

congregations of over 20 people, significantly called "associations" by the authorities. He denounced that this prohibition deprived man of the "most precious advantage of social life". As historians have increasingly noticed, republicans like Laponneraye sided with the workers because they distinguished the potency of their societies for the cities they lived in.[155] Association, he argued, be it in the form of "commerce", of an "enchainment of relations", an "exchange of aid" (*secours*), or a "communication of ideas"; in sum, "association as a strength of means [*forces de moyens*] established among the individuals of the human species" would see an "opulent city" rise.[156]

Indeed, as the 1830s advanced, the working group's association and organization impacted other circles of French society. Worker's association had left its Saint-Simonian nest and "penetrated" into the national life of a society that did not only witness the potency of their association in the workshop but praised it as a more general political principle for their republics, conceived as the spaces, the cities, where politics were instituted. The working groups and republicans convened that they did not want the "fetid swamps, or thick and dark forests"[157] of the monarchical regime but a city where association could guarantee the free life of their "worker-citizens" as Rosanvallon defined them. Behind the disagreement as to what republic to build, however, there were more than just workers or citizens.

Historians have identified the radical difference between the city of the working groups and the city built by the ascending bourgeoisie. Maurizio Gribaudi has illustratively described the process of urban verticalization along the *rive gauche* of the Parisian Seine river, where boulevards and their commercial hubs replaced the formerly hidden passages that had little if any natural light. These passages predominated the urban landscape of the *rive droite*, bordered by the city center to the west, the rue de Saint-Antoine to the faubourg Saint-Antoine to the east and south, and Ménilmontant and Belleville to the north. Such were the places where the "collective manufacture" emerged. The "horizontal architecture" of the closed passages communicated working spaces with the working population's houses, at times also attaching the guinguette and

---

[155] Ronald Aminzade, *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, 2010; Jacques Rougerie, "Entre Le Réel et l'utopie: République Démocratique et Sociale, Association, Commune, Commune," in *Essais d'histoire Critique. Textes Réunis Autour Des Travaux de Michèle Riot-Sarcey* (Saint-Denis: Press universitaires de Vincennes, 2014), 273–92.

[156] Albert De Laponneraye, "Pétition à La Chambre Des Députés Pour Demander La Radiation de l'article 291 Du Code Pénal Ainsi Conçu: « nulle Association de plus de Vingt Personnes. Ne Pourra Se Former Qu'avec l'agrément Du Gouvernement et Sous Les Conditions Qu'il Plaira à l'autorité Publique d'imposer á La Société [1831]," in *Les Révolutions Du XIXe Siècle*, ed. Pierre Marie Sébastien Bigot de Morogues, vol. 4: Naissance du mouvement ouvrier : 1830-1834 (Paris: EDHIS, 1974), 2–3. My italics.

[157] De Laponneraye, 3.

the cabaret, creating an accessible network of livelihood for these groups.[158] Architectural horizontality, that is, mirrored a working community's living, organizational, structure that was in contrast to the verticalization instructed by a bourgeois civility of individuals.

The closed passages where the working individual encountered his peer and his superior also enabled the exchange of different kinds of industrial knowledges, later transformed and adopted by chemists and biologists. The industries that developed there benefited from the exchange of new knowledges on how to use and recycle "every immediate resource" and create a "materially autonomous" production for Parisian industry. For instance, pharmacists, as middlemen between the great schools of chemistry in the southern wards near the Seine and the working quartiers of Paris on the northeastern shores of the river, were essential in the constitution of this scientific-industrial atmosphere. Their competence in biology and chemistry helped them teach gilders and hatters the management of chemicals for their work, but also of the use of saltpeter (potassium nitrate, heavily present in the Parisian sewage system) for their profit in productive processes. In other words, before the full industrialization of chemistry, artisans, and tradesmen were the first to learn how to integrate these chemicals into their productive activities.[159]

Such horizontal spaces of production became, as Gribaudi names them, "open-air factories" where each block specialized in the production of certain merchandises, around which different trades and professions worked and formed production cycles. Concentrating *grosso modo* in today's third, eleventh, nineteenth, and twentieth Parisian wards, the industrial network that was formed in these years was organized according to the material and economic needs of the groups that inhabited these spaces. Be it in need of recycling resources or of forming networks of commercial cooperation, the reseaux of workshops and factories instituted practices and knowledges that effectively organized their world according to principles that emerged from these same spaces and actors. It was thus the autonomy of their concept of work in contrast to labor, the latter conditioning the former to the logics enacted and upheld by the individualist market,[160]

[158] Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière*, 164–80.

[159] Some examples André Guillerme gives are "les matières organiques délaissées pour fabriquer de l'ammoniac, des matières fécales pour en tirer la poudrette vendue aux maraîchers de banlieue afin d'augmenter les rendements agricoles, les gros os déposés en périphérie pour tirer la gélatine et les floculants phosphatés, les petits pour faire des chapelets, les ongles pour faire de la colle, le verre cassé pour faire des bouteilles". André Guillerme, "La Chimie Parisienne Entre Artisanat et Industrie (1760–1830)," *Comptes Rendus Chimie*, Histoire de la Chimie / The History of Chemistry, 15, no. 7 (2012): 570. Maurizio Gribaudi uses Guillerme's discoveries to propose an interpretation in which Paris did not only have "collective manufactures" –following Cottereau–, but also an "organic industrialization". See the previous note.

[160] This does not mean that the collective manufacture was absolutely independent from its surrounding world. It sought to integrate the production processes, altered by the formation of an internal capitalist market, and adapted them to the practices and principles that regulated the manufactures: mutualism instead of labor protection, cooperation instead market competition. In this sense, William Sewell's latest book is probably the most suggestive study to date of how capitalism was effectively "made French" through the appropriation of the essential task of production of surplus value to the local productive dynamics that

which could effectively emancipate these working groups from an individualist atomization. As was mentioned, the horizontality enacted in the mutual-aid societies in Lyon and the collective manufacture built along the faubourg Saint-Antoine in Paris were among the most relevant means through which their work and industries were effectively –internally and mutually– organized. If, as *L'Atelier* stated, these networks formed the working groups' politics, it was because they organized and administered the nation according to their own principles, governed by mutual cooperation and assistance of the workers. Once again, Jules's brother Pierre, famous for having coined the word "socialism",[161] offers a worthy synthesis of how the political dimension of association-organization of work "elevated" the working groups to the status of a working nation –directing us toward the conclusions of this chapter.

With the advantage of a retrospective outlook, Pierre Leroux[162] realized how after "July, the critique of society as it understood itself and as it would have liked to maintain and constitute it, was amply realized; and from this criticism sprang a multiplicity of truths that from now are above any dispute".[163] The critical stance against individualism, he affirmed, was a correlate to the experience of emancipation the years after the revolution had unfolded. He subscribed to the Saint-Simonian philosophy of history, by which humanity revealed itself through the phases of the exploitation of man by man. Like his former companions he thought progress was marked by the continuous "emancipation of the most numerous and poorest class". In this sense, 1830 was a net

---

shaped both the production process and capitalism according to the formation of commercial networks. William H. Sewell, *Capitalism and the Emergence of Civic Equality in Eighteenth-Century France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021). More general reflections on capitalism that inform nuanced studies on the matter are included in: Alessandro Stanziani, *Rules of Exchange: French Capitalism in Comparative Perspective, Eighteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Jürgen Kocka and Marcel van der Linden, *Capitalism: The Reemergence of a Historical Concept* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016).

[161] I do not wish to go into the discussion of the emergence of the word socialism precisely because of the consciousness that the topic merits a study of its own. The following analysis should, however, give an idea of where I place the importance of the emergence of socialism: not in the coinage of the word, as much as the triple institution of the worker movement, its social science, and the appearance of its political dimension. This turn is greatly inspired in: Francesco Callegaro and Andrea Lanza, eds., *Le sens du socialisme: histoire et actualité d'un problème sociologique*, vol. 11, Incidence. Philosophie, littérature, sciences humaines et sociales (Paris: Le Félin, 2015). Some hypotheses were advanced in: Matias X. Gonzalez, "Desde El *Sozialismus* Hacia El *Socialisme*, Ida y Vuelta. Por Una Historia Conceptual Inter-Conectada Del Socialismo." *Conceptos Históricos* 6, no. 10 (2021): 122–53.

[162] I will not analyze his thought in detail given the extensiveness of his works, as well as the historiography that has been written about his thought. See, among many others: Ludovic Frobert, "Politique et économie politique chez Pierre et Jules Leroux," *Revue d'histoire du XIXe siècle. Société d'histoire de la révolution de 1848 et des révolutions du XIXe siècle*, no. 40 (July 15, 2010): 77–94, https://doi.org/10.4000/rh19.3992; Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, 2010; Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)*, 2016, 127–38; Lucie Rey, "« Le Sphinx de La Révolution »: Pierre Leroux et La Promesse Révolutionnaire," *Archives de Philosophie* 80, no. 1 (2017): 55–74.

[163] Unless otherwise noted, all citations are taken from: Pierre Leroux, *Cartas a los filósofos, los artistas y los políticos*, trans. Antonia Andrea García Castro (Barcelona: Gedisa, 2016), 170–208.

progress regarding 1789, where emancipation had only been enacted as the result of the "institutions of pure liberty" from the "decrepit nobility". If with 1789 the "theological" system had been overcome, 1830 was a valuable lesson that pointed to the necessity of overcoming individualism. Skillfully synthesizing the Saint-Simonian sociological gesture, he adds a significant final shift. For Leroux, overcoming individualism could only be possible once the "elevation" of the third estate was no longer part of the revolutionary agenda. He thus posited a new revolutionary, republican, agenda for the working groups. In a word, he synthesized the political becoming of the working groups as a working nation.

This agenda is clearly visible in his own synthesis of the sociological principle: neither liberal nor conservative, neither monarchical nor exclusively republican, Leroux offers a third alternative to the constitution of the French nation. In effect, the "*quasi* Restauration" of Louis Philippe's reign was characterized by its regime's backsteps. There was no guarantee of liberal illustration or conservative morality, further abandoning the "social forces" to their private interests and the "egoism of individuals". For Leroux, as much as for the working groups, the problem seemed to be that the revolutionary heritage could not, or at least should not, be taken to its ultimate consequences, for it would only deepen the state of egoism and individualism that would consequently lead society to its absolute dissolution. Association, therefore, would have to alter the scant state of egoism installed since 1789 from within. For only association could "elevate, transform [...] the whole nation". Indeed, the institution of the working nation could only happen once its political and sociological principle was established as the social mechanism that governed the groups of the nation's lives. If we were to borrow the vocabulary of the Mexican working nation, the French working groups could only constitute their working nation once they established a "fraternal chain" of association with the rest of the groups of their nation.

The singularity of Pierre Leroux was perhaps the radicality with which he communicated the principles ushered by his brother and other working collectivities. As such, he concluded that association was a political matter, for only association could have solved the problem with which the July Monarchy was constantly faced: "the problem of government". If the "social forces" were correctly administered and directed, politics would "conduct to association" and, as a consequence, to the "benefit of the majority". Politics, however, could not stand as the only means for the constitution of society: the arts would have effectively "incited" the souls towards association, whereas science would "constitute" the associated souls "on the grounds of a general certainty". Association, the arts, and science would together provide the "eternal cement from which society is made and without which it would not exist". Pierre Leroux's radicality thus crystallized the synthesis of the three aspects that formed, and "elevated", the working groups to the state of a working nation: the politics of working association, the imaginary of work, and the

sociological principle. Further, he explicitly projected the activity of society's reformation as a structuration of government according to the principle of association.

As one of the institutions that link the working groups with the political project of the nation, the workers' social science retraces the operation inaugurated by Sieyès and thus generates a new "general philosophical principle" that cuts across the juridical project and restores its proposal for a political community on a whole set of new bases.[164] No longer dependent on the individual subject, on the representative mechanism of the state that ensured its legitimacy, or on the "free" relations between individuals, it should be no wonder that the monarchical regime of Louis Philippe conceived of these "particular" societies as going against their capacitary order.[165] Progressively working for the institution of their associations as the regulatory mechanism of the nation, the French working nation was in the process of formulating a radically alternative project of the nation that did not depend on the former's concept of the "political".[166] Work encompassed the sociological idiom of association, the organization of the activities that were the condition of possibility to reform labor dependencies, as well as the political organization of working groups into a wider national community. As a social institution that embedded the material and "spiritual" life of their society, the imaginary of work carried by the French working groups formulated an alternative project of the working nation since the 1830s. The sociological principle which lay at the core of such an organization of the nation could be precisely the "general philosophical principle" Rosanvallon failed to see, perhaps because it was irreducible to a purely "philosophical" principle, abstract by nature. As was seen, despite the intrinsic complexities and inner contradictions, the imaginary of work was constituted through the representation of practices,

---

[164] See: Brahami, *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848)*, 2016, 136. We follow Brahami in differing profoundly with Jacques Guilhaumou who defends the thesis that Sieyès did not so much prefigure as much as invent the "notion" of sociology and socialism itself. See: Branca-Rosoff and Guilhaumou, "De 'Société' à 'Socialisme'"; Guilhaumou, "El Lenguaje Político y La Revolución Francesa."

[165] Smart, "The 'École Saint-Simonienne''s Outrage to Public Morals."

[166] To the extent of our knowledge, it has been principally Andrea Lanza who has taken Rosanvallon's frame of the political and challenged it through the formation of the "socialist-fraternitarian discourse". He unbalances the ambivalent position of a bilaterally structured form of politics in Rosanvallon to propose a more "governmental" reading of the socialist sources, which radically, socially, reforms the structure and dynamics of modern politics. Lanza's work is greatly inspired in Claude Lefort's and Giuseppe Duso's conception of government as irreducible to modern sovereignty, national representativity, and to the concept of power with which both were theorized. See: Claude Lefort, "Permanence Du Théologico-Politique?," *The Temps de La Réflexion* 2, no. 13 (1981): 13; Claude Lefort, "La Question de La Démocratie," in *Le Retrait Du Politique: Travaux Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique*, ed. Jacob Rogozinski and Jean-Luc Nancy, Cahiers Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique (Paris: Galilée, 1983), 71–88; Pierre Rosanvallon, *Pour Une Histoire Conceptuelle Du Politique: Leçon Inaugurale Au Collège de France Faite Le Jeudi 28 Mars 2002* (Paris: Seuil, 2003); Giuseppe Duso, "El Poder y El Nacimiento de Los Conceptos Políticos Modernos," in *Historia de Los Conceptos y Filosofía Política* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2009), 197–242; Andrea Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, Studi e Ricerche Storiche (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010).

institutions, and knowledges constituted by the working nation. If its principle was general, it was because it was formulated and appropriated by the groups that composed such a collectivity.

6. Conclusions

The Leroux brothers helped us present two important intellectual gambits that led to the institution of the working nation from the institutions –for the sake of redundancy– of the working groups. The connection between the imaginary of work (Jules) and the concept of nation, in an altered sense with respect to Sieyès's nation (Pierre), was finally brought to light, without annulling the complex reality of the French collective manufactures. As has been seen, the imaginary of work –which repurposed labor as work, understood as the practices and customs that kept the collectivity of the working groups together–, and the working nation synthesize the different levels upon which the daily life of the people that populated Paris, Lyon, or Marseille enacted and pursued the reconstruction of a political community out of the individualist society they found themselves living in by 1830. Integrating their workshop-livelihoods into the new monarchical scenario meant re-imagining the social principles upon which their lives were (dis)organized, an appeal that attracted the attention of the *fils de bourgeois* from Saint-Simon and his followers in the 1820s, to Fourier and his followers from the mid-1830s.

During this process of political reflexivity as much as of scientific exigency that descended from the high polytechnic academies to the faubourgs, science was reinvented with the proposal of a social science that historically preceded the capacitary order of the doctrinaires, and politically exceeded the juridical ordering of French society ensued since the 1789 revolution. The heterogeneity of the groups involved in this process, synthesized by some historians as "peuple", "working classes", worker-citizen,[167] is best expressed in the working nation. Since chapter two the concept of working nation has allowed this dissertation to acknowledge the singularity of the working groups' institutions and the politics their imaginary of work carried. In this chapter, we saw that the French working nation had both commonalities as well as singularities regarding the Mexican working nation. Not only did the French working groups live in a context where a collective manufacture was possible –due to the urban and particularly industrialized networks–, but the collective network of the working groups was also connected with striking capacity. The association they carried out through their working practices and customs, the arts they crafted in the workshop, and the application of their knowledges of chemistry and pharmaceutics managed to improve both the production process and the quality of their merchandise. Singular,

[167] For another perspective which is informed from a social historian's perspective on the problem of the connection between the citizen and the worker, see: Madeleine Rebérioux, "Citoyens et travailleurs," in *Pour que vive l'histoire*, Littérature et politique (Paris: Belin, 2017), 337–48.

corporative, trades were thus transformed into a collective manufacture where these productive activities, industrial and artisanal, stood as their trading, interchanging, point, from the tailoring of the hat to the merchant's capacity to sell it in the *grands boulevards*.

This network experience that instituted the working nation could not be understood without the critical stance these groups adopted *vis-à-vis* the individualist system that was built around them. A radical disagreement with the individualist system was met with the Saint-Simonian "organic series" (order, religion, association, devotion), which sought to reorganize society according to the principles withdrawn from a "positive" knowledge of humankind. An organic system that was contrary to the "critical series" (disorder, atheism, individualism, egoism) established by the "disordered liberalism".[168] Commonly misconceived, the word socialism actually appeared as Pierre Leroux's criticism against the individualist system, but also as the moment where he detached himself from the doctrine and adopted the working groups' perspective that behind the Saint-Simonian concept of organization, there was a veiled burial of "all freedom, all spontaneity". As historians have suggested, behind the negative connotation with which the term was coined, socialism prevailed as a concept capable of integrating "various parameters" which illustrate "an inversion of the values carried by the terms".[169] As mentioned, then, the Leroux brothers synthesized the imaginary and the institution that gave the French working nation its uniqueness, perceived mainly in the sociological principle formulated since the 1830s, and politically "elevated" through the sociohistorical concept of socialism. They synthesized what we could call a "socialist-sociological principle".

Socialism thus offers a conceptual synthesis for the historian to understand a complex social system where the working groups were the decisive factor that overturned the nation from a political "mechanism"[170] into a form of society that could integrate the "majority of the population". In a sense, it is a historical concept that informs the historian about the context, but it is also a concept that drastically changes the historian's perception of this context. The social, political, and economic possibilities the concept conveys outline new research lines that enable the historian to understand its context more widely.[171] It is more than a "notion" because it can help

---

[168] Bazard et al., *Doctrine de Saint-Simon : Exposition. Première Année 1828-1829*, 393.

[169] Piguet, "Individualisme: Origine et Réception Initiale Du Mot," 56. I have discussed this in more detail, from a conceptual history perspective, in: Matias X. Gonzalez, "Desde El *Sozialismus* Hacia El *Socialisme*, Ida y Vuelta. Por Una Historia Conceptual Inter-Conectada Del Socialismo".

[170] Duso, "Revolución y constitución del poder."

[171] Although this is in seeming dialogue with Koselleck's concept of *Historik*, recent social and labor historians have underlined the necessity of "radically contextualizing" social dynamics because of the implications local and global understandings of such dynamics have on our way of conceiving our historical studies. See: Reinhart Koselleck, *Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018); Christian G De Vito, "History Without Scale: The Micro-Spatial Perspective*," *Past & Present* 242, no. Supplement_14 (November 1, 2019): 348–72, https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz048; De Vito, Schiel, and van Rossum, "From Bondage to Precariousness?"

capture the encompassing nature of the imaginary of work and the working nation, a relation that drove these groups towards the construction of a new political dimension that ultimately sought to reform society as a whole –hence its synthesis in "social" *ism*.[172]

In the French case, we saw that this political dimension emerged not only from the working groups' cooperation with the Saint-Simonians and Fourierists, as well as the institutions of work such as the mutual-aid societies and the goguettes but also from the political contact with certain republican groups. Following Leroux's phrasing, we could affirm that from the mid-1830s onwards, socialism would be brought to the Republic as the Republic to socialism.[173] Instead of a philosophical extraction of government according to a capacitary order, then, these first associative and organizational attempts were conducted as the primary expressions of a truly socialist-sociological principle that tied and "elevated" the working nation to the government and administration of their society.

As was mentioned, the inheritance of the corporative trade organizations into the organization of the mutual-aid societies did not completely disappear from the picture of the working groups' industrial association. Yet their political integration of the nation also points to an appropriation of the republican inheritance of the revolution, while strictly denying its internal individualist organization. The sociological "awareness of the social whole", politically embedded in the associationist, socialist, preoccupation for the "majority" of the nation, were the features that distinguished the working nation from the liberal and conservative nation, for it was neither fully individualist, traditional, or "holistic". It had what certain sociologists and anthropologists call a "hybrid" essence.[174] As individualism was not capable of setting the conditions for the construction of society, let alone its government and administration, its overcoming through

[172] This directly contradicts Koselleck's thesis that socialism, as a "concept of movement", ending in -ism, was void of experience and of the character it was originally built from (in this case, *social* experience itself). Socialism was a different kind of historical concept precisely in that it did both analyzed "a finitely limited possibility of presumed organizational opportunities" and helped "create new organizational situations". Other political concepts of movement (liberalism, republicanism), on the contrary, were tensioned by the expectancy that dissolved their reflection on previous "organizational opportunities". As mentioned, this reflection would merit a study of its own. *Cfr.* Reinhart Koselleck, "'Erfahrungsraum' Und 'Erwartungshorizont': Zwei Historische Kategorien," in *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik Geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979), 373; Reinhart Koselleck, "Introduction and Prefaces to the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: (Basic Concepts in History: A Historical Dictionary of Political and Social Language in Germany)," trans. Michaela Richter, *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6, no. 1 (June 1, 2011): 1–37, https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2011.060102.

[173] See Frobert, "French Utopian Socialists as the First Pioneers in Development," 738.

[174] Louis Dumont conceives of holism as a system of ideas by which order is given to society once each of its elements is in conformity with the role of the whole. Socialism's "hybrid" dimension was rooted in the fact that its organization was not based exclusively on the social whole but also appraised the individuals that composed it. Louis Dumont, *Homo Aequalis: Génesis y Apogeo de La Ideología Económica* (Madrid: Taurus Ediciones, S.A.-Grupo Santillana, 1982); Louis Dumont, *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 102–3.

association had to be set by the working nation as the synthesis through which the individual could have a place in their global society.

The working nation's hybrid essence may eventually shatter the historiographic common senses about the nation and the lives and knowledges developed by the working groups. As suggested above in the transition from Spain to France, the hybridity of the working nation could only appear once the core aspect of the sociological principle emerged. This was an aspect that did not emerge in the first part of the dissertation. Through the experiences of Guénot and Prieto, the dissertation unveiled an aspect that the Spanish and French working nations formulated but did not appear in Mexico. The socialist-sociological principle, which was taken up by Prieto through his readings of Fourier, was at the core of an international network of exchange, between Spain and France. The contemplation the French *fils de bourgeois* articulated in their communication with the working groups instituted knowledges that were mutually appropriated, leading to the imaginary of work. This form of practicing a scientific observation of society might be considered the missing link in the "fraternal chain" of work.

Despite this singularity, there were points in common with the Mexican working nation that have already emerged in this chapter. Probably the most fundamental common socket upon which the groups on both sides of the Atlantic built their institutions was the process of articulating an organization of their nations according to their principle of working, industrial, association. Without this common socket, communication between the working nations would be unconceivable, curbing any chance of understanding on what basis Sotero Prieto denounced Escandón and Alamán's "military" organization of the nation following the project of industrialization, instead of organizing the groups of the Mexican nation according to the imaginary of work. Prieto's denouncement could not have been understood without the "hybrid" appropriations effected by the Spanish groups in Andalusia, who sought to "imitate" their French peers, but actually exceeded such imitation in their own formulations of political and social reform. Socialism's hybrid aspect, in other words, traveled with the working groups, in the international travels that moved the sociological principle between France and Spain, and to the other shore of the Atlantic with Prieto and Guénot. As shall be seen in the next chapter, their travels did not only tie the history of three Atlantic nations, but also altered the organization of such nations by appropriating and instituting the imaginary of such nation's working groups. As much as Abreu and Fourier, Prieto found himself amid an international reseaux of working nations.

Looking closely at some ideas that emerged after Prieto's return to Mexico will further put into perspective the differences between each working nation's experience, as well as the connections that emerged through specific exchanges. From when the centralist regime started

entering into a funnel of crises that eventually led to its decay in 1846, there were new languages being knit that speak of a combination of circumstances at the time Prieto came back to Mexico. Upon his return he almost assuredly engaged in an open conversation with the Fourierist circles in France, especially those under the leadership of Considerant, and reproduced some of the exchanges in the local press. He quite literally came back with a luggage full of Fourierist content which spread in Guadalajara and other Mexican cities. As stated above, the intellectual impact of these materials cannot be ignored in a history that wishes to understand how the working groups imagined and instituted their national community. The following chapter will thus analyze the international dimension that emerges from these interactions between the working nations, which transform key aspects of political life, both in France and in Mexico. For reasons that shall become clear as the journey back to Mexico advances, the center of attention will be the Republic because of its pivotal role in the second half of the 1840s in Mexico and France.

Chapter IV

Atlantic socialism, there and back. The nation and the republic, beyond the "political divide"

1. Introduction

As stated in chapter three, there is little information on the return of Sotero Prieto to Mexico. He probably returned with his parents in the first months of 1838, for there is evidence that while in Spain, he sent a letter to Victor Considerant requesting he send some of Fourier's books to Mexico, through the mediation of their "mutual friend" Joaquín Abreu, as soon as he had the chance. By the end of the year, he was already in Guadalajara, where he partnered with his cousin Manuel Olasgarre and his business partner Manuel Escandón, who assured him a "destiny in the tobacco industry".[1] He also partnered with Mariano Chiafino in the city of Sayula on the Pacific coast and maintained his shares in La Escoba, the spinning and weaving mill in the vicinity of Guadalajara, throughout the 1840s.[2] The return of Prieto was therefore marked by his search for economic stabilization as an industrialist. Although the letter he sent to Considerant hints at the fact that he did not lose contact with his Fourierist past, the evidence that I was able to retrieve which openly refers to his relationship with Fourier's and Considerant's ideas suggests that only until the mid-1840s, precisely in a document dated August 19th, 1845, Prieto once again mentions the names of his French peers.

The relevance of the date of this document is astounding due to two reasons that can be considered the *fil rouge* of this chapter. One is the connection that reappears with his European experience almost 8 years after his return from Spain. The fact that he wrote this document in 1845 helps us, as historians, to explain some possible reasons why Prieto takes up the Fourierist

[1] Sotero Prieto, Letter from August 28th, 1837, and July 2nd, 1840. Archives Nationales (AN) 10AS 41 (15)//681 MI/73; Federico De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant," *Cahiers Charles Fourier*, no. 19 (2008): 72, http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article568.

[2] AN 10AS 41 (15) //681 MI/73. See also María del Socorro Guzmán Muñoz, "Sotero Prieto Olasagarre. Un Visionario Decimonónico," *Relaciones. Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* XXlX, no. 116 (2008): 122.

argument. In an atmosphere of growing tension with the U.S. presidency of James Polk, political tempers in Mexico had begun to flare. José Joaquín Herrera, a moderate federalist who replaced Santa Anna as president, suffered the consequences of being in the middle of the struggle between federalists and centralists. As 1845 drew to a close, and the United States administration had sent troops to Texas, tensions continued to grow. Once and again, historians have explained that the pending conflict with the U. S. was a *leitmotif* for political radicalization taken up by federal republicanists, while centralists started adhering to the idea of monarchism. On the other hand, Sotero Prieto's figure unveils a particular radicalization that emerged from political groups across the country which, though attached to republicanists, did not necessarily respond to the federalist arguments, as presented, for instance, by Valentín Gómez Farías or Mariano Otero. His return to Guadalajara will be an important lead towards the Mexican political world, which through his eyes and that of politicians like Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo will appear differently than it has until now. In this sense, Prieto's letter will be the first testimony of powerful transformations that were happening between Atlantic as well as local republicanisms: the emergence of an international "socialist republicanism". It will be the first symptom of a truly unique politics that had few precedents in Mexican history, of which the most important was precisely the politics articulated by the Mexican with the French and Spanish working nations, which together configured an "Atlantic socialism". By unchaining the consequences his contacts had in Mexico, the chapter will follow the national and international transformations of republican politics, closely linked with the political and social involvement of the groups surrounding Prieto.

2. The hybrid dimension of the international working nation: in the search for the "social organization" of the nation

In a letter sent to his French Fourierist peers, Prieto desperately requested that they send some copies of the *Démocratie pacifique*, the Fourierist newspaper directed by Considerant at the time and the main periodical with which the Fourierist groups started to "mobilize politically".[3] The letter was directed specifically to Julien Blanc, a former Saint-Simonian and, from 1838, member of *La Phalange*, the previous Fourierist newspaper with which its directors sought to spread their master's ideas. When the *Démocratie pacifique* came into existence, he "rubbed shoulders" with its directors –Victor Considerant, Clarisse Vigoureux (Fourier's closest correspondent during the

[3] Bernard Desmars, "À La Conquête de l'espace Public. Les Fouriéristes et *La Démocratie Pacifique*," in *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, ed. Thomas Bouchet et al. (Paris: La Découverte, 2015), 191.

1820s), and Just Muiron–, and was often commissioned as the newspaper's correspondent to cover important events like strikes or worker demonstrations.[4]

Sotero Prieto was appealing to the highest ranks of Fourierism as he felt "completely alone" for the propagation of the "phalansterian idea" in Mexico. The revolution that had begun with the fall of the centralist administration further diminished his position as a phalansterian. The "new revolution" had limited the doctrine's propagation to no other means than that of oral exchange. Yet he also denounced the "political zeal" with which the Mexican government handled internal affairs, dividing the nation into three parties: the clergy, the army, and the "federals". Even if the latter promised to attack the former two and thereby acquired the support of the "masses", they had not managed to prevent the country from falling into a "vicious circle" of revolutions.[5]

During the last months of 1845, military events would prove Prieto right: Mexico was swept away by another revolutionary cycle. In December, as tensions with the United States continued to grow, President Herrera commissioned Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga as an army general to help block an advance by Zachary Taylor's armed forces, which had arrived shortly before in the neighboring state of Texas. Paredes, however, instead of leading his forces from San Luis Potosí to Monterrey to repel Taylor, decided to use them to mount an offensive against the federalist government and impose himself as president of the Republic with the help of his monarchist supporters. His calculations went sideways pretty fast: in the spring of 1846, Taylor's army advanced to the Río Bravo attacking a virtually undefendable territory with a weak army presence, a force curtailed by more than six thousand of its effective soldiers due to Paredes's actions.[6]

In another letter issued to his Fourierist "friends", where he renewed the request for copies of the *Démocratie pacifique*, Sotero Prieto reacted to the crisis triggered by a renewed change in the government. By attacking the "freedom of the people", Paredes was unchaining a new cycle of revolutions, although the newspapers closest to his administration (*El Tiempo*, *Reforma*, *La Época*), condemned the idea of "social change". Prieto argued that he did not adhere to the revolution unchained by Paredes because such a movement did not promote social change but a "dreadful illness".[7] According to Prieto, however, not all revolutions should be condemned. If organized correctly, it could be taken as an opportunity to "settle palpably and unequivocally the peaceful and conservative character of my ideas". As was seen in the previous chapter, his idea,

[4] Thomas Bouchet and Bernard Desmars, "Blanc, Julien, Dit 'Le Petit Blanc', Ou 'Le Blanc Des Blancs,'" in *Dictionnaire Biographique Du Fouriérisme*, December 2021, http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article470.
[5] Sotero Prieto, Letter to Fourierists, August 19th, 1845, AN 10 AS 41//681 MI/73.
[6] Peter Guardino, *The Dead March: A History of the Mexican-American War* (Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press, 2017), 49, 76–81.
[7] Sotero Prieto, Letter to Fourierists, February 17th, 1846, AN 10 AS 41//681 MI/73.

which communed under the sociological principle which articulated French socialism, was to "organize" the "peoples" (*peuples*) and guide them away from "concurrence".[8]

Despite his feeling of loneliness and isolation, Prieto was appropriating the core of the French socialist-sociological principle. He sought to organize the nation's groups, and its peoples, and drive them away from the ill concurrence they were sunk in. We should highlight the fact that Prieto was not simply "applying" Fourierist theory to Mexican reality, but that he used it, appropriating it, to propose a social state that would overcome the revolution in which Mexican society, dismembered and disorganized, was submerged. In a sense, he was appropriating the central sociological gesture of the French working nation. He observed his society and criticized the lack of organization continued by the state of revolution in which the nation found itself, but did not deny the progressive utility it may have had for the enactment of a –alternative– social organization. We should recall that his proposition to overcome the state of revolution which prevented the organization of the nation's peoples was built upon prior imaginaries affirmed in social conservation through these groups' peaceful relationship. His sociological sensibility, similar to that of Fourier, is quite astounding. Only a few months after Paredes y Arrillaga's pronunciation against federalism, the "revolution" effectively incited the reorganization of the nation's groups as the industrialist had called for. The initiative started in Sotero Prieto's adoptive hometown Guadalajara, a former stronghold of the monarchist president but with a marked federalist past and, as was seen in the first part of the dissertation, important industrial hubs.

A group of important entrepreneurs in Guadalajara was among the first allies who decided to abandon the flank of Paredes y Arrillaga in 1846. Names include José Palomar, Manuel Olasgarre, and, noticeably, Sotero Prieto. But they were not alone. Shortly afterward, important politicians from Jalisco issued a *pronunciamiento* on May 20 against the monarchist government, further rallying federalists under the banner of the 1824 Constitution. José María Yáñez and Felipe Santiago Xicoténcatl led the pronunciamiento, which soon received the support of other federalists like Juan Álvarez, an important federalist army general in the department of Guerrero. Yáñez and Xicoténcatl, after seeing the effect of their pronunciamiento, did not hesitate in describing this movement as the "true regeneration of the nation", which adopted the agenda of repealing Paredes y Arrillaga's presidency and refurbishing the military defense of the northern border from the advance of Taylor's troops. Yáñez proceeded to appoint Juan Nepomuceno Cumplido as interim governor. When in office, he instituted a Departmental Assembly that sought to sustain federalism in the region with the creation of Republican Guards, protecting Jalisco from the U.S. threat, and reorganizing the "government and public administration" which enabled any

[8] Sotero Prieto, Letter to Fourierists, August 19th, 1845, AN 10 AS 41//681 MI/73. The letter is written in French.

community with over a thousand inhabitants to have a local legislature. José Palomar and Manuel Olasgarre, two important industrialists, were among the members of this assembly, where the name Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo also may strike the sight of the historian.[9] The fact that the latter was included in this assembly is not surprising: until then he was a renowned moderate federalist, close to Valentín Gómez Farías, who had expressed his discomfort with the continuous state of revolution Mexico was in.[10] An idea that was not so distant from the ones expressed by Prieto.

From the end of 1846, Sánchez Hidalgo and Sotero Prieto, under the circumstances of social and political change that were ensued during 1846, crossed paths and exchanged ideas.[11] One of the results of this exchange was Sotero Prieto's exile from his isolation –and the consequent dissemination of his ideas in official media such as the *Republicano jaliciense*.[12] A letter addressed to Lucas Alamán in 1845 was published under the endorsement of Sánchez Hidalgo himself in 1847. In it, he openly denounced the head of the Dirección Nacional de Agricultura e Industria, Lucas Alamán, for the "obstinacy to disdain Fourier, and in deferring the trial of the realization of the maximal problem of association which he has solved", all of which led to an "incoherence of efforts and the opposition of interests". Instead of association, what Alamán's system had reproduced was "division and antagonism without limits, oppression, and misery". Social division and antagonism reproduced "fraud and monopoly" in the economy, which only facilitated industry and commerce to clash instead of associating to organize their society. In Prieto's opinion, there was no other relevant way of avoiding division and antagonism than by adopting the "sacred" principle of "passional attraction" uncovered by Fourier. Sacred because it was the "most flattering manifestation" of love. Relevant, in turn, because it discovered one of the most powerful "stimulants" of "societary work [*trabajo societario*]".[13]

---

[9] Jaime Olveda, *Autonomía, Soberanía y Federalismo: Nueva Galicia y Jalisco*, Investigación (Colegio de Jalisco) (Zapopan, Jalisco: El Colegio de Jalisco, 2014), 233–36; Jaime Olveda, "Jalisco Frente a La Invasión Norteamericana de 1846-1848," in *México al Tiempo de Su Guerra Con Estados Unidos (1846-1848)*, ed. Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 1998), 281–308, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3f8npp.13.

[10] Michael P Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846: Hombres de Bien in the Age of Santa Anna* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 192; Federico De la Torre, *El Patrimonio Industrial Jalisciense Del Siglo XIX: Entre Fábricas de Textiles, de Papel, y de Fierro* (Guadalajara: Secretaría de Cultura, Gobierno de Jalisco, 2007), 170.

[11] De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant," 63; Federico De la Torre, *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX)* (Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara-Centro Universitario de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2021), 322–27.

[12] Besides some references included in the works of Jaime Olveda and Federico de la Torre, I did not find a study that closely studies the newspaper and its members. With the information that shall be showed here, however, it will become evident that a detailed study on the *Republicano jalisciense* should be done.

[13] We maintain the translation of *trabajo* with *work* as proposed since chapter two. Sotero Prieto, "Documento Para La Historia," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847. Original in: AN 10 AS 41(15)//681 MI 73.

In a text full of religious allegories, Prieto evoked the plague in case the head of the Dirección Nacional did not "guide" national industry and agriculture according to the plan sketched by Fourier and his French disciples with "didactic superiority". Despite the latter's didactic efforts, such ideas had been "nullified" in what was a "general disarray of ideas and interests in which humanity is moaning".[14] Prieto sought to intercede in national politics from a very particular position. Though he was a relative foreigner to the Guadalajara elites, he could still be considered to be a part of a "fundamentally optimistic and confident society in their ability to combine their religious faith with their hope for progress". He was not the only regional politician to consider that Jalisco's biggest hope was its participation in the "great march of human change".[15] Prieto's particularity, however, was his adoption of Fourier's ideas as the guiding framework for this reformation of humanity.

Through the network of Guadalajara's politicians, and considerably Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, he started to publish Fourierist pieces in the press. By August 1847, the Fourierist didactics of politics had rippled the Mexican press: on the thirteenth, the *Republicano jaliciense* had published an extract of Jules Lechevalier's *Leçons sur l'art d'associer les individus et les masses, hommes, femmes, enfants, en travaux d'industrie, science et beaux-arts* (1832). Describing the revolutionary meaning of passional attraction developed by Fourier, which in a Saint-Simonian gesture united Newtonian physics with Fourierist desire and passion, Lechevalier explained its relevance as the "free development" of peaceful relationships between men. Humanity, he explained, came together to "more fully satisfy" their passions, but it also gathered in smaller groups (or series) to fulfill "more specific objects of interest or affection". Series dealt with the "subdivision" of work and were therefore in charge of "the whole of the same work". What is the same, a series was in charge of a given task within a wider set of tasks. Finally, attractive work was more generally coordinated by the phalange, a "complete ensemble of series" which united the "common center" of these groups with the "political element". Combining the division of work with the right passions,[16] namely the phalange with the composite and alternating passions, the "material and

[14] Sotero Prieto, "Documento Para La Historia," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847.

[15] Brian Connaughton, *Dimensiones de La Identidad Patriótica: Religión, Política y Regiones En México, Siglo XIX*, Biblioteca de Signos (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2001), 163.

[16] Lechevalier presents only three of the twelve passions Fourier describes: the "cabalist" (passion of rivalry and competition), the "composite" (a "simultaneous excitation of the soul and the senses that concur to a same object"), and the "alternating" (the need to avoid monotony and change occupation). For the passions summarized by Fourier, see Charles Fourier, *The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier. Selected Texts on Work, Love, and Passionate Attraction*, ed. Jonathan Beecher and Richard Bienvenu (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971), 219–20. For more on Fourier's theory of passional attraction, see: Jonathan Beecher, *Charles Fourier: The Visionary and His World* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986), 220–40.

moral system" would safeguard humanity's interests.[17]

As the editors of the *Republicano jaliciense* (hereinafter *Republicano*) comment after the text's translation, Lechevalier was a worthy example of Fourierist theory because his "lessons" were written to "thin out" the "truly positive" parts of Fourier's works and procure their application in the canton of Condé-sur-Vesgre, the main Fourierist phalange. As the editors remembered, Lechevalier was a particular member of the doctrine. Initially a disciple of the Saint-Simonian doctrine, after the 1831 "schism" he decided to abandon the doctrine in favor of his Fourierist comrades. Naturally, his lessons included "connections between the theory of Fourier and Saint-Simon", not without frequent "vigorous and satirical criticisms of the latter". For the *Republicano*, an added value to his theory was that many of his "predictions", in the process of separation from the Saint-Simonian doctrine, were "confirmed by experience".[18]

The importance of this appendix, most probably written either by Sotero Prieto or Sabas Sánchez, should not be underestimated. Firstly because it is probably one of the first pieces available in the Mexican press where the connections between the Saint-Simonian and Fourierist doctrines appear. Yet the paper's editors confirm something even more relevant that was illustrated in the previous chapter as we uncovered the emergence of the imaginary of work: the French sociological principle, which sought the organization of the working nation through association, was not only a creation of the Besançon-born merchant (Fourier) or the Parisian dispossessed aristocrat (Saint-Simon), it was at its highest expression when it was appropriated by the groups that surrounded them. This was true for the French disciples and the French working nation. Another Frenchman and former Saint-Simonian who abandoned the doctrine in favor of the phalansterian idea insisted, in a letter to Lechevalier himself, that they need not abandon "the realization of the goal indicated by Saint-Simon": the union of the "human family" under the maxim of the "amelioration of the most numerous and the poorest class".[19] Concisely summarizing the socialist-sociological principle of the working nation, the combination of the Saint-Simonian and Fourierist ideas further unveils the hybrid nature of the socialist principles of the working nation. More importantly, it allows us to narrow down that the place where this hybridity emerged was not so much in the exchanges between groups in a given nation (France), but foremost in the

[17] Jules Lechevalier, "Lecciones Sobre El Arte de Asociarse–Exposicion Del Sistema Social de Cárlos Fourier, Por Julio Lechevalier," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 13/8/1847. The paper does not mention who translated the piece.

[18] Jules Lechevalier, "Lecciones Sobre El Arte de Asociarse–Exposicion Del Sistema Social de Cárlos Fourier, Por Julio Lechevalier," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 13/8/1847.

[19] Pierre-Guillaume Cazeaux to Jules Lechevalier, AN 10 AS 37 (1)//681 MI 59. For more on Cazeaux: Jean-Claude Dubos and Jean-Claude Sosnowski, "Cazeaux, Pierre-Guillaume," in *Dictionnaire Biographique Du Fouriérisme*, accessed September 3, 2022, http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article647.

exchanges between groups in different nations (France-Mexico). We thus have to come back to how such imaginaries and ideas were effectively "appropriated"[20] in the Atlantic voyages.

Indeed, further articles of Fourierist affiliation were published in the *Republicano*. In December 1847, while the peace negotiations with the U.S. started, a particularly significant article appeared. With the title of "Social science [*Ciencia social*]", the newspaper published a piece authored by Joaquín Abreu which summarized the importance of Fourier's social science for the "terrestrial needs" of humanity. He underscored the hybrid dimension by indicating the specific goal of his theory of passional attraction: "social organization" as the only way of "arranging exploitation" by combining, as Lechevalier also underpinned, the "individual forces" which were the "springs and wheels of the social mechanism". By precipitating Lechevalier's summary into an industrial reality, Abreu's article presented the practical consequences of the Fourierist theory of social organization which did not abandon the individuals that composed its mechanism. The *Republicano* thus underscored how the "arranged concert" of each individual's force is subordinated to the "concert of passions": the Fourierist principle of harmony. However, as Fourier taught his disciples, this passional direction of society is not rooted in the preponderance of one over the other. As Abreu notes, the "social problem shifts place once again". Abreu phrased it as follows: "it is no longer in the means of a direct combination of individual or industrial forces that belong to man; but rather in the means of a direct agreement of passions and wills". In other words, it was not a matter of competition but of harmony: the social problem and the harmony of the passions were one and the same thing. Fourier's "system of association" united them under the acceptance of the "inequalities and differences of all types". With this awareness, the individuals of society could gather under the common objective of "social life", combining the "productive forces of man" which would be "distributed to each in proportion to the share he has had in its production, as worker, capitalist, or director".[21]

The last lines are a powerful demonstration of the hybridity Joaquín Abreu's thought was impregnated with, for it combines the Saint-Simonian principle of "to each according to his ability; to each according to his works", with the "materialist" distribution of work and passions following Charles Fourier's principles. It was neither one *or* the other, but a combination that privileged the goal of organizing the nation according to the principle of organization of work through the association of society's individuals. The hybridity imbued into this international principle was, as evidenced here, further reproduced in Mexican soil at the hands of other Fourierists.

---

[20] Elías José Palti, "The Problem of 'Misplaced Ideas' Revisited: Beyond the 'History of Ideas' in Latin America," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67, no. 1 (2006): 178, https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2006.0009.
[21] Joaquín Abreu, "Ciencia social," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 21/12/1847.

In the previous chapter, we already saw that Prieto had displayed an array of Fourierist ideas, which have been gradually reconducted to the original doctrine. In the analyzed letter, he denounced Lucas Alamán's and Manuel Escandón's "supine mistakes" in his projects of organizing the nation through its industrialization. In the piece he published a few months later in the *Republicano*, which ensued the principles exposed in Lechevalier's and Abreu's pieces, he synthesized how such Fourierist ideas could be fulfilled in Mexico; how the French hybrid socialist-sociological principle could be appropriated by the Mexican working nation. The organization of the working groups, he argued, would come as a result of a "perfect association" in the "field of production and distribution of wealth".[22] The Fourierist criticism of Saint-Simonians as "individualists"[23] was abandoned by the radical displacement and appropriation of their common principles from Mexico. Intellectual collisions that happened in France did not have the same weight in Mexico.

For Prieto and the members of the *Republicano*, the priority seems to have laid in how the principles articulated in France could be productively dislocated to organize the nation according to the imaginary of work shared by all socialist actors on both shores of the Atlantic. In this sense, Fourierist or Saint-Simonian ideals were not simply "transmitted" to Mexico.[24] What emerges quite clearly is that the industrialist and working groups in Guadalajara, as Fourier and Saint-Simon, were more than a motor for the transmission of ideas from one place to the other: they were materially and intellectually articulating an exchange of imaginaries that converged around the working nation, in between some of the Atlantic nations. Such an exchange was far from sterile. The movement of ideas crystallized the movement of certain groups of the nations involved in the exchange.

Internal stabilization through the organization of the nation's groups, as drawn from Abreu's column, was not enough in the context of international warfare that drew upon Mexican

---

[22] Sotero Prieto, "Documento Para La Historia," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847.

[23] This criticism was widely spread in the first wave of followers who abandoned the doctrine, for they lamented Enfantin's use of the apostles as a means of reducing the doctrine's real appeal to the working classes, the message of association. As mentioned in chapter three, the motive for the schism is best illustrated in Rodrigues and Flachat's effort to continue with the *Enseignement des ouvriers* in the streets of Paris rather than in the newly built church in Ménilmontant. For a Fourierist critique, see: Alexandre Delhasse, "Science sociale". AN 10 AS 37 (7)//681 MI 58. As mentioned, Fourierism's spread more significantly in Paris when Fourier allied with Lechevalier and other Saint-Simonians who made the former's ideas "accessible", "intellectually respectable" and worthy of the attention of new readers who were disappointed with the Saint-Simonian schism. See Beecher, *Charles Fourier*, 421–29.

[24] This is a problem that will be discussed at length in chapter five. For now, it is important to underline the fact that studies on the contacts between Mexicans and Fourierism has followed the tropes of the history of ideas, that analyze their journey between countries as a reproduction of ideas, ultimately following the trope of "misplaced ideas" Elias Palti discussed. See above. As noted in the introduction to the dissertation, this has also been an idea developed by global and conceptual historians such as Margrit Pernau. For the relevance of this "interconnected" history, see the introduction and conclusions to the dissertation.

soil. Prieto clearly agreed with his fellow Spanish Fourierist, but at the end of his "documento para la historia", he added a key twist that was not present in the original letter. In the letter, he argued that the association of the working groups of the nation, be they workers, capitalists, or directors, was the only means to internally pacify the country. But August 1847 was different from June 1845: on the seventh, Winfield Scott's troops left Puebla towards a siege of Mexico City that would last at least five weeks and end in an occupation of Mexico's capital.[25] In the middle of the U.S. invasion of the Mexican altiplano, Prieto urgently advocated for internal, *i. e.* national, peace. Without it, a "peace between two potencies" was straight-out unconceivable. "International relations" were "disconcerting" without the social system ascertaining the association of human groups to accompany them.[26] Prieto thus took the principle of the working nation's organization to a renewed hybrid, international, level. The internal association of the working groups of the nation and their organization of work was a fundamental condition for the establishment of peaceful international relationships –an aspect that had not appeared thus far.[27]

The novelty of Prieto's proposal was the way he conceived the combination of an intra-national with inter-national integration under the socialist-sociological principle. In other words, like many of his contemporaries, Prieto was developing a new frame upon which to reflect on the existence of the nation.[28] He did not frame his defense of the nation in terms of the "conservation of a center of union" that would defend the "nationality of the Republic" by continuing the war with the U.S., as the interim president Pedro Anaya declared a few months earlier. Although neither wished the territory to be "dismembered", its unity to be dissolved, or its institutions to be destroyed,[29] Prieto, unlike the president, did not resort to conflict as a response to aggressions perpetrated on the nation. Despite the unfortunately limited comment Prieto dedicates to such a matter, his conception of the nation prefigures the radical alternativity with which he, along with the Atlantic working nations, conceived the process of nation-building altogether. In effect, his

---

[25] Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, "México y La Guerra Con Estados Unidos," in *México al Tiempo de Su Guerra Con Estados Unidos (1846-1848)*, ed. Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, 2nd ed. (El Colegio de Mexico, 1998), 43, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3f8npp.4.
[26] Sotero Prieto, "Documento Para La Historia," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847.
[27] This is not to say French socialists had not reflected on international or indeed colonial matters. As is well known, Saint-Simonians actively analyzed and reflected on the opportunity presented by France's invasion of Algeria in 1832, for instance. For more on the subject, see Naomi J. Andrews, "Selective Empathy: Workers, Colonial Subjects, and the Affective Politics of French Romantic Socialism," *French Politics, Culture & Society* 36, no. 1 (March 1, 2018): 1–25, https://doi.org/10.3167/fpcs.2018.360101.
[28] As Peter Guardino's latest book illustrates masterfully, on many occasions the U.S. invasion of Mexico –and especially during the troops' advance on the altiplano– posed the question of the existence of the nation to many Mexicans who reacted in consequence. His analysis of the military organization of the nation is relevant to see how Mexican society was reacting in the most variegated ways to the invasion. See, particularly, Guardino, *The Dead March*, 232–63.
[29] José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 5 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 265–66.

imaginary of the nation did not follow a military organization that responded to the preservation of Mexican "nationality" but was consequent with the principle of the association of the nation's (working) groups. In the "documento para la historia", he clearly advocated for the preservation of the nation according to the socialist-sociological idiom of association over the "divisive and antagonistic" conception of nationality.[30] As part of a particular social milieux in Mexico, his ideas did not always fall into the deaf ears of the crony spheres he was actively denouncing.

Indeed, Prieto's "documento" did not stand alone in the pages of the *Republicano*. Writing in the middle of a true national crisis, when the community saw itself on the brink of its independent existence, Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo took Prieto's reflections to its ultimate consequences. In the column he published right after the "documento", Sánchez reflects on the international dimension of the organization of nations. With an astute political decision, he displaces the terms of discussion not only in terms of a national but also a republican organization, advocating for the creation of a "Confederación continental americana".

3. A socialist-republican turn. The working nation between Mexico, Spain, and France

Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo's column shows nothing short of a sense of bewilderment at the possibility that Mexico lost its independence at the hands of its neighbor in the north. What struck the author most was that previous "partialities" continued to divide Mexicans to the point that the "defense and even the existence of the *patria* are irrelevant for them": "a simple exhortation to merge the parties would be to preach in the desert", he asserted. A greater objective was needed to really avoid the "dismemberment of the Mexican nation into several republics". How to save this "nationality" that was dying? It was necessary, he argued, to "neutralize the interests and the character of the contest" by invoking a principle that could both settle the "undisputable right" of Mexico to defend itself from the "republic from the North", as much as accept the latter's "physical superiority". The "resource" of peace and the salvation of the Hispano-American republics depended on the "continental commonwealth", a "Continental American Confederation", and its "material expression", the "supranational Mexican congress".[31]

This short passage sparks the attention of the historian in at least two ways. As defined by historians, the argument of an "American republican modernity" as a "New World civilization of sister republics that would challenge Europe and redefine the future of the world",[32] appears quite

[30] Sotero Prieto, "Documento Para La Historia," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847.
[31] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Confederación Continental Americana," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847.
[32] James Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Duke University Press, 2014), 63.

clearly. We might assume that, as he proposed this "confederation", Sabas Sánchez most likely did not ignore some of the projects that had abounded on the possibility of an American republican confederation in the 1820s, particularly proposed from the South of the continent. As historians have confirmed, he was at least inspired by the confederalist experience in Mexico during the 1820s.[33] He was recovering a discussion that had been at the center of the constituent congress between federalists and confederalists that would lead to the federalist constitution of 1824. If federalists sought to concentrate sovereignty in the representation of the people –*i. e.* popular sovereignty–, confederalists wished to singularly represent the states in the national congress based on a composite form of federalism.[34]

Sánchez wished to recover this collegiate representation as presented by his mentor Francisco Severo Maldonado, a renowned federalist from Jalisco that was key in the region's particular political position during independence. Maldonado advocated for a "free association" of the nation's provinces, each of which would have an independent internal government. In this way, sovereignty could be distributed without damaging the organization of each territory, or its *pueblos*.[35] As a federalist himself, Sabas Sánchez recurred to Maldonado in the context of the federalist reorganization of 1846-1847, in the middle of a process widely acknowledged as the time of "political regeneration of the nation".[36] As he admits, he wished to articulate this period of federalist reorganization to the "only motive of this [confederalist] politics": the "benignity of the

[33] Federico de la Torre confirms he had contacts with some of the confederalists of the 1820s in Mexico in the Seminar of Guadalajara. De la Torre, *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX)*, 323. Mexico itself was a "confederal" republic in the guise of the 1824 Constitution. As Marcello Carmagnani established: "El nuevo Estado confederal [in 1824] nace de la voluntad de crear un poder federal mínimo, en modo que las primicias pudieran implementar e institucionalizar su gobierno interior a partir de las funciones que ejercieron informalmente por largo tiempo". The federal power was thus reserved to sustain national independence and its relations with other countries, while the confederacy was given to the "independent, free and sovereign" states that composed the nation. Marcello Carmagnani, *Las Formas Del Federalismo Mexicano* (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Coordinación de Investigación y Posgrado, 2005), 11–12. Besides James Sanders's account of "American republican modernity" (Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World*, particularly chapter 3), some interesting accounts of this "American" dimension of confederation beyond Mexico can be read in: José Antonio Piqueras, "Estado, nación y federalismos en el siglo XIX. La contribución de José Carlos Chiaramonte," *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana Dr. Emilio Ravignani*, no. 45 (2016): 43–63; Lina Del Castillo, "Inventing Columbia/Colombia," in *The First Wave of Decolonization*, ed. Mark Thurner, Routledge Studies in Global Latin America (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2019), 48–76. Other studies will be referred to below.
[34] On 1823-1824 federalism in Mexico, see: Jaime E. Rodríguez O., "Las Cortes Mexicanas y El Congreso Constituyente," in *La Independencia de México y El Proceso Autonomista Novohispano, 1808-1824*, ed. Virginia Guedea (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2001), 286–320.
[35] For more on Maldonado, see: Juan Real Ledezma, *Enciclopedia histórica y biográfica de la Universidad de Guadalajara*, vol. 1: La Real Universidad de Guadalajara, 1791–1821, 5 vols. (Guadalajara: Editorial Universitaria, 2017), http://enciclopedia.udg.mx/articulos/maldonado-y-ocampo-francisco-severo.
[36] Olveda, *Autonomía, Soberanía y Federalismo*, 101, 234.

national character".[37] The formation of an American Confederation, that is, should respond to the national character defended by peace.

Indeed, Sánchez praised Maldonado for his confederalist ideas, but also and foremost because of the "general filiation" he had with the "theories of organization or social regeneration" that had "shaken human understanding or the human heart". According to Sánchez Hidalgo, Maldonado's philosophy shared with the greatest philosophers, from Aristotle to Babeuf, the will to "investigate the essence of government and the nature of social relationships". In this sense, he adds, it was a misfortune that Maldonado did not get to read Robert Owen, C. H. de Saint-Simon, or Charles Fourier, for they were the first thinkers to truly establish a communication between the "legislative" and the "economic" sciences. Their "knowledge of man, or their analyses of his passions and affections" had established the need for science –legislative and economic, political and social– "to agree with the mechanism that directs them [humans], and facilitates their natural manifestation and their combined recreation; and this mechanism must consist in the organization of society itself".[38] From a very particular political and historical position, Sabas Sánchez appropriated the knowledges developed by the European socialists and "radically contextualized"[39] the socialist-sociological principle by combining the confederalist tradition with the reorganization of the Mexican nation.

In the context of the peace negotiations of December 1847,[40] he argued that they should be celebrated as a condition for a "peaceful and perfect" resolution that could build the American Confederation. He openly criticized his peers –in this case the liberal Mariano Otero who had a strong presence in the 1847 constitutional assembly– for rejecting the possibility of establishing peaceful relationships with the U.S. Contrary to federalist liberals, he conceived the possibility of peaceful negotiations as a condition for the re-establishment of internal peace upon the same international principles. Without such negotiations, the organization of the nation according to its "benign" character would be virtually impossible. People who rejected peace, he argued, revealed their "complete ignorance" of the knowledges that allowed the development of a "compassion" for the "pitiful fate of our plebs [*plebe*]", deprived of the "fruit of their petty labors [*labores*]".

---

[37] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Confederación Continental Americana," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 17/8/1847.
[38] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Suscripción al Juicio Crítico de Las Obras Del Dr. Maldonado," *La Linterna de Diógenes*, January 1847.
[39] The expression appears in: Christian G De Vito, "History Without Scale: The Micro-Spatial Perspective*," *Past & Present* 242, no. Supplement_14 (November 1, 2019): 348–72, https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz048.
[40] New perspectives on the eventually traumatic loss of half of its territory in February 1848 with the Guadalupe Hidalgo have started to arise in historiography. See, for example: Amy S. Greenberg, "Nicholas Trist: Diplomático Sin Autorización," in *Embajadores de Estados Unidos En México.*, ed. Roberta Lajous et al., Diplomacia de Crisis y Oportunidades (El Colegio de Mexico, 2021), 49–68, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2kcwnm2.7.

There was a consensus regarding the fact that "we do not have industry; therefore we repel the foreign". He thus asks his contemporaries if the solution was not to create and perfect their industry: "Yes, evidently; but it then becomes necessary to say how it is raised and perfected; and this is the difficulty that is avoided, not without reason". Sánchez then fully deploys the purpose and nature of his objection to his contemporaries' ideas: if the "*sublime doctrine*" weren't "so discredited", he would propose the "organization of work [*trabajo*]".[41]

Once again, we see the (indirect) reference to Fourier's sublime doctrine being seemingly linked to what we have here called the "imaginary of work". Its nucleus, which has appeared on both sides of the Atlantic in the differentiation between work and labor, is here associated with a new form of republican politics which had not emerged in our first journey to France. He did, however, like his French peers, recur to a republican ply for the organization of the nation's groups as an organization of *work* that led to the perfection of industry. The unprecedented importance of Sánchez's "critical judgment" in *La Linterna de Diógenes*[42] is precisely rooted in his acknowledgment that such an organization could not happen without international negotiations being affirmed in a "conferral" between the "European socialists and the Mexican".[43] In 1847, Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo was talking, for the first time in Mexico, about a collectivity of national socialists. To the extent that such Mexican national socialists did not profess the principle of nationality, the fact that they were Mexican nationals did not entail that the collectivity was formed only domestically. On the contrary, it carried the consequences of an international, Atlantic, network of cooperation between socialists and their nation's groups.

As was mentioned earlier, Sánchez framed his socialist reorganization in terms of, and during, a republican-federalist reform of the nation. Coming from a context of federalist republicanism and being an apprentice of Maldonado's ideas of confederation, Sánchez establishes a connection between his socialism and federalism which, although unprecedented in Mexico, has an uncanny resemblance, and therefore establishes the conditions for a

[41] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "La Exposición Del Lic. Otero PARODIADA," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 14/12/1847.

[42] To the extent of my knowledge, this document had not been consulted by historians. Only the reproduction of the "critical judgement", which appeared in the *Republicano Jalisciense* between October 1847 and February 1848, has been analyzed by De la Torre. The original piece, quoted here, is from January 1847. The *Republicano* of June 29, 1847, confirms that the *Linterna* only had two numbers: November 1846 and January 1847. Both copies are available at the Archivo Histórico de Jalisco (AHJ), in Guadalajara. For references to this piece, see: De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant"; De la Torre, *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX).*

[43] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Suscripción al Juicio Crítico de Las Obras Del Dr. Maldonado," *La Linterna de Diógenes*, January 1847.

"communication",[44] with the ideas of other groups of French socialists.

Sánchez's republican organization ultimately subverted Fourier's agenda of wiping out the existent organization of the nation and implementing a phalansterian organization. For the Frenchman, moral and political organization was posed in terms of a "civilizational" change, which meant literally uprooting the contemporary social order and establishing the principle of attractive work as the new associative, social, and economic principle of society.[45]

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this was particularly appealing to the new generations of French *savants* and worker groups, which sought more radical principles upon which to reflect on their reality.[46] For instance, Alexandre Delhasse, a Belgian Fourierist who would be key for the diffusion of Fourierism in Europe after 1848,[47] contested the "republican", "liberal" and "Saint-Simonian" criticisms against Fourier's *La fausse industrie* (1836). Attacking their conciliatory attitude, Delhasse argued that Fourier finally allowed the possibility to erect a new civilization by "knocking down" the old society; it was necessary for "our institutions, our laws, our [illegible word], everything……; because everything is bad [*mauvaise*] and has to be redone [*à refaire*]". Only so could a "new world" be made, a "new being [*être*]" that will obey laws that are in "harmony" with its nature, with the "need to work", making it "attractive and lucrative".[48] Fourierism, contrary to Saint-Simonianism, did not accept the idea of "reform". As Fourierists conceded to Saint-Simon's efforts, he managed to grant "legitimacy" to his agenda by giving it "an

---

[44] Here I follow Margrit Pernau and Luc Wodziki's concept of communication. "This concept of communication involves more than the scope encompassed in the narrow definition of the term as 'the successful transmission of information.' Actions are endowed with meaning by the different actors involved in the transaction—the problem is how actors, while pursuing their interests, develop a common horizon of interpretation (or a range of overlapping horizons), which allows them to correctly read the meaning of each other's actions, and to anticipate future moves. This development can be intentional, involving anything from the employment of translators, to making an effort to learn about the others' manners and customs. In most cases, however, it will constitute a constant modification of previous knowledge and assumptions (the pre-mediation that actors bring into an encounter, and which shapes the form of the encounter) through the ongoing integration of new experiences". Margrit Pernau and Luc Wodzicki, "Entanglements, Political Communication, and Shared Temporal Layers," *Cromohs. Cyber Review of Modern Historiography* 21 (2017): 5. This concept has a striking familiarity with that developed by "radical geographers", who present the need to study the "considerable dynamic" and "substantial potential for transformation" ideas had in the displacement from one context to another. "If all articulations in a discourse refer to others, insofar as they are 'citations': then they are dependent on one another". To this extent, "Western knowledge" was a result of entanglements, where both Europe and the Americas are mutually dependent in the formation of such knowledges –especially if one contests the assumption of the other. See Michael Bergunder, "Comparison in the Maelstrom of Historicity: A Postcolonial Perspective on Comparative Religion," in *Interreligious Comparisons in Religious Studies and Theology : Comparison Revisited*, ed. Perry Schmidt-Leukel and Andreas Nehring (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2016), 47.

[45] See Beecher, *Charles Fourier*, 195–219.

[46] Ludovic Frobert, "French Utopian Socialists as the First Pioneers in Development," *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 35, no. 4 (2011): 741–42.

[47] On the topic, see: Jonathan Beecher, *Victor Considerant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001), 267–91.

[48] Alexandre Delhasse to Felix Delhasse, "Lettre sur la science sociale", March 1843, AN 10 AS 37 (7)//681 MI 59.

organic and stable form". Fourier, on the contrary, wished to carry out a "radical change in the condition of humanity, [...] it is in a way a new human species that he aims to create". Rather than reform, then, Fourier and Fourierists sought a radical change.[49]

Republicans, in turn, were for obvious reasons sensitive to the trope of continuing the revolution and enhancing its heritage. From 1830, with the worker revolution and the movement that ensued, internal divisions among republicanists led some of their groups to side with the working groups and their demands. In this process of re-assemblage, new groups were formed, such as the *Amis de la Verité* and the even more important *Société des amis du peuple* (later known as *Société des droits de l'homme* and *Société d'amitié fraternelle*). As historians have registered, workers were attracted by their republican propaganda, while republicans allied with workers as a way of "rooting" their activities in the *ville*. They were even attracted to the spaces of experience and intellectual exchange created by the Saint-Simonian *séances*. Mutually informing themselves in the urban landscape, radical republicans and the working nation physically started distancing themselves from the 1840s onwards, since the worker movement repudiated the republican violent attitude and actions. Secret societies that appeared throughout the 1830s lost a great part of their support once a true "workers' voice" appeared, reflected in the creation of worker newspapers such as *La Ruche populaire*, *L'Atelier*, *L'Union*, *La Démocratie pacifique*, *Le Populaire*, *La Fraternité de 1841,* among many others.[50]

As historians have established recently, the process by which the working nation gradually drifted apart from some of these republican societies did not mean its socialism drifted apart from republicanism altogether. It rather speaks of the development of a "socialist republicanism" by the working groups who achieved to displace the reflexivity on the city and its organization to the terms defined by their "quotidian and economic life".[51] In recovering the republican idea of the construction of a new social order, one of the principal means used to appropriate republican

---

[49] Paul Janet, "Le Socialisme Au XIXe Siècle," *Révue Des Deux Mondes* 3rd epoch, no. 35 (1879): 621.
[50] Rancière defines the "workers' voice" as a "multiplicity of microexperiences of repartitioning the sensible, a multiplicity of operations that have reframed the place of the worker, the time of his work and his life, the exercise of his gaze, the way he speaks, and so on". Jacques Rancière, "Afterword: The Method of Equality: An Answer to Some Questions," in *Jacques Rancière: History, Politics, Aesthetics*, ed. Philip Watts and Gabriel Rockhill (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009), 277, https://doi.org/10.1353/book.65109. See also: Andrea Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, Studi e Ricerche Storiche 387 (Milán: FrancoAngeli, 2010), 83–108; Maurizio Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848* (Paris: La Découverte, 2014), 292–372; Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo, "Pierre Leroux o El Republicanismo Saint-Simoniano," in *Pensiero Critico Ed Economia Politica Nel XIX Secolo: Da Saint-Simon a Proudhon*, ed. Vitantonio Gioia, Sergio Noto, and Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo (Bologna: Società editrice Il mulino, 2015), 61–82; Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *Le Procès de La Liberté: Une Histoire Souterraine Du XIXe Siècle* (La Découverte, 2016), 253–62; Jacques Rougerie, "Entre Le Réel et l'utopie: République Démocratique et Sociale, Association, Commune, Commune," in *Essais d'histoire Critique. Textes Réunis Autour Des Travaux de Michèle Riot-Sarcey* (Saint-Denis: Press universitaires de Vincennes, 2014), 273–92.
[51] Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, 94.

politics was its conjugation with the socialist-sociological principle of association reviewed here. As Andrea Lanza described this process, it was through association and fraternity that these groups wished to "recreate the social bond".[52] Indeed, the socialist-sociological idiom of association developed by the working nation offered republicans the possibility of synthesizing an effective "governmental action" that placed "collective" over individual interest. Eliminating, through a socialist-republican government, the idea of competition between the working groups and the republican individual, allowed the working groups to further affirm their political claims.

> It is here that the action of government [*l'action gouvernementale*] is revealed. The principle is good in itself; it tends to classify one day all the workers of a profession under the same organization, to place them under the same regiment [*à les enregimenter*], so to speak, in the same association, since the numerous associations of a profession must be in solidarity with each other. [...] Competition, for us, has disastrous results which can very well be avoided as soon as it is no longer supported by people who have an interest in it.[53]

The movement set by the working nation and republicans replicated Leroux's motive, mentioned in the conclusions to the third chapter: to narrow the distance between the republic and the workshop. Louis Blanc, who was also a prominent figure in this process, held continuous correspondence with the Fourierist leader Victor Considerant in his mission to convince him of the importance of his republican views. A letter draws with great specificity what principle was at play in the conformation of this socialist republicanism. The socialist-sociological idiom of association is not mentioned because Blanc wished to draw the attention of the Fourierist leader to another principle of republican origin: the "importance of political rights". In 1836, Blanc sought to convince Considerant that they could no longer disregard political rights because it was the means of assuring the "proper application" of the "sovereignty of the people". They had to oppose the "censorial power [*pouvoir censitaire*]" by surveilling the application of this principle, through which Blanc's political science and Considerant's social science showed their "sisterhood".[54]

Possibly due to the influence such a context exerted on his thought, Considerant molded his ideas to the political effervescence of the Parisian 1840s. Throughout the decade, Victor Considerant and his followers would come to terms with embedding their socialist reflections on the problem of political rights. Nothing sums this up better than the publication of his *Principes du socialisme* (1847), the *opus* that condenses the work of half a decade included in their newspaper *La Démocratie pacifique* (1843-1851), where the doctrine abandons some of its

---

[52] Lanza, 98. On the principle of fraternity, see: Andrea Lanza, "Fraternité e Solidarité Intorno al 1848. Tracce Di Un Approccio Sociologico," *Scienza & Politica. Per Una Storia Delle Dottrine* 26, no. 51 (December 28, 2014): 17–39, https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1825-9618/4627.
[53] "Réforme Industrielle. Entretiens Sur l'association," *L'Atelier*, 9/1841.
[54] Louis Blanc to Victor Considerant, 1836, AN 10 AS 36 (7)//681 MI 57.

Fourierist dogmas by contacting and analyzing the political world.[55] In a context where workers had acquired an independent voice that challenged the monarchist regime, Considerant harnessed Fourierism to the transformed, republican, context.

By appropriating Blanc's suggestion through his socialist thought, Considerant saw that "political questions" were not so distant from "social questions", in that the political is strictly the "regulation of all elements of the life of Societies". He did agree however that in his context, the political and the social had grown to oppose one another because "publicists" now used *politique* as that which designated the "nature, form, constitution and composition of Power: its system and its daily acts". Thanks to them, the social had been separated from the political to designate the "set of facts that characterize the state, nature, and economy of Society". Significantly, however, Considerant perceived that the separation of these principles had not been fulfilled. Paradoxically, the transition to the "social terrain [*terrain*]" had caused the "re-awakening [*réveil*] of the public spirit":

> the field of social ideas, labored in silence by workers long time obscured [*labouré en silence par des travailleurs long-temps obscurs*], is sown, covers itself with vegetation, and becomes the meeting place, from day to day more frequented and more alive, of the strong intellects, of the ardent hearts, of the new generations, of all those, in a word, who strongly feel the beat of the love for humanity in their breast, and those which a sure instinct of the destiny of the peoples [*peuples*] leads to the glorious paths of the future.[56]

The conquests of this *peuple* had put the "democratic principle in possession of the terrain". Considerant thus poses the political and social question in terms of the people, composed of the groups of workers. In other words, his sociology introduces a significant turn into the Fourierist system by approaching the terms of his social science towards a republican imaginary which reflects on a republican working nation, the *peuple travailleur* composed of worker-citizens.[57]

As can be seen, Sánchez was thus not simply transmitting Fourierism, as a doctrine, to Mexico but was in fact conferring the republican developments of French socialism with the national defense of Mexico's Republic in a context of international conflict. Concretely, it was the mutual rapprochement of the working nation and the republican groups which invited Sánchez to uphold this conferral between Mexican and French socialists. The latter elevated the working nation to a singular republican-socialist politics, but it also reformed the "knowledge of man" he advocated in the Mexican context. Appropriating Considerant's ideas, he established that such a knowledge must "agree with the mechanism that directs them and facilitates their natural manifestation and their combined recreation; and this mechanism must consist in the organization

---

[55] For more details on this process, see: Desmars, "À La Conquête de l'espace Public. Les Fouriéristes et *La Démocratie Pacifique*."

[56] Victor Considerant, *Principes Du Socialisme : Manifeste de La Démocratie Au XIXe Siècle ; Procès de La Démocratie Pacifique* (Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1978), 29–32. Citation taken from the last page.

[57] For a discussion of what this category implies, see chapter three.

of society itself".[58] His conferral, however, goes deeper still. In a column included in the *Republicano jaliciense* where he reflects on the "means and ends of politics", he explicitly links the existence of the "Mexican nation" to its defense of democracy. Not only did this entail defending the nation's independence, but it also meant assuring the construction of an "American confederation" which could assure "common peace and concert, the national rights of each republic and the consequent individual prosperity of all of its associates".[59]

He took the idea of confederation and posed it based on a modern defense of each nation's political rights through the "federal bond". As mentioned above, his federal project was not circumscribed to the principle of nationality. On the contrary, consolidated on the affirmation of the "national rights of each republic", the "international system" he proposed would finally consolidate the regime of each country, which would in turn guarantee the consolidation of an "American equilibrium". Sánchez elapses on the same goal as the texts analyzed above, with a significant twist. The "object" of his considerations was to "concrete them in their ultimate expression to show how complex the matter of peace or war with the United States is, and how hard it is, if not impossible, that Mexico end it on its own if it is not by recasting it within a bigger and truly saving cause: the American confederation".[60] In other words, for Sánchez, like his peers Considerant and Prieto, the solution for national politics was inalienable from the establishment of an international system which was a combination, a mutual conferral, of socialist and republican principles of political organization of the nation's working groups. The difference, however, was precisely the end this organization would have in the American continent. Unlike the French who sought the establishment of a French "republic of work", in Mexico the "international system" was ushered in the form of a confederation.

Although this is not the place to delve into the history of the contact between socialism and federalism in France, it is necessary to mention that the contact between one and the other seems to have been precarious before the second half of the nineteenth century. The only one who might have pursued a dialogue with federalist traditions, before Considerant, was Saint-Simon.[61] In what

[58] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Suscripción al Juicio Crítico de Las Obras Del Dr. Maldonado," *La Linterna de Diógenes*, January 1847.
[59] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Medios y Fin de La Política," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 22/10/1847. The italics are mine.
[60] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "OJEADA Sobre La Exposicion Que El Ciudadano Diputado Mariano Otero Dirigió al Gobierno Del Estado de Jalisco, Acerca de La Guerra Anglo-Americana," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 2/11/1847.
[61] In the introduction to his compilation of some of Saint-Simon's "political" writings, Ghita Ionescu suggests a fascinating link between the French *comte* and the seventeenth century political philosopher Johannes Althusius, famous for having developed a theory of confederalism. See Ghiţa Ionescu, "Introducción," in *El Pensamiento Político de Saint-Simon* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2005), 11–85. Saint-Simon reflects on a new international order during the Vienna Congress in: Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon and Augustin Thierry, *De La Réorganisation de La Société Européenne, Ou De La Nécessité et Des Moyens de Rassembler Les Peuples de l'Europe En Un Seul Corps Politique, En*

may have been an indirect gesture towards Saint-Simon,[62] Considerant briefly mentions the importance of federalism in his *Principes du socialisme*. It was the "genius of battles" Napoleon who "announced the Destinies of modern Democracy, the Federative Unity of the European races, and, by an irresistible consequence, the definitive establishment of the harmonious Unity of the World".[63] Thanks to the work of historians, it is known that the unity of the European races was of great inspiration to Napoleon since federalist ideas appeared at the time (1823) during the American and Greek independencies.[64] Besides this short reference to federalism, however, it did not appear again in Considerant's 1847 booklet: it is but a transient reference that does not have the same transcendence as in Sánchez's work. And, to the extent of our knowledge, the principle of federalism would not play any major role in the French socialist imaginary until the publication of P. J. Proudhon's *Du principe fédératif et de la nécessité de reconstituer le parti de la revolution* in 1863. Sánchez's socialist-federalist project was thus unprecedented both in Mexico and France.[65] Indeed, of the countries analyzed here, only Spain had witnessed a similar contact of federalism, republicanism, and socialism.

Historians have since long established that, for the groups hosted in Madrid and Barcelona, federalism was the "matrix" in which the principle of popular sovereignty could properly "materialize", given the "absolute difference that still separated the different nationalities of the Spanish State".[66] To the extent of our knowledge, however, no concise proof that either Prieto or Sánchez contacted the groups in Madrid or Barcelona has emerged. Nonetheless, we must not neglect the fact that it was the Spanish experience, concretely Abreu's thought, which opened an unprecedented hybrid, international, dimension to our analysis of the Atlantic working nation. His singular appropriation of Fourier's ideas unfolds the reason why we see his thought prevail on

---

Conservant à Chacun Son Indépendance Nationale (Paris: Adrien Égron/Delaunay, 1814). See a thought-provoking analysis in: Luca Scuccimarra, "A Constitution for Europe. Saint-Simon and the *Réorganisation de La Société Européenne*," in *Pensiero Critico Ed Economia Politica Nel XIX Secolo: Da Saint-Simon a Proudhon*, ed. Vitantonio Gioia, Sergio Noto, and Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo (Bologna: Società editrice Il mulino, 2015), 83–102.

[62] As is well known, the *comte* did not refrain from admiring Napoleon throughout his works. See, for example, Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, *Introduction Aux Travaux Scientifiques Du XIXe Siècle*, vol. 2 (Paris: J. L. Scherff, 1808).

[63] Considerant, *Principes Du Socialisme*, 33.

[64] Juan Pro, "La utopía de la unidad americana en la época de las revoluciones: territorio y comunidad política," *Ariadna Histórica. Lenguajes, conceptos, metáforas.*, no. 10 (December 16, 2021): 184–85.

[65] There are no references in his texts to the works of South American intellectuals who also developed a contact with socialism in these years, such as Francisco Bilbao in Chile, who has been considered as the "embodiment" of American republican modernity. See: Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World*, 136–60. For Bilbao's link with the formation of the concept of "Latin America", see: Michel Gobat, "The Invention of Latin America: A Transnational History of Anti-Imperialism, Democracy, and Race," *The American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (December 1, 2013): 1345–75, https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/118.5.1345.

[66] Jorge Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, Temas Hispánicos (Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1977), 277.

both shores of the Atlantic. Recent Spanish historians have summed up the potency of his thought in this adaptability to different contexts: "Fourierism seems so adaptable and so prone to combination with other ideas because it constitutes an invitation to break the established bounds of thought".[67]

As we can notice, it is only with Sánchez's "socialist conferral" of imaginaries that circulated on both sides of the Atlantic that his discourse has relevance as a project that sought to make sense of the connections between three collectives of working nations. He not only appropriated the political and scientific hybrid created in the French-Spanish Fourierist dialogue, but his thought also precipitates the sense of the political into the Mexican national reality by means of a republican appropriation of its premises on the organization of work, readily presented by Sotero Prieto. Most significantly, Sánchez did not propose a socialist republican project in terms of strictly local politics, but in consequence with its radically international dimension.[68]

By formulating a "confederalist" project, Sánchez was imprinting an unprecedented "international system" to his republic which could guarantee each group's "national rights" as much as the "prosperity of all of its associates": it was a project that did not forget the national roots it sprang from. The republics and the nations that interact in this system exist not only as individual, differentiated, groups of people but also as a collective of groups whose existence depended on mutually assuring a "common peace and concert", as Sánchez formulated.[69] Indeed, by going back and forth, and therefore renovating an international (as in "between-nations")[70] analysis, we can see how Sánchez appropriated the imaginary of work articulated by the Atlantic working nation, within the particular and precarious Mexican republican context. The fact that his republican project was affirmed in the socialist-sociological principle should avoid irreflexive attempts of familiarizing his project with the traditional precept of republican politics as the affirmation of a "virtuous association".[71] For Sánchez, on the contrary, the principle of association

---

[67] Juan Pro, "Thinking of a Utopian Future: Fourierism in Nineteenth-Century Spain," *Utopian Studies* 26, no. 2 (2015): 342.

[68] Perhaps the late Pierre-Luc Abramson articulated the most recent and cohesive attempt of historiographically establishing the bridges between American and French socialists before 1848. This study, although it does not analyze the thought of Sánchez or Prieto, does advance fundamental hypothesis that mirror that of Juan Pro's regarding the radicality of Fourierism and its capacity to touch the "social communitarian structures" of the Latin American working groups. We owe his work and perspicacity a great lot, for at an early stage of the research it opened up questions that ended up structuring this chapter. See: Pierre-Luc Abramson, *Mondes Nouveaux et Nouveau Monde : Les Utopies Sociales En Amérique Latine Au XIXe Siècle*, 2nd ed. (Dijon: Les Presses du réel, 2014).

[69] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Medios y Fin de La Política," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 22/10/1847.

[70] See the discussion in the introduction to the dissertation. See: Marcel Mauss, *La Nation, Ou Le Sens Du Social*, ed. Jean Terrier and Marcel Fournier, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2018), 123.

[71] Tom Long and Carsten-Andreas Schulz, "Republican Internationalism: The Nineteenth-Century Roots of Latin American Contributions to International Order," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, July 16, 2021, 1–23, https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2021.1944983.

is conducted to the organization of the nation's working groups, to the organization of work. Behind his theory of confederation, we must remember, lay Fourier's "sublime doctrine" that organized the nation as a consequence of the organization of work, precisely because the "present social mechanism" was ruled by a system divided into "opulence and idleness" on the one hand, and "annihilation and misery" on the other. It was "indispensable" for "talent and work [*talento y trabajo*] to obtain its worthy compensation in the social workshop [*taller social*]".[72]

Unlike the principle of republican virtue, which placed the matter of a moral government of citizenship as a question of distribution of authority, Sánchez ushered it in a political project of republican association that placed the active principle of society, work, at the center of its organizing capacity. Like the French "socialist republicanists",[73] through the concept of association, he was able to put republic, association, and national society on a level of exchangeability that gave the socialist-sociological principle a political relevance for Mexican and American politics. Yet its exchangeability with the concepts of association and society was defined under conditions that were specific to the Mexican context. Indeed, the condition of possibility for the existence of a socialist-federalist organization was not the existence of a republic, but the form into which Mexican society had constituted itself: the nation. As stated above, the first condition for democracy to "triumph" in Mexico was that "Mexico exist as a nation and the United States respect its integrity as such".[74] In a separate column, presumably signed by Sánchez along with other republicanists in Guadalajara, the *Republicano* affirmed that the existence of the nation meant accepting and unifying republicans, "without distinction of *puros* and *moderados*, of centralists and federalists", under their two basic interests: "LA INDEPENDENCIA Y LA REPÚBLICA".[75] Sánchez, in other words, might be the key that helps us unlock the socialist connection between nation, republic, and association into a Mexican "socialist republicanism".

It was not any kind of society that was upheld by people like Sánchez, Prieto, and Considerant. They were ultimately dealing with the creation of a modern society that in the Atlantic space often took the form of a nation. The nation, and not the republic, was at the center of their modern political project and was often the center of disputes with other political and social imaginaries. In fact, we cannot fully understand the consequences of the socialist-republican imaginary if it is not at least briefly contextualized with other relevant political ideas which circulated in the Atlantic at the time, such as monarchism. Seeing that Sánchez was contesting not

[72] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Suscripción al Juicio Crítico de Las Obras Del Dr. Maldonado," *La Linterna de Diógenes*, January 1847.
[73] Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, 198.
[74] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Medios y Fin de La Política," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 22/10/1847.
[75] El Republicano, "Llegada de Mr. Bresson–Planes Carlistas-Proyecto de Monarquía En México-Inquietud Por La Escacez de Subsistencias," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 24/5/1847.

only the U.S. invasion but also more global concerns which involved European monarchist interests in his country, reveals the importance of the link his socialist imaginary established between a republican polity and national politics. As the last quotation points out, it was a matter of the existence of the nation in direct relation to Mexico's recent independence being jeopardized by foreign interventions. The problem was even more pressing for Sánchez because he saw some of his countrymen support European monarchist initiatives as their way of defending Mexico's "nationality".

4. The Atlantic working nation's "international system", beyond the "political divide"

Sánchez's socialist republicanism emerged in a context where centralists faced growing problems as the federalists began to contest their republican administration of the nation. Indeed, the fall of the Centralist Republic in 1846 had been in the oven for at least a couple of years. As was seen in part I, the pronunciamiento of San Luis Potosí which led to the government of the *Bases orgánicas* of 1843, was presented by the ruler who had claimed the need for a new constitution after the proclamation of the *Bases de Tacubaya* in 1841. Santa Anna attacked what he had formerly sworn to defend: the 1843 *Bases* dismantled the possibility to reinstall the 1824 constitution and, throughout 1843, did not cease to chase *moderados* who held important public offices, even attacking former close collaborators of his like Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga. Conflict with José María Tornel, by then his closest collaborator, proved central in the crisis of his administration and, by extension, of the Bases orgánicas altogether.[76] Internal disputes over Santa Anna's excessive self-confidence as the "only one Mexican talented enough to govern the country"[77] was not the only reason for the slow breakdown of centralism.

Some Departments started to openly complain about the course taken by the dispositions of San Luis Potosí, which had manipulated those of Tacubaya to the demise of the federalists' defense of regional autonomy. Mariano Hermoso and Pedro Barajas, representatives of the departmental congress of Jalisco, clearly stated that the "movement" Jalisco had ascribed to in 1841 was risky. Following Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga's call, they had adhered to a movement that had initially wished to re-establish "order in the interior" and "respect in the exterior", two

---

[76] Michael P. Costeloe, "Los generales Santa Anna y Paredes y Arrillaga en México, 1841-1843: rivales por el poder, o una copa más," *Historia Mexicana* 39, no. 154 (October 1, 1989): 417–40; Will Fowler, *Tornel and Santa Anna: The Writer and the Caudillo, Mexico, 1795-1853*, Contributions in Latin American Studies (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000), chapter 5.

[77] Will Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 224. For the pronunciaimentos, see: https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/dates.php?f=y&pid=274&m=12&y=1842.

things the central government had not guaranteed. As representatives of the Guadalajara elites, they ascertained that if "this Department is determined to save the Nation", it has been in response to the "vexations suffered by commerce, the consequent misery of artisans and journeymen, the lack of consumption of agricultural products, and the starvation that threatened the soldier".[78] In other words, as a famous historian noted, they had ascribed to the Guadalajara pronunciamiento in the "hope that the nation's fortunes would improve". The *Bases de Tacubaya* had effectively raised their hopes, as it established the possibility to install "new authorities". Santa Anna, "who had been vested with so much power", now had to answer to the newly established Congress. Yet he "was not political [*político*] nor just", and the "minds of the authors of the plan" ended up establishing a "dictatorship without responsibility", a "power without limits and an organization without guarantees"; a project that went against the will of any Mexican. By doing this, the government that was issued from the *Bases orgánicas* of 1843 only retroacted its steps "in the eminently national purpose for which it was created".[79]

Santa Anna's regime was constantly reproached for being founded on a deceitful rule of the nation, from the moment his government formed a "simulation of a congress" that expressed his "anti-republican singularity". Soon, federalists, and republicans in general, started denouncing his rule not only as an anti-republican but also as a "dictatorship without responsibility", a "power without limits and an organization without guarantees". Sánchez Hidalgo was not the only one who accused Santa Anna's government was led by a "monarchist band" that since 1821 had shut down the possibility of establishing a "fundamental law" for the nation.[80] Between 1846 and 1847, a sway of pronunciamientos finally abolished the centralist system the administrations of Santa Anna and Paredes y Arrillaga had been able to withhold.

Even some officials of the administration of José Mariano Salas, the radical federalist who replaced Paredes y Arrillaga in 1846, thought this government had betrayed its federalist agenda. Manuel Rejón was soon removed from his ministry and did not fear accusing the government of Salas and Gómez Farías, who had risen to the presidency of the council of ministers, of being too "loyal" to the monarchist interests of Paredes y Arrillaga, and in line with the "traitor" Santa Anna.

---

[78] See above, note 15. "Comandancia general del Departamento de Jalisco.—Acompaño á V. S. dos ejemplares del decreto que con esta fecha ha publicado el Exmo. Sr. Gobernador de este Departamento de acuerdo con su Junta Constitucional", *Boletín Oficial*, no. 27, 21/9/1841. (Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México (AHCM), Ayuntamiento, Historia, Revoluciones, vol. 2279, exp. 12, ff. 124-125).
[79] "Comandancia general del Departamento de Jalisco.—Acompaño á V. S. dos ejemplares del decreto que con esta fecha ha publicado el Exmo. Sr. Gobernador de este Departamento de acuerdo con su Junta Constitucional". See also Costeloe, *The Central Republic in Mexico, 1835-1846: Hombres de Bien in the Age of Santa Anna*, 220–27.
[80] "La asamblea departamental, a sus habitantes", *El republicano jalisciense*, 25/8/1846. See also Will Fowler, *Mexico in the Age of Proposals, 1821-1853* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998), 25–30.

Although he was infuriated with his destitution, he accepted it for he did not wish to participate in an administration that had abandoned the federalist principles of the Plan de la Ciudadela (1846).[81] He insisted the government had abandoned the federalist cause by allowing "a reaction against the program of the last revolution [the federalist takeover of the republican administration], and in favor of the stationaries or retrogrades". He was "honored to see myself separated from the ministry", as an "enemy of that public tranquility" which Salas, as Paredes, sought in the "foreign monarchy" with the "utmost loyalty".[82]

As is well known, Paredes y Arrillaga was the first Mexican head of State to, though discretely, defend the assertion of a monarchy in his country since Agustín de Iturbide. The only other precedent was José María Gutiérrez de Estrada openly monarchist pamphlet (1840), where he observed that the Mexican nation had experimented with "democratic, oligarchic, military, demagogic and anarchic [republics], so that all the parties, and always to the detriment of the nation's honor and happiness, have tried the republican system under all possible forms", yet there had not been an attempt at a "*true monarchy* in the person of a *foreign prince*".[83] But as soon as the print began circulating, it was automatically denounced by the Chamber of Deputies which ordered the Ministry of Interior to investigate its nature and purposes. It was promptly deemed as "subversive and seditious" by the "judge of letters" (*juez de letras*) in charge of the trial. Five years later, however, public figures like Lucas Alamán and the Spanish crown emissary Salvador Bermúdez de Castro were less reluctant to show their monarchist filiations.[84]

Although Paredes was cautious not to publicly endorse monarchism, it is now well known that he was personally involved in the establishment of a monarchist newspaper, financed by Alamán and by the Spanish government: *El Tiempo*. He was thus fulfilling his opinions, which "were *the same as they always have been*": monarchical with the desire of raising a crown in Mexico, "*reigned by a Prince of the Royal House of Spain*".[85] Consequently, *El Tiempo* "professed

[81] Salas and Gómez Farías had taken over Mexico City on August 4, 1846, by proclaiming principally two things: to nullify the laws and decrees from the Centralist Republic because its "men, some addicted to the monarchy, others to the detestable centralism and all disaffected with the army" had all caused Mexico's independence to be in the brink; and to constitute a congress "in accordance with the will of the great majority of the nation". See the Plan here: https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/dates.php?f=y&pid=557&m=8&y=1846.
[82] Varios poblanos, *Ultimas comunicaciones habidas entre el Sr. Salas y el Sr. Rejon*, Puebla, Imprenta de José María Macias, 1846, pp. 1-2. (Biblioteca Nacional (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF) 396 (28)).
[83] I take Edward Shawcross's translation and quotation: Edward Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867* (New York, NY: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018), 96.
[84] Corinna Zeltsman, "Defining Responsibility: Printers, Politics, and the Law in Early Republican Mexico City," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 98, no. 2 (May 1, 2018): 189–222, https://doi.org/10.1215/00182168-4376666. As Zeltsmann traces down, Alamán was indirectly involved in Gutiérrez de Estrada's case because of his personal relationships with some of the people that had printed the pamphlet.
[85] This was a private conversation he had with Salvador Bermúdez Castro, an emissary from Madrid in charge of the negotiation of the crowning of a Spanish monarch in Mexico. The citation is taken from: Elías

its faith" openly by stating that the solution to the problems faced by the country –"ruin, demoralization, anarchy, but also the entire dissolution of the nation, the loss of our territory, our name, our independence"– was "representative monarchy". In the context of the explosion of the conflict with the U. S., *El Tiempo* would trace the destiny of the Mexican nation while conducting it towards monarchism: "'Its destiny is to be the first American potency or to disappear from the catalog of peoples: *to be or not to be*'".[86] By building an "Anti-Americanism" into an "argument against all forms of republicanism in favor of monarchy and orientation [*sic*] towards Europe",[87] people like Mariano Paredes, Francisco Sánchez de Tagle, Lucas Alamán, and José María Tornel radicalized their political ideas in opposition to the American republicanism defended by federalists.

Historians have described the division of Mexican politics between republicanists and monarchists as the resurfacing of an underlying "political divide" which existed since the times of independence: an international division between republican federalists and monarchists.[88] As can be remembered from the first part of the dissertation, Mexican politics have been commonly described as having depended on an internal "antinomy" which is corresponsive to that political divide: the division and conflict between federalists and centralists. According to this thesis, such a "dichotomic frame of reference" ultimately prevented politicians to build a new pact, a new constitution, since the fall of Bustamante in 1841 structured Mexican politics at the time. Some scholars have argued that moving beyond that bipolar structure would have precipitated a "rupture of intelligibility" only paralleled to the conflict in 1846 with the U.S.[89] Yet, as was seen since chapter two, the Mexican working nation utterly destabilizes this assumption because it shows that such frame of reference did not enclose the "intelligibility" of contemporary Mexican society. Rather, it neglects the singular role the majority of its (working) groups played in the process of nation-building. Part II of this dissertation has given us further evidence, at the hands of Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo and Sotero Prieto, that the working nation's hybrid composition –which included the working groups as well as local foreigners– further questioned the republican organization of the nation. In doing so, they did not recur to a bipolar structure,[90] but rather to the radical appropriation of an Atlantic imaginary of work.

José Palti, *La Invención de Una Legitimidad: Razón y Retórica En El Pensamiento Mexicano Del Siglo XIX ; (Un Estudio Sobre Las Formas Del Discurso Político)*, 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007), 205.

[86] *El Tiempo*, no date provided. Quoted in: Palti, 206.

[87] Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 137-8.

[88] Shawcross, 91.

[89] Palti, *La Invención de Una Legitimidad*, 195–98.

[90] Historians have argued that the bipolar division between federalists and centralists was slowly "substituted" from 1846 with the bipolarity between liberals and conservatives –therefore giving it the character of a supra-historical narrative. Alfredo Ávila and Alicia Salmerón Castro, eds., *Partidos, Facciones*

In this chapter, the sources have conveyed how Mexican republicanism did not depend on a bipolar framework. Sotero Prieto and Sabas Sánchez introduce a third element that destabilizes the federalist-centralist structure. We may even say that this third element introduces enough contingency into Mexican politics to better explain the division between republicanism and monarchism, while not depending on this frame to explicit the involvement of different actors in a wider context of changing global politics of empire. Until now, historians have described this division by recurring to the domestic division of Bourbonists from federalists in the 1820s. They argue that, like in 1821-1823, when monarchists sought a Spanish sovereign to rule the Mexican Empire, in 1846 Alamán and Bermúdez de Castro actively agencied for a Spanish monarch to take the place of Paredes y Arrillaga. In turn, republican federalists were seeking ways to defend independence, first with the help of the "sister republics" like the U.S. and other republics in South America in the 1820s, then again in the 1840s with the South American republics.[91] Discovering these tendencies has involved historians in asking who was behind these polities; not only who proposed or defended a monarchist or federalist project, but who they recurred to in the conception of their political imaginary. As we have seen here, if we ask this question to certain republicanists of the time, the answer may not always be the republican "virtuous association" of the nation, the *pueblo* composed of *pueblos*, their civil militias, and their Department's –or state's– federalist representatives.

Pronounced federalists were not the only ones to defend the republic against the monarchic claims of Paredes y Arrillaga and the people he "rubbed shoulders" with, remembering Eric Van Young's formula.[92] Even characters more difficult to pigeonhole such as Antonio de Haro y Tamariz exposed republican motivations against monarchy in Mexico. An industrialist from Puebla (who was probably involved in the litigations on raw cotton presented in chapter 3), Haro was a friend and collaborator of Santa Anna, eventually becoming the minister of treasury in 1844. With the arrival of Herrera's government (1845), Santa Anna and all his ministers were led to exile, the former remaining in Cuba while Haro traveled to Europe. From Paris, Haro y Tamariz

---

y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX, 1st ed., Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012). As mentioned in the first part of the dissertation, this does not mean that this structure did not exist at all. What we are contending is that it should not be assumed as the general structure of politics or society for there were evidently other "frames of reference" at play.

[91] Alfredo Ávila, "El Triunfo de Los Republicanos," in *Para La Libertad: Los Republicanos En Tiempos Del Imperio 1821 - 1823*, Historia Moderna y Contemporánea (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2004), 213–76; Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World*; Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*; Pro, "La utopía de la unidad americana en la época de las revoluciones."

[92] Eric Van Young, *A Life Together: Lucas Alaman and Mexico, 1792-1853* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), 449. See above, chapter 3.

reacted to the publication of *El Tiempo*'s "profession of faith" analyzed above. He published an "exposition" of his opinions on the constitutional ("representative" in *El Tiempo*'s words) monarchy proposed by Paredes y Arrillaga and Alamán.[93] Originally published in April, his countrymen printed it in August 1846, once federalists had deposed Paredes's monarchist administration. Beyond his obvious advocacy for the republic, he presented a series of arguments that have not been linked, to the extent of our knowledge, to the industrialist context he came from.

In the pamphlet, he recurred to the historicist trope of justifying the republic as the "system" that had fought against the "proscription of democratic principles" by the "inquisition" and the "colonial government". "Not monarchy but the republican system" was the reaction enacted by the "most ancient patriots", who sustained the "living and eloquent tradition of the patriarchs of the independence". As the "interprets" of the "desires and passions" of their time, independence was "indispensable" by 1821. The *caudillo* of the three warranties (independence, union, preservation of Roman Catholicism) Agustín de Iturbide had triumphed because of the "dominant ideas of *popular sovereignty*", which established the principle of independence (p. 13). Since then, monarchists "speculated" that this idea was theirs, dividing the country by introducing "opposite principles" into the direction of the "parties that today dispute the command under new names and with the same purpose". He quickly dismissed the monarchist idea of bringing a foreign monarch because the "new nobility" that would have to be created would soon lose its "popularity" due to the lack of "political antecedents". The "elements of anarchy" would only grow to the point where the "fierce" passions would lead to the "struggle of the representatives of ancient ideas with those of modern ones". As a result, the only way to "reorganize society" was a revolution that would have to "imitate" the French "conventionalists" of 1793 (p. 16). He thus sentenced: "From the moment there is no longer a community of interests in any class of the state, rivalries immediately arise, and these are the main support of revolutions". This would continue to be the tendency as long as "delusional or ill faith writers [...] are determined to bend the [republican] interests and passions of the multitude to their [monarchist] speculative principles" (p. 18). Up to this point of the pamphlet, Haro did not resort to arguments alien to his fellow republicans.[94] The difference or particularity appears when he begins to defend federalism.

---

[93] Antonio de Haro y Tamariz, "Esposición que Antonio de Haro y Tamariz dirige á sus conciudadanos, y opiniones del autor sobre la monarquía constitucional", Mexico City, Imprenta en el Arquillo de la Alcaicería, 1846. (BN LAF 299 (21)). Another analysis of this pamphlet is included in: Jan Bazant, *Antonio Haro y Tamariz y Sus Aventuras Políticas, 1811-1869* (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 1985), 41–43, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv26d8tb. Until otherwise noted, all citations of Haro y Tamariz's pamphlet will be included in the body of the text in parenthesis.

[94] For a suggestive analysis of the concept of representation in Latin America that analyzes some of the tropes mentioned by Haro, see: François-Xavier Guerra, "Las Metamorfosis de La Representación En El Siglo XIX," in *Pensar La Modernidad Política: Propuestas Desde La Nueva Historia Política : Antología*, ed.

Indeed, even if a foreign monarch would successfully be implanted into the Mexican government, the "new sovereign's feverish activity" would not be followed by the Departments which were at the "extremes of the territory", namely the northern regions from Sinaloa to New Mexico. On the contrary,

> the monarchy, far from providing for the encouragement of their wealth, and the protection of their property and lives, will only extend its heavy arm to continue the vicious and miscalculated system of contributions, and the no less ruinous system of prohibitions, which is so favorable to the corruption of employees and the ruin of Mexico. (p. 21)

Establishing a foreign prince meant "to subvert the majority of Mexicans *because the nation* that had during twenty-three years spilled its blood" would not submit its "destinies to the wrong and worrisome judgment of a foreign prince". Haro y Tamariz thus unveils the irreducibility of republicanism's conflict with monarchism to a bipolar antagonism: either project had to come to terms with Mexican society, with the majority of Mexicans that constituted the nation. In other words, either political form –Republic or Monarchy– had to deal with the subjects it wished to rule. The majority of Mexicans who composed the nation did not want a foreign prince because he would not respect their most evident interest: the existence of their independent republic.

It was thus in the majority of the nation's interest to uphold a federalist organization of the Republic, for this would ensure that even the northern Departments of the Republic could "attend to their necessities and take advantage of the elements of public wealth that abound in their fruitful bosom". Indeed, Haro even pressed these northern Departments to follow the influences of their Texan neighbors, who had been "stung" by the incentives of industrial, agricultural, and commercial progress (p. 21). As an industrialist from Puebla, Haro y Tamariz connected the independent existence of the nation, as a collectivity of departments with industrial, agricultural, and commercial activities unfolded by the majority of the Mexican working groups, to the interest of being a Republic that reflected their elements of wealth.

For Haro, the republican destiny of Mexico was therefore historical *and* social. When seeking "in good faith" a solution to the current "revenue disarrangement" in Mexico, he looked for the "elements of monarchy, and I only find the elements of republic" (p. 22). In this sense, if Mexicans backed a republican project, it was not because of an "arbitrariness" that commonly dominates the "usurpers" (p. 9). Republics and monarchies "are good when their peoples [*pueblos*] need them and prosper with them", when they originate from "customs and are a consequence of their legal traditions", but most importantly, when they "follow the ideas and interests of the majority" (p. 23). This said, the pamphlet was addressed to his fellow *poblanos* (from Puebla), with the intent to show that he had remained "enthusiastically faithful" to

---

Alicia Salmerón Castro and Cecilia Noriega Elío (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2016), 183–216.

republicanism, which was of the utmost importance during the "great crisis of the social body [*cuerpo social*]" of 1846-1848 (p. 29). He did not have "intentions of any kind" beyond this republican counter-profession of monarchical faith. Yet he raises a question that has been surprisingly neglected by historiography:

> Could it be that the evils of the nations come from the fact that the legislators have fought against the tendencies and missions of the human species since their birth, as the philosopher from Besançon Fourrier [*sic*] exposed in his social system? It is left to those who were born with the genius of Newton and with the dialectic and picturesque eloquence of the Genevan writer to resolve such intricate matters. (p. 27)

The only comment that has been found for this part of the document has been if "one could question whether Haro was not in his Parisian youth a supporter of Fourierism".[95] The question Haro raises, however, is much more relevant than his support or not of Fourier. It comes after questioning the existence of the nation and the survival of its republican interests. An inquiry that entailed doubting the capacity of Mexican politicians to respond to the interests of the "majority" in a context where the "social body" was suffering a profound, existential, crisis. Even if a Rousseauian reference to Fourier at the end of the pamphlet should not determine the whole message of the document, the combination of his republican ideals with a radical questioning of the political and social arrangement of society as Fourier's, followed by the reference to Newton and Rousseau, should not be neglected or overlooked with a simple question on his intellectual "influences". Just as his final mention of Guizot and the epigraph quoting Odilon Barrot –a supporter of Louis Philippe and Louis Napoleon's regime– are significant in the wide gamma of principles his republicanism recurs. In effect, he places these thinkers in the context of a central question for the Mexican nation and its republican tradition: could it be that its "chained" destiny was due to the blindness of Mexican legislators, who did not respect the will of the majority which was clearly republican? By criticizing the centralist years and the more immediate monarchist profession of faith of *El Tiempo*, he displays a double fidelity to republicanism and, more fundamentally, to the "sacred code of 1824" (p. 23). His veiled federalism evokes Fourier's rejection of legislative politics as a republican argument against the tradition of monarchists who fought against the "customs and traditions" of the Mexican nation. A matter which could only be solved by geniuses and the intricate intelligence of scientists and philosophers, mirroring the reflection of Sotero Prieto mentioned in chapter 3.

This body of evidence might help us affirm that at least some Mexican republicanists, besides Sánchez and Prieto, were carefully "looking", observing, their society and the groups it was composed of. Characters who were relatively foreign to the political world, or who had been ostracized from it, like Manuel Rejón who was separated from his office, or Haro y Tamariz who

[95] Bazant, *Antonio Haro y Tamariz y Sus Aventuras Políticas, 1811-1869*, 44.

was exiled due to the "unfortunate" political link he had developed with his friend Santa Anna, have the advantage of denouncing certain attitudes through their disenchantment. Undoubtedly, the similarity with Sotero Prieto and Estévan Guénot, who were also "foreigners" to the world of the agiotistas, is an important aspect to keep in mind when reflecting on these republicanists. Rejón, for example, sincerely hoped Salas refrained from his tendency of presenting the "most civilized" of Mexico's populations, the "poor inhabitants of the capital of the republic" who composed the battalions of the National Guard, as a "den of thugs ready to attack the properties of nationals and foreigners".[96]

As historians have shown, militias were typically composed of the poor inhabitants of the pueblos, towns, villages, or cities. In places like Mexico City, they commonly grouped in peripherical zones where people would migrate to search for subsistence, often filling the cities with people that did not have fixed labor and were commonly regarded as "idle", "vagabonds" or "loafers" by authorities. Historians have registered that such groups were commonly the first to be recruited into the militias, where they formed the battalions Rejón mentions.[97] Quite contrary to what Salas or Santa Anna had done regarding these populations of urban poor workers who wandered in their unfortunately common non-labor hours, Rejón and Haro thought of them as populations worth considering in the foundation of a federal republic. Indeed, we discover that Guénot's message analyzed in chapter two was not so uncommon. More importantly, we discover that behind the republican motive of organization of the "majority of the nation", there was the working nation's imaginary of work being appropriated and transformed as soon as 1846. Though for some historians this simply implied that there was a general expansion of the republican rights for citizens, directly linked to the possibility of voting and being elected,[98] if analyzed carefully, the republican expansion of rights entailed a whole lot more according to some federalists. There was a matter of "social progress" at hand.

[96] Varios poblanos, "Ultimas comunicaciones habidas entre el Sr. Salas y el Sr. Rejon", Puebla, Imprenta de José María Macias, 1846, p. 2. (BN LAF 396 (28)).

[97] Clara E. Lida and Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Trabajo, Ocio y Coacción: Trabajadores Urbanos En México y Guatemala En El Siglo XIX* (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2001); Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Entre El Discurso y La Coacción. Las Elites y Las Clases Populares a Mediados Del Siglo XIX," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política* (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 311–38; María del Refugio Magallanes Delgado, "Artesanos En Armas. Del Gremio de Oficios a Las Milicias En Zacatecas, 1758-1820," in *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*, ed. Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores (Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012), 127–65.

[98] See Alicia Hernández Chávez, "Monarquía-República-Nación-Pueblo," in *Ensayos Sobre La Nueva Historia Política de América Latina*, ed. Guillermo Palacios, Siglo XIX (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2007), 147–70, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47w53q.11.

A newspaper that briefly and intermittently substituted *El siglo diez y nueve* in 1843, 1845, and 1847 reflected on the transformations of the tasks of public administration.[99] The editors of the *Estandarte Nacional* agreed that recent events had proven the scientific division of "personal government" (private law) from the administration of "the material and the judicial ruling" insufficient, for "the interests of people and the ordering of things are intertwined in such a way that there is no way of separating them, neither in the region of theories nor in the field of government". The "political body" of the State, no matter its representation, had always needed to recognize "the need to provide pecuniary resources" to conserve independence and order in society. This explains the need for "dispositions" to "honor work [*trabajo*] and favor production". Yet in this particular aspect, it was not necessarily due to the State's administration and government of the nation that these dispositions were advanced. As a result of the State's need to provide "general prosperity", the "social need for political guarantees has been made felt". Thanks to "social progress during modern times [...], the country has sought to take part in the supreme power to influence the administration of the state's patrimony, which became its [the country's] own administration [*se convertía en su propia administración*], and to avoid, as far as possible, any kind of arbitrariness".[100]

Though admittedly with a different political tone as the one deployed by socialist republicanists on both shores of the Atlantic, some in Mexico unfurled a republican organization of the nation that obeyed the interests of the people as workers and producers. Federalists or not, such republicanists communed under the impulse of the Mexican working nation's imaginary, which sought an organization that could correspond to their productive and reproductive interests. During the most acute crisis Mexico had lived through since independence, "radical republicanists" sought to keep a link with the "popular aspirations" they had historically sought to embrace.[101] What is evidenced here is that the groups that sought the contact could no longer neglect the political participation of the working groups in the process of a proper reformation of

[99] On the intricacies of printing at times of heated political debate in nineteenth century Mexico, see the eye-opening study of Corinna Zeltsman: Corinna Zeltsman, *Ink Under the Fingernails: Printing Politics in Nineteenth-Century Mexico* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2021).
[100] "Administración", *El Estandarte Nacional. Periódico político, literario, artístico, científico, industrial, defensor de las doctrinas y de los intereses sociales*, tomo I, 21/5/1845, p. 4-5. (Hemeroteca Nacional de México (HNM) MO56 EST.n).
[101] Alfredo Ávila, "El Radicalismo Republicano En Hispanoamérica: Un Balance Historiográfico y Una Propuesta de Estudio," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 41 (June 1, 2011): 48–49, https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.2011.41.26584. Ávila discusses the hypothesis shared by Mallon and Guardino that what they call a "popular federalism" in the 1830s and 1840s depicts prior forms of republicanism as detached from "popular aspirations". The latter characterizes popular federalism by its "inclusive definitions of citizenship, an emphasis on local autonomy, and opposition to the wealthy few who were accused of both exploiting Mexico's impoverished majority and conniving to subvert Mexico's independence". Peter Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 217.

the Mexican nation, be it in terms of the constitutional reformation of 1847, or the more deep sense of a reformation as the country was battered by a U.S. invasion. We could say that the working nation had transformed radical republicanism from a "plebeian" or "elite" political form by showing itself as the political synthesis of their dreams of "social progress".

Evidently, the approximation between republicanists and the working groups entailed a determinant change for federalism, Sánchez being perhaps the most radical example. However, his fellow Jalisco federalist legislators also acknowledged the changing national winds of progress. As the governor of Jalisco conveyed in 1844, the "political regeneration of the nation" depended on the "reorganization of the nation" that must abandon the "vices" of the previous centralist organization, which burdened the populations of "proletarians" with an incapacity to have "hopes of prosperity".[102] From the French approximation of the Republic to the workshop, republicans from Jalisco conceived the possibility of approaching the rule of the states of the federation –the former Departments under centralist law– to the political regeneration of the working groups. Without the manufacturing groups that concentrated in the industrial landscape, defending the nation would be as impossible as sustaining its economy, for they were still the groups and productive activities that held "national industry" on its feet.[103] Radical republicanism, in other words, is the common socket that allows us to displace the bipolar framework of federalism-centralism or republicanism-monarchism, to a more contingent political and historical structure that can also help explain, in that it contextualizes, how Sabas Sánchez proposed a socialist republican organization of the nation in 1847.

In the final section of the chapter, we come back to Sánchez's proposal and shed light on its radicality. Indeed, although his project did have some common inspiration in radical republicanism, in that it wished to build a new network of "sister republics", it does not completely follow the "American republican modernity" some historians talk about. We shall come back to the fact that it was not simply a contrast to a "Europhile" modernity of monarchical inspirations, or a "New World civilization" according to domestic republican inspirations.[104] If this counter

[102] "Antonio Escovedo, gobernador constitucional del Departamento de Jalisco, á todos sus habitantes, sabed: que La Ecsma. Asamblea departamental se ha servido remitirme las comunicaciones oficiales que siguen. Y para que llegue á noticia de todos los habitantes de este Departamento, mando se imprima, publique circule á quienes corresponda. Dado en Guadalajara en el Palacio del Gobierno á 1.o de Noviembre de 1844". (AHCM, Ayuntamiento, Historia, Revoluciones, vol. 2279, exp. 49, f. 1).

[103] On this aspect, see: Guy P. C. Thomson, "Traditional and Modern Manufacturing in Mexico, 1821-1850," in *América Latina En La Época de Simón Bolívar : La Formación de Las Economías Nacionales y Los Intereses Económicos Europeos, 1800-1850*, ed. Reinhard Liehr, Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana 33 (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1989), 55–87.

[104] For the thesis that American republican modernity was built as against Europhile modernity, see: James Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 61–73; James Sanders, "Decolonizing Europe," in *The First Wave of Decolonization*, ed. Mark Thurner, Routledge Studies in Global Latin America (New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2019), 95–117.

position of two modernities, ultimately American or European, may hold when respecting the lens of a federalist-monarchist/liberal-conservative/plebeian-elite reading of politics,[105] Sánchez and Prieto deploy, through the *Republicano*, a series of arguments that destabilize this image, by introducing socialist republicanism into the picture. As previously advanced, the watershed between these republicanisms lies in what Sánchez spells out as a confederalist project.

In an anonymous column, "copied" from an unstated source, the *Republicano* asks: "How do nations stand in relation to one another?" In a state where "savage men" did not have a "social link" to unite them but had certain "conventions" that allowed them to "breath and rest". The frail state of international relations nonetheless admitted the conditions for peace to be upheld through the commonly sought "uses and convened rules". The parable thus rhetorically asks whether this was not the "perfect state" of relations. In it, nations had achieved a "state of formless society" and "absolute isolation" that was more or less similar to that of savages. The state gathered them in the same group "by a kind of mutual confidence [...], without having known how to organize a public power that would ensure the rights of each one of them". Such a state of affairs was far from perfect, to the extent that it was still ruled by the "law of nations".[106]

On the contrary, they asserted that a truly international "federation" needed to attend to the two greatest interests of nations: "internal peace of each nation and the foreign security of each". Internal and external war would be avoided by examining the "interests of the allies", by "hindering war" through the establishment of an "equilibrium" between each nation's power and balancing forces, as well as an establishment of a "common law" surveilled by a congress dedicated to "inalterably" conserve peace and friendship among the nations. The *Republicano* was thus advocating for one specific polity to be formed: the American confederation. Its editors recurred to previous confederalist ideas by privileging the task of reinstating a balance between the federation's members, to avoid situations like the conflict with the U.S. where one country

---

[105] The historical counter-position has been transferred even to most historiographic trends. This is evident in recent debates that discuss the origins of a "pan-Latin" discourse. Synthetically, it might be said that it was either republican-liberal or monarchist-conservative. And much of the conclusions depend on which standpoint the historians adopt: America or Europe. See the work that respectively defend one or the other thesis in: Gabriela De Lima Grecco and Sven Schuster, "Decolonizing Global History? A Latin American Perspective," *Journal of World History* 31, no. 2 (2020): 425–46, https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2020.0024; Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*.

[106] "De La Federación General de Los Estados Americanos," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 20/8/1847. Unless otherwise noted, citations are taken from this source. On the exchanges between European and American law in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, when Vattel's theory of the "law of nations" was in vogue, see: Tamar Herzog, "Did European Law Turn American?: Territory, Property and Rights in an Atlantic World," in *New Horizons in Spanish Colonial Law*, ed. Thomas Duve and Heikki Pihlajamäki, vol. 3, Contributions to Transnational Early Modern Legal History (Frankfurt am Main: Max Planck Institute for Legal History and Legal Theory, 2015), 75–96.

powered over another.[107] This federalist composition was not only their idea. As the *Republicano*'s "sincere friends", the *Démocratie pacifique* claimed Mexicans needed to "gather [*concentraos*]" and form a "common mass [*masa común*]" with the country's provinces. Only this internal organization, which would allow the country to get rid of the "onerous burden" of some provinces, could eventually allow it to have "happy allies" instead of "subjugated [and] dangerous enemies".[108] The message was quite clear: do not privilege territorial unity over the possibility of building peaceful relationships with domestic provinces and foreign nations. This was not left unnoticed by the *Republicano*'s editors.

They immediately introduced a comment on how "profoundly some European thinkers have fathomed our political abyss", illustrating matters that were very popular in France while unfortunately "excessively unknown" in Mexico. Indeed, though they thought the "continental cause" should be clearly American, uniting the "common masses" of states, their newspaper translated another article that appeared in the *Démocratie pacifique* because it "tends to highlight" what that specific cause was, namely that "American politics [*política americana*] consists of work [*trabajo*], whose development brings about the alliance, and not the war of peoples [*pueblos*]". Victor Considerant's newspaper affirmed that "European politics, entirely of quarrels, of supremacy, of perpetual clashes, will contribute nothing to the increase of the American nations". They were convinced that the true spirit of Anglo-American politics was work, and the U.S. had to "attract America to this league of industrial work".

> The confederation of the American republics, freed from every seed of discord, tired by European politics and interests, would give an immense impulse to their industrial work, to which both the United States and Europe itself would contribute since the latter would not have to be represented in America by means of diplomats, jealous of each other, nor by combatants, facing each other, but by workers, engineers, and capital [*capitales*].[109]

The future society, composed of these free communities, would be organized in the form of a federation.[110] Represented by the working groups instead of diplomats, Europe and America

---

[107] Indeed, these ideas were held since the 1820s, as stated above. More importantly, they seem to have reappeared precisely in the 1840s throughout the continent. There seems to be no connection with Sánchez or the *Republicano*, but the project of an American confederation was seriously pursued in the following two decades in South America. See Gobat, "The Invention of Latin America"; Germán A. de la Reza, "Confederations as a Balancing Power Device: The Continental Treaty of Santiago (1856)," *Passagens* 11, no. 1 (2019): 91–110.
[108] "La Inglaterra y México," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 21/6/1847.
[109] "La Política Americana Consiste En El Trabajo," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 21/6/1847.
[110] As Pierre-Luc Abramson insists, the contact of Considerant with Mexico was all but mild. He sought to "act upon the social history of Mexico" through his federative and Fourierist imaginary, which would enact the "great social reform". Abramson, *Mondes Nouveaux et Nouveau Monde*, 58–67. The contact of Considerant with Mexico is well studied. See, for example: Silvio Zavala, "Victor Considérant ante el problema social de México," *Historia Mexicana* 7, no. 27 (January 1, 1958): 309–28; De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant"; Carlos Illades, *Las otras ideas: estudio sobre el primer socialismo en México, 1850-1935* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era : Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Cuajimalpa, 2008).

would create an international bond that could prevent conflict. Any European intervention that did not happen after the request of free passage through the isthmus –referring to both the Panama and Tehuantepec (Mexico) isthmus– by "all peoples [*todos los pueblos*]" was "more noxious than profitable". This, in fact, would be the next step that the American confederation could advance in line with the formation of "federal links more extensive than their current demarcations". The utopian tone with which the French Fourierist groups were appraised by their Mexican *amis* was also toned down according to the difficult context in which these ideas were being formulated. Indeed, the *Republicano* would be forced to consider that their country was surrounded by the U.S. invasion and affirmed that "desolation and slaughter do not end but increase the difficulties". However, the most relevant problem was not the desolation created by the war. It was, as mentioned above, the law that divided nations which should, on the contrary, be put into relation.

They thus insisted that the "continental cause" could not be affirmed if nations were considered as isolated individuals. As such, they found themselves submerged in a "barbarous state" that did not allow any "conciliation of interests" because there was no justice. The path was easier than it might have seemed for contemporaries, for there were previous agreements upon which they could construct continental agreements. In effect, they only needed to "perfect" and "consume the institution" of the 1826 Panama congress.[111] Hence, their call was clear: "Initiate Mexico the erection of a supranational American tribune and submit to its decision the international matters of the continent and those in common with Europe".[112] The American confederation defended by the *Republicano* and Sánchez was thus establishing a communication between the Americas and Europe, in an attempt of establishing an international confederation.

With these three pieces, which summarize an argument more or less present in over seventy numbers of the *Republicano* from 1846 to 1848, we finally arrive at the decisive point where previous historiographical divisions of Atlantic politics in the 1840s into an American republican modernity and a Europhile monarchist modernity are fractured by the socialist-sociological principle conveyed by the Atlantic working nation. The watershed, as can be deduced, does not lie in the confederalist project as such, but on the international dimension imbued into the imaginary of work carried by socialists as well as radical republicanists. Overcoming previous divisions, Sánchez's project took the republican organization beyond the principle of nationality and conferred it with French socialist republicanism. He abandoned the trope of a virtuous

[111] The 1826 congress of Panama convened representatives from what is today Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Panama, Mexico, Peru, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica. Its purpose was the establishment of a "plenipotentiary assembly" that could represent the American states and serve as a balancing power against Spanish and European interests in conquest of the territories involved. For a detailed analysis of the congress and its consequences throughout the continent, see: Pro, "La utopía de la unidad americana en la época de las revoluciones."

[112] "Remitido," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 6/7/1847.

republican association of individuals in favor of a national working organization that could precipitate the association of American as much as European nations into a republican confederation. Together with the collective behind the *Republicano* and other radical republicanists, he did not refrain from criticizing their monarchist countrymen who wished to hamper the "nationality" of Mexico by attracting ignorant monarchs to their vast and complex territory. But he did so through the vast international network weaved by the socialist-sociological principle that traveled between the Mexican, Spanish, and French working nations, altering Atlantic politics through its hybrid imaginary of work. The Atlantic working nations alter the bipolar political structure of intelligibility by introducing their own institutions, imaginaries, and collectivities, and by constituting what we call "Atlantic socialism".

5. Altering modernity from within. The Atlantic working nation's socialism

Though it might be evident, before concluding the chapter, I would like to shed light on what I consider "alternative" in the Atlantic working nation's political project. As anticipated in the considerations included in chapter two regarding the "alternativity" of the *Sociedad*, its novelty alters both modernities proposed by monarchism and republicanism, carving out the place that embedded Atlantic socialism. That is, it instituted the possibility of organizing the working nations of the Atlantic into a fraternal chain of republics according to the common principle of their politics: association through work. For the Atlantic working nations, then, it could be said that work took the place of sovereignty in the republican organization of the nation's groups. As conceptual historians have confirmed, it was precisely throughout the 1830s and 1840s that sovereignty in Hispanic America began "detaching", as a political concept, from the "social capacities" of the nation, that is, from the "originary sovereign authority" handled by the nation since 1812.[113]

In this sense, the first symptom of Atlantic socialism's disruption was the alteration of the nation not as a sovereign body in need of political legitimacy, but as a collectivity of groups that precipitated the principle of working association into their republican lives. In part II of the dissertation, however, as soon as other working nations in the Atlantic began expressing their own imaginaries of association, the hybrid dimension of the working nation emerged. It was not a community asserted in the exclusiveness of "nationality" that affirmed itself *vis-à-vis* a foreign enemy, but a collectivity that imagined itself in radical communication between nations. It

[113] Noemí Goldman, "Soberanía En Iberoamérica. Dimensiones y Dilemas de Un Concepto Político Fundamental, 1780-1870," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Noemí Goldman, vol. 10, Iberconceptos (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 36.

imagined the institution of a nation that could be organized not "from above" or "from below", but "from within": from the working and productive groups distributed throughout each nation. Indeed, work and association were the principles which allowed Sánchez to re-imagine the project of an American confederation. Socialist association in the 1840s could be thus considered as the central aspect which turned the counter-position between monarchist, republican, and global relations into inter-national relationships, within and between American and European nations. Thus, the "political divide" in the Atlantic space by the mid-1840s hosted republicanism, monarchism, *and* socialism. And it was the third which conveyed the possibility of an alternative modernity based on the "international system" of Atlantic socialism. Ultimately, it is the international project that historically preceded and politically exceeded the "competing modernity" posed by Mexico which was based on democracy, republicanism, and liberty in the following decades.[114] Atlantic socialism, that is, enabled Mexican socialism to precede liberalism as it appeared in the 1850s.

Atlantic socialism emerged through an intricate process of connectivity established between the Mexican, Spanish, and French working nations. It dialogued productively with concomitant political experiences such as radical republicanism. As shall be seen in the next chapter, revisiting the presumption of such radicality, and embedding it in the imaginary of work that allowed its reinvention in the 1840s and 1850s, exceeds previous conceptions that put it simply as a response to local centralists or global monarchisms. It altered local political intelligibility by communicating with international groups and imaginaries, which ultimately led Sánchez to compose Mexican federalism with socialist republicanism into a project that did not need to look for a mysterious "arcane" because it was already there:[115] American confederalism. Appropriating the federalist politics proposed by Victor Considerant, Sánchez was able to propose an inter-national cooperation, a "fraternal chain" of the Atlantic working nations, between America and Europe. Going past the unreasonable proposal of dividing Mexico's vast federation during the U.S. invasion, Sánchez was able to recover the socialist-sociological principle of the Atlantic working nations, organization through association, by elevating it as the politics that should circulate

[114] James Sanders, "Revolution and the Creation of an Atlantic Counter-Modernity: Popular and Elite Contestations of Republicanism and Progress in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Latin America," in *L'Atlantique Révolutionnaire: Une Perspective Ibéro-Américaine*, ed. Clément Thibaud et al., Le Monde Atlantique (Bécherel: Les Perséides Éditions, 2013), 233–57; Sanders, "Decolonizing Europe." There is no need to remark the dialogue this section intends to establish with the study of a "polycentric republicanism" developed in the last decade. Clément Thibaud et al., eds., *L'Atlantique révolutionnaire: une perspective ibéro-américaine*, Le monde atlantique (Bécherel: Les Perséides Éditions, 2013); Hilda Sábato, *Republics of the New World: The Revolutionary Political Experiment in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Princeton Oxford: Princeton Unversity Press, 2018); Clément Thibaud, "Para Una Historia Policéntrica de Los Republicanismos Atlánticos (1770-1880)," *Prismas. Revista de Historia Intelectual*, no. 23 (2019): 145–62.

[115] "Remitido," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 6/7/1847.

between the American nations but was also susceptible of exchange with Europe. An unheard-of inter-national exchange was posited in terms of the association of the majority of the groups which composed the international *milieux* that had been built by 1847 in the Atlantic. From 1848, however, this landscape changed radically. In the metamorphosis of socialist politics in relation to republicanism and monarchist imperial politics, the 1850s saw the Atlantic nations deal with new actors that transformed international politics that had been instituted thus far.

6. Conclusions

As was seen in this chapter, what seemed to be a shift that was dependent on external affairs of international connections between Mexico, Spain, and France, actually had undeniable local precedents that prepared the terrain for the displacement of the political arena, so to speak. While the conditions for international communication were beginning to be elucidated, Mexican federalists in Jalisco and other Departments, states, or provinces were actively imagining the "regeneration" (Yañez and Xicoténcatl), that is, the "reorganization of the nation" after the centralist radicalization of the Santa Anna administration and the monarchist pursuit endorsed by Paredes y Arrillaga. The pressing necessity of this reorganization was felt with more potency since these "retrogrades" had taken over the Republic's administration. Federalist tropes were instrumental for some radical republicanists to advocate for the defense of the "republican system", which was the system defended by the "majority of Mexicans", the Mexican nation. Most importantly, it meant defending the "ideas and interests of the majority" (Haro y Tamariz). As was seen in chapter two, the composition of this majority of Mexico's population was principally rural and lived in the *pueblos* that were scattered throughout the territory, but republicans such as Rejón and Haro y Tamariz convey a central aspect that communed these groups' experiences: they were the creators of "public wealth". These rural and urban groups which composed the majority of the nation, as affirmed, were "manufacturing the nation", and to that extent have appeared here as the Mexican working nation.

The socialist-sociological principle, as it appeared in Sotero Prieto, and the socialist-federalist principle of Sabas Sánchez, was correlative to the radical republicanists' "rapprochement" of the political and social world. With Leroux and Considerant, they were instituting a political imaginary that could conduct the republic to the workshop and vice versa. As the principle of association for manufacturers and artisans, radical republicanism allowed federalists in the *Estandarte Nacional*, for example, to unveil the "arbitrariness" with which the State and its division from society had been built. The socialist-sociological contemplation of their society illustrated how the "political body" for republicans, the State, had been presented with the

need to "honor" work and "favor" production. "Social progress" had pushed the social body's "needs" to be inexorably "felt". The wide collectivity of republicanists thus expose a "radical republicanism" which, although sustained by federalists, does not depend on a defense of a "plebeian" or "elite" republic for it was the result of the contact between realities which were unapproachable in the guise of others. Rejón's argument which presented the battalions as the "most civilized" populations is a powerful testament to this rapprochement.

As mentioned, this republicanism bends the "frames of reference" previous politicians and thinkers, and historians in their wake, built. If it certainly does not correspond to centralism's political agenda, neither does it fit the liberal condemnation of Mariano Otero, who famously sentenced that the "most numerous class" was "extremely inclined" to throw itself into an unfearful and unworthy fight, ultimately driven by its "taste for prodigality and pleasures".[116] Mexican radical republicanism becomes radical not because of an abstract and rhetorical discussion on politics, principles, and concepts, but because there were groups that were in contact with their society and the transformations that were happening in it. Some politicians, pinpointed and at times even isolated from the common currents of republicanism, contemplated the working nation's transformation of the nation, and sought to implement them through a republican, federalist, politics. Undoubtedly, some federalists still conceived the reorganization of the Republic in line with the discussions of the constitutional reform of 1847. That is, with the re-formation of a "popular representative Republic"[117] in accordance with the 1824 "sacred code", but where the federation was no longer to be conceived as a "*simple society of societies*". Now the "ventures [*negocios*] of internal administration" of these united citizens, under the power of their State, was "exercised directly" without the intervention of the power of the states of which the Federation, the "Union", was composed. This was what marked the difference from the "weak confederations of antiquity" and what made the government of the Union a "national government" which could "regulate its own organization through a fundamental law".[118] The threshold with federalism as re-imagined by the radical republicanists appears quite clearly. In contrast with the *moderado* and *puro* constituent assembly, radical republicanists conceived the nation as a society of societies, as a federation that was in some senses reminiscent of the "confederations of antiquity"

---

[116] "La clase más numerosa, la escluida de todos los beneficios sociales, la que sentía sobre sí el peso de la injusticia y la opresión, y en cuya mayor parte ecsistían profundos recuerdos de odio y de venganza, estaba sin duda en estremo dispuesta á lanzarse en una lucha que su valor salvage y la miseria de su vida no le hacían temer, mientras que veía en ella la ocasión lisonjera de vengar sus agravios y de mejorar de condición, es decir, de entregarse á su gusto por la prodigalidad y los placeres". Mariano Otero, *Ensayo Sobre El Verdadero Estado de La Cuestion Social y Politica Que Se Agita En La República Mexicana.* (Mexico: Impreso por Ignacio Cumplido, 1842), 41.

[117] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 5:275–79.

[118] Mariano Otero, "Voto Particular de Mariano Otero (5 de Abril de 1847)," in *Suprema Corte de Justicia. Sus Leyes y Sus Hombres* (Mexico City: Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación, 1985), 130.

Otero accused of being weak. This approach, we suggest, was precisely what raised awareness of the working nation's role, as the majority of the nation. Yet it was only the collectivity behind the *Republicano*, where Sánchez Hidalgo had an important role, who took this idea of an American confederation to its ultimate consequences, introducing a categorical shift in the republican conception of the "association" of the republic's bodies.

If Sánchez was able to tread beyond the "political divide" between republicanism and monarchism, it was not only due to the path followed by the socialist-sociological principle imagined in the Atlantic. Internal republican conditions of political and social radicalization marked a context where Sánchez received new ideas through his friend Sotero Prieto. The rapprochement of radical republicanists with the working nation's groups was taken by Sánchez to an international level that was heretofore unheard of. The appropriation of and communication with the Fourierist groups in Europe placed the republican principles upon socialist institutions. They transformed Mexican republicanism by appropriating a sociological observation that perceived that the nation was composed of a "reciprocal and forced relation" between the men that "concurred to work" and the "systems" of agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing activities.[119] The political alteration, that is, was social, national, before it was republican. It was a transformation of Atlantic modernity from within. If we do not speak of a "working Republic", it is because the collectivity of groups to which such a republican imaginary appealed was not the republic, but the nation as imagined and instituted by the working groups. Republicans on both sides of the Atlantic sought to cooperate with the working groups' metamorphosis of the nation from within. This leads us to 1848, when the Republic of work was instituted in France, where the third and last part of the dissertation will begin.

[119] Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, "Juicio Crítico de Las Obras Del Dr. Maldonado. Concluye El Artículo II," *El Republicano Jalisciense*, 1/2/1848.

Part III
The State and the Working Nation. Atlantic Modernity's "intersocial dimension"

Chapter V

The Nation and the State, beyond the Nation-State. The working nation's alteration (1848-1855)

1. Introduction

This chapter will analyze an era in Atlantic politics that was, in many regards, a threshold for many of the principles that had structured the political world until 1848. These pages mark both a synthesis of parts one and two of the dissertation, but also set the ground to understand what happened in the 1860s, which in a very specific way relaunched and reconfigured the previous structure of politics. Particularly, as will be seen, the decade that runs from 1848 to 1857 runs into a problem the dissertation has faced but not quite fully grasped: the differentiation of nation and state. Historically, then, this decade synthesizes a long-running process of differentiation that has been widely studied as the configuration of a liberal Nation-State through the 1857 Mexican constitution. Yet this differentiation will be pondered through the eyes and witnesses of our subject of analysis: the working nation. The individuals and groups that composed it deploy some of the elements that help us explain the paradox of a movement that reached the State's pinnacle in 1856, and was quickly displaced by its closest allies, the *moderados*. The working nation, in other words, is central because it explains the unbalances the Ayutla movement was born with, in that it played a determinant role for a very particular social constituency to briefly occupy the State. In turn, as shall be seen in the next chapter, such a movement was key for a new Constitution to be drawn by a constituent assembly.

The chapter unwinds this "consolidation" process by rebuilding the problem of the nation since 1848. As with the previous chapters, understanding this decade according to the ideological divisions introduced by the *puros*, *moderados*, former federalists and centralists, and the newly baptized liberals and conservatives, will become evidently insufficient once the social roots of these political groups come to the fore. The fact that the first half of the decade (1848-1853) at hand has been analyzed as the "forgotten years",[1] perhaps drives a wedge into the message the sources

[1] Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853," in *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, ed. Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler (New York: Routledge, 2018), 1–34.

convey. On the one hand, as shall become evident, these years have been "forgotten" for certain topics of study more than others. In fact, this chapter revisits a whole brand of historiography that has analyzed these years and the subjects that lived and acted in them. It shall become evident that it has rather been the latter who have been forgotten by other political historiographies, not necessarily the "years" they lived in. Political history has thus successfully registered certain testimonies by some actors of the period when the Mexican nation was a "tragic victim" of a "great injustice":[2] namely, the infamous purchase of Mexico's half-northern part of its territory by the United States through the equally disgraceful Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and the Gadsden Purchase. Other significant characteristics of the period for these scholars were the generational transition. Between 1848 and 1853, Anastasio Bustamante, Joaquín Herrera, Mariano Otero, Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga, José María Tornel, and Lucas Alamán, which have been central actors mentioned throughout the dissertation, died. This fact, as well as Santa Anna's second exile in little less than a decade, toppled the end of the "age of proposals" and saw the ascent of a new generation of politicians which were born after the independence. Here, I will argument that there was much more to this generational and epochal transition than meets the eye of these political histories.[3]

There have been, nonetheless, other political and social histories that register a different level where national politics was put into play. We could say these studies have helped grasp how certain political groups of Mexican society levelled, matched, or disputed national politics throughout the decade. If the former political histories have implied that, following the devastating and existential crisis the Mexican nation faced after 1848, its fate was obscured and even sealed by the ensuing conflicts that arose in the country, the latter trouble the generalization of this historical depiction. We should not be surprised by the fact that these scholars have similar theses as the ones presented in the previous chapters, especially regarding the critical approach to "politics" in the 1830s and 1840s. Social and political historians such as Leticia Reina, Peter Guardino, and Florencia Mallon traced the "popular" responses to critical political times in the nineteenth century, and 1848 is no exception. The insurgence of a radical republicanism mentioned in the previous chapter, for example, opened the possibility to understand how certain imaginaries were articulated in response to the crisis, opening the possibility for the reconstruction of the nation after the 1848 blow to national consciousness. Romana Falcón took this experience

---

[2] The phrasing is José María Tornel's. Quoted in Will Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007), 291.

[3] Carmen Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado: La Dictadura, 1853-1855* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1986); Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*; Luis Medina Peña, *Invención Del Sistema Político Mexicano: Forma de Gobierno y Gobernabilidad En México En El Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Economica, 2014).

to establish that "popular groups" did not carry a passive and clientelist role regarding the "political factions *de los de arriba*" (from those on top). Quite on the contrary, she discovered that they "used many of the spaces opened by institutions to tone down their disputes, with argumentations and litigations [*litigios*] within the justice apparatus, as well as complaints and petitions to municipal presidents, political chiefs [*jefes*], governors, military chiefs, and even the president himself".[4]

An insightful reader might ask if these popular archives are enough to understand Mexican politics after 1848, especially in an Atlantic perspective. By reading the sources carefully, one discovers that, together with the supposed "forgotten" years and its forgotten subjects, we could almost polemically establish that there has been a forgetfulness of other significant actors and events that happened in the same year. Namely, the "forgotten" February –hence, not the June– Parisian revolution of 1848.[5] In an Atlantic perspective, the Mexican nation also reacted to the crisis that was unchained by the socialist, worker revolution of 1848. There were a series of reactions that were issued from the Mexican nation's groups. Such reactions were different and complex. Above all, they are irreducible to a reaction against the loss of half of the country's territory that injured the principle of nationality. They articulated responses in different degrees, linked to problems and issues such as the dispute over lands, the resources included in them, the notions of property at play, and, more importantly, the use of these resources for their labor in some cases, and their work in most of them. The argument of the working nation re-emerges in this decade. As in the previous chapter, the role the "international system" played, as Sabas Sánchez named it, was central. Significantly, because now the imaginary of revolution was travelling between shores and frontiers, potentially and possibly interceding in national and international politics.

The forgetfulness carried out by historiography for these years and subjects did not discriminate the intimate connections established between the post-1848 Mexican trauma and the post-1848 French Republic of work. The last significant contribution in the study of the links between one and the other was written around twenty years ago, and no Mexican (or French, for the matter) historian has seriously reopened the archives put together by Clara Lida.[6] The lack of

[4] This does not mean denying, as Romana Falcón later nuances, that there were also key figures in local and regional politics like caudillos (people with military support) and caciques ("notables" with influence in more limited spaces). Romana Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856," in *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 146.

[5] Maurizio Gribaudi and Michèle Riot-Sarcey, *1848, La Révolution Oubliée* (Paris: La Découverte, 2008).

[6] As mentioned in the previous chapter, two noticeable exceptions might be found in the contributions of Carlos Illades and Federico de la Torre. Carlos Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853," *Historia Social*, no. 8 (1990): 73–87; Federico De la Torre,

attention may be explained, but not necessarily justified, by the focus on the loss of over eight hundred thousand square kilometers and the internal and multifaceted crises it unchained in Mexico. As in any historical piece of work, the evidence gathered here nuances this position by contextualizing Mexico's crisis within a wider set of international crisis and transformations. As Lida duly noted, the 1850s and 1860s cannot be fully understood without seeing the repercussions of the Atlantic 1848, which in turn nuanced and iterated political imaginaries that altered the terms in which any political dialogue was to be established.[7]

Continuing with the perspective garnered by the imaginary of work, instituted by the working nation, the chapter will thus ask: what role, if any, did the latter have in these years? How and to what degree was the link with the February revolution important? How does this link internally and internationally transform national politics, and the nation and the state themselves? Does this in any way change Lida's assumption that the "echoes" of the European revolutions were heard in Mexico only until 1855, even if she shows evidence that Mexican newspapers were aware of their existence by the spring of 1848?[8] The series of answers that will emerge from the contact between the Mexican and French working nations necessarily displaces the role the groups of peasant and working populations played by 1855, when the Ayutla movement overthrew the Santa Anna presidency and dictatorship. Re-appraising the evidence and the imaginaries that were put into play necessarily configures a new interpretation of the years between 1855 and 1857, when a "wide social constituency" would present the possibility of constituting a liberal State by February 1857.

2. Moving the nation. The indigenous working groups, 1848-1853

To the extent of our knowledge, the last and perhaps only book that has taken the connections between the Americas and Europe during the 1848 "springtime of the peoples" as its research

"Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant," *Cahiers Charles Fourier*, no. 19 (2008), http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article568; Carlos Illades and Andrey Schelchkov, eds., *Mundos Posibles: El Primer Socialismo En Europa y América Latina*, Colección "Ambas Orillas" (Mexico City: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Cuajimalpa, 2014); Federico De la Torre, *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX)* (Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara-Centro Universitario de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2021). As shall be seen below, Vanessa Teitelbaum recovers some aspects but does not directly analyze the French-Mexican contact from 1848 onwards.

[7] Another recent exception is Santoni and Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853." As shall be seen, however, their theses present some inconsistencies with the evidence gathered here.

[8] Clara E. Lida, "The Democratic and Social Republic and Its Repercussions in the Hispanic World," in *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*, ed. Guy P. C. Thomson (London: Institute of Latin American Studies, 2002), 66.

subject was the volume edited by Guy Thomson in 2002. One of its most significant theses is that the "social question" which was enhanced by the revolutionary episodes, first in Paris and then elsewhere, did not limit its circulation to Europe but was extended to the Atlantic. As he notes in the introduction, the "revolutions of 1848 renewed and extended Latin America's democratic vocabulary and republican symbolism".[9] As was seen during the previous chapters, the "social question", which appeared under the socialist-sociological principle, was well established by the "international system" that emerged from Sabas Sánchez's reflections. We have seen here that by 1848 it was not new, either in France or in Mexico. As historians have established, the central turn was determined by the precipitation of the social question into new political forms by means of the "combination of the social dimension with republicanism and democracy".[10]

As has been noted throughout the dissertation, except for a couple of studies, historians have neglected the determinant importance of the preexistent links between Mexico and France during and after the 1848 revolutions. The established international networks did not only exist thanks to the exchange of intellectual material such as newspapers and journals, but also of ideas and imaginaries. Indeed, the circulation of the word "socialism" in Mexico since 1849 has for a long time been known.[11] Here, this fact will appear as consequential to another series of factors which give the imaginary behind the word substance and significance. As will emerge once the historical journey progresses, what has been commonly conceived as the initial working ground for the "international system" to be built, the 1849 appearance of the word is irrelevant if we do not attend the social and historical conditions of its appearance. Indeed, the 1847 appearance of the word under Sabas Sánchez's pen was relevant in the previous chapter only to the extent that is was part of a whole social, political, and institutional movement: what we call Atlantic socialism. Only when such conditions emerge will we be able to undergo an inquiry into the concept that embraced the Atlantic since 1848: revolution.

---

[9] Guy P. C. Thomson, *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas* (London: Institute of Latin American Studies, 2002), 7.

[10] Lida, "The Democratic and Social Republic and Its Repercussions in the Hispanic World," 48. Due to a matter of space and time, we will not analyze the importance of the Spanish case in this chapter. For the matter, see: Clara E. Lida, *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888: Textos y Documentos* (Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España, 1973); Jorge Maluquer de Motes, *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*, Temas Hispánicos (Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1977); Sonsoles Cabeza Sánchez-Albornoz, *Los Sucesos de 1848 En España* (Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1981); Florencia Peyrou, "1848 et le Parti démocratique espagnol," *Le Mouvement Social* 234, no. 1 (2011): 17–32, https://doi.org/10.3917/lms.234.0017.

[10] Lida, "The Democratic and Social Republic and Its Repercussions in the Hispanic World," 53.

[11] Francisco López Cámara, "Los Socialistas Franceses En La Reforma Mexicana," *Historia Mexicana* 34, no. 9 (October 1, 1959): 269–73; Gastón García Cantú, *El socialismo en México, siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Era, 1969); Moisés González Navarro, "Las Guerras de Castas," *Historia Mexicana* 26, no. 1 (1976): 70–106.

By that year, Mexico was plagued by a series of movements, uprisings, and revolts in the context that immediately followed the disgraceful peace treaty with the United States that saw Mexico lose over a million square kilometers. Some of these movements had even sparked before the conflict was over. Perhaps the most notorious example, due to its extension and the uniqueness of its watchword, was the series of rebellions that were unchained in the Sierra Gorda between 1848 and 1849. Comprising the mountains in the states of Guanajuato, Querétaro, and San Luis Potosí, the Sierra Gorda was a unique piece of the Mexican territory, hosting a wide range of indigenous groups and creole populations. The area was economically active since the times of the colony, where mining occupied a large amount of Guanajuato's and San Luis Potosí's population.[12] Given that since independence mining activities were in a relative stalemate, the indigenous population returned to their traditional peasant activities. It was precisely these populations which were firstly affected by the 1847 government's initiative to draw profit from the mortmain property (*bienes de manos muertas*), pieces of land which were in the hands of the Church and the indigenous pueblos as communal property, "in dead hands" according to the State's treasury, to raise funds to fight the war with the United States. The situation reached higher levels of conflict when, after the latter's troops occupied Mexico City, the government's seat was relocated to the city of Querétaro, a few hundred kilometers from the Sierra Gorda. With the support of some military leaders such as Tomás Mejía, who had recently participated in the defense of Monterrey against the U.S. troops, within a lapse of two months, the indigenous otomí, nahua and totonaca groups managed to receive a government indult by which they could simultaneously keep their communal lands while repealing U.S. incursions into their territories. The echoes of these indigenous communities' defense of their land and resources reached the vicinities of the sierra in Hidalgo, southeast of Querétaro.[13]

Some authorities recognized the fact that the movements of peasant organization to defend their communities, their lands, and the resources their livelihoods depended on, "presented themselves only to reclaim their rights". Most, however, agreed that they had not presented these claims within the frames established by the "forensic style". In the neighboring Estado de México,[14] to the southwest of Hidalgo, other contentions were presented. The vastness of the territory in the altiplano was litigated by indigenous municipalities and the *hacendados*, property-owning individuals that centralized the administration and exploitation of large estates which,

[12] John Tutino, "The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 3 (1998): 367–418, https://doi.org/10.2307/2518330.
[13] Leticia Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 5th ed. (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1998), 291–93.
[14] Or State of Mexico. I will leave the name in Spanish to avoid confusions with the State as an institution.

commonly, absorbed previously autonomous indigenous localities. The *ayuntamiento* (city council) of Apan was site of these litigations, where the nahuatl populations were in open conflict with the hacendados over water resources. Along with other hacendados, Andrés Quintana Roo, a renowned independence insurgent and politician, presented a complaint to the governor of the state arguing their land and water sources from the Huejocal river had been usurped by the "naturales" from the pueblo of Almoloya, with the consent of the authorities of the municipality of Apan. Their efforts to repossess the water's courses and the surrounding land had been stopped by the indigenous communities. Countering Quintana Roo's attempt of reappropriating the water sources with the aid of armed forces, the inhabitants of Almoloya laid down on the floor, without any weaponry, conveying the message "that they would rather have them pass over them than be outraged and spoiled", as the Estado de México's governor advocated.[15] This led to the denunciation of the governor, the municipality of Apan, and the pueblo of Almoloya by Quintana Roo and his fellow hacienda owners. Over the village's advocation for the protection of what they conceived as *their* land and its resources, the hacendados opposed the argument that the land had to be "protected", for the "security" of their interests, from the "occupation" and "usurpation" enacted by the "villainous" and "highwaymen [*salteador*]".[16]

As can be drawn from the examples mentioned here, the problem posed by the indigenous communities seems to have been basically a matter of defense of their land, and the resources included in it, against the property-owning individuals' attempt to extract value from these same lands. This may confirm the fact that the "fight over land and its natural resources" was, as a renowned historian established, the "main cause of indigenous protest" over the first forty years of independent life in Mexico.[17] Such theses precipitate other, perhaps more significant, conclusions: the peasants who were defending their land were not doing so only in name of property rights, as a defense of the territories they had historically inhabited; they were also doing it as peasants. In this sense, recent historiography has started to uncover the "importance of labor in rural history".[18]

---

[15] Mariano Arizcorreta, *Manifestación que hace al público el lic. Mariano Arizcorreta contra la comunicación dirigida a los propietarios de fincas rústicas del Estado de México*. Toluca, Tipografía de Juan Quijano, 1849, p. 13. (Biblioteca Nacional de México (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF) 20). This case is also mentioned in Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856."

[16] *A Collection of Pamphlets, Chiefly Political, Relating to Mexican Affairs from 1808 to 1864*, vol. 6, 1846, 13–14, https://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_100056228360.0x000001#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=6&xywh=-104%2C-1%2C3287%2C2332. We will return to this specific case below.

[17] Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, xi, 169–70.

[18] Peter Guardino, "Antonio Escobar Ohmstede and Matthew Butler (Eds.), Mexico in Transition: New Perspectives on Mexican Agrarian History, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," *Mundo Agrario: Revista de Estudios Rurales* 16, no. 33 (2015), http://www.memoria.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/art_revistas/pr.7118/pr.7118.pdf.

One could argue this dialogue between the category of the rural –which comprises its inhabitants, its populations, and the conflicts that stemmed in these contexts– and the category of labor had been implicitly established since the 1990's with Florencia Mallon's pioneering *Peasant and Nation*, along with other scholarship. When we reopen these archives, we find fascinating evidence that directly touches our topic of research, for these scholars' work articulately questions how this dialogue helped form a political discourse. In other words, how did a dialogue between labor and the rural landscape help form a political discourse?

A phenomenon started forming in the central highlands and sierras when merchants, workers, and hacienda *labradores* (peasant laborer) slowly knit a very particular communication network. The area that separated the mountains south of Mexico City from the mountainous sierra in today's Guerrero was a prolific site for such exchanges. Like most regions surrounding Mexico City, Morelos was a prolific ground for the establishment of haciendas, particularly fertile for the production of sugar cane and, eventually, also rice. Much like in the northwestern limits of the Estado de México mentioned above, a series of conflicts sparked over the possession and property of land –communal for some, useful for hacienda-related exploitation for others– in the nearest regions to Guerrero, in the southwest of Morelos. Peasants typically channeled their discomfort through the occupation of haciendas. But they also recurred to other actions. In a hacienda near Xochitepec, the labradores moved the *linderos* (typically stone walls that served as boundaries named *tecorrales*) of the hacienda back to its patio and away from the communal lands. The hacendados were particularly fearful of these movements because they were supported by some army generals of the *guardia nacional*, the civic militia that had been created in 1846 since the war with the U.S. started, and later reformed by the minister of war as a mechanism of control over the states.[19] In effect, they were doubly surrounded: the peasants occupied their lands while Cuernavaca, the area's most important urban bastion, was occupied by U.S. troops. The peasant occupation, however, soon came to an end once the army general who had supported such movements was instructed by his superior, Juan Álvarez, that the priority at the time was the defense of national independence rather than defend "outside litigation".[20]

Pacified in the short term, peasant uprisings did not take long to spark again. Possibly connected to the movements in the southwest of the state, the indigenous communities near Cuautla, to the east of today's Morelos, systematically tore down the tecorrales of nearby haciendas that had surrounded their communal lands. Peasants who had been "scorned" and neglected by tribunals in the fight for the devolution of their land "appealed to the de facto remedy [*vía de*

---

[19] Michael P. Costeloe, "Mariano Arista and the 1850 Presidential Election in Mexico," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 18, no. 1 (1999): 60, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-9856.1999.tb00187.x.
[20] Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 161.

hecho]" with the help of the soldiers of the guardia nacional, who in turn did not find "any crime" in the peasant's proceedings. Local soldiers argued that they were not willing "take up arms against their brothers and against their own rights given that all belonged to the popular class".[21] Indigenous communities that lived near the mountains north of Morelos were not the only ones to sustain and compose the forces of the guardia nacional. As historians have showed, the pueblos of the sierra in Puebla were also a crucial base, to the extent that many of these communities continued to pledge allegiance to defend the territory until the successful repeal of the French army in 1862.[22] In such cases, peasants defended their lands with arms that were used by former or current members of the region's civic militias. But were these indigenous peasant communities only defending their land? Was the litigation only a matter of property, and the guardia nacional a mere mechanism to obtain weaponry?

Some pueblos near Tlaxcala show that there was actually more to this defense. Around these same years, some pueblos concurred to their ayuntamientos or city councils to bargain the need of the *leva*, or army conscription. Peasants did not wish to be a part of the regular army because it went against their interest: either because conscription meant they would participate in conflicts they were not necessarily involved in, because they ignored the motive for such conflict, or simply because they did not wish to fight.[23] But peasants in Tlaxcala presented another compelling argument. It was not only because of their interests as indigenous communities that they wished to avoid the leva, they were also protecting the interests of the "merchants, millers, laborers [*obrajero*][24] and muleteers of the pueblo". As some historians have proven, it was not so much the institution of the army which appealed to the need of defending these communities. It seems that

[21] Quoted in Reina, 162–63. See also Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 141–57.
[22] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 26.
[23] Pedro Santoni, "'The Powerful Element That Would Certainly Have Saved Us': Debating the Revitalization of the National Guard in Post-War Mexico," in *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, ed. Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler (New York: Routledge, 2018), 72–114. Other examples of worker adherence to the Guardia Nacional in this context in: John Tutino, "Agrarian Social Change and Peasant Rebellion in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: The Example of Chalco," in *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*, ed. Friedrich Katz (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 95–140, https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400860128.95; Alejandro Tortolero, *Notarios y Agricultores: Crecimiento y Atraso En El Campo Mexicano, 1780-1920 : Propiedad, Crédito, Irrigación y Conflictos Sociales En El Agro Mexicano* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 2008); Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856."
[24] As was seen in part I, obraje was the name of the structure that hosted the whole process involved in textile production since colonial times. Obrajero was thus specifically the textile worker, be it spinning, weaving, dyeing, and finishing the wool manufacturing process. Manuel Miño Grijalva, *La Manufactura Colonial: La Constitución Técnica Del Obraje* (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 1993), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv6mtc2z; Richard J. Salvucci, *Textiles and Capitalism in Mexico: An Economic History of the Obrajes, 1539-1840* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988); Hugo G. Nutini and Barry L. Isaac, *Social Stratification in Central Mexico, 1500-2000* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009), 35–71.

they were firstly defending what sustained their livelihoods.[25] If for Tlaxcala this meant protecting the production of *pulque* (an alcoholic beverage made from the fermented sap of maguey), in Huauchinango, in the western sierra of Puebla, this was extensive to the lands where *aguardiente* (sugar cane liquor) was made.[26] Both these examples have an illustrative similarity: they were also suppliers of workers for the Estado de México and Hidalgo, respectively. The right for land was extensive to the protection of their work or, in the case of Morelos, labor in the haciendas.

As in the case of Apan, the pueblos in Tlaxcala and Morelos appealed to their respective ayuntamientos in the intricated process of litigating their territories. It was among these groups of different proveniences which, according to some historians, ultimately allowed the formation of political discourses. Dialogues were "interlocked" between "villagers as well as citified politicians, within and between regional factions, and between rural people and state officials".[27] It would seem that many of these groups or "factions" were actually composed foremost, and perhaps more generally, by workers. The "peasant nation's" movements were accompanied and supported by more "urban" professions like the merchants or obrajeros in Tlaxcala and Puebla. The "class consciousness" the Morelos indigenous communities developed as peasants and soldiers[28] is thus only a part of the identity these groups were developing. In the haciendas, villages, ayuntamientos, distilleries, mining centers, and the factories, it was not so much "class" but the institutions of work which built a common denominator. How this was even possible among populations that varied ethnically, socially, and economically could be understood by the way they connected geographically. Indeed, these pueblos of peasants and workers moved between regions, between the sierras near Puebla and Querétaro, and the cities in the altiplano. For instance, from the (relative) vicinity of Morelos, people "moved back and forth among a variety of urban occupations, commerce, agriculture, and occasional wage labor" not only between Cuernavaca, Cuautla or Tepoztlán, but also to and from Mexico City, to supply labor as much as the individual's working capacities to the neighboring populations.[29]

---

[25] Blanca Santibáñez, "Condiciones de Vida y Trabajo En Los Pueblos de Tlaxcala Entre 1840 y 1867," in *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 129–33. Unfortunately, despite the evidence she quotes, the author still overweighs the pueblos' role in local politics as an "destructive batter [*azote destructor*]".

[26] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 28.

[27] Mallon, 140.

[28] Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 163.

[29] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 145. See also Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 291–304; John Tutino, *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv301gv1; Will Fowler, "The Sierra Gorda *Pronunciamientos* of 1848–1849 and the Origins of Popular Conservatism in Mexico," in *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, ed. Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler (New York: Routledge, 2018), 116–40.

Once again, the institutions of work give us a wider perspective to the problem of the formation of political discourses among different working sectors or groups because they narrow down the dynamics through which they were created. In between the classical division of the village from "city politicians", there were other meddling actors that served as intermediary groups for the construction of communication lines between the sierras at more than three thousand meters above sea level in Puebla, to the neighboring highlands of Puebla, Tlaxcala, and the Estado de México. The same could be said about the hacienda workers in Morelos and the peasant communities closer to the sierras of Guerrero or the Estado de México. Such figures could also be local authorities that acted in accordance with the pueblos' interests and even, as in the case of a litigation in today's state of Hidalgo, openly acted in their defense through court and justice appeals. Their "reticules of power" were often built upon "tacit pacts of loyalty and promises of mutual help" for the neediest populations, typically the pueblos and indigenous communities.[30] More attention on the working groups in this period teaches us that there were intermediary institutions and groups that directly interceded in the dialogue, on the one hand, but also that these groups created networks, dialogues, that were crossing and touching different contexts throughout the country. Not only because of a common denominator which could be simply attributed to their indigenous origins, but also to the internal differences due to their geographic positions and economic organizations. These groups moved between boundaries, geographical and social, to seek work and labor. Such movements blur the boundary between what we are used to categorize as the rural and the urban, as the indigenous communities who tore down the hacienda linderos questioned. As in chapter three, it also points to the construction of a wide community through common activities that pierce our common senses of labor and political dependencies. Thus, for instance, if a more or less coordinated military defense of their territory talks of a more general organizational capacity, the zeal with which these defense mechanisms spread among the central altiplano and sierras hints to a communication between different kinds of communities that blur the lines that separate them in our contemporary imaginary.

As was seen in part I of the dissertation, historians have since long registered the blurry lines between the city and the rural area in nineteenth century Mexico. In the 1850s, the idea of a "city" was still far from what we conceive of it today: they were rarely a conglomerate of urban spaces but rather a combination of small pawn shops, workshops, and some commercial and industrial establishments that were scattered along rural spaces which were commonly occupied by cattle

[30] Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856," 148–55. In this regard, Falcón's crucial contribution has been in deconstructing the idea of the "jefe político" in Mexico as an omnipotent figure or as a necessarily "anti-popular" figure. See Romana Falcón, *El Jefe Político: Un Dominio Negociado En El Mundo Rural Del Estado de México, 1856-1911* (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2015).

and livestock. A famous geographer and historian of the time annotated in his *Manual de geografía y estadística*: "The majority of [the Mexican] population lives in 26,468 cities, villages, pueblos, haciendas and ranchos" in the "elevated part" of the country and the foots of the "cordillera".[31] Scholars have abundantly confirmed that most movements of "rural" nature came precisely from these areas, be it from the Sierra Norte in Puebla, the Sierra Gorda in Querétaro and San Luis Potosí, the mountains that divide Mexico City from Cuernavaca, the Montaña Alta or the coastal foot land of the Costa Chica in Guerrero, the forestall highlands of Michoacán, and their working, sharecropper, peasant, manufacture, mining, hacienda laborer, populations. Only in the few blocks comprising the city center of the biggest cities such as Mexico City, Guadalajara, the urban centers of Veracruz, or Puebla, as was seen in chapter two, could there be a similar structure to what we conceive of as a city today.[32]

Yet examples as the factories of Atemajac, La Constancia, and La Escoba also showed, the population of the cities (in this case Guadalajara) was commonly scattered and structured according to the presence of industrial, agricultural, or political poles, such as the factory and the hacienda. Most of the first textile factories, for instance, replicated the manufacturing organization they had when they were originally established beside haciendas or other traditional spaces of production during colonial times. Such practices could include the assignment of rented housing for workers to live in; the control of workers through fines which would be deducted from their salaries, or from the living goods they received in compensation for their work; as well as the prohibition to own livestock which would allow the workers to feed themselves independently,

[31] Jesús Hermosa, *Manual de Geografía y Estadística de La República Mexicana* (Mexico City: Instituto Mora, 1991), 27–28. As is well known, and as Hermoso himself establishes, most Mexicans lived in the center-south regions of the country, between what is today Michoacán to the west and Veracruz to the east, and the Bajío to the north and Oaxaca to the south. For an updated account on the historiography of rural history in Mexico, see: Laura Machuca and Alejandro Tortolero, "From Haciendas to Rural Elites: Agriculture and Economic Development in the Historiography of Rural Mexico," *Historia Agraria Revista de Agricultura e Historia Rural*, August 1, 2020, https://doi.org/10.26882/histagrar.081e02t. Indeed, it is to the latter, together with Guardino (*Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996).) and Miño's *La Manufactura colonial* that we owe a larger conception of the hacienda as an articulative space of production and sociability. See also Tortolero, *Notarios y Agricultores*.

[32] Ciro F. S. Cardoso, "Las Industrias de Transformación (1821-1880)," in *México En El Siglo XIX (1821-1910): Historia Económica y de La Estructura Social*, ed. Ciro F. S. Cardoso (Mexico City: Nueva Imagen, 1988), 153–59; Jaime Olveda, *La Oligarquía de Guadalajara : De Las Reformas Borbónicas a La Reforma Liberal* (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1991); Jorge Durand, "La Industria Textil En El Siglo XIX," in *Industria y Comercio*, ed. José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara (Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1993), 21–32; Mario Trujillo Bolio, *Empresariado y manufactura textil en la Ciudad de México y su periferia: siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social-UNAM, 2000); Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Los Hijos Del Trabajo: Los Artesanos de La Ciudad de México, 1780-1853* (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, 2005).

and potentially even sell their goods, such as pork meat or milk.[33] "City" life was very close to village and peasant life, and the latter had a very deep relationship with how workers and laborers developed their livelihoods: through work.

As we can see, there were evident limits to the impositions of categorical organization of these communities' lives. Just as the project of industrialization was contested from within, the divisions of territory and the communities that lived in them was unbalanced by the dynamics with which they lived. The proximity of village with city life in this period was similar to the closeness of different kinds of labor and the creation of working communities between haciendas, obrajes, and small factories. Manufacturers and peasants in these contexts, as was evidenced, often defended their work as the defense of the resources such activities depended upon. If for the hacendados it was the means to increase their wealth, for the working indigenous communities it was the means by which they could sustain their livelihoods, as well as the productive and reproductive activities. This affirmation is important precisely because it builds on previous research which has already placed these same indigenous communities as one of the foundational sockets for the formulation of the "social question" in Mexico in these years.[34] Their status may have been defined as indigenous communities, but the central innovation from 1848 was that they were part of a growing community of working groups, distributed in the geographically uneven territory of central Mexico.

3. Defending the "work of nationals". The socialist re-imagination of the Mexican working nation

Raising the question of the institution of work does not discuss the validity of previous scholarship's thesis which stated that peasants were a core group in the formation of the nation in the transition from the 1840s to the 1850s. A common argument has been that one vehicle for the formation of their own political discourse was the contestation of the racial or caste component inherent in the class discrimination these populations suffered –and suffer to date– within the wider process of litigation over the land and its resources. A discrimination which was reproduced historically and, since, historiographically.[35] What we managed to do here is name or identify with

[33] Cuauhtémoc Camarena Ocampo, "Las Luchas de Los Trabajadores Textiles: 1850-1907," in *Las Luchas Populares En México En El Siglo XIX*, ed. Leticia Reina (Mexico City: SEP-Cultura/Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 1983), 192; Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856."

[34] Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, i–xxiii.

[35] Paula López Caballero's work skillfully demonstrates this for the indigenous communities that live in Milpa Alta to the south of Mexico City. Paula López Caballero, *Indígenas de La Nación. Etnografía Histórica de La Alteridad En México (Milpa Alta, Siglos XVII-XXI)* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2017). See also John Tutino, *The Mexican Heartland: How Communities Shaped Capitalism,*

more precision the vehicle presented by the sources, as an underlying and common historical process, a social institution, that belongs to the communities that formulated a contestation to certain economic policies: work. This identification may help point to places and actors where the search opened by Guardino and others since the mid-1990s should seek the collective sense built by the movements facing the moderate national and conservative state governments between 1848 and 1855. A sense that managed to "cut across class lines" and thus form a "fluid" political movement.[36]

This seems to give further relevance to the acknowledgement that work, labor, and industry did not decay in the crisis that pierced nearly every other aspect of Mexicans' life –not only as an "economic" fact but also because of the significance they had as *social* phenomena. Production in the textile, brick, food, soap, hat, and other manufacturing processes all benefited in the decade that followed 1848, either by partial mechanization or by the process of industrial re-organizations of the production processes.[37] In the case of the spinning and weaving industries, looms nearly doubled between 1845 and 1854.[38] The decade-long lump mining production had suffered since independence finally came to an end towards the 1850s, when it recovered productivity levels similar to the period previous to 1810.[39] As with the distribution of land, however, the conditions of labor were hardly beneficial for the working populations.

---

a Nation, and World History, 1500-2000 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018); Peter Guardino, "CONNECTED COMMUNITIES: Villagers and Wider Social Systems in the Late Colonial and Early National Periods," in *Beyond Alterity. Destabilizing the Indigenous Other in Mexico*, ed. Paula López Caballero and Ariadna Acevedo-Rodrigo (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 61–83.

[36] Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State*, 9.

[37] Guy P. C. Thomson, "Traditional and Modern Manufacturing in Mexico, 1821-1850," in *América Latina En La Época de Simón Bolívar : La Formación de Las Economías Nacionales y Los Intereses Económicos Europeos, 1800-1850*, ed. Reinhard Liehr, Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana 33 (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1989), 55–87.

[38] Throughout the period, "with its limitations, the economy grew and followed the course of possible rather than desirable channels, within a spectrum of short period decisions". As Contreras and Ibarra later note, however, this did not mean State finances were stable; rather, as seen in chapter three, it talks about a stability that was outside of public finance and depended on the *agiotistas* and other rich particulars to inject inversions into the economy. Neither does this mean that the pueblos did not suffer economically: taxes were raised, and the aftermath of war in their territories were very much palpable. María Contreras Valdéz and Antonio Ibarra, "El Proceso Económico," in *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880*, ed. Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, vol. 2, América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea (Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012), 168–69. For State finance instability, see: Marcello Carmagnani, "Finanzas y Estado En México, 1820-1880," in *Las Finanzas Públicas En Los Siglos XVIII-XIX*, ed. Luis Jáuregui and José Antonio Serrano Ortega (Mexico City: Instituto Mora/El Colegio de Michoacán/El Colegio de México/UNAM, 1998), 131–77.

[39] Alejandra Moreno Toscano, "Los Trabajadores y El Proyecto de Industrialización, 1810-1867," in *La Clase Obrera En La Historia de México: De La Colonia al Imperio*, ed. Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, vol. 1 (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Ed, 1980), 13–36; John Tutino and Alfredo Ávila, "Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation," in *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 233–77.

In 1851, six thousand one hundred twenty four artisans sent a *Representación* (appeal) to the congress of Mariano Arista's government, lamenting the "mercantile franchising [that] dragged a *social question* that affects the *subsistence* of millions of Mexicans". The conflation of the country's enemies "destroy our subsistence of today". Even if there would eventually be "prosperous results" through the free circulation of foreign products, those who live "with poverty by the sweat of their brows" would disperse in search for the bread that would feed their family, maybe recurring to "improper means" to do so. Replicating the argument presented by Guénot a few years earlier, they claimed such events would not be their fault but of those who "deprived of the laborious [*laboriosa*] population of their *poor resources*". To protect work (*trabajo*), the activity that gave these "millions" of Mexicans their daily bread, the administration need only stop the "indiscrete and illegal" introduction of foreign commodities. The "social question", according to these artisans, was thus clearly linked to the question of work. "That the legislation be protective, and there shall be *work* [*trabajo*] and the country will prosper", for

> Our interest is that of the farmers [*agricultores*], of the manufacturers and of commerce itself, which will not be possible when they all perish; it is also that of the treasury, which cannot be rich when those who should form it with their contributions live in misery.[40]

The *Representación* that sought protection for the "work of nationals" (note, again, the use of labor and work as two separate concepts: laboriosa and trabajo) clearly speaks of a broad sense of "national" when referring to the Mexican working groups. There seems to have been certain arguments that "crossed the lines" contemporaneity has sometimes ebbed from the sources. In this case, it is clearly about defending, protecting, something much broader than a "class", for it comprises activities like commerce and agriculture, as well as the many groups that unfolded these activities, mainly manufacturers. As many of the examples mentioned above show, the defense of land was also a defense of their livelihoods, of their means of survival: the *Representación* only confirms this by expanding and, in this case, defining the defense into a protectionism of *work*. If bread was bought with money, and money was obtained through work (*trabajo*),[41] it was only a natural consequence that legislation had to protect the latter. The sources thus clearly show how the working groups that were dispersed throughout the territory "cut across class lines" to generate an imaginary of work that was linked to their labor or waged activities, albeit still irreducible to the latter. Peasants and artisans seem to have recurred to the defense of the basic goods that sustained their communities –from the land to the bread– through work. Despite evident differences between these indigenous and manufacturing populations, which composed

---

[40] *Representación dirigida al Congreso de la Unión por 6.124 artesanos pidiendo protección para el trabajo de los nacionales*, Mexico, Tipografía de G. Torres, 1851, pp. 3-5. (Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México (AHCM), Artesanos y gremios, vol. 383, exp. 34, fojas 16-46). Italics are mine.
[41] *Representación*…, p. 5.

an "ensemble of different nations",[42] there seems to be a common thread that touched them and awoke their need of organization. It lay behind what the Mexico City artisans called the "work of nationals".

As mentioned above, the Sierra Gorda communities had the particularity of recurring to U.S. forces for the defense of their communal properties. By 1849, Tomás Mejía, otomí leader of the previous peasant movements, had been integrated as captain into the regular army directly under the orders of Anastasio Bustamante, the former president under the centralist administration. When uprisings re-sparked under the leadership of Eleuterio Quiroz –a former *mozo* (servant) of an hacendado–, various groups from the sierra took the opportunity to combat conscription and other forms of authoritarian impositions, like the imposition of taxes or the threat of appropriation of communal lands by local hacendados. By March, the government's forces lost significant battles in San Luis Potosí, where they faced the proven dexterity of indigenous forces when fighting in their own territory. The rebel groups managed to advance to Río Verde, where the movement grew exponentially thanks to the great number of peasants working in nearby haciendas. From there, Quiroz proclaimed the *Plan Político y Eminentemente Social del Ejército Regenerador de Sierra Gorda.* The plan did not only seek to abolish large haciendas by converting them into pueblos, but it also wished to abolish rental for housing or for activities linked to the produce extracted from communal lands. Most significantly, the Sierra Gorda indigenous, peasant, movement wished to abolish the *faena* (labor by task) and fair retribution for the work force of temporary laborers or pawns (*peones*). The governments of Querétaro, Guanajuato, and San Luis Potosí did not stutter in advancing against this movement of indigenous workers. By the summer, Quiroz's forces had been dispersed back into their pueblos by the troops commanded by Bustamante.[43]

The indigenous worker movement that sparked in Xichú in the Sierra Gorda was not the last to spark –or even the first. About a year before Quiroz and the otomí pueblos of the Sierra Gorda published the imminently political and social plan, a "New Society" (*Nueva Sociedad*) had been established in the vicinity of Acambay, Estado de México. The Society, "daughter of meditations, and more than this, of the sentiments" of Antonio López de Portugal's whole life with the journeymen and artisans that were in his domicile, published the Nueva Sociedad's *Acta Constitutiva.* The society, which only welcomed people who "had an art or were journeymen

---

[42] Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, eds., *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 13.

[43] See the *Plan* in Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 300–301. For the rebellion: González Navarro, "Las Guerras de Castas"; Reina, *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906*, 294–99; Fowler, "The Sierra Gorda *Pronunciamientos* of 1848–1849 and the Origins of Popular Conservatism in Mexico," 121–23.

[*jornaleros*]", was established not only as a center for public discussion, but also to seek cure for the ill member; assure his professional as well as moral and political education, so his kids could receive the same education; as well as give him the necessary goods for the fulfilment of his art. Indeed, articles one through six of the Nueva Sociedad may well remind us of the *Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios*'s protectionist spirit. But the society of Acambay introduced a novelty to the latter: article seven "seriously" established the need of protecting the "indigenous race", for which it named a commission to "propose all the measures that lead to the benefit of the *indios*", purposedly imagined to "bring them out of the miserable state they are in".[44]

Historians have confirmed the "seriousness" claimed by Portugal and his fellow workers. The Nueva Sociedad established fifteen branches in the surrounding areas of Acambay, near today's states of Querétaro and Hidalgo. The majority of the indigenous population, who commonly held their reunions in Otomí or Náhuatl rather than Spanish, quickly allowed the consolidation of the Nueva Sociedad in the area. Around three to four thousand workers answered to the society's convocation and immediately started forming their *capítulos* (sections) of the association in the neighboring areas. Authorities soon banned these "socialist" gatherings, surveilling, confiscating their writings, and detaining their leaders. They mandated the formation of "commissions of citizens" which had the authority of dissolving the "reunion or *junta* of *naturales*".[45]

We should note the tone with which authorities denounced these worker uprisings as "socialist". The tensions of the post-1848 world began to be formed and respond to the appearance of the word in a broader context. The "calumnious" accusations against the Estado de México's authorities were soon denounced by the press. They assured that the State did nothing but ensure the righteous treatment of the *indios* through their civil court law: "the government ignores whether complaints have been presented to the judges and discarded by them". The "paper" published by the indios was "nothing but the whim [*arbitrio*] often used by revolutionaries, who speculate with the simpleness of the masses".[46] While Joaquín Herrera's moderate government sought solutions for the series of indigenous, worker, uprisings, and

[44] "Remitidos", *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 31/7/1848, p. 2.
[45] Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856," 155–58. Citation is from p. 156. See also James Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 118.
[46] *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 18/4/1850, p. 1.

movements, establishing for example the military "colonias",[47] other state governors such as Mariano Arizcorreta sought alternatives to solve the problem.

As was seen above, he openly confronted a series of hacendados in the Estado de México, in the process of litigation over the land of the pueblos near Acambay, and more precisely over the water resources of the Huejocal river. Defied by the complaints directed at him from the hacendados who had seen their properties being "usurped", or from the *moderado* government who saw him as a man of "malpractice and incompetence", Arizcorreta replied to the "imbeciles" who accused him of proselytism that he was actually abiding to the task of any worthy governor. A "circumspect, fair and prudent" step by a "legitim government" had raised scandal among the "men who call themselves of order and peace" because they were alarmed by his sentence, which confirmed they "have usurped terrains from the pueblos", a fact that only fomented the "caste war". They forgot that property rights were protected by the fundamental laws, which protected "all classes of society",

> that the rulers must protect in their enjoyment not only the rich owners but also those of short and poor assets, that if the governments must prevent the masses from overflowing and usurping the property of the opulent, they must also serve as a dike so that they do not oppress the poor with the power that their fortune gives them, that the plebeian [*plebeya*] class is incited more than anything else to revolt by the abandonment, excessive rigor and disregard of their grievances.[48]

Despite the efforts of his *Protesta* to counter his critics, Arizcorreta's radical republicanist administration soon lost most of its support and he was replaced by Mariano Riva Palacios, one of the Estado de México's biggest landowners.[49] The recently created conservative party, together with its publishing organ *El Universal*, was among the first to start denouncing the policies of the "puros" because of their adherence to the "urban poor" for the implementation of their agenda.[50]

---

[47] Formally established since 1846, the military colonies were practically used as pieces of land where civic and regular militias would establish to work the land under the strict supervision of the government. Originally established with the scope of occupying unprotected territory to prevent foreign incursions, by the end of the 1840s it was used as a way of controlling the populations of civic militias, typically composed of indigenous people, and granting them certain economic stability to avoid their attachment to political movements as the ones described above, as is testified by the decree that established them: "The notoriety that the said tribes [in the north of the territory] are composed of industrious and hard-working men, whose character and habits bring them nearer to civilization, as they live by work and profess moral habits without ceasing to be warriors and of unquestionable valour". José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 5 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 217–18; González Navarro, "Las Guerras de Castas," 91; Michael P. Costeloe, "Mariano Arizcorreta and Peasant Unrest in the State of Mexico, 1849," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 68.

[48] Arizcorreta, *Manifestación*, pp. 17-18.

[49] Moisés González Navarro, *Anatomía Del Poder En México, 1848-1853* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1977), 161; Costeloe, "Mariano Arizcorreta and Peasant Unrest in the State of Mexico, 1849," 71–74; Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856," 154.

[50] Erika Pani, "Entre La Espada y La Pared: El Partido Conservador (1848-1853)," in *Partidos, Facciones y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX*, ed.

Joaquín Herrera's government (1848-1850), among the few moderados that did not close the door to the puros, had the initiative of protecting the national treasury by installing an import tax through a consumption right (*derecho de consumo*) which would control the process of "importation and admission [*internación*]", and thereby protect "national industry, agriculture, and above all, the political being of the nation".[51] Precisely the law denounced by the *Representación* as an attack on the "work of nationals".

El Universal did not refrain from criticizing these measures, for national industry and the "artisan" have only seen their condition become less and less "enviable". They further criticized the government's will of enabling the existence of "ridiculous associations". They rhetorically asked: "Have they by chance been of any use?". While attacking the moderate government of Herrera, conservatives were also denouncing the working associations as a danger to "social order". The editorial criticized the artisan's "class" projects of betterment of their condition, for although the "organization of work" was "useful and healthy for individuals and for society, [...] under the bases that the democrats of today establish, such an organization is a sarcasm, because it means confusion, disorder and bewilderment". Have the French artisans, they rhetorically asked, obtained anything after the proclamation of the Republic in 1848 and the bloodbath that ensued? Are they better off "now than then"? "Oh!", the scandals of Mexico City, of Azcapotzalco (where the revolts of Acambay managed to gather supporters), the uprising of Xichú, the mutiny in Guadalajara, are all the "bitter fruit" of those societies, "servile imitation" of the French which only manage to take time away from work and accustom the artisan to idleness.[52] In effect, *El Universal* speaks of another context where the working groups had sparked their unrest: Guadalajara.

The mutiny had happened in the textile factory owned by Charles Tarel "& co.", some of whose shareholders were among the twenty French immigrants arrived in Jalisco throughout the 1840s. The *Fábrica de rebozos de Seda de Tarel & Cía.* (Silk shawl factory of Tarel and Co.) was founded in 1849, monopolizing the production of silk and appropriating the technical breakthroughs the artisans of Michoacán, presumably near to Estévan Guénot, had done with the processing of silk. The hired *reboceros* (shawl producers), around five hundred artisans, protested against the owners of the factory for the introduction of machinery because it meant downgrading the masters' coordinative role within the production line, while they also reduced salaries that

---

Alfredo Ávila and Alicia Salmerón Castro, 1st ed., Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012), 76–105.

[51] *El Monitor Republicano*, 18/8/1849.

[52] "La prensa periódica y los artesanos", *El Universal*, 19/6/1850. It should not come as a surprise that among *El Universal*'s chief editors was Lucas Alamán, of whom we analyzed the discourse of idleness and labor in chapter two.

ended up affecting the "luck of the very miserable". There were, however, other alleged causes. *El Universal* accused another worker society of being "the enemies of public tranquility [who] have managed to infiltrate the venom of their doctrines into the hearts of our pacific workers" through the creation of a "society of artisans in Guadalajara". They were referring to the *Compañía de artesanos*, founded a couple of months earlier.[53]

The capital of Jalisco continued to be a pole of attraction for industry and a working nation that harnessed the political reflections of a group of privileged radical republicanists and industrialists such as Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo and Sotero Prieto. In the second half of the decade, however, another industrialist had returned from his studies in Paris's *École Polytechnique* and with prominent chemists in Germany: Vicente Ortigosa.[54] His name was included in many of the transactions and letters issued by Prieto and Sánchez to their Fourierist *amis* in France. In 1850, at least Prieto and Ortigosa, but most probably Sánchez as well, participated in the foundation of the Compañía de artesanos, convened by the local Junta de Artesanos. In a markedly Fourierist vocabulary, Ortigosa hosted the inaugural speech of the Compañía. Criticizing the "foul-mouthed" (*lenguaces*) that denounced progress as contrary to the "dogma of the original sin", he opposed the supposed well-being of the peoples through "*political forms*" to the "more or less perfect degree" that ensued from "social organization".

> They reject a social perfection to which we have never pretended, and which would consist in being happy without working. It is thus that our system is founded precisely on the organization of work; therefore we neither deny work, nor do we pretend to any other welfare, to any other social perfection than that which results from a good organization of the productive elements.[55]

There was an evident socialist claim being increasingly appropriated by the Mexican working groups. What could be called a progressively national consciousness, garnered by the socialist working nation. Indeed, *El Universal* had warned its readers that the mutiny in Guadalajara at the Tarel factory was not the only "happening" of concern. A newspaper had appeared under the name *El Socialista*,[56] under the direction of José Indelicato, an Italian immigrant of shady origins.[57] For the conservatives, this group of socialists in Guadalajara would

---

[53] "Doctrinas disolventes", *El Universal*, 1/5/1850; for both Guadalajara companies, see: De la Torre, *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX)*, 210–14, 293–94.

[54] Federico De la Torre, "Ciencia, Industrialización y Utopía Social: Notas Sobre Vicente Ortigosa de Los Ríos, 1817-1877," *Letras Históricas*, no. 5 (2012): 53–79.

[55] Héctor Oscar González, "Dos Proyectos de Sociedades de Artesanos: Guadalajara, 1850," *Relaciones. Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* 10 (1982): 108–9. Italics in the original.

[56] *El Monitor Republicano*, 20/1/1849.

[57] Mentions of this immigrant are included in: Illades, "De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853"; Vanesa E. Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización: Honor, Trabajo y Solidaridades Artesanales En La Ciudad de México a Mediados Del Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2008), 169–94; De la Torre, "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant"; De la Torre, *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX)*, 74.

evidently make the world go backwards into barbarism, destroying "every sentiment that until now had guided the march of human societies" through an "illusory fraternity" that was nothing else than a "sordid and low egotism". When they were talking of the distribution of property, when they were talking of the organization of work, they were doing nothing more than "removing his [the citizen's] rights". They were incessantly claiming against the rich, "as if their work [*trabajo*] were not as sacred as that of others, or as if their wealth were not the fruit of that same work".[58]

El Universal quite clearly presents the principles at play, in the midst of a reconfiguration of the actors and imaginaries that disputed the fate of the Mexican nation. Adopting the category used in the first part, it displays the *mésentente*, the "disagreement",[59] with which the groups confronted each other. Rather than being a matter of the rich against the poor, that is, a problem of "class" division, what *El Universal* saw as the root of "anarchy", "dissolution", "ridicule", "barbarism", "misery", the "affliction" of the "eternal religious and social principles" and the "*beautiful traditions*", was the socialist attack on the "principles" of social order: tradition, religion, law, and authority.[60]

The coexistence of indigenous worker uprisings and artisan mutinies with the hybrid group of industrialists –like Sotero Prieto and Vicente Ortigosa–, politicians, and intellectuals –such as Sabas Sánchez Hidalgo, Pedro Tamés,[61] and José Indelicato–, seems to have placed the terms of the discussion on the matter of work, of which the divisions of class and race were a key component. It should not be bewildering to see these topical demarcations surface once the conservatives started reacting against the claims of the working groups. In a typical gesture during times of crisis, the former denounced the dangers of what they saw as the "barbarous" hordes that would tear down the little order that was left in the country.[62] *El Universal* polemized with the

[58] "Doctrinas disolventes", *El Universal*, 1/5/1850

[59] Jacques Rancière, *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

[60] "Doctrinas disolventes", *El Universal*, 1/5/1850; "Doctrinas anárquicas", *El Universal*, 6/6/1850; "Compañía de artesanos", *El Universal*, 7/4/1850; "La prensa periódica y los artesanos", *El Universal*, 19/6/1850. See also: Gastón García Cantú, *Idea de México. El Socialismo*, vol. 2, Vida y Pensamiento de México (Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1991).

[61] In a personal letter to his *amis*, Sotero Prieto mentions Tamés as the "pivot" of the Phalansterian groups in Mexico. (Archives Nationales (AN) 10 AS 41 (15)//681 MI 73).

[62] On the concept of order, see Javier Fernández-Sebastián, "El Concepto de Orden En Iberoamérica. El Orden Entre Dos Voluntades: Divina y Humana," in *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, ed. Carol Leal Curiel, vol. 6, Iberconceptos 2 (Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014), 42–43. Both Shawcross and Sanders abundantly analyze the counter-conceptual dynamics of "barbarism" in Latin America in these years. James Sanders, "Revolution and the Creation of an Atlantic Counter-Modernity: Popular and Elite Contestations of Republicanism and Progress in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Latin America," in *L'Atlantique Révolutionnaire: Une Perspective Ibéro-Américaine*, ed. Clément Thibaud et al., Le Monde Atlantique (Bécherel: Les Perséides Éditions, 2013), 233–57; Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*; Edward Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867* (New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018).

working groups for promoting the attack on the rich man's work, but in the same process did not refrain from polemically including *El Monitor republicano* within these "socialist" or "anarchic" groups. As supporters of the moderate governments of Joaquín Herrera (1848-1851) and Mariano Arista (1851-1853), they quickly replied that with such an imputation, "either they [*El Universal*] are completely ignorant of what socialism is, or they are committing a slight calumny in an attempt to cast an undeserved slander upon us".[63] The polemical answer did not take long to boomerang back to *El Universal* at the hands of the moderados: "Although we are not and cannot be socialists, we do believe an explanation is in order". Paradoxically, it will be the liberals of the *Monitor* and the conservatives of *El Universal* to deploy the profound disagreement on nation-building after 1848, insofar as they reacted to the socialist politics being instituted by the working nation.

El Monitor republicano ascertained that the conservative principle of "regression" (*retroceso*) was not consequent with their defense of religion. What the conservatives endorsed, on the contrary, seemed to be enforced ignorance on the "pueblo" (note the singular), which would only naturally be barbarous. Likely quoting Saint-Simon's *Catechism of the industrialists* (1822) or Lamennais's *Le livre du peuple* (1839), the editorial added that if as the "celebrated French writer" said, and as "a thousand historical facts" had proven, "Christianism is the basis of civilization", the only consequence was that the "conservative idea" and the "religious idea" were a contradiction. Hence, the conservative principle that socialism was "impious" was at least doubtful, for despite "the exaggerations of its partisans" (*partidarios*), its foundations were the words full of wisdom and charity enunciated by the Divine Savior of the world: *love your neighbor as yourself.* The wrong or good in an idea was to be sought in itself rather than the abuses committed in its name. As such, "*true socialism is the Catholic religion*" for the principles of liberty, equality, fraternity were that of the Gospel. Yet they set a clear, albeit veiled, difference with the French socialist revolution of 1848: "We have not thrown the *red cap to adore the Cross we once attacked*". On the contrary, they were defenders of the Catholic religion, liberty –of the individual and the patria–, property, and progress. If the conservatives accepted these principles as socialist, then they were willing to accept that "*we are socialists*".[64]

Instead of entering into a rather useless debate of whether the moderates were "actually" socialists or not, as if there was something like an ideological consistency that is traceable to very

[63] "Los socialistas en México", *El Monitor Republicano*, 21/10/1850.
[64] The original is: "no hemos arrojado el *gorro colorado para adorar á la cruz que antes atacábamos*". The "gorro colorado", red cap, is most probably referring to the French Revolution's Phrygian cap, which was symbolically thrown away during the 1848 revolution by the "anti-Catholic" socialists. "Progresos de la idea conservadora", *El Monitor Republicano*, 7/12/1850. Unless noted, all italics or special characters are in the original. On the Phrygian cap, see: Gonzalo Capellan, "Democracia. Iconografía Política de Los Conceptos Fundamentales de La Modernidad," *Historia y Política: Ideas, Procesos y Movimientos Sociales*, no. 44 (November 19, 2020): 173–217, https://doi.org/10.18042/hp.44.07.

limited characteristics, it may be more interesting and fruitful to discuss the political implications of the double demarcation *El Monitor* operated on the word socialism –precisely to the extent that it was not only a word. They present it as a negation of conservatism, polemically striking the founding principles of the latter: tradition and religion. But if they accept the name of socialists, they conduct the word to their field, to the set of principles which guided them. They asserted their political principles by introducing a twist into the word, denying its revolutionary heritage symbolized in the Phrygian cap, and stating to their fellow citizens that they defended law and property when "WELL UNDERSTOOD".[65] Indeed, the word socialism seems to have behaved like a powerful bee nest, approachable by its adversaries under the condition that its former inhabitants left the necessary cells empty so they could introduce their own ideas into the honeycomb. Behaving like drones, *El Monitor* and *El Universal* did not strictly produce a socialist politics but an idea on socialism, according to which they molded the structure of the honeycomb to the detriment of the bees. Each of the newspaper editorials were effectively seeking to appropriate or make sense of the happenings during the "springtime of the peoples", when the working bees most tenaciously sought to defend their honeycomb. The fact is that Mexican politics was proving to be all but immune to the 1848 revolutions, particularly the Parisian.

We should note that the following account does not pretend to exhaust with historical detail the happenings of the revolution, but it does wish to show the paradox that accompanied the working nation's revolutionary spillage into the republican, monarchical, public sphere. Specifically, it pretends to highlight the radical disagreements that were crystalized during the springtime of 1848, which revolved around the concept of socialism that would travel between the Atlantic working nations.

4. The working nation's Republic of Work. Between Mexico and Paris (1848-1855)

The uprisings that sparked in Paris on February 22 were the harvest of the experience the French *ouvriers* had accumulated throughout the 1830s and 1840s, with its interruptions and frictions. Decades-long research has led scholars[66] to establish the limits of interpreting the French uprisings

[65] "Progresos de la idea conservadora", *El Monitor Republicano*, 7/12/1850. The former discussion is also included in: Matias X. Gonzalez, "El socialismo en su lugar. La «organización social» de la nación y los orígenes intersociales del primer socialismo mexicano hacia 1850," *Historia Y Memoria*, no. 24 (2022): 177–224, https://doi.org/10.19053/20275137.n24.2022.13537.
[66] Rémi Gossez, *Les Ouvriers de Paris. L'organisation, 1848-1851* (La Roche sur Yon: Imprimerie centrale de l'ouest, 1967); Ronald Aminzade, "Reinterpreting Capitalist Industrialization: A Study of Nineteenth-century France," *Social History* 9, no. 3 (October 1, 1984): 329–50, https://doi.org/10.1080/03071028408567600; Ronald Aminzade, *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); William H.

of the spring of 1848 as a response to short-term factors or due to "contagion" of the revolutionary wave that began in Europe before February.[67] Rather, and quite crucially for the path we have been following in this dissertation, what seems to have been pivotal in the years from 1836 to 1847[68] in France was the worker's appropriation of the republican ideals they had shared with, and were centrally developed by, republican groups rooted in secret societies and their conspiring actions. If for some republican revolutionaries it was a matter of erasing and founding a new republic altogether, in a *tabula rasa* logic, for the majority of the working nation, it was increasingly and inversely a matter of appropriating the "public word".[69] Journals and newspapers such as *La Ruche Populaire*, *L'Atelier*, *L'Union*, *Almanach phalanstérien*, *La Revue sociale*, and *La Revue indépendante* all hosted working groups and intellectuals that had been more or less in contact with the Fourierist and Saint-Simonian groups of the 1830s: Pierre Leroux, George Sand –the male pseudonym used by Aurore Dupin–, Philippe Buchez, Victor Considerant, among many others. Other newspapers such as *Le Populaire* and *La Fraternité de 1845* were directed by the communist or *égalitaires*, as the followers of Etienne Cabet, Philippe Buonarroti, Théodore Dézamy, and Babeuf named themselves. Louis Blanc, the prominent republican socialist, directed the *Revue du progrès* with a clear appeal for the "organization of work", as his homonymous collection of pamphlets was named.[70]

Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Gribaudi and Riot-Sarcey, *1848, La Révolution Oubliée*.Gossez, Sewell, Aminzade. Other scholarship will be quoted below.

[67] Jonathan Israel is a recent example of authors who still abide to this thesis. Jonathan Israel, "The Revolutions of 1848: Democratic Republicanism versus Socialism," in *The Expanding Blaze. How the American Revolution Ignited the World, 1775-1848* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017), 547–67, https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400888276-022.

[68] We follow Thomas Bouchet's periodization of the first generation of socialists: 1825-1835, the "first maturation of ideas" against liberalism and renewing republicanism; 1836-1847, an "intellectual and editorial effervescence" where previous ideas are "refined and affirmed"; and 1848-1851, where after the bloody days of June 1848 ideas and doctrines are renewed and refurbished for the next couple of decades. Thomas Bouchet et al., *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860* (Paris: La Découverte, 2015), 20.

[69] Andrea Lanza, "Fraternité e Solidarité Intorno al 1848. Tracce Di Un Approccio Sociologico," *Scienza & Politica. Per Una Storia Delle Dottrine* 26, no. 51 (December 28, 2014): 11, https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1825-9618/4627. For the process by which the working groups and organization slowly abandoned their support of secret republican societies, see: Jean-Noël Tardy, *L'âge Des Ombres: Complots, Conspirations et Sociétés Secrètes Au XIXe Siècle* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2015); Maurizio Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848* (Paris: La Découverte, 2014), 347–59.

[70] Due to lack of space and time, we cannot describe the differences and communions between these doctrines. A synthetical and reliable description can be found in: Andrea Lanza, *All'abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847*, Studi e Ricerche Storiche (Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010), 195–211. Detailed information on most of these newspapers and journals can be found in: Bouchet et al., *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, 143–57, 181–202, 247–54.

Behind the curtain of the public sphere, and the financial difficulties most of these publications faced due to the low amounts of sales and subscriptions,[71] there was the working nation that lived in the "collective factories"[72] in the main cities in France, and especially in Paris. As was seen in part II of the dissertation, the liveliest debates that the working nation held with the liberal conservatives and monarchists during the July Monarchy were precisely on their labor and working conditions. As such, the work of Jules Leroux, or of the anonymous worker-writers of *L'Atelier*, repeatedly reflected on the ways of combining their liberty with proper labor conditions.[73] The working nation sought to erase institutions like the *marchandage* (the practice of sub-contracting that enforced "competitive bidding" among small merchants and entrepreneurs)[74] or *chômage* (partially subsidized unemployment) because it affected their conditions of work and labor employment. The argument that appeared during the 1840s was that workers wished to conciliate, through the institutions of work, their relations with the *patrons*. Once that "the remedy, conciliation" was possible, the "system of competition [*système de concurrence*]" which ruled the working nation's lives would cede its place to the "great [*grande*] organization" of work (*travail*), as Coutant the typographer expressed in 1844.[75] More than ever, the working nation began to mirror its "direct and unmediated experience of reality" through its publishing organs, claiming the organization of work as a project that touched the "ensemble of producers".[76]

Having notoriously surfaced in the public sphere, the working nation took advantage of the series of banquets that were organized by republican leaders since mid-1847. By February 1848, officials were highly skeptical such banquets could bring about any positive results for the July Monarchy. They banned their organization after a banquet, originally planned for the highly populated, working, Parisian twelfth ward, was moved to Champs-Élysées, where most of the participants the banquet was supposed to host were still excluded. The enforcement of a six-franc entry fee only sparked the resentment from the people who wished to participate –a mixture of

[71] The *Démocratie pacifique*, for example, despite its reasonable prices (48 francs for the annual subscription while other newspapers such as the *Journal des Débats* was 80 francs), was still considered to be costly for the "popular" classes. Bernard Desmars, "À La Conquête de l'espace Public. Les Fouriéristes et *La Démocratie Pacifique*," in *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, ed. Thomas Bouchet et al. (Paris: La Découverte, 2015), 194.
[72] Alain Cottereau, "The fate of collective manufactures in the industrial world: the silk industries of Lyons and London, 1800-1850," in *World of possibilities : flexibility and mass production in Western industrialization*, ed. Charles F. Sabel and Jonathan. Zeitlin (Paris/Cambridge: Maison des sciences de l'homme ; Cambridge University Press, 1997), 75–172. See chapter three of this dissertation.
[73] Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848*, 367–72.
[74] Definition taken from: Roger Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 291.
[75] Jean-Baptiste Coutant, *Organisation du travail. Discussion entre le journal Le Globe et un ouvrier typographe*, Paris, Bureau de La Ruche Populaire, 1844, pp. 8-10.
[76] Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848*, 362, 370.

members of the National Guard, low-income republicans, and working organizations–[77] and by the next day barricades were lifted in the popular neighborhoods. A moderate republican majority, a radical republican minority, and a very limited number of workers took the Hôtel de Ville two days later, on February 24th, once Louis Philippe had fled, and installed a provisional government. The Provisional government almost immediately discovered that proclaiming a Republic did not ease the workers' effusion, for the assembled groups did not leave the streets surrounding the Hôtel de Ville at least for the next following week.[78] Indeed, as it is well known, it was thanks to the latter's collective pressure that the moderate majority ceded in establishing the National Workshops, the Luxembourg Commission, and, most importantly, the right to work (*droit au travail*, most commonly translated as right to labor).[79]

The tensions between a moderate-republican project and a socialist-republican project soon surfaced. As the spring advanced, the gradual economic failure of the National Workshops made the Luxembourg Commission the last bastion the working nation could aspire to in a growing opposition to the republican groups which, in turn, increasingly sought the support of parts of the bourgeoisie that had sustained the monarchy before the February Revolution. After the workers' and radical republican (famously named "Dem-Soc") electoral defeat of April, and the government's abolishment of the Luxembourg Commission in May, the National Workshops' closure in June was received with a sense of deep betrayal by the protagonists of the February rebellions that had led to the proclamation of the Second Republic. The National Guard, led by the famous general Cavaignac, arrested more than eleven thousand workers and citizens, and killed at least five thousand according to recent calculations.[80] Paradoxically, once the Second Republic failed in its relation to the working nation, the possibilities of the establishment of the "republic of work", rephrasing Sewell's well known aphorism, were taken back by the working groups to the workshop and its immediate surroundings. Strictly speaking, the working nation was now public and acted as such until the lashing repression during the 1851 December coup d'état.

---

[77] Vincent Robert includes a fascinating account of the typographer banquets, which had been established since the 1830s and were key during the reform banquets in 1847-1848. Vincent Robert, "Interdire Un Banquet, Déclencher Une Révolution (Paris, Février 1848)," in *Le Temps Des Banquets : Politique et Symbolique d'une Génération (1818-1848)*, Histoire de La France Aux XIXe et XXe Siècles (Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2021), 367–90.

[78] There were only thirty four representatives of the *peuple* that did not adhere to any previous party. (AN AB XIX/681).

[79] Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 245–49; Gribaudi and Riot-Sarcey, *1848, La Révolution Oubliée*, 19–22.

[80] Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 262–72; Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848*, 384–93; Samuel Hayat, "Running in Protest. The Impossible Candidacy of François-Vincent Raspail, December 1848," trans. Sarah-Louise Raillard, *Revue Française de Science Politique* 64, no. 5 (2014): 1–35. The numbers appear in Gribaudi.

It could be affirmed that the Second French Republic did not meet the excess materially and practically posed by the groups of workers that gathered around the Hôtel de Ville. A publication that emerged after the June Days called *La République Rouge* vindicated the existence of more than "two" Republics in reference to Victor Hugo's assertion: "there are three, there are four".[81] The profound disagreement that emerged in 1848 precipitated former debates on the sense the Republic should assume *vis-à-vis* its society. In other words, whether or not it should be instituted as a *social* Republic or not. The collectives of workers were everything but dubious. A *rapport* by the abbot Roux noted that the "people" already possessed the "democratic" Republic. The social Republic, on the contrary, was still up for grabs. If *social* meant *communism*, then "you will never have it". If by *social* they meant the "'the right of association, the right for workers to place their work in common, the right of voluntary [*sic*] association, a patronized association, favored by the government to a certain extent', (Yes! yes! [answered the workers]) 'well! my friends, you will have this right, and the Chamber will take care of it'".[82] Despite the promises of the abbot Roux, the establishment of this social Republic of work would be quickly truncated by the events that were ensued throughout the summer by general Cavaignac and his followers.

Nonetheless, the disagreement on what "social" meant, was not only reflected in the discussion of what political forms society, composed by the majority of the working nation,[83] could institute; it was also in relation to the social forms this politics acquired. In a word, there was also a profound disagreement on the concept of socialism, perceived as a "word" or an "ideology", instead of as a set of institutions according to the working nation's political imaginary. In this regard, Louis Reybaud occupies a privileged position among the authors that wished to discredit the "modern" socialists: Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, and Fourier. By doing so, however, he paradoxically extended the disagreement on the concept by including authors from Plato to Thomas More, from the "Jesuits from Paraguay" to Fenelon, in the same "kinship [*lien de parenté*] that unites the various social revolts proclaimed nowadays". They are all "sisters", if not by the means, at least by their ends.[84] At the hands of Reybaud, socialism became a (dangerous) ideal that

---

[81] Quoted in: Andrea Lanza, "1848 Comme Reconfiguration Des Discours Politiques," *POLIS Working Papers*, no. 135 (March 2009): 17.

[82] "Rapport de M. l'abbe Roux. Sur les journées des 25 et 26 juin au Faubourg Saint-Antoine", *Le Rapport par M. Roux, vicaire des quinze-vingts, sur le Faubourg Saint-Antoine*, 1848. (AN AB XIX/681). As Lanza established: "If democracy, the democratic republic is apprehended as the overcoming of the State understood as an instrument external to the society, this overcoming is imagined by a reabsorption of the political within society [*réabsorption du politique dans la société*], by the construction of a general Association inside which any part of the social body can contribute to progress". Lanza, 20.

[83] As Sewell intelligently synthesizes: the term "national" in the National Workshops meant that they were a "fundamental institution of the Republic". Sewell, *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*, 246. Here, we could note that it was a fundamental institution in that it was the reflection of society, whose groups were mostly working groups.

[84] Louis Reybaud, *Études Sur Les Réformateurs Ou Socialistes Modernes. Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen* (Paris: Guillaumin et Cie, Libraires, 1849), 291.

was defended by anyone that threatened the "rest" and "virtue" of society through their reforms of modern morality.

The disagreement that was created regarding the term socialism in the French public sphere does not enclose, nor does it in any way fully describe, the social movement that was created between the working nation and the socialist-sociological principle in the 1830s and 1840s. On the contrary, the former seems to create a "vulgate" that is reproduced with polemical purposes:[85] in no way does it correspond to the "experience of reality" historians have managed to discover among the experience of the working groups, the republican organizations, and the industrialists that were borne into the movement that surfaced throughout the 1840s. This is why it might make much more sense to conceive socialism as a "movement of modern society", rather than a mere "ideology" void of any social institution.[86] For the precision, then, the movement is not so much an "excess" as much as a social institution that is profoundly irreducible to its linguistic condensation conveyed in the monarchical and then republican public sphere.

However inconsistent with the working nation and its socialist imaginary the "vulgate" of socialism might have been, it still traveled well beyond the Parisian public debate.[87] When it traveled to Mexico, the radical disagreement with the word socialism was appropriated by the moderate republicans and the conservatives, while retaining the fundamentally polemic structure of the *word* socialism. As the French experience helps confirm, the international debate that sparked after February 1848 in the public spheres on both coasts of the Atlantic revolved around the *word* or, at best, the *concept* of socialism. As was evidenced in chapter four, however, Atlantic socialism was circulating well before the 1848 revolutions, and was being appropriated and transformed by working groups on both shores of the Ocean. 1848, however, brought a discussion on the word to the fore. In what follows, we will try to analyze both dynamics and the differences they engendered.

As was seen earlier, from 1848, Mexican conservatives and moderates seemed to have reduced the words for their political identities to the above mentioned principles, leaving out

[85] Pierre-Luc Abramson, key author for part II of the dissertation, placed him as the first to create a vulgate out of socialism, precisely by placing it in strict continuity with –and creating a– "socialism" in the Ancient Regime. Pierre-Luc Abramson, *Mondes Nouveaux et Nouveau Monde : Les Utopies Sociales En Amérique Latine Au XIXe Siècle*, 2nd ed. (Dijon: Les Presses du réel, 2014), 186.
[86] Indeed, according to Marcel Mauss, socialism is the "ensemble of ideas, forces, groups, which tend to regulate the whole of economic life by the nation". Marcel Mauss, *La Nation, Ou Le Sens Du Social*, ed. Jean Terrier and Marcel Fournier, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2018), 251–52. More on this discussion can be found in: Matias X. Gonzalez, "Desde El *Sozialismus* Hacia El *Socialisme*, Ida y Vuelta. Por Una Historia Conceptual Inter-Conectada Del Socialismo," *Conceptos Históricos* 6, no. 10 (2021): 122–53. Karl Mannheim's work continues to be a central exception in conceiving socialism as an ideology while not operating an ideological emptying of the historical concept. See: Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York/London: Harcourt, Brace & Co./Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954).
[87] See Abramson, *Mondes Nouveaux et Nouveau Monde*, 77–194.

socialism as a possibility for Mexican politics and groups to identify the word with its movements and institutions. Indeed, if we were to adopt this as a non-contingent assertion, what happens with all the aforementioned groups, their movements, and the politics they were tailoring? Does this mean there was a sort of "impossibility" of socialism in Mexico at the time, according to these political actors? If we were to accept this "impossibility" beforehand, supposing these sources speak an evident truth, should we naïvely accept that the moderate, puro, and conservatives held absolute hegemony over the political system?

In the previous section, the French working nation helped us display the social irreducibilities to the word with which the public sphere debated and disagreed. By doing so, we approached a radical play determined by the appropriation of different political identities, expressed in those irreducibilities. In addition to the political and polemical senses commonly outlined for this context, articulated by moderates and conservatives, we have seen that the institutions of work opened the possibility for the identification of a wide range of groups, under different specific objectives, but always with at least one clear watchword in mind: the organization of labor, of its product, or of the stem, the land, from which the social institutions of work arose. The Mexican indigenous and worker uprisings which fought for the(ir) rights over the land; the resources that it sheltered, be it water, wood, or the land's harvest; for political rights, old such as the communal property of land or the protection of master's hierarchy within the production line, or new such as the defense of their "civil" rights; all of these motives reflect internal and external transformations by these same groups. If previous scholars have unmistakably ascertained that these peasant communities imagined "alternative visions" that could build an "oppositional political culture",[88] here we have narrowed the sense of these visions to the institutions of work, which paradoxically widen the senses available to different groups for their appropriation. We discover, then, that in a very similar manner as it happened in France, the institutions of work encompass a wide range of communities and working groups under an identity which is, due to its very social nature, moldable to specificities irreducible to the "ideological divide", as staged by Mexican moderates and conservatives.[89]

The novelty that came when the senses of socialism were accommodated in Mexico were precisely the senses produced by the different peasant, working, and indigenous groups that presented a whole set of problems that were aggregated to the ones posed by artisan, factory, and manufacturing workers. Despite the Mexican specificity, there were common messages contained

---

[88] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 149, 156.

[89] Santoni and Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853," 8. We see, in this sense, that the "political divide" that appeared in the previous chapter between republicanism and monarchism has evident historiographic and historic continuities with the division between (liberal) moderates and conservatives.

in the call for the "protection for the work of nationals" embraced by the six thousand artisans who commended the *Representación*. The protection of work, as the *reglamento* of the Nueva Sociedad and the French typographer Coutant proved, was the very basis of the "social question" as presented by these working groups. In effect, the institutions of work appear quite clearly in the series of sources analyzed above. The *how* in the question consisted of work's organization, its protection (through the cure of the individuals that carried out productive activities as much as the assurance of the reproducibility of the community, the individual, and the activities they carried out). Yet the *who*, on the other hand, was clearly answered by the "question" itself. The groups of workers were protecting and organizing the nation. They were defending and organizing the working nation, the majority of the nation and society. Be it through the fair retribution for the silk worker's labor as in the Tarel factory, or through the just attribution of the pueblos' place within a given territory, these groups conceived their plans as "imminently social *and* political", as Quiroz entitled his proclamation in the Sierra Gorda.

As mentioned, what these groups and their institutions seem to prove is the fact that they were moving in a new register regarding other coexistent politics and social groups; they were *a fortiori* altering the registers the latter had imagined, which could also explain the categorical reactions to the working nation's institutions and imaginaries. In a sense, this seems to confirm, by establishing an important precision, the hypothesis of Alejandra Moreno Toscano, who mentioned the possibility that the artisan working groups were a "class for itself" around the same years analyzed here.[90] Although the working groups were not a "class" in the strict sense of the term, they were groups that articulated a collectivity irreducible to each one of them, evidenced in the "fluidity" that "cut across class lines", as Guardino proposed. The working nation is irreducible to its peasant, artisan, or obrajero component, while simultaneously inconceivable without any of the former. They were, in this sense, forming an identity which was a result of their "economic" conditions. Yet, again, in this case economy should be taken in the wide sense of the word, as organization of the community and the activities that allowed its reproduction, which in this case was specifically the organization of their working activities.[91]

Work, then, did have a "substance" in society, but it was irreducible to the "function" liberals and, in the Mexican case, centralists and then conservatives as well, wished to attribute it: productive labor.[92] If the institutions of work carried out a central function within their groups,

---

[90] Moreno Toscano, "Los Trabajadores y El Proyecto de Industrialización, 1810-1867," 346.

[91] For the category of "economy" and the "economic", beyond Polanyi's distinction, see: Louis Dumont, *Ensayos sobre el individualismo: una perspectiva antropológica sobre la ideología moderna* (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1987), 115–24.

[92] As Foucault established in his *Society must be defended*, "functionality" was a typical discursive tool by which liberals appropriated the material uses of individuals for their political and economic benefit. Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended* (London: Penguin, 2003). The thesis that the working groups were a

and for "millions of Mexicans", as the artisans of Mexico City claimed, it was because it had a normative purpose: it regulated the productive activities, the trades, the role each individual carried out in different production systems, therefore organizing production itself. Such institutions, however, also regulated the task outlined by the Compañía de artesanos: the organization of work and its groups. The norms, as the Nueva Sociedad and before it the Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios, were not simply about imposing rules, but about setting the conditions for the construction of a community to be possible, through care, mutual aid,[93] as well as specific working activities: hat tailoring, looming, cropping, harvesting, commercializing, and other manufacturing and productive activities. In a word, they were regulating their societies' lives to the extent that they were organizing the activities that kept these groups active and alive. Only when one understands the scope of the institutions of work in this sense can we start grasping the full extent of affirming, like the radical republicanists of the mid-1840s, that the "majority of the nation" was the working population, the working nation. They were the groups that kept the nation alive.[94]

It is in that affirmation of a social and political imaginary that the denounced socialism acquires its specificity for the Mexican working nation. A specificity that was carved out in the national imaginary since 1847, but through 1848-1851 was radicalized in that it was socialized, it ripened into a social form that allowed certain groups, the groups that composed the working nation, to institute a particular political identity. As we saw, it was particular above all because the *name* of the politics, socialism, was not iterated by most of these groups: it was the reaction to the politics they configured, after the Guadalajara industrialists had identified themselves with the international system that linked the working nation to socialism, that the word appeared in the "public sphere". Until now, the thesis that structures historiography on the appearance of the

---

"class" because of the "liberal vision that grants work [*trabajo*] a substantial function in society" is included in: Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Entre El Discurso y La Coacción. Las Elites y Las Clases Populares a Mediados Del Siglo XIX," in *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política* (Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003), 311–38; Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2011); Sonia Pérez Toledo, *Población y Sociedad. México (1830-1880)* (Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE/Santillana ediciones generales, 2015). El ensayo de Sonia en el libro de Brian; "Población y sociedad"; *Trabajadores, espacio…*, 2011. For a discussion of the irreducibilities to liberalism, see chapter two and the conclusions.

[93] Another example of such societies in Mexico City is the *Sociedad Artística*, founded in 1848 by Luis González. See these and other examples in: Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización*, 189–207.

[94] Although she speaks in terms of "pueblo trabajador" and not working groups, the fact that they were a majority seems to be confirmed by Sonia Pérez Toledo, perhaps the greatest specialist in the Mexican world of labor in the nineteenth century. See: Sonia Pérez Toledo, "Población y Sociedad," in *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880*, ed. Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, vol. 2, América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea (Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012), 231.

word socialism in 1849 Mexico stated that it had the effect of creating an "obvious dilemma" for Mexican politics in the 1850s: "conservative politics […] or socialism".[95] This thesis tensions conventional historiography which reflected in terms of liberals and conservatives. Albeit, in either explanation, there are political imaginaries that are being left out from the political system that emerged in the 1850s. A new proposal which understands the reactions to the appropriation of the word *and its senses* more subtly might be more fruitful.

This is why we need to proceed by questioning other implications the wide sense and scope the institutions of work has regarding the nation. All the more because, as we advance in the 1850s, the matter of the construction of authority, sovereignty, and State-building acquire a central place in the political debate. All of which were problems the working nation faced since 1848. In 1853, the moderate and conservative reaction to the series of radical republicanist and working groups' movements sought to constitute an authority with enough legitimacy to disarticulate the network woven by these indigenous, peasant, and manufacturing populations. Although it has remained implicitly as a topical tension throughout the dissertation, the crystallization of the relation between nation and state in the 1850s, in turn, is a privileged arena to discuss the implications the working nation –as an institution– had for the state as conceived, and greatly enabled by, the *puros* or *radicales*. The evidence gathered since the first chapter –where the idea that there was something like a "Nation-State" in 1835 was discussed– will be useful to discuss, with the 1850s working nation, if there was a "definitive triumph of the natural law over the ancient pactist liberties". An idea that presupposes as consequential evidence that the liberal State "triumphed" to the extent that its Constitution was established in 1857 and not effectively replaced until 1917.[96]

5. Between revolutions: 1853 and 1855. Or the plight for the State.

Joaquín Herrera's presidency managed to keep the multiple tensions caused by the repeated uprisings sufficiently at bay for his presidency to end with the election of the next president. Faced to the *puros*, the *conservadores*, and the *santanistas*, the *moderados* achieved a presidential election where Mariano Arista, Herrera's minister of war, was accompanied by other prominent figures like Gómez Pedraza, Mariano Otero, and Luis de la Rosa. Despite Arista's sketchy past, by 1850 he was known for having been the head of the ministry of war that managed to pull Herrera's government through thick and thin.[97] As soon as he rose to the presidency, the very groups he had

[95] García Cantú, *El socialismo en México, siglo XIX*, 12–53; García Cantú, *Idea de México. El Socialismo*, 2:43.
[96] María Luna Argudín and Reynaldo Sordo Cedeño, "La Vida Política," in *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880*, ed. Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, vol. 2, América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea (Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012), 51.
[97] Costeloe, "Mariano Arista and the 1850 Presidential Election in Mexico," 56–60.

systematically dismantled in favor of Herrera's moderados began striking back. Significantly, the regular army, which had been drastically reduced (from forty thousand to nine thousand nine hundred ninety nine troops), allied with the santanistas and the conservatives, of whom he had stripped the governorship in Mexico City. In such a context, his offensive against the Church was assuredly not a wise tactic for securing power.[98] With little difficulty, a series of *pronunciamientos* against his government in 1852 soon spread the word for the reestablishment of federal order under the then exiled Antonio López de Santa Anna.[99]

By January 5th, 1853, Arista stepped down and his replacement, Juan Bautista Ceballos, was replaced by Manuel María Lombardini, a skillful santanista who managed to collect the votes of eighteen congress members for the election of Santa Anna as Mexico's future president.[100] Shortly afterwards, a santanista newspaper argued that the Mexican "people" behaved like a sick man that did not know how to "cure himself" and had even chosen the "wrong doctors". It therefore needed a dictatorship, "'not just a doctor, but a guardian who ensures the prescribed medicine is taken'".[101] His presidency, engineered into a dictatorship while a new congress could draw the new Constitution to replace the 1847 federalist reformed constitution, was soon unveiled as a project of the santanistas in their commitment to have "Santa Anna govern the country for an indeterminate period of time".[102] By then, the alliance between the conservative groups –they no longer conceived themselves as a "party" in that they represented Mexican society entirely, not a part of it– and the santanistas was consolidated.[103] United under the principles of religion, property, and conservation or "devolution [*devolución*]" of what the nation had lost during the precedent five years, by April 1853 a new presidential cabinet, with a "small number" of counselors following Alamán's advice, had been drawn.[104] The santanista vocation of reaffirming power in the State was concreted when most of Santa Anna's cabinet was either conservative or

---

[98] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 48–51; Santoni and Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853," 14–17.

[99] "Plan de Blancarte" (26/11/1852), "Segundo Plan de Blancarte" (13/9/1853), "Plan del Hospicio de Pobres", (10/10/1853), all available in: https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/index.php.

[100] José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 6 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 329; Santoni and Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853," 17.

[101] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 292.

[102] Will Fowler, "El México de Los Años de La Intervención Estadounidense y La Posguerra (1846-1856)," in *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 27–29.

[103] Moisés González Navarro, "Tipología Del Liberalismo Mexicano," *Historia Mexicana* 32, no. 2 (October 1, 1982): 218–21.

[104] Moisés González Navarro, "La Era de Santa Anna," in *Historia Documental de México*, ed. Miguel León Portilla, 4th ed., vol. 2, Serie Documental / Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2013), 209–11.

santanista. His two strongest allies, despite past differences and encounters, were given the two most important secretaries (*secretarías*) of the State: Alamán was the new minister of external affairs, while José María Tornel was awarded the ministry of war. Some moderates close to the conservatives like Antonio Haro y Tamariz (treasury) and Teodosio Lares (Justice) were given key ministries, while Miguel Lerdo de Tejada (Fomento),[105] a puro, accompanied Joaquín Velázquez de León.[106]

United under the conservative motive of restoration of the nation, the first measures to be passed through the *Bases para la administración de la República hasta la promulgación de la Constitución*,[107] were the return to a centralist administration, which meant the *estados* would again be called *departamentos*, while their legislatures were dissolved. Tornel would reestablish the dominance of the regular army's numbers back to forty-five thousand troops.[108] Significantly, the ayuntamientos were disintegrated in every capital city of the re-established Departments. The municipalities, as the "first civil institution", were to be administered by a governor that had the exclusive role of being an "agent" of the national government. As with the centralist charters, the *ayuntamiento* (city council) could not carry out any kind of "political" action: its task was to safeguard the municipio's interests. Government and administration were entrusted to commissions in charge of, and formed for, very specific tasks: public works, meat inspection, street maintenance, etc. The ayuntamiento, then, had the simple function of regulating internal budgets, permits, and regulations for these commissions' operation.[109] As is visible, the Santa Anna regime was, once again, dismantling the very places and institutions where the peasant, indigenous, working nation had stemmed their political actions.

Through a combination of institutional and administrative reforms, the dictatorial regime countered the senses the working groups were instituting of the nation. Following the dissolution of the "political" centers (ayuntamientos and municipios), and the dissolution of the federal system they upheld, Santa Anna ordered the "extinction" of the Juntas de Fomento Ignacio Trigueros had established under his supervision a little over a decade earlier. The newly created ministry of fomentation and colonization would centralize the assignment of officials to substitute the former

---

[105] The ministries were now called, respectively: *Secretaría de relaciones exteriores; Secretaría de gobernación; Secretaría de justicia, negocios eclesiásticos e instrucción pública; and Secretaría de fomento, colonización, industria y comercio*. Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 6:366.
[106] González Navarro, *Anatomía Del Poder En México, 1848-1853*, 221. For the internal operation of each ministry, see: Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado*, 44–46.
[107] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 6:366–73.
[108] Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 298.
[109] Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado*, 111. There are unmistakeable continuities between this constitutional Project and the Siete Leyes of 1836. See: Catherine Andrews, "El Legado de Las Siete Leyes: Una Reevaluación de Las Aportaciones Del Constitucionalismo Centralista a La Historia Constitucional Mexicana," *Historia Mexicana* 68, no. 4 (April 1, 2019): 1539–92, https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v68i4.3855.

juntas, which would now be "subject to the orders and instructions" the regime gave to specifically designated people, with "skills and necessary qualities". Commerce and merchants would henceforth be forced to register in the "commercial courts" (*tribunales*), which would take care of all matters related to the regulation of their "draw" (*giro*) or profit, through a strict imposition of taxes, be it result of their individual or company's activities. The Junta General de Industria would now be exclusively composed by the owners (*propietarios*) of cotton, wool, silk, and paper factories; their first obligation being to report activities to the "supreme government"; the last, to assure its "operators" have the adequate religious and civil education, which would assure the "conditions of such an interesting class".[110] The centralization of the administration and government of the practices of labor and work was accompanied by a redefinition of the central purposes of the nation. More precisely, the nation became an object upon which Santa Anna's "supreme power" would be exerted –even if every decree he commissioned reiterated the fact that he did so "in service of the faculties the nation conferred me".[111] His power was supreme to the extent that he dissolved the existent political parties while continuously exalting his figure.

Preservation of national unity would be guaranteed through the reestablishment of traditional institutions like the *Orden de Guadalupe*, but Santa Anna greatly focused the construction of his authority and power through symbolic acts. His State council, for example, granted him the title of His Serene Highness (*Su Alteza Serenísima*), after his rule was extended for the first time on December 16th, 1853. With a series of factors like the death of Lucas Alamán and Tornel, his personalist fever grew and began invoking pompous adulations in his favor. June 13, his saint's day, became a national festivity. Historians have studied how the celebrations were established with all the amusements, but always under the control of the police that had to control the "restless citizens". The festivities began to multiply until every victory or displacement of his "most serene highness" deserved a lavish reception by the city that received the "exalted leader".[112]

As mentioned, the santanistas were supportive of any means of incrementing the president's authority as a way of seeking solutions for the country's problems. Their defense of the

[110] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 6:594; José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*, vol. 7 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 95–98.

[111] "Que en uso de las facultades que la nación se ha servido conferirme, he tenido á bien decretar lo siguiente:". See the first paragraph of any of the above quoted decrees in the *Legislación mexicana…* Authority was thus exerted in accordance with the legitimacy the indirect elections that named him president conferred him. Strictly speaking, the "nation" was composed of the members of congress who had voted for him a few months earlier. As we shall see, this eventually posed problems for his administration.

[112] González Navarro, "Tipología Del Liberalismo Mexicano," 221; Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado*, 47–52; Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 301; William H. Beezley and Colin M. MacLachlan, *Mexico's Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 74.

dictatorship was deeply rooted in a disbelief Mexicans could "sustain a successful democratic system". A view that was neighboring to their quest for a European prince as a means of assuring strong allies for Mexico in case the United States did not stop at the recent annexation of the northern-border area known as La Mesilla (109,574 square kilometers).[113] The balancing authority had to be a European prince with enough relation to Mexico's Latin race to counter the "Anglo-Saxon" invasion.[114] Since the beginning of Santa Anna's regime, the example to follow was set in the French emperor. In Napoléon III's fashion, Santa Anna also wished to appear as a "credo above party struggles", as historians described the former.[115]

According to *El Universal*, the Frenchman managed the "final defeat of the democratic idea, vanquished on its own grounds", establishing the "shining focal point" upon which the "theatre of reaction" should unfold. The fact that his reaction was ensued by a *coup* that saw his proclamation as an emperor was ever more appealing for the authoritarian groups within the conservative party. It was the perfect example for Santa Anna and his regime precisely because of the emperor's capacity to emphasize the "homogeneity of society" over the division and individuality created by the liberal system that defended the free press. Directly inspired in the French organic law of February 1852, Lucas Alamán and Teodosio Lares, at the head of the ministries of interior relations and justice, drafted a strict press law that suppressed, or at least severely controlled, free public opinion.[116] Lares further drafted a series of laws which strictly changed the nature of property into a matter of public administration, on the one hand, but also restricted the actions of the groups that inhabited those lands. The "family congregations" that lived in a piece of land, for example, could no longer erect themselves into "politically organized populations".[117]

---

[113] Also known as the "Gadsden Purchase" because it was effectively Santa Anna's transaction with James Gadsden by which the U.S. ambassador assured Santa Anna a ten million dollar payment. Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 304.

[114] Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 119–65. As was briefly mentioned in the previous chapter, the idea that Panlatinism was of French and conservative origins has been convincingly discussed by Gabriela De Lima Grecco and Sven Schuster, "Decolonizing Global History? A Latin American Perspective," *Journal of World History* 31, no. 2 (2020): 425–46, https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2020.0024. The contacts and exchanges between the French Second Empire and the Mexican conservative party will be further analyzed in the following chapter.

[115] Roger Price, *Documents on the Second French Empire, 1852-1870* (London: Springer/Palgrave, 2016), 37.

[116] Printers had to register their name and residence, be registered with a license, and every text had to be reviewed by authorities before it was printed. *El Monitor republicano*, the moderate-controlled newspaper, would disappear five days after the law was approved. Smaller newspapers soon disappeared because of the government's reform that forced printshops to have a "deposit" available in case they were surprised of having broken the law. "Seditious" publications, be them books, pamphlets, or newspapers, were often confiscated and even burned on some occasions. Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 6:369–73; Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado*, 201–18; Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 166–68.

[117] Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado*, 75–76, 149–50.

Despite the regime's efforts of grandiloquence and authoritarian stability, the country soon entered a phase of economic crisis that unchained the discontent of the same populations that had been systematically suppressed by Santa Anna's authority. The populations that reacted to his reactionary presidency were precisely the peasant, indigenous, communities that lived in today's Guerrero, particularly in the vicinities of Ayutla. The movement rapidly extended through Morelos and Michoacán, reaching Jalisco to the west, and Puebla, Hidalgo, and Veracruz to the north-east. The movement began in *El Sur*, an area that included the southwest of Michoacán and the Estado de México, Morelos, parts of Puebla and Oaxaca, and the northern boundaries of Guerrero. Perhaps its most important leader was Juan Álvarez, who since October 1854 sought a "national coalition" in which the movement of the peasant and indigenous communities could participate, under the renewed banner of "federation and liberty".[118] As such, the movement appealed to "villagers and townspeople", for whom the "more direct issues were social justice, access to resources such as land, and the responsiveness of local political institutions". Indeed, as historians have established, it was precisely this need for "negotiated convergences" which would ultimately drive Álvarez's articulation of a "radical federalism",[119] refurbishing the 1840s radical republicanism. Santa Anna's reaction to the series of movements only ended up pushing his regime's destiny to unsteady terrain. He dismissed important federalist leaders from their posts in the department of Guerrero, giving the regular army general and regional caudillo Nicolás Bravo more authority over the civic militias coordinated by Álvarez. The latter's relation with peasant leaders scattered throughout the territory, in turn, eased a coordinated response against the Serene Highness's dictatorship.[120]

Santa Anna cut the regime's cooperation with Álvarez by further debilitating the role of civic militias, but he also operated an economic cut-off so the region would be isolated. The regime closed the port of Acapulco in the department of Guerrero, closing all incoming commerce from one of the most important ports of the country. Having incapsulated and isolated the region, Santa Anna and his troops systematically repressed the movement from May 1854, albeit without ever managing to extinguish it entirely. As some have suggested, it was precisely the network Álvarez had managed to build with local peasants and indigenous communities which eventually proved key in organizing the defense of the territory and its groups.[121] On October 20, Santa Anna issued

---

[118] Vázquez Mantecón, 164–65.
[119] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 148–57.
[120] Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State*, 184.
[121] Acapulco would remain a tactic position for the dictator's counter-offensive against the Ayutla movement. One of the former's most significant victories against the peasant militias in Guerrero was precisely on April 20th when Santa Anna managed to lead Álvarez's forces off. For a detailed summary of the movement from the point of view of the santannistas to the fall of his government, see: Vázquez Mantecón, *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado*, 164, 281–96; Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 311–14.

a decree that wished to contest the "perfidious maneuvers of the seditious", which had now extended all the way to Tamaulipas in the north of the country. As he did not wish to "command" (*mandar*) Mexicans that had withdrawn their confidence in him, he summoned the reunion of popular councils (*juntas populares*), under the respective political authorities, to which "all Mexicans, of any class or condition" would express their opinion on whether Santa Anna should continue to exercise his "supreme command" over the Republic with the same faculties. In case he should not continue in his command, Mexicans had to answer who it would fall upon "immediately". On February 2nd, 1855, the State Council decreed that it was "the will of the nation" that Santa Anna continue as president of the Republic with the same "ample faculties".[122] His appeal to "all Mexicans" through the juntas populares, no matter how popular it may have been, did not stop the Ayutla movement. By August that year, Santa Anna had fled Mexico City and on the 16th left the country, leaving a "triumvirate", eventually directed by Martín Carrera, in his stead.[123]

In Juan Álvarez's own words, even after Santa Anna had "ravaged the *pueblos*, felled the mountains, devastated the crops", he could not go back to Mexico City with a triumph, for the "pacific inhabitants" of El Sur could not commend to the idea of seeing "national sovereignty" deposited in one man, be that who it may. Where the "holy dogma of national sovereignty" was not a chimera, there was a parliament whose seats were occupied by the "artisan, the farmer [*agricultor*], the manufacturer [*fabricante*], the merchant; all those who are patriotic and know how to defend the people from the oppression of the government. So do we the inhabitants of el Sur": They wanted the nation to be represented by any patriotic, honest, Mexican that rejected the "pernicious influence" of the classes that called themselves "privileged" so they could "exploit the *pueblo*". This is why the *surianos* (people of the south) would always fight for "holy liberty". Without it, there can be "no agriculture that thrives, arts that advances [*adelantar*], or commerce that flourishes". The surianos had formed the idea that the "temporal happiness of nations" meant that there would be "peace, liberty, love of work and family, and honesty in government". Abundance would appear, and misery would exit "through our doors". "Let there be one law for all, let there be guarantees for the citizen, let the classes stop from sucking the patria dry of its substance, let the division between brothers disappear".[124] "And unite they did".[125]

---

[122] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 7:326–27, 399.

[123] Lozano and Dublán, 7:553–54; Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 315; Fowler, "El México de Los Años de La Intervención Estadounidense y La Posguerra (1846-1856)," 33.

[124] Juan Álvarez, *Juan Álvarez, general de división del ejército mexicano, a sus compatriotas*, 1855. (Centro de Estudios de Historia de México-CONDUMEX (CEHM-C), Fondo XXVIII-1.1-7.11).

[125] For the series of peasant movements that unchained in the Morelos-Guerrero borderline and their relation with Álvarez: Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 152–57; Carlos Barreto Zamudio, "¿Tata Juan o Pantera Del Sur? Presencia Del General Juan Álvarez En La Región de Morelos, 1828-1860," in *Historia de Morelos. Tierra, Gente y Tiempos Del Sur*, ed. Horacio Crespo, 2nd ed., vol. 6: Creación del Estado, leyvismo y

The (re)discovery of Álvarez's pronunciamiento is truly groundbreaking for our research. The document reflects much more than the ideas of one of the last representatives of the generation that was born before –and fought during– independence.[126] Within a wider history of the movement of the working nation, Álvarez may be considered the leader of a revolution that articulated the principles of the populations he commanded. Populations which were indigenous, peasant, and working communities that saw their means of productive and reproductive capacities stripped by an authoritarian reaction. The suriano consecrated the principles of the peasant, indigenous, working nation because their movement claimed "holy liberty" as a consequence of peace, love of work, and honesty. Liberty, that is, as the principle that was a consequence of independence, was void without the "abundance" that came with the protection of those other principles, acclaimed by very specific groups. Only by combining these groups' principles could they eventually create the unity among the "brothers" of the patria and bring "salvation" to the nation. Salvation precipitated, or should precipitate, into the construction of the "national coalition" he aspired to build. The system that would organize such unity could be no other than federation in a "country like ours, divided in provinces, very unevenly populated, of very distant capital cities, of contradictory interests".[127] He expressed, in other words, the hierarchy of political values that articulated the federalist, radical republicanist, movement of 1854 with the working groups, to constitute a working nation. And unite they did, as Mallon says, because the movement was taken to the instances of the Mexican State.

From Ayutla, alliances were managed to be woven despite the tense context. Such movements, articulated since 1854, eventually managed to chase off Santa Anna from power. Their claim over the State's power, however, was not lasting. In the process that saw political authority over the State being transferred, Juan Álvarez was not able to hold the presidency for more than a couple of months. The Plan de Ayutla which had been issued in March 1854 was modified by Ignacio Comonfort only ten days afterwards, with the crucial introduction of one clause that internally shifted the implications and consequences of the movement and its capacity to eventually administer authority over the State. The radical Ayutla plan was conceived, from the south of the country and by the working peasant communities, as a defense of territorial independence, with the consequent use of its resources and the sustainability of the communities that inhabited it, and as an intent to abolish the dictatorial authority of Santa Anna. The moderate

porfiriato, 9 vols. (Cuernavaca,: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, 2018), 35–54. The quotation is Mallon's, p. 152. She also mentions Álvarez's proclamation.

[126] As mentioned, between 1853 and 1855, a whole generation of prominent politicians died: Mariano Otero, Lucas Alamán, José María Tornel, Nicolás Bravo (the political counterweight of Álvarez in Guerrero), Anastasio Bustamante, José Joaquín Herrera, and Mariano Arista. Of this generation, only Gómez Farías and Álvarez survived past 1857. Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 316.

[127] Álvarez, "Juan Álvarez, general de división del ejército mexicano, a sus compatriotas".

plan of Acapulco, instead, transformed the claim of the pueblos into an outright "liberal" plan in which the only convenient way of administering the country was with "liberal institutions" that defended "republican equality".[128] Though Álvarez has risen to the presidency, it was the political legitimacy of the moderate plan which upended his presidency at the hands of Comonfort. Significantly, however, the alliances Comonfort was able to craft with the liberal puros such as Melchor Ocampo and Benito Juárez, slowly began to lose importance *vis-à-vis* the alliances with the moderados such as José María Lafragua and Manuel Payno, as well as key figures which were close to the conservative party such as Antonio Haro y Tamariz and Félix Zuolaga. By 1856, then, the presidency was occupied by a liberal moderate that encompassed a broad coalition, with Álvarez having returned to Guerrero along with the armed groups of *pintos*, as the indigenous and mulatto groups were called in a derogatory manner.[129]

As shall be seen in the next chapter, the Ayutla alliances, contrary to what some may suggest, were not only a contestation to the politics articulated by Santa Anna's regime. It would rather seem that they were alliances that merged different –even contradictory as Álvarez himself suggested– interests in a process that put together groups and their movements in the construction of a new unity that did not fall into the dictatorial scheme cultivated by the santanistas[130] –nor into the moderate-liberal interests of those closest to Comonfort. In a sense, the movements which revolved in and around El Sur, and were eventually largely integrated into the Ayutla movement, were nothing less, and much more, than a sociopolitical reaction to the authoritarian reaction of 1853; that is, a reaction to the latter's national project which directly attacked the interests of the peasant, working, majority of the nation.[131] As the case of Morelos and the Estado de México demonstrated, peasant and indigenous communities were particularly staunch where territorial and resource control was channeled to the hands of hacendados and large estate holders, such as the duke of Monteleone and Terranova in Morelos.[132] Ultimately, what gave coherence to this

---

[128] Beezley and MacLachlan, *Mexico's Crucial Century, 1810-1910*, 81. See the plan in: "Plan de Ayutla reformado en Acapulco", available in: https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/dates.php?f=y&pid=1559&m=3&y=1854.
[129] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 7:565; Brian Hamnett, "The Comonfort Presidency, 1855-1857," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 85–88.
[130] Florencia E. Mallon, "Peasants and State Formation in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Morelos, 1848-1858," *Political Power and Social Theory* 7 (1988): 31–39.
[131] The word reaction is also used by Falcón. Particularly relevant is her use of the word when she describes the Acambay "rebellion" of the indigenous peoples, which could have been a "mere defensive reaction from those from Acambay against the police actions of the government". Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856," 158. As was seen above, the reaction articulated much more than this immediate defense.
[132] Romana Falcón, *Las Rasgaduras de La Descolonización: Españoles y Mexicanos a Mediados Del Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1996), 104–14. Reina mentions that in several aspects the "defense of the territory against the foreigner" was an important motive to push peasants from other parts of the country into participating in regional struggles for the defense of the country against U.S. offensives, even after 1848. Leticia Reina, "Oaxaca En La Guerra y La Guerra En Oaxaca," in *El México Profundo En La*

social reaction was the process of organization by which its groups organized themselves into working collectivities, with different productive activities, on the one hand, and as collectivities that united to defend statutes, such as national independence itself, which went beyond the strictly local or communal organization, thus weaving the thread that pierced the interests of different groups or "classes". As a renowned historian established, if in 1824 the federalist movement, ending in the 1824 Constitution, was led by creole elites, in 1854-1855 the federalist movement had a "far wider social constituency".[133]

This constituency was most probably based in the populations which, as was specified here, were above all integral to the peasant, manufacturing, working, nation. This nation purported a social reaction to the extent that it was irreducible to any previous political reaction to a national project directed from the State. As the February worker revolution in Paris, it was nothing less than a political institution of the working nation to the extent that it was irreducible to a drive towards State authority. In a singular way, both working nations' reaction was irreducible to a form of government because it was irreducible to a single social and political form.

6. Conclusions

As we have seen in this chapter, Clara Lida's affirmation that the echoes of 1848 "began to be heard loud and clear after the victory of the Ayutla Revolution in 1855, during the political debates leading up to and following the promulgation of the Reforma laws and the Constitution of 1857",[134] is troublesome once we see the active role the working nation carried out in the political conformation of a national project. The institutions of the working groups, which revolved around the establishment of the organization of work as the activity that linked such collectivities and enabled their own organization, were an important threshold for the radical differences they presented for the coalition of a national movement in 1855. Only then can we see why we have established the chronological division in 1855 rather than 1857: in the eyes of the working nation's movement, it is not so much the Constitution of February (1857), as much as the Ayutla movement (1854-1855) and its institution's reach to the state which speak of a national project, irreducible to the one garnered by liberal moderados and federalists. The political familiarity between the movement and the liberal groups, which continues to structure most historiographical debates, is unbalanced once we see the accommodations of socialist imaginaries among the working groups.

Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856), ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 177.
[133] Guy P. C. Thomson, "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 10, no. 3 (1991): 273–74, https://doi.org/10.2307/3338671.
[134] Lida, "The Democratic and Social Republic and Its Repercussions in the Hispanic World," 72.

Beyond artificial divisions of Mexican politics in the scene that led to the Constitution of 1857, this chapter has discovered that there were more cleavages than those which appear at first sight. One which has been neglected by historiography, "by omission or commission" recovering Mallon's phrasing,[135] has been the emergence of peasant, artisan, working, socialist, groups throughout the Republic.

This chapter privileged the analysis of the social movements and institutions that were the socket for the socialist imaginary to emerge with its very own senses and forms of expressivity during the 1848 Atlantic revolutions. A significant part of these movements, particularly when they were directed or organized by working groups that outwardly sought the construction of *nuevas sociedades*, embraced a socialist imaginary that would open new political possibilities for their collective organization. In a very strict continuity with the socialist republicanism prior to 1848, the working groups appropriated the socialist imaginary to both observe and, especially from 1848, act upon the conditions their communities were organized. Like Sabas Sánchez or Sotero Prieto, the indigenous communities of Acambay or the Sierra Gorda conceived "imminently" social and political plans for the fair conditions of work, transforming their traditional organizations into societies and associations which altered the "functional" principles of their contemporary polity. To this extent, the socialist organization of the working nation was imagined as a reaction to inadmissible conditions these groups were sunken in. Before consciously adhering to a socialist movement, most of these groups instituted an imaginary that altered the sense in which people reflected upon national politics. Paradoxically, however, it was the conservative groups which openly denounced the working nation's movements as socialist. The conservative belief, shared by many moderate liberals, that "*barbarism*, *Indian*, and *democracy*" were synonyms[136] had the polemical utility of communing a wide variety of indigenous pueblos and working associations under a same banner. In this sense, the latter's reaction, as was seen here, was irreducible to an "ideological" system, it was a much more articulate and complex social reaction. Socialism, before being any kind of political ideology, was an imaginary held up by social institutions that were organized by the working nation. It was the symptom that allowed these groups to raise the social question, intrinsically linked to the working groups' political awareness.[137]

---

[135] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 330.
[136] Mallon, 155; Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*, 96–97.
[137] Mexican historians have since long acknowledged the undeniable link between the emergence of the "social question" and socialism. See: Carlos Illades, *Las otras ideas: estudio sobre el primer socialismo en México, 1850-1935* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era : Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Cuajimalpa, 2008); Juan Felipe Leal, "Artesanado Urbano," in *La Clase Obrera En La Historia de México: Del Estado Liberal a Los Inicios de La Dictadura Porfirista*, ed. Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, vol. 2, 17 vols. (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Ed, 1988), 121–201.

To raise the social question from 1848 cannot be considered as the beginning of their claims. It is only the corollary of a wide social movement that, as was evidenced in the previous chapters, began presenting the arguments of the working nation. Their radicalizations through 1855 were thus precisely that: the precipitation of the institutions of work into a more articulate imaginary. Opening the working nation's history from the past –in the 1840s– and the future –in the 1860s– as shall be seen in the next chapter, has key consequences for any analysis of the presence of socialist movements around 1848 in the Atlantic space shared between Mexico and France. Ultimately, the question of work, the social question, altered the question on democracy in these countries to the extent that it was perhaps the most important political means for the defense of the economic, political, and social rights of the nation's majority.[138] The political alteration approaches the "democratic" dimension of the movement, but not necessarily toward the constitutional process of the Nation-State.[139] Instead, it displaces the logic of the movement toward the political construction of the societies, the groups, the pueblos and communities, who made up both the majority and the "most important part" of the Mexican nation: the working nation. It could be said, then, that by the 1850s the working nation speaks of a totality that includes the "popular" federalists and liberals but is irreducible to these groups in that it included other groups that did not necessarily appear as federalist. In other words, perhaps the relevance of the working nation stems from its integrating role within a global Mexican and Atlantic society. Both the French and working nations' decisive role was their capacity of altering the general movement of their nations and states, through their institutions.

As Clara Lida concludes her study, she establishes that the problem for the "working class majorities which made up the popular classes" was both political *and* social. In fact, it was 1848 to have "aroused the awareness" of certain social sectors that had remained "on the fringe of debate and political participation". Their merit, then, was to put the matter of citizen rights as a social problem, a social question, that made the Republic "effectively democratic".[140] The awareness that emerged with the social question, rather than frame it as *class* awareness, was much

[138] For the irreducibility of these rights to "citizen" rights, see: Gonzalez, "El socialismo en su lugar. La «organización social» de la nación y los orígenes intersociales del primer socialismo mexicano hacia 1850." At the time, I was not aware of the similarities my interpretation has with Mallon's idea of a "multi-ethnic concept of citizenship" endorsed by the pueblos. See Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 26–32.

[139] Sanders, *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*, 82, 121–22. This is another point where our interpretations part ways. The irreducibility of the democracy proposed by the working nation is correlative to an irreducibility with the American republican modernity Sanders sees "ascend" with the 1855 Ayutla "liberal" revolution.

[140] Lida, "The Democratic and Social Republic and Its Repercussions in the Hispanic World," 74. She remarks that the "Republic of work", as her studies and Carlos Illades's *Hacia la República…*, appeared in 1876 with the Congress summoned by the Círculo Obrero. However, the "Social Republic would await a further half a century, until the Mexican Revolution, when the right to work was established in the Constitution of 1917". p. 73.

more "fluid". It sparked a collective, inter-group, communication through the activities that ended up tying them into a national coalition: work. In both the French and Mexican cases, for the working nation, the social question was unequivocally the question of work, as well as labor. As a matter of work, or more precisely, as an effort to organize the communities' activities and livelihoods, primarily through work, such question was irrevocably linked to the socialist-sociological principle. Contrary to what we are used to think when reading the term socialism, however, these communities, associations, and organizations of work were not determined by the principle but rather appropriated it according to the interests, imaginaries, and identities they lived with.

The evidence with which this chapter has worked with teaches us to better distinguish the groups and the activities that were involved in the movement the working nation headed. The groups' individuality did not impede communication but rather was the tool to build a mutual reference that could "cut across class lines", as Guardino suggested. In these transversal group movements, a national movement was constituted that was neither strictly rural nor urban. The collectivities and their individuals crossed roads constantly in the travels of their labor's product, the inter-regional commercialization of their products, in the displacements of communities between places in search of subsistence, or simply fleeting situations where subsistence was no longer possible. Such social movements open up the possibility to embrace the contingency that, beyond any ideological "adherence", the pueblos, the hacienda workers, rural campesinos, urban artisans, printers, shoemakers, hatters, lawyers, and even some industry owners of textile and weaving factories instituted a social fact that was circulating effectively since, at least, the beginning of the 1840s. What the Atlantic working nations witnessed between 1848 and 1855 was a radicalization, or more generally a precipitation of the politics these groups endorsed. And this was true for the working nations as much as for the liberal and conservative groups on both shores of the ocean. In other words, from 1848 a triadic "board" was set up once socialism was contested by liberalism and conservatism. From that point onwards, the political identifications that were put into play could not avoid confronting each political contingency.

This might be considered the ultimate importance of the Mexican working nation's experience. The former affirmation might seem counterintuitive when analyzing the French or European evolution of political ideas, for it is well known that socialism did not precede either liberalism or conservatism. The Mexican experience, however, speaks of a working nation that preceded both liberalism and conservatism, in their narrow senses, as political concepts. Though socialism had been a reaction to centralism and a radicalization of republicanism[141] in the 1840s,

[141] As was mentioned in chapter four, previous accounts of this form described it as a "popular federalism", characterized by "inclusive definitions of citizenship, an emphasis on local autonomy, and opposition to the

it is also true that it strictly preceded the partisan synthesis of either liberalism or conservatism. This counterintuitive affirmation is a result of the interconnected history of Atlantic socialism and can only be sustained once we analyzed the working nation as an integrated social movement, a national coalition that was instituted through the Ayutla movement. Together with the February 1848 revolution, it can be considered as the institution of a social reaction orchestrated by the working nation's imaginary.

Conditions after October 1855, albeit, changed. Given that, from August 20th, 1855, to February 5th, 1857, there was an assembly that wished to "freely constitute the nation under the popular representative form",[142] should we see the State that was ensued as a result of the working nation's constituency? Or, taking such implications to their ultimate consequences, does this mean that the 1857 Nation-State was constituted as a working, socialist, Nation-State? To prevent any hasty conclusions, the next chapter will analyze these years by considering the perspective that the working nation offers. In what follows, we shall see that it was here that the working nation's "longing for a better future"[143] materialized and was quite immediately disappointed when it was transferred to some of the nation's ruling groups.

---

wealthy few who were accused of both exploiting Mexico's impoverished majority and conniving to subvert Mexico's independence". Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State*, 217. The same tensions seem to have happened in Puebla and Tlaxcala, see: Thomson, "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888"; Santibáñez, "Condiciones de Vida y Trabajo En Los Pueblos de Tlaxcala Entre 1840 y 1867."

[142] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 7:554.

[143] Falcón, "En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856," 170.

Chapter VI

Empire, Nation, and State. The intersocial dimension in the Age of Empires (1857-1867)

1. Introduction

The Ayutla movement effectively arrived at the pinnacle of the Mexican State by the summer of 1855. As anticipated, however, the working, peasant, indigenous nation faced a series of problems in their interest of constituting a new national State. There were evident contradictions and disagreements amongst the groups that formed the movement. As we shall discover in this last chapter of the dissertation, the working groups faced a relentless disappointment, presented as a "non-compliance" by the liberal State. The war of Reforma (1858-1861), which evidenced a division of presidential authority among the liberal and conservative groups, was yet another hiatus of the communication between the working nation and the State, but now the former suffered crucial transformations. The analysis of some sources will evidence the working groups' appraisal of their consciousness as *classes*. Contrary to what many have supposed, the paradoxical relation between mutual aid societies and the State is yet another symptom for the imaginary of work's appropriation of labor institutions. As is well known, the emergence of the working classes as well as their paradoxical and complex relationship with the State did not only happen in 1860s Mexico.

In effect, the chapter delves once more into the Atlantic dimension by putting the emergence of the Mexican working classes within an imperial perspective. The experience of the Mexican and French Second Empires, which united the regimes of Napoléon III and Maximilian of Habsburg, reveals certain paradoxes when we simultaneously regard the development of the working classes. Some which will be highlighted here are the imperial States, how they built a familiar relationship to liberal policies, while developing favorable legislation *vis-à-vis* the working classes. Indeed, through the analysis of "beneficence" institutions, the working groups, self-perceived as working classes, and their movements will unveil further contradictions and

disagreements between the imperial and liberal States, and the working nation. As we approach the conclusions, the "political culture" of "labor internationalism" shall become evident through the radical communications the Mexican and French working classes established. As we shall discover, it was not so much a "labor movement" as much as the worker labor movement –of which the working *classes* were the protagonist– which instituted a worker's internationalism that prefigured the International Working Men's Association (IWMA).[1] The surfacing of such an international dimension, as shall be discussed, gives us the tools to historically discuss, in the general conclusions to the dissertation, the correspondence with Marcel Mauss's concept of the "intersocial".

2. Another nation and another State. 1857 with the working nation

On August 20th, 1855, a new congress to "freely constitute the nation under the popular representative form" was summoned in Mexico City.[2] By October, Ignacio Comonfort had occupied the place of Juan Álvarez, who had gone back to El Sur together with his militias and the indigenous, mulatto, working groups. The separation of Álvarez from the command of the State has normally been interpreted as the expression of a radical "rift" between the Ayutla movement and the moderate State organized by Comonfort, the ministers surrounding him, and the legislatures.[3] Notwithstanding the rift, the liberal moderates were quite aware of their task at

[1] This chapter does not include an analysis of the IWMA precisely because its effects in Mexico were only heard from 1870 onwards. We should, however, keep in mind Horacio Tarcus's recent thesis in this regard: "The tensions that existed at the time [1860s and 1870s] within the Mexican organizations (political struggle v. abstention; mutualism v. cooperativism; opposition v. collaboration between Capital and Labor) had preceded the debates in the International". Horacio Tarcus, "The First International in Latin America," in *"Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth": The First International in a Global Perspective*, ed. Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, Studies in Global Social History, Volume 29 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018), 256. As shall become evident, a series of arguments linked to the working nation, the institutions of work and the imaginary of work were a crucial arena for the discussion of the international dimension of the working classes and the worker labor movement. The IWMA's presence in Mexico is one of the most understudied phenomena of labor history. To the extent of our knowledge, only José Valadés and García Cantú, and in their wake Carlos Illades, have studied it. Gastón García Cantú, *El socialismo en México, siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Era, 1969); Carlos Illades, *Las otras ideas: estudio sobre el primer socialismo en México, 1850-1935* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era : Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Cuajimalpa, 2008); José C. Valadés, *El Socialismo Libertario (Siglo XIX)*, ed. Paco Ignacio Taibo II (Mexico City: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung/Para Leer en Libertad A.C., 2013).
[2] José María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose María Lozano*, vol. 7 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876), 554.
[3] Florencia E. Mallon, "Peasants and State Formation in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Morelos, 1848-1858," *Political Power and Social Theory* 7 (1988): 1–54; Guy P. C. Thomson, "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 10, no. 3 (1991): 265–92, https://doi.org/10.2307/3338671.

the head of the State: to organize Mexican society. Manuel Payno, minister of finance until May 1856 and again in 1857, raised a key question in the liberal State's constituent process:

> However much partisan spirit, the desire for wellbeing, patriotism or any other sentiment may have wished to destroy with a single blow all that existed in order to create something absolutely new, the fact is that it has not been possible, because when it comes to remedying great ills, in practice there are also great insurmountable difficulties that Your Excellency [*V. E.*] will have felt while handling the affairs of the State under your worthy command.[4]

In his view, it was necessary to cut "disorderly and exorbitant" expenditures which had consumed the "product of industry and the work of the citizens", erasing any trace of the "material goods [that] animate and transform" societies in these times of progress and civilization. The task of achieving a well ordered and arranged "economic" administration, would be attained not only through a correct administration of the treasury, but also through the obligation of the *pueblos*, "constituted into *a society*", of contributing with a portion of their wealth, their blood, and their liberty to form the "public treasury, richness and liberty". These obligations did not exempt the "civilized" government from respecting the pueblos' "fair and essential right" that had been reclaimed "a long time ago", of giving only the "absolutely necessary" contribution to the national coffers. The government would also have to use these contributions correctly to "invest in their benefit and happiness", specifically by not abandoning "certain charity and instruction establishments".[5]

We might justifiably suspect that such an attitude of protection of the pueblos may have emerged from the immediately precedent experience of the Ayutla revolution. Indeed, the fact that Álvarez had been dismissed from the presidency by the moderados may not necessarily entail the latter's negligence towards the groups of the movement. Historians have since long accepted the idea that the "free worker" (*trabajador libre*) had established an undeniable contact with these constituent liberals.[6] As Carlos Illades argues, the 1856 constituent congress had established an undeniable link between the concept of freedom and work, creating the link between the latter and wage labor. For the constituents of 1856, no kind of industry, commerce or "useful work" could be curtailed by the law. Only individuals that had been granted an "exclusive privilege" over an invention or "perfection" of their works could decide the conditions of their industry or labor.[7] The decree was discussed throughout the constituent congress.

---

[4] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1876, 7:638.

[5] Lozano and Dublán, 7:638, 641. My italics.

[6] Juan Felipe Leal, "Artesanado Urbano," in *La Clase Obrera En La Historia de México: Del Estado Liberal a Los Inicios de La Dictadura Porfirista*, ed. Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, vol. 2 (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Ed, 1988), 157.

[7] Carlos Illades, *Hacia La República Del Trabajo: El Mutualismo Artesanal Del Siglo XIX*, 2nd ed. (Mexico City: Gedisa/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2016), 85–86; Francisco Zarco, *Historia Del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente, 1856-1857* (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 1956), 331. See for example, the "privilege" the interim president conceded to André Levasseur for the use of special textile machinery. José

It was nobody other than Arizcorreta, the former governor of the Estado de México, who together with Ignacio Vallarta, a young deputy from Jalisco, argued against the "form" in which article 17 had been drafted. Standing against the abuses of the proprietary classes, Vallarta enounced a famous discourse that called for the eradication of monopoly, and practices such as the removal of populations from their land or coerced labor to be dispelled from the country. But in the current "social state" (*estado social*), the necessary "social organization of work" that would solve such problems was impossible. Perhaps, Vallarta stated, some affirm that he had come to "preach these doctrines that the vulgar call subversive, that the rich call plundering and their apostles call socialism", the "most vast" system that human intelligence had created. "None of this is accurate": he respected too much the "social edifice" to attempt such a "reedification". It was Quesnay and Smith's principles to which economies should obey: *laissez faire* and universal competition. These principles, then, dictated that it was only freedom of work which should be proclaimed in the constitution, nothing else. All other particular matters which were not "economic", such as the abuses of the landowners on the villagers (*pobladores*), should not be a matter of constitutional law. The latter should not interfere with "protections" and "regulations" of work and labor.[8]

As other legislators, like Ponciano Arriaga, help evidence: the matter that the legislature should debate on was not work or labor as such, but the principle upon which they were to be established: freedom. He argued that "social organization" was founded on this principle, which in turn was the translation of individual right (*derecho de la persona*), represented in property. Linking property, freedom and individual rights through a "sacred" bond, any property was subordinated to the free individual's person. The root and model of any property was the "property of the self" (*yo*). It was thus absolute and prior to any law. "Work and production do not constitute, but rather confirm and develop, the right to property". First, came the right of the "first occupant", the person that by occupying an object, appropriates it. Notwithstanding, work (*trabajo*) allowed our personhood to be imprinted into the "unoccupied matter [*materia*]": work "united [property] to our person". Protecting property meant protecting individual freedom, of which work was only the process of imprinting one's individuality into that material expression of a political, natural, right. It was towards the possibility that this individual freedom, the appropriation of the matter by the individual, that legislation should abide and procure. To

María Lozano and Manuel Dublán, *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose María Lozano*, vol. 8 (Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1877), 429–30.

[8] Zarco, *Historia Del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente, 1856-1857*, 705–9. Quotations to this text will remain simplified, only referring to the specific pages used. Francisco Zarco is not the author of the ideas. He simply wrote down the deputies' interventions. The latter's names will be mentioned in the main body of the text.

dispose and enjoy the "fruit" of one's labor should be the ultimate consequence of this law, which avoided conceiving property as that of the landlords. Instead, property rights should be linked to individual, and mutually respectful, freedom among the limitlessly producing worker for which any kind of privilege was abolished. In sum, when "well understood", property rights would give the individual his foremost natural right: freedom.[9]

Only two days after Arriaga presented his speech, Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, secretary of treasury and public credit, passed a decree regarding the use of urban and rural property. The decree, known as the *ley Lerdo*, dissolved Church, communal, or any kind of corporative property –from confraternities to ayuntamientos–, or mortmain properties,[10] confiscating its goods for the potential benefit of the free individuals conceived by Arriaga: the liberal citizen of the new Republic, as well as the State which would benefit from the newly created tax revenues. The Lerdo law practically created a great divergence between the Mexican populations. As some historians have remarked, if it had wished to end with the division of their citizenship into races by breaking the indigenous and communal organization of land and "integrating" its groups into the nation, this almost inevitably meant reducing the value and worth of their lands to their market value.[11] As such, it also implicitly reduced the value of these communities' work to the market value of their "free" labor.[12] The freedom Ponciano Arriaga wished to defend as the principle of property right was not always present in the establishment of property laws, even when such laws were proposed by fellow *radicales* such as Lerdo de Tejada.[13] To this extent, for example, Vallarta's appeal to separate any kind of labor regulations from constitutional law was complied. Congress had heard the landowners' appeal to avoid the elimination of poverty, for wealth, they argued, "had always been and would always be divided unequally, and poverty was no more unnatural than the unequal division of any other human attribute".[14] Drawing from this evidence, we might

---

[9] Zarco, 387–402.

[10] For the intrinsic problems faced by the clergy and the Church, see: Brian Connaughton, *Dimensiones de La Identidad Patriótica: Religión, Política y Regiones En México, Siglo XIX*, Biblioteca de Signos (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2001), 183–222; Erika Pani, *Para Mexicanizar El Segundo Imperio: El Imaginario Político de Los Imperialistas*, El Imaginario Político de Los Imperialistas (El Colegio de Mexico, 2001), 229–41, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv512s5w.8.

[11] Leticia Reina takes the case of the Tehuantepec Isthmus and the negotiations with the U.S. as an example of this internal divisions. Leticia Reina, "Oaxaca En La Guerra y La Guerra En Oaxaca," in *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 175, 187–93. See also: William H. Beezley and Colin M. MacLachlan, *Mexico's Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010), 82–83.

[12] For this topic, see: Marcel Van der Linden, *Workers of the World: Essays toward a Global Labor History* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 39–62.

[13] For the tensions between radicales and moderados in these years, see: Brian Hamnett, "The Comonfort Presidency, 1855-1857," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 81–100.

[14] See Guardino's fascinating analysis on property in Guerrero in these years: Peter Guardino, *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857* (Stanford: Stanford University

say that the liberal congress was not so attentive to the matter of work as much as it was carefully establishing the principles for an integration of the nation's populations into the liberal principles of political-economic organization: property and individual freedom. It was precisely Vallarta's argument that protection and regulation had to be addressed by "secondary laws" that workers did not hesitate to contest.

In the opening lines of an encyclopedic manual published in Aguascalientes, José María Chávez asked what craftsmen, the artisan, "those who live off the work of our hands", would do to "get out of the precarious and miserable state [*estado*]" caused by the lack of "*protection*, of *work*, and *education* [*instrucción*]?". "Will we wait" for the government's protection, the rich landowner's labor, or education from the press where the most talented men in the country could guide them? "*No*". "From whom should we await to come out of inaction? From ourselves", for in the current situation of the "wretched patria we should not rely on anything but our own strengths". Artisans would have to create a "common mass", a "confraternity of artisans" through the creation of a "mutual aid association; but a purely industrial association". Without any kind of intrigues, let "*work* employ our time; that *work* which moderates our customs" and richness will ensue as a "precise consequence of order". It should be no wonder that Chávez was directly inspired in the *Semanario Artístico* in his establishment of "moral education" and the formation of the mutual aid association as the priorities of his encyclopedia.[15]

Chávez was not alone in denouncing the state of the working groups. Severo Cosío, member of the 1856 legislature for the state of Zacatecas, denounced the "tenebrous abyss" to which the "working classes" –"that class of the *pueblo* that is composed of artisans, peasants, miners, and workers [*trabajadores*]"– had been "cast, pushed aside", having formed a "circle apart". The remarkable clarity with which the future governor of Zacatecas limned the working classes' composition, precisely similar to what we have here named the working nation, is proportional to his acknowledgement of a phenomenon the working nation had, perhaps silently to the eyes of politicians thus far, denounced: their social and political segregation from their society. But his perception of the present social state was perhaps more optimistic than theirs. He claimed a "ray of light" had nonetheless managed to illuminate society. The "restitution" of the "diligent and honorable" artisan and every member of the "working classes" to their "natural rank and

---

Press, 1996), 196–201. Brian Hamnett also registered the uncontrollability of the pueblos by the liberal government, mainly due to issues related to the question of property. See Brian Hamnett, "Liberales y Conservadores Ante El Mundo de Los Pueblos, 1840-1870," in *Los Pueblos Indios y El Parteaguas de La Independencia de México*, ed. Manuel Ferrer Muñoz (Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1999), 167–207.

[15] José María Chávez, ed., *El Artesano: Manual Enciclopédico de Industria y Artes*. Aguascalientes: Tipografía de José Ma. Chávez, 1856, 1–2. (Hemeroteca Nacional-Fondo Reservado (HNM-FR), HFRM A124).

position", now enabled the "stonemason, a blacksmith, a textile worker (*obrajero*), a peasant (*labrador*)"[16] to deposit his vote in the ballot box or even opt for office if "he is considered worthy, and his tasks allow it".[17] Yet, as mentioned, the artisan's will did not coincide with Cosío's ideals. They preferred to claim their independence than be blindly integrated as mere republican citizens. Chávez immediately gathered a *Junta* to establish the mutual aid association, a project that had been interrupted since 1848 due to "political disturbances". His appeal to Jesús Terán, governor of Aguascalientes, to offer protection to the association was heard out, and with the aid of 19 members, the society was founded with a *Montepío* (charitable fund) that received 200 pesos.[18]

In effect, the relationship established by the liberal constituent with the working nation was contradictory and undulated between Vallarta's tendency to exclude the institutions of work from the Constitution, and other representatives' dismay in such an exclusion. The contradictions and ambiguities of the constituent regarding the working nation are perhaps most clearly expressed by Ignacio Ramírez, perhaps the most intriguing thinker of the time. In a very well-known and often quoted speech he gave at the 1856 legislature, *El nigromante* Ramírez "charged" the commission responsible for the drafting of the 1857 charter with having gravely "conserved the serfdom of the journeymen". He sentenced the commission for not breaking with past traditions of exploitation. "In the past, the servant was the tree that was cultivated to produce abundant fruit, today the worker is the cane that is squeezed [*exprime*] and abandoned". The wise economists of the commission would proclaim the people's sovereignty in vain if they continued to deprive the journeyman of the fruit of his work (*trabajo*), forcing him to "eat his own capital" and in its stead put a "ridiculous crown on his forehead". On the contrary, they would complete their work, "getting ahead of socialism's aspirations" when they concede the "unquestionable right to a revenue on work capital [*capital trabajo*]".

> As long as the worker consumes his funds under the form of salary and yields his income with all the profits of the enterprise to the capitalist partner, the savings bank is an illusion, the people's bank is a metaphor, the immediate producer of all riches will not enjoy any mercantile credit in the market, will not be able to exercise the rights of a citizen, will not be able to educate himself, will not be able to educate his family, will perish of misery in his old age and in his illnesses. In this lack of social elements, you will find the real secret of why your municipal system is a chimera.

If there is any doubt that Ramírez was approximating the very core of the "social question", as presented by the Atlantic working nation in the previous chapter, and presenting it to the constituent, in the very same paragraph he added: "The true social problem is to emancipate the journeyman from the capitalists"; the constitution's duty, then, was to "put order in the movement", founded on the "privilege of the destitute" (*menesteroso*), so "public power" would

---

[16] For the translations of obrajero and labrador, see above, chapter 5.
[17] Severo Cosío, "Artesanos", in: *El Artesano*, 17–18.
[18] Chávez, "Asociación de socorros mutuos", in: *El Artesano*, 18–19.

be nothing less than "organized beneficence".[19] Ramírez's thought, as is visible, deserves a study of its own.[20] Our interest for now is limited to remark the outstanding communication the working nation's imaginary was able to establish with at least some of the most radical politicians of the time.

With an even greater precision than Severo Cosío, he presents the social question as a problem of *integration* of the nation. Indeed, the problem was the lack of integration of the matter of work and the working subject, the working nation, the "working classes", into the "organization" of the "Mexican nation". Ramírez displaces the discussion on constitutional law towards the organization of the social institution of work, which for him was doubtlessly a matter of the "organization of progress". The ambiguity of the drafts of the constitution established a chimerical municipal system because the legislature succumbed to the illusion that the *patria* was composed of a "homogeneous population". Underneath the "light veil" of a "mixed race" lie "one hundred nations that we in vain try to combine in one alone, for such enterprise is destined to the constant and energic work of peculiar and well combined institutions".[21] El nigromante's identification with the working groups[22] was thus not only merely a matter of his subjective perspective and analysis, but also a radical political appropriation, communication, with the principles the pueblos and Mexican *nations* had articulated during the previous decade. He was echoing, within the chamber of his fellow liberals, the arguments the working nation had been advocating throughout the country for the last years; trying to put order to a vast and wide social movement.

The fact is that despite these advocations and approximations by the most radical liberals, among which historians have also included the author of the history of the congress of 1856-1857 Francisco Zarco, and Ponciano Arriaga, Ignacio Ramírez, León Guzmán, Ignacio Vallarta, Guillermo Prieto, Melchor Ocampo, as well as other less known intellectuals closer to socialism such as Juan Nepomuceno Adorno and Nicolás Pizarro,[23] the working nation did not fully commit

[19] Zarco, *Historia Del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente, 1856-1857*, 471.
[20] Although references to Ramírez are pretty much ubiquitous to historiography of nineteenth-century Mexico, perhaps two of the most detailed accounts of his thought can be found in: Elías José Palti, *La Invención de Una Legitimidad: Razón y Retórica En El Pensamiento Mexicano Del Siglo XIX ; (Un Estudio Sobre Las Formas Del Discurso Político)*, 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007), 338–92; Laura Ibarra García, "Las ideas de Ignacio Ramírez, El Nigromante Su significado en la historia del pensamiento mexicano," *Iztapalapa. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades* 33, no. 72/1 (2012): 153–78.
[21] Zarco, *Historia Del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente, 1856-1857*, 469. Ramíez's intervention of July 1856 is in pages 467-471.
[22] Ignacio Ramírez, *Salario y Trabajo*, Materiales de Cultura y Divulgación Política Mexicana 9 (Mexico City: Partido Revolucionario Institucional/Comité Ejecutivo Nacional, 1974), 3–4.
[23] Luis Chávez Orozco, *Prehistoria Del Socialismo En México* (Mexico City: Publicaciones del Departamento de Bibliotecas de la Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1936); José C. Valadés, "Cartilla Socialista de Plotino C. Rhodakanaty. Noticia Sobre El Socialismo En México Durante El Siglo XIX,"

to the former's compromises. This dimension has been identified by some of the most prominent labor historians in terms of the contradiction between a liberal-juridical frame and the recently dismantled corporative statute of labor societies.[24] As has been observed here, however, it was not much a matter of a contradiction as it was a matter of irreducibility of the working nation to the liberal nation. The incommensurability between an organization of the nation according to the institutions of work and a constitution of the nation according to the juridical principles of freedom and property, as Ramírez himself expresses, was precisely the latter's incapacity to regulate the relationship between society's classes; between the majoritarian working groups which were the very driving force of their society, and the privileged landowners and industrialists that administrated and managed the nation's everyday life.

The journey we have followed with the working nations thus alters much of the recent hypothesis historians have reached regarding this relationship. Driven by the idea that the working groups or "labor societies" articulated an imaginary that was relatable to the political language conceived by contemporary liberals, the definitive differences articulated by those groups have been occasionally neglected by the attention to the undeniable contacts these societies had with the government's "fomentation" policies. Paradoxically, scholars seem to have arrived at this conclusion from the difference between civil society and the societies of labor, as if the latter were a separate social institution regarding the rest of society.[25] What we have seen here, however, has presented different nations that were not necessarily fully independent or autonomous from each other: they all, at least indirectly, strove to organize a nation. Perhaps the conflicts and disagreements were caused by the paradox of belonging to the same society, while its groups curbed radically different imaginaries, institutions, and ideas. As shall be seen below, this thesis might destabilize the idea of a liberal integration of the nation's groups into their civil society.

Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México 3 (1970): 9–66; José C. Valadés, "El Nacimiento de Una Industria Mexicana," *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 4, no. 04 (1979): 95–103; Valadés, *El Socialismo Libertario (Siglo XIX)*; Illades, *Las otras ideas: estudio sobre el primer socialismo en México, 1850-1935*; Illades, *Hacia La República Del Trabajo: El Mutualismo Artesanal Del Siglo XIX*.

[24] Illades, *Hacia La República Del Trabajo: El Mutualismo Artesanal Del Siglo XIX*, 87.

[25] Miguel Orduña Carson, "Artesanos de La Ciudad de México En La Segunda Mitad Del Siglo XIX: Luchas de Resistencia En El Marco de La Hegemonía," *Travesía*, no. 10–11 (2008): 101–20; Miguel Orduña Carson, "Historiografía Social Sobre El Artesanado de La Ciudad de México En El Siglo XIX," *Trashumante. Revista Americana de Historia Social*, no. 1 (2013): 32–48; Miguel Orduña Carson, "Los Artesanos En La Prensa Decimonónica de La Ciudad de México. Liberalismo, Opinión Pública e Identidad Nacional," *El Taller de La Historia* 6, no. 6 (2014): 217–45; Vanesa E. Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización: Honor, Trabajo y Solidaridades Artesanales En La Ciudad de México a Mediados Del Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2008); Vanesa Teitelbaum and Florencia Gutiérrez, "Sociedades de artesanos y poder público. Ciudad de México, segunda mitad del siglo XIX," *Estudios de historia moderna y contemporánea de México*, no. 36 (2008): 127–58.

At this point we might be in the conditions to consider more seriously the possibility that the working nation integrated its groups to the extent that civil society was finally plausible as a political project that could be imprinted into a written constitution in the 1850s. Rather than speak of a "social excess"[26] posed by the working, peasant, artisan, journeymen groups to the problem of the nation, we may reflect in terms of the liberal government's project to harness those groups as part of the society they wanted to constitute. The "strategic model of civil society"[27] does not so much explain other changes in the organization of Mexican society in the second half of the century, as much as it expresses the way the liberal search for a model incarnated into a mechanism that can rule the nation which actually preceded the civil society, representative, model: the working nation. Although we will discuss this briefly in the general conclusions to the dissertation, it is important to establish here that the strategic model and the institutions of work speak in two different political registers. The latter seemingly consists of the social institutions imagined by the majority of the nation's groups, while the other is a model created to rule the nation, conceived as a civil society composed of free proprietary –rather than working– individuals. During the 1850s, the disagreement on the nation seems to have been transformed by the social question, which tensions the latter conception of the nation in terms of its rule from the State-civil society model.

3. 1857 and its reactions. The working nation and civil society

The shift presented by the institution of the working nation throughout the 1840s and into the 1850s is thus determinant for any historical work that pretends to reflect on the constitution of the nation during these years. But it is especially relevant for any reflection on the nation and the State beyond the epoch of Reforma, which widely spans from the 1856 constituent congress to 1861, when the war that was ensued from the conservative contestation to the 1857 Constitution ended. The last sections of this chapter and the dissertation will thus reflect on the contestations to the liberal State ensued during the last decade at focus. The Atlantic working nation's role will once again prove to be fundamental in the new social and political structure that emerged from the liberal society that wished to integrate the nation into their "model".

---

[26] Which has been thought in terms of the "necessity-impossibility" of reducing the "heterogeneity of the social to the political", the latter being intimately related to the question of the representativity of society within the State. As we have seen here, for the working nation the "problem", the social question, was not related exclusively to their representativity. It was foremost a matter of looking for a way in which the liberal institutions could respect the imaginary their institutions had been founded upon since the 1840s. The "excess" being, in this case, of the political according to liberals rather than the social. *Cfr.* Elías José Palti, *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*, Metamorfosis (Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores Argentina, 2007), 213–16.

[27] Elías Palti has given this name to the product of the inner transformations of liberalism and its transformation of the model upon which to build society according to "civil society". Palti, *La Invención de Una Legitimidad*, 287.

As recent historiography has suggested, the conflict that arose from the opinion that the 1857 Constitution was "unworkable" was far from a simple "liberals vs. conservatives" conflict. During the previous decades, many claimed that the problem posed by the leaders of the Tacubaya *pronunciamiento* was that the arrangement and distribution of authority between the executive, legislative, and judiciary powers was at least unsettling. Allegiances to the pronunciamiento, originally issued by liberal *moderados* such as Félix Zuloaga, were soon to be backtracked. It was Ignacio Comonfort's indecision, as president elect since the summer of 1857, that finally drove the forces that dissolved congress into Mexico City and took over the executive power in January 1858. Far from being a consensual incursion, Zuloaga and his conservative allies were outnumbered by liberal authorities supporting Benito Juárez, who as president of the Supreme Court of Justice proclaimed himself president according to article 79 of the Constitution. Behind the evident contradictions among liberal and conservative authorities, municipal loyalties to the pronunciamiento of Tacubaya were even more unstable and unpredictable.[28]

In Puebla, for example, the conservative allegiance to Zuloaga's authority was contested by some municipalities, configuring what Florencia Mallon called a complex social and political "tapestry" where "exchanges of loyalties" were the common denominator.[29] In defense of the sovereignty of Mexico City's government, the pueblos of Zacapoaxtla and Chignahuapan garnered an attack on Zacatlán de las Manzanas and Chalchicomula, villagers that were supporters of the Veracruz liberal government headed by Benito Juárez. Much of the problems that arose between the pueblos and the municipal authorities were linked to the much-debated question of the place of religion within the community's livelihoods. In Zacapoaxtla, priests were commonly leaders of the village's discomfort towards other communities that embraced with more facility the liberal view that was directly attacking the privileges of the Church. It was in 1859 that Church properties, for example, were nationalized to the discontent of the pueblos, either because most of the common activities developed in the surroundings of such properties, or because its institutions were intimately linked with the communal, "corporative", properties attacked by the liberal groups since 1856.[30] Despite the fact that the conservative motive of these uprisings may have been

---

[28] Perhaps the most updated account of the war is: Will Fowler, *The Grammar of Civil War: A Mexican Case Study, 1857–61* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2022), 43–87. Other recent accounts are included in: Guillermo Palacios and Erika Pani, eds., *El Poder y La Sangre: Guerra, Estado y Nación En La Década de 1860* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México–Centro de Estudios Históricos, 2014); Pablo Mijangos y González, *The Lawyer of the Church: Bishop Clemente de Jesús Munguía and the Clerical Response to the Mexican Liberal Reforma* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015); Will Fowler, *Independent Mexico: The Pronunciamiento in the Age of Santa Anna, 1821–1858* (University of Nebraska Press, 2016), 188–245.

[29] Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 23–62.

[30] Mallon, 93; Erika Pani, "Law, Allegiance, and Sovereignty in Civil War Mexico, 1857–1867," *The Journal of the Civil War Era* 7, no. 4 (2017): 573, https://doi.org/10.1353/cwe.2017.0083; Edward Shawcross,

linked to religious matters, I would be more cautious when stating that *because* their motives were linked to religious matters, they were *sine qua non* conservative uprisings.[31] If we were to sustain this argument, we could also state that liberals also appealed to the people's sovereignty in terms of a defense of the 1857 Constitution to convince the "conservative" rioters they were supporting a "sacrilegious abuse" against the "holy doctrine of Christianism" and therefore the country's life: "Perchance there is not a single pueblo where the reaction has not sacrificed any victim".[32] By following this line of interpretation, we wind up agreeing with the same liberal-conservative structure we wish to consistently avoid and, perhaps, overcome.

More often than not, as these studies and the evidence gathered here may prove, the uprisings seem to have been intimately related with questions which were more fundamentally posed by these communities in terms of their disagreement with the way in which property, work, the municipality's administration of the pueblos' traditions, or the army's activities during conflict were regulated.[33] The disagreements presented by the nation's groups, rather than be hinged upon one "ideology" or the other, with the consequence of "closing spaces" in response to the

---

France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867 (New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018), 157–86; Fowler, *The Grammar of Civil War*.

[31] Such seems to be the underlying argument presented by Fowler. In his works, it ultimately serves as a piece of evidence to present a continuity between peasant and village uprisings against religious offences, and the conservative motive that arose in the 1850s. He thus establishes a continuity between popular centralism and popular conservatism, in contrast to the continuity between popular federalism and popular liberalism. The conclusions we arrived to in the previous chapter should help destabilize this consequential thesis, which is clearly structured upon the bipolar scheme of the political we wish to avoid. Indeed, not all popular federalisms derived in liberalism. Will Fowler, "The Sierra Gorda *Pronunciamientos* of 1848–1849 and the Origins of Popular Conservatism in Mexico," in *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, ed. Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler (New York: Routledge, 2018), 117–27. A similar argument was also presented in Mallon, "Peasants and State Formation in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Morelos, 1848-1858," 31–39; Thomson, "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888"; Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 92–95. Tutino and Guardino, on the contrary, have shown us to nuance this position. John Tutino, *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 242–76, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv301gv1; John Tutino, "The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855," *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 3 (1998): 367–418, https://doi.org/10.2307/2518330; Peter Guardino, "CONNECTED COMMUNITIES: Villagers and Wider Social Systems in the Late Colonial and Early National Periods," in *Beyond Alterity. Destabilizing the Indigenous Other in Mexico*, ed. Paula López Caballero and Ariadna Acevedo-Rodrigo (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 61–83; John Tutino, *The Mexican Heartland: How Communities Shaped Capitalism, a Nation, and World History, 1500-2000* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), 237–60.

[32] Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1877, 8:676.

[33] The limits of interpreting these rebellions as "conservative" because they were attached to the defense of church property, for example, are already evident in González Navarro's interpretation: Moisés González Navarro, "Las Guerras de Castas," *Historia Mexicana* 26, no. 1 (1976): 88–89. It should not surprise us that his historical sensitivity towards the problem of work, linked to land redistribution and its "usufructo", is central in this displacement from Fowler's interpretation, who also seems to argue that these rebellions were conservative not so much because of their revindications but rather because of their allegiance to conservative army leaders such as Tomás Mejía or Paredes y Arrillaga and, by extent, their repeal of liberals, typically the well-off hacendados. Fowler, "The Sierra Gorda *Pronunciamientos* of 1848–1849 and the Origins of Popular Conservatism in Mexico."

radicalization of their political practices,[34] were actually a symptom of profound re-organizations and reactions to the Constitution being set in course. Evidence seems to prove that what they were doing was not so much close, as much as open, spaces where such re-organizations could be possible. Of course, the discontent and unrest were undeniable, and the working nation was also directly touched by its surrounding experience of conflict and discomfort. Indeed, the precarious association the working nation had established with the liberal groups was profoundly unsettled by the war of Reforma (1857-1861).

In a letter sent to the nation's "supreme powers", "many artisans" severely condemned the assassination of a "true democrat", Melchor Ocampo.[35] If they petitioned the congress to retaliate "with severity" on the actions perpetrated by the groups of people who, at best, could be called "reactionaries", it was in the name and request of the "laborious and working classes". Defining their collectivity with distinct clarity, the "democrat artisans" claimed that they did not present this idea as "contractors or employees", but as "Mexican *obreros*". As such, the "idea" that "we want peace, security in our persons, families, and work" (*trabajo*) had been their true inspiration.[36]

It should not come as a surprise that for the past century labor historians have significantly seen the threshold that traces the limit between the 1850s and the 1860s as the years in which a "labor" or "working class" movement emerged.[37] As the Mexico City artisans testify, in the strict sense of the term (*movimiento obrero* is perhaps the most semantically similar translation of *labor* movement), this might be considered to be true. However, in a wider sense that considers labor and working relations, we should at least briefly reconsider the implications of such an affirmation.

---

[34] Erika Pani, "Monarchism and Liberalism in Mexico's Nineteenth Century," in *Institute of Latin American Studies* (Liberalism, Monarchy and Empire: Ambiguous Relationships, Senate House, London, 2012), 1–15, https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/4043/; Will Fowler, "El México de Los Años de La Intervención Estadounidense y La Posguerra (1846-1856)," in *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, ed. Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed. (Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016), 36; Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853," in *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, ed. Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler (New York: Routledge, 2018), 1–34.

[35] Ocampo was assassinated at the hands of Leonardo Márquez, a conservative army general who accused Benito Juárez's closest collaborators of treason. Santos Degollado and Leandro Valle also suffered Ocampo's same misfortune in June 1861. Andrés Lira González, "Del Desastre a La Reconstrucción Republicana, 1848-1876," in *Nueva Historia General de México* (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2010), 468; Patricia Galeana, *La Disputa Por La Soberanía (1821-1876)*, 1st ed., vol. 3 (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2010), 101–2, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3f8nk7; Fowler, *The Grammar of Civil War*, 87.

[36] *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 10/6/1861, p. 4. Also analyzed in Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización*, 215.

[37] Besides the already mentioned work from Chavez; Valadés; Leal and Woldenberg; García Cantú; Illades; Teitelbaum; Orduña, see also: Rafael Carrillo Azpéitia, *Ensayo Sobre La Historia Del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1823-1912* (Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1981); Carmen Ramos-Escandón, *La Industria Textil y El Movimiento Obrero En México* (Mexico City: División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades-Departamento de Filosofía e Historia-Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Iztapalapa, 1988); Guy P. C. Thomson, *Puebla de Los Angeles: Industria y Sociedad de Una Ciudad Mexicana, 1700-1850* (Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Dirección General de Fomento Editorial, 2002).

If read attentively, what the sources suggest is a radicalization of the working nation's social consciousness. In other words, the groups of workers convey with ever more clarity the fact that they were foremost *obreros* (workers) than employees, wage-earning laborers. This is an argument that had not been so clearly identified in our historical corpus. Until now, the evidence had conveyed the radical difference between labor and work, the latter being imagined as the series of activities which fundamentally enabled the social and economic reproduction of the working groups or communities. Since the 1840s, practices of mutualism as the cure of the ill and old through a common fund sustained by the healthy artisan were perceived as practices of *work*. The distinction of these mutualist practices with wage labor, shared by the Atlantic working nation, helped us see the consequences of the difference established by the Mexican artisans in their context. In the transition to the 1860s, however, we now see that along with the formation of the "working classes", the Mexican working nation conveys their identity through the institutions of work as well as labor.

After the liberal forces finally recovered control over their presidency in Mexico City in January 1861, working associations and groups such as the *Gran Familia de Artesanos* took the occasion to protest against the administration's economic reforms. Specifically, they repudiated the governmental waive of protectionist policies towards industrial activities and its decrease of *aranceles* (import taxes). Slightly modifying the language of the *Representación* of 1851, endorsed by over six thousand artisans, the *Gran Familia* argued that "scarce protection" over "national work [*trabajo*]" was the "principal cause" of the "complete ruin of the working class [*clase obrera*]". In spite of the promises delivered to the "men of the *pueblo*", that their interests "were the object of the solicitation of their rulers", they have only delivered a "misunderstood protection" over foreign trade. The result only deprived these men from "occupations where they would comfortably earn their livelihoods [*ganarían sus vidas*] and by means of which they would improve their condition in all their relations, whether civil, moral or political". It was furthermore "unbelievable" that the Supreme Government would act upon such a "serious matter" without waiting for the "public's observations", for the latter could guide them into actions that would not harm the "nation's rights and interests".[38]

As is visible, the institutions of work have a remarkable place within the imaginary of these classes. Indeed, the principal argument conveyed by the corpus of sources we gathered is precisely linked to the importance of the protection of work, reinstating the central feature of the "social question". In this case, its protection meant directly invoking the protection from foreign commodities which would directly harm the product of *national work*. Reconceiving the

[38] *El Siglo Diez y Nueve*, 22/11/1861, p. 5.

discussion presented by some groups of artisans since 1829[39] in terms of the protection of the nation as synonymic to the protection of work, the Gran Familia was furthermore portraying the link of work to labor, to their occupations. In this sense, Chávez Orozco's observation that it was the privileged artisans in the urban centers who principally set the compass for the worker movement of the 1860s may still be considered to be generally valid.[40] But the working class movement was doing more than just contest some of the policies the liberal government was promoting. Fundamentally, they started to build a parallel between labor, their "occupations", and work, as the activity that overall characterized their social livelihoods, the set of relations (civil, moral, and political) that governed their lives.

The difference that allowed the construction of such a parallel, and the consequences it has when reflecting on the "worker movement" that was ensued in the 1860s, has not always been acknowledged by the scholars who have studied such topics. Especially when analyzing the transformed movement of the working nation and its relation to the liberal and conservative groups. Vanesa Teitelbaum, for example, has dedicated much of her work to the analysis of the conflictive relationship the working groups developed with the liberal groups.[41] Contrasting the contact between the working groups and some puro leaders during the Ayutla revolution, from 1856 liberals systematically started expressing their "racial" views towards the pueblos and working groups. Moderates who remained close to the Zuloaga and the Miramón administrations in Mexico City (1858-1861), for instance, continued excluding peasants, indigenous pueblos, and the working groups from the government's agenda.[42] For some, this entailed a significant transformation of the workers' attitude towards the government in the 1860s, when the pacific aspect of their petitions began morphing into public protests. Predictably, some of the most notable liberals like Francisco Zarco immediately condemned the groups of artisans that decided to storm congress. Such actions, he denounced, refashioned the "'legislative benches into a public square, into a field of popular struggle'" (*lucha popular*). Despite the nature of such movements, where the working classes escalated their petitions to the liberal public sphere, historians perceive their pleas as marking a stark contrast with "public power", merely "labor" related, and

---

[39] See chapter two.
[40] Chávez Orozco, *Prehistoria Del Socialismo En México*.
[41] Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización*; Teitelbaum and Gutiérrez, "Sociedades de artesanos y poder público. Ciudad de México, segunda mitad del siglo XIX"; Vanesa E. Teitelbaum and Florencia Gutiérrez, "De la representación a la huelga. Las trabajadoras del tabaco (ciudad de México, segunda mitad del siglo XIX)," *Boletín Americanista*, no. 59 (December 7, 2009): 265–88; Vanesa Teitelbaum, "Asociación y Protesta de Los Artesanos al Despuntar La Década de 1860," in *Los Trabajadores de La Ciudad de México 1860-1950: Textos En Homenaje a Clara E. Lida*, ed. Carlos Illades and Mario Barbosa (Colegio de Mexico, 2013), 51–80.
[42] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 166–75.

specifically posed in the "economic and labor field".[43] In turn, this has led other scholars to accept the idea that the working groups' "political and social proposal", despite their constant contestations, ultimately "accepted the hegemonic model of subjectivity", in clear reference to the "strategic model" mentioned above.[44] Judging by the corpus of evidence analyzed here, these thesis are at least debatable. In this sense, perhaps even since the first edition of his *Hacia la república del trabajo* (1996) Carlos Illades in turn defines the underlying disagreement more accurately: it was not so much an acceptance or refusal as much as a "contradictory and paradoxical" relationship between the worker's now "public" idiom and the liberal "model" of civil society.[45]

The difference that emerges from the sources between the working nation's imaginary and the liberal model of civil society does not necessarily entail the former was not "political". The fact that the former did not simply wish to "change the form of government" did not limit their capacity to intervene in national politics, as their claims on "national work" and the "work of nationals" indicate. In any case, for the period under consideration here, we could claim that the artisan, working class, peasant movement that transformed the working nation, was different and in some regard detached from the "modeled" politics to the extent that these groups' interventions did not necessarily strive for a direct interference in constitutional law. Nonetheless, this detachment does not mean, as the Gran Familia de Artesanos conveys, that they were not intervening in politics altogether. Their defense of work, as was mentioned above, was seen as the protection of the means by which the nation and its majorities managed to reproduce their livelihoods. In the 1860s as in the 1850s, this also meant protecting their occupations, conceivably because of the slow process of dismantlement of their former communities of work, similarly structured to traditional craftsmen's guilds, which had suffered the open and direct attack on corporations enhanced by the 1857 Constitution.[46]

In other words, the terms of the disagreement between the working nation and the liberal nation had forcibly suffered a profound modification by virtue of the political, social, and economic experience during the 1850s. The social consciousness achieved by the working nation, who was now presenting itself as the working classes within the nation, was not retributed by the liberal policies. A fact that these groups radically and widely perceived as the government's "non-

[43] Zarco quoted in Teitelbaum, *Entre El Control y La Movilización*, 256–256. See also pp. 225-238.

[44] Orduña Carson, "Artesanos de La Ciudad de México En La Segunda Mitad Del Siglo XIX: Luchas de Resistencia En El Marco de La Hegemonía," 112.

[45] Illades, *Hacia La República Del Trabajo: El Mutualismo Artesanal Del Siglo XIX*, 131–41.

[46] Illades, 86–92; Mario Trujillo Bolio, *Empresariado y manufactura textil en la Ciudad de México y su periferia: siglo XIX* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social-UNAM, 2000), 167–87.

compliance" with their demands.[47] The integration of the working nation, that is, had not been corresponded by the liberal pursuit to integrate these groups *into* the liberal nation. Workers claimed the protection of their reproductivity through work while they simultaneously transformed their labor organizations, the mutual aid societies, as part of the institutions of work. By presenting that argument, as was seen, they were more clearly defining the scope of their political intervention as the search for an integration *of* the nation, presenting profound paradoxes to the liberals' integration of the groups *into* the Nation-State. In any case, Mexican artisans were addressing the problem of their cohesiveness as groups, as classes, taking the discussion of their self-consciousness as working collectives to new terrains and consequences. The series of arguments they recurred to do not seem to have been merely local but were part of a wider transformation of the Atlantic working nation. If they were not anticipating some claims that surfaced in other countries in the 1860s, we might at least be able to collect some corpuses of evidence that point to a strong communication between imaginaries of work on the Atlantic level.

The last sections of the dissertation delve into this understudied territory. Even the most recent scholarship of a "global labor history" acknowledge the difficulty in the study of the "new political cultures" that emerged in the 1860s, significantly named "labor internationalism". The study of this internationalism, which seeks to understand the "entanglements between localities and struggles which were sometimes very different, interconnected by complex flows and appropriations", is yet in its early phases. The fact is that any scholar that delves into these years is faced by a set of problems that start by acknowledging the huge voids the lack of sources and

[47] This much is further evidenced in a series of documents found in the AHCM, Alumbrado, vol. 351, docs. 200-276; AHCM, Asociaciones, vol. 388, doc. 20; AHCM, Beneficiencia Consejo General, vol. 415, doc. 9. Although we will not analyze, for these years, the agrarian movement that sparked as part of the transformation of the working nation's movement, historiography has registered the profound radicalization enacted by the indigenous pueblos and communities regarding the liberal State. See, among others, the above quoted Tutino and Guardino as well as: Antonio Escobar Ohmstede and Matthew Butler, eds., *Mexico in Transition: New Perspectives on Mexican Agrarian History, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries/México y Sus Transiciones : Reconsideraciones Sobre La Historia Agraria Mexicana, Siglos XIX y XX*, 1st ed. (México, D.F.: CIESAS, 2013); Paula López Caballero, *Indígenas de La Nación. Etnografía Histórica de La Alteridad En México (Milpa Alta, Siglos XVII-XXI)* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2017); Alejandro Tortolero, *Notarios y Agricultores: Crecimiento y Atraso En El Campo Mexicano, 1780-1920 : Propiedad, Crédito, Irrigación y Conflictos Sociales En El Agro Mexicano* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 2008); Alejandro Tortolero, "The Mexican Path toward Agricultural Capitalism," *Études Rurales*, no. 205 (June 1, 2020), https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesrurales.22196; Laura Machuca and Alejandro Tortolero, "From Haciendas to Rural Elites: Agriculture and Economic Development in the Historiography of Rural Mexico," *Historia Agraria Revista de Agricultura e Historia Rural*, August 1, 2020, https://doi.org/10.26882/histagrar.081e02t. Tortolero's work is an interesting counter weight to political historiography that analyzes the agrarian movements. In this sense he is an important reference to nuance some of the observations done by researchers who, unlike him, have not grown in the very territories he studies.

previously neglected problems carry into present-day research.[48] When we look elsewhere, however, there are other windows into "labor internationalism" that are paradoxically opened by the global history of empires. France and Mexico are no exception to this counterintuitive rule. Indeed, the window both open is quite immediately found in the shared experience of the imperial reaction to the Mexican liberal State's economic policies.

The scarce results of the liberal State's integration policy were evident as soon as December 1857, when the war of Reform started. And even when liberals recovered their position in the Mexico City presidency, after the two bloodiest years in nineteenth century Mexico,[49] their government over the nation was noticeably brittle and susceptible to the intervention of other groups. Political factors were in constant mutation. The profound disagreement the liberal Nation-State had created regarding the working nation was clearly not the only front where these groups would have to face rejection and organized warfare against them, as the series of decisive battles in December 1860 proved. The fact that they had displaced the conservative groups leaded by the presidency of Miguel Miramón did not mean he and his allies disappeared. Unrest and tension were very much ostensible once liberals recovered authority over their original reforms and Constitution. Unpopular measures included the confiscation of mortmain property, tax reforms, the suppression of the ministry of ecclesiastical affairs, the official separation of the Church and State's administration, the nationalization of Church, as well as the (unratified) McLane-Ocampo treaty with the U.S. which (potentially) financed the liberal armies while the country in the north freely accessed the Tehuantepec region that communicated the Gulf of Mexico with the Pacific. The new constitutional president, Benito Juárez, was elected by an electoral college in June 1861 among precarious legislative balance. From July 17th, domestic indignation turned into an aggression to foreign policy as congress passed the suspension of the payment of its foreign debt. Indignation did not take long to spark from Mexico's three principal loaners: Spain, France, and Britain. In October, they met in the Convention of London to discuss the way to proceed. They did not only demand the debt's payment, but also decided on fulfilling a long-lasting dream of a tripartite intervention, commanded by Louis-Napoléon and his imperial aspirations.[50]

---

[48] Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, "Introduction," in *"Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth": The First International in a Global Perspective*, ed. Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, Studies in Global Social History, Volume 29 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018), 1–20.
[49] Fowler, *The Grammar of Civil War*, 43.
[50] The treaty was named after Robert McLane, special envoy from James Buchanan's government, and Melchor Ocampo, foreign affairs minister when the treaty was signed in 1859. Lozano and Dublán, *Legislación mexicana*, 1877, 8:680–83; Romana Falcón, *Las Rasgaduras de La Descolonización: Españoles y Mexicanos a Mediados Del Siglo XIX* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1996), 226; Galeana, *La Disputa Por La Soberanía (1821-1876)*, 3:101–14; Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 2, 176. Shawcross has convincingly discussed the long-standing thesis that it was pro-conservative Mexican ministers in Paris who persuaded the French to intervene. His extraordinary archival research proves, among other causes, that it was rather a bilateral imperial drive to curb the "U.S. threat",

Despite the dexterity shown by Manuel Doblado –secretary of foreign affairs under Juárez's administration– in the negotiations with Spain and Britain, the French armed forces of Louis-Napoléon were reluctant to accept the conditions for a retreat. Unlike their European peers, they had disembarked at Veracruz with no intention to contract the foreign debt. Arguably, their conditions had little to do with the debt. Among other aspects, their motives hinged upon an imperial relationship that would serve as a counterbalance to the imperial will of the U.S. in the territory.[51] A "rationale" that was the creation of French imperialists who jointly collaborated with Mexican conservatives. "Conservatives wanted European rather than U.S. protection, and France wanted the benefits Liberals offered to Washington for itself".[52] After a first offensive in the spring of 1862, when the liberal general Ignacio Zaragoza successfully repealed French troops in the famous *cinco de mayo* battle of Puebla, the French army came back a year later and in June quietly entered Mexico City under the command of General Forey. Juárez having priorly fled from Mexico City to San Luis Potosí, and later to the U.S., Forey faced no struggle as his army advanced into the valley. With the help of local figures such as Juan Nepomuceno Almonte, the "auxiliary" to the French emperor and son of one of the most important insurgents of independence José María Morelos, the French empire and the *Junta de Gobierno* finally elected Maximilian of Habsburg as the head of the Second Mexican Empire (1863-1867).[53]

Since the fall of Iturbide's empire, after more than twenty years from José María Gutiérrez Estrada's monarchist pamphlet being published, and nearly a decade after Lucas Alamán's quest for cooperation if not direct intervention by Louis-Napoleon's empire in Mexico during Santa Anna's dictatorship, the "dream" of empire had materialized in Mexican soil once again. Abandoning previous conceptions of this imperial shift as a mere "reactionary" episode in the republican continuity,[54] recent scholarship on the Mexican and French Second Empires has

---

i.e. the "Western Question", which convinced both the French empire and Mexican conservatives that an intervention in Mexico would finally stop the spread of the Protestant North over the Latin and Catholic South. Imperial interests were highly driven by commercial and economic power over the declining political stability in the U.S. as the Civil War began. In essence, his proposal counters a single-sided "Mexicanization" of the French intervention and substantiates the experience through its "imperialization". See pp. 177-186 for the Second French Intervention. Previous attempts and further developments of this idea of the "unity" of the Latin race, are briefly mentioned in chapter 4 of this dissertation. *Cfr.* Pani, *Para Mexicanizar*.

[51] For the U.S. perspective of this new balance, see: Patrick J. Kelly, "The North American Crisis of the 1860s," *Journal of the Civil War Era* 2, no. 3 (2012): 337–68.

[52] Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 186. A detailed account of the happenings between December 1861 and April 1862, when the Prim-Doblado Treaty that led Spanish and British forces offshore, is included in: Falcón, *Las Rasgaduras de La Descolonización*, 230–46.

[53] Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 197–202.

[54] Manuel Rivera Cambas, *Historia de La Intervención Europea y Norteamericana En México: Y Del Imperio de Maximiliano de Habsburgo* (Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1987); Gastón García Cantú, *La Intervención Francesa En México* (Mexico City: Clío, 1998). Erika Pani has done perhaps the most important synthesis that wished to avoid such perspectives in the analysis of the Mexican Second Empire. Erika Pani, *El Segundo Imperio: Pasados de Usos Múltiples* (Mexico City: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, 2004).

underscored the profound discrepancies the politics of empire faced through 1867, when Maximilian of Habsburg was captured and executed, officially ending the imperial experience in Mexico.

4. Squabbling for the State. The Second French Empire and its groups

1863 marked the starting point of the second institutionalized imperial experience in nineteenth-century Mexico. Unlike the first Empire under Agustín de Iturbide, the Second involved global actors being put in a monarchical post in Mexican soil. As mentioned, it was by virtue of a bilateral effort from France and Mexico to contest the liberal State that such a project was concreted at the hands of conservatives in Mexico, as much as Bonapartists in France. To understand the political structure of the *Prince-President*'s regime, and the complex relations with the interests of Mexican monarchists, we need to trace back our steps by a little more than a decade. The Second French Republic suffered a wide reconfiguration of the political game as Louis-Napoleon aptly placed himself in the presidency from December 1848.

Through a brisk and successful candidacy, he managed to present himself to the overwhelming peasant majority in France as an opponent of the "moderate Republicans", who were not only responsible for the June Days but also for new highly unpopular taxes.[55] Many thought that they were "voting against the Forest Codes, the wine-tax, usurers, the danger of a return to seigneuralism and the tithes".[56] Very soon, however, these same villagers had to bear with increasingly severe repressions to their political activities, forcing them into clandestinity and the formation of secret societies, the majority of which were either formed by peasants or local artisans. In the cities "political clubs" were closed.[57] As a social historian established, it was precisely the activities from these societies which the "Bonapartist bureaucrats" justifiably feared towards 1852.

[55] Countering the 74% achieved by Louis-Napoleon, the socialist republican candidate who advocated an "impossible candidacy" received an unflattering 0.5% of the votes. See Samuel Hayat, "Running in Protest. The Impossible Candidacy of François-Vincent Raspail, December 1848," trans. Sarah-Louise Raillard, *Revue Française de Science Politique* 64, no. 5 (2014): 1–35.
[56] Roger Magraw, "The Second Republic and French 'Republican Socialism', 1848-51," in *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*, ed. Guy P. C. Thomson (London: Institute of Latin American Studies, 2002), 43–44.
[57] (Archives Nationales (AN) AB XIX 681). Ted W. Margadant, *French Peasants in Revolt: The Insurrection of 1851*, *French Peasants in Revolt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), 104–37, https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400820320; Peter McPhee, "Popular Culture, Symbolism and Rural Radicalism in Nineteenth-century *France*," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 5, no. 2 (January 1978): 238–53, https://doi.org/10.1080/03066157808438046.

A left-wing victory was far from a chimera and was very much seen as a threat.[58] As one might presume, internal divisions were reproduced between the peasant, the artisan, and the regime.

Conservative republicans, legitimists close to the Church, and traditional groups, not to mention Orléanists and liberals (particularly those close to Guizot and the July Monarchy) were all skeptical of the new group being formed around Louis-Napoléon. Whether it was part of their original political orientation or an adaptation to the context is a matter of discussion, but there is little doubt that the Bonapartist *coup* of December 1851 was placed in the name of authority, order, and respect for tradition.[59] In turn, royalists and other upper classes started to reconcile with the newly created hereditary empire. Historians have argued that for the next decade, the "strength of the Empire" was mainly due to the initial success of authoritarian Bonapartists in directly appointing officials and assembling a group of loyal *ralliés* to the regime.[60] Most of its long-lasting support seems to have come from the elites. Coming from "solid *haut bourgeois* families", the regime's ministers such as Eugène Rouher or Jules Baroche had been "socially conservative and anti-democratic supporters of the parliamentary institutions associated with Orleanism".[61] A particularly poignant example of the alliance between the Bonapartists and the more traditional, clerical, and conservative elites was the education laws promoted by Alfred de Falloux in 1850, which among other things was focused in preventing the disappearance of religion from the classrooms. Symbolically, it promoted the use of crucifixes in all educational spaces.[62]

The tendency of the regime, to the detriment of this constructed agreement with traditional sectors of society, soon began to detach from the conservative principles and began approaching a very particular form of representativity. At the time, Émile Littré famously defined the new system as "cesarism" in his *Dictionnaire* (1863). Ever since, historians have seen it as an "illiberal" system dependent on a "face to face" representative apparatus that curtails "public freedom" while

---

[58] Magraw, "The Second Republic and French 'Republican Socialism', 1848-51," 28. The interpretation being explicitly in line with Maurice Agulhon's, *La République Au Village: Les Populations Du Var de La Révolution à La IIe République* (Paris: Seuil, 1979).

[59] Due to the fear of repression, many liberals were persuaded to support an authoritarian and repressive government. "The upper and middle classes had welcomed the *coup*, and the *classes inférieures* were terrified. The army was disciplined to obedience". Roger Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 97.

[60] Sudhir Hazareesingh, *From Subject to Citizen: The Second Empire and the Emergence of Modern French Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 41; Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 68–70.

[61] Roger Price, *Documents on the Second French Empire, 1852-1870* (London: Springer/Palgrave, 2016), 21–22.

[62] Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 368. Pierre Zind offers a detailed explanation of the series of discussions that led to these laws: Pierre Zind, "La Religion Dans Les Lycées Sous Le Régime de La Loi Falloux, 1850-1873," *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques* 7, no. 2/3 (1980): 249–73. For the teacher and student contestation to the law, see: Nicholas Toloudis, "The Carnot Commission and the Teacher Insurgency of Second Republic France," *French Politics, Culture & Society* 32, no. 3 (2014): 57–78.

consistently affirming the "people's sovereignty".[63] Imperial history, however, helps us precise to what extent the construction of this representativity was a result of particular imperial policies. Such inner contradictions began spreading among imperial officials. In 1853, for example, the *procureur general* reported with particular satisfaction that the "socialist virus" had been replaced with order among the textile workers of Mulhouse, Strasbourg, and Colmar.[64] Napoléon III, however, wished to reconcile such order with liberty. As he recalled in 1865, it was by virtue of a "liberal legislation" that France achieved a "free expansion of individual initiative" and the Empire's "prosperity".[65] Since March 1852 he had expressed his desire to "cease the dictatorship".[66] In sight of the birth of his child in 1856, he conveyed to the *Conseil d'État* that the terrain had to be prepared for a "tranquil reign of a wise freedom".[67] Among other policy changes, perhaps the most illustrative of his call for freedom was the abandonment of the Empire's centralist administration, promoted by the closest collaborators of his regime since the first half of the decade. The strengthening of the "'autonomy of the department and the commune'" he sought was in "stark contrast" to previous policies. His ideas raised different reactions.[68]

In a context where the "'industrialist, the merchant, the lawyer, the government official rubbed shoulders with the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie'", a change in policy by the emperor was either received as a way of negotiating with the opposition to the regime, which could potentially change the ways power was exerted (imposing "restraints on the Emperor's personal power" or by re-establishing their participation in decision-making); or as a threat to the "authoritarian-bureaucratic" system built by some groups following the elections of 1848. The second belief, backed by legitimist and more conservative groups of the regime, was not unfounded either: the growing importance of distinct republican figures and adversaries to the empire like Adolphe Thiers, Pierre-Antoine Berryer, and Emile Ollivier gave their adversaries motive for alarm.[69]

Modifications of internal policy did not depend exclusively on the influence of republicans and liberals. The increasing notoriety of the prefect of the Seine department (1853-1870), the

---

[63] Pierre Rosanvallon, *La Démocratie Inachevée Histoire de La Souveraineté Du Peuple En France* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000), 37; Claudio de Boni, "Le Seduzioni Della Dittatura: Positivismo e Bonapartismo," in *Bonapartismo Cesarismo e Crisi Della Società: Luigi Napoleone e Il Colpo Di Stato Del 1851*, ed. Manuela Ceretta, Studi e Testi 21 (Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 2003), 56.
[64] David I. Kulstein, "The Attitude of French Workers towards the Second Empire," *French Historical Studies* 2, no. 3 (1962): 363, https://doi.org/10.2307/285886.
[65] *Discours prononcé par sa majesté l'Empereur, à l'ouverture de la sesión legislative, le 15 fevrier 1865*, Paris, Imprimerie du Sénat et du corps Législatif, 1865. (AN 45AP1 (3)).
[66] *Discours du Prince Louis-Napoléon, president de la République, prononcé à l'installation du Gran Corps d'État, le 29 Mars 1852*, Paris, Imprimerie du Sénat et du corps Législatif, 1852. (AN 45AP1 (3)).
[67] "Naissance du prince impérial", Paris, Imprimerie du Sénat et du corps Législatif, 1856. (AN 45AP1 (3)).
[68] Hazareesingh, *From Subject to Citizen*, 53–54.
[69] Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 82, 104. The quotation at the beginning of the paragraph is taken from page 82: (AN BB30 (377)).

baron Haussmann, was accentuated during the turn of the decade. Advocating for the creation of an enormous debt –financed and managed by the newly created *Crédit foncier* (1861) as well as the *Crédit mobilier* (1852)–, Haussmann received great support by the Emperor himself to transform Paris. Despite the elite's fears such a policy would create tax raises, the former advocated for Haussmann's project.[70] He was convinced the "embellishment" of Paris, with "such spacious streets, such architectonic houses, such gardens open to everyone, such artistic monuments, by increasing well-being [*bien-être*] perfect the taste". One cannot but notice the defensive tone adopted by the emperor in his advocation for these renovations. Ostensibly, he began recurring to ideas he had developed in his youth and applying them in the administration of his regime.[71] Changes in loyalty to the regime were only a part of the overall shift in policy marked by a so-called "liberalization".

Although here is not the place to discuss the development of Napoleon III's economic and political ideas in detail, we should at least note that in his youth he had developed a particular taste for Saint-Simonian ideas, as the publication of the *Extinction du pauperisme* (1844) attests.[72] The vicinity with Michel Chevalier may reflect his interest in the "economic" world. Chevalier was the editor of the Saint-Simonian newspaper *Le Globe* in 1831-1832, and overall a controverted figure for the socialist circles due to his growing distance from the religion's members *vis-à-vis* his vicinity to the *academiciens*. He was eventually invited by Napoléon III to be a member of the empire's *Conseil d'État*. Probably influenced by the presence of the former Saint-Simonian, the emperor embraced a "reenforced liberalism" that did not only ply for the construction of a vast railway system in France but was also "sympathetic" to the working classes' condition. A condition, he believed, that could be "relieved" by an effective intervention through infrastructural projects.[73]

---

[70] David H. Pinkney, "Money and Politics in the Rebuilding of Paris, 1860-1870," *The Journal of Economic History* 17, no. 1 (1957): 45–61; Niamh Sweeney, "'Fictitious Capital': Haussmannization and the (Un-)Making of Second-Empire Paris," *L'Esprit Créateur* 55, no. 3 (2015): 100–113; Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 76.

[71] *Discours prononcé par sa majesté l'Empereur à l'inauguration du boulevard du Prince Eugène* (1862); *Discours de l'Empereur* (1862). All included in: (AN 45AP1 (3)). This folder also contains some of his personal writings, where some of the ideas that will be mentioned below appear repeatedly.

[72] For the emperor's relations to Saint-Simonianism, see: Éric Anceau, *Napoléon III: Un Saint-Simon à Cheval* (Tallandier, 2020).

[73] Such a view is explicitly espoused in his famous account of his travels through the U.S., particularly in the second volume: Michel Chevalier, *Lettres Sur l'Amérique Du Nord.* II (Bruxelles: Wouters & Co., 1844). For an interesting review of Chevalier's life and his link to Louis-Napoleon, see: Michael Drolet, "Industry, Class and Society: A Historiographic Reinterpretation of Michel Chevalier*," *The English Historical Review* CXXIII, no. 504 (October 1, 2008): 1229–71, https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cen252. As is well known, once the 1832 "schism" in the Saint-Simonian family happened, it was principally the "industrial" views adopted by some members which became more polemic. *Père* Enfantin was particularly prone to the construction of a vast railroad network in France and was well known for his dreams of taking this industrial civilization to the African continent. He not only wished to establish a Saint-Simonian civilization in Algeria, he also famously proposed the construction of a canal in Suez. See, among others: Christophe Prochasson, *Saint-*

In the inauguration of one of the first *boulevards* of the Haussmannian project, Louis-Napoleon distinctively noted that the "administration's duty" during the renovations in Paris was to avoid any "deviations" from the avowed course of action. "You know such course: imprint activity into work [*travail*], a new life into the industries and commerce of Paris, by releasing them from the obstacles which hindered their development; – protect the least advantaged [*favorisées*] classes". In particular, the administration of the *ville* was bedecked with the emperor's zeal because of its "amelioration of the most numerous class's fate", the fate of the working classes, by virtue of the recent limit it had imposed on the cost of water supply, which directly favored the low prices of the bread sold in local *boulangeries*.[74] Such domestic policies were taken to imperial and global lengths by the emperor himself.

As historians have argued, Napoléon III was not only looking for ways to supersede the expansion of the U.S. His regime was also looking for new territories to support domestic economic expansion by widening the scope of the regime's industrial endeavors. The highly contested decision of anchoring the French imperial legacy in the Mexican territory was founded upon the principles of free trade and commercial expansion. As he expressed in a speech in 1863, when Forey's troops were entering the Mexico City basin, France and Mexico would establish a free trade which would form a "bigger community of interests", and favor "the legitimate aspirations of the peoples", in front of the "contemplation" of the most "civilized nations". Mexico's populations will have owed their "regeneration" to the French forces.[75] Evidently, the French Emperor wished to rule the territories from Paris to Mexico and was conceiving ways to rule the populations that ultimately created the market from which his Empire could potentially benefit financially. In such a quest he was clearly not alone. The Emperor of the Mexican Empire also strove to create a political system that ultimately combined "liberalism with limited monarchy".[76] Much like his French peer, Maximilian faced more traditionalist groups within the regime: the Hispanophile, conservative, imperialist project that advocated the memory of Iturbide's Empire, and had been crucial in the entrance of French troops into Mexico in 1863. The contradictions between conservatives and their imperial rulers, who were openly embracing

Simon Ou l'anti-Marx: Figures Du Saint-Simonisme Français, XIX-XXe Siècles (Paris: Perrin, 2004); Nathalie Coilly and Philippe Régnier, eds., *Le Siècle Des Saint-Simoniens: Du Nouveau Christianisme Au Canal de Suez* (Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2006); Pamela M. Pilbeam, *Saint-Simonians in Nineteenth-Century France: From Free Love to Algeria* (Springer, 2014); Naomi J. Andrews, "Selective Empathy: Workers, Colonial Subjects, and the Affective Politics of French Romantic Socialism," *French Politics, Culture & Society* 36, no. 1 (March 1, 2018): 1–25, https://doi.org/10.3167/fpcs.2018.360101.

[74] *Discours prononcé par sa majesté l'Empereur à l'inauguration du boulevard des Malesherbes* (1861). (AN 45AP1 (3)).

[75] *Discours de l'Empereur*, 5/9/1863. (AN 45 AP 1 (3)).

[76] Robert H. Duncan, "Political Legitimation and Maximilian's Second Empire in Mexico, 1864-1867," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 12, no. 1 (1996): 27–66, https://doi.org/10.2307/1052077.

a liberal political economic agenda, became evident very soon in Napoléon's "Mexican question".[77] Since 1863, the Emperor had made it clear that he did not wish to disgrace his flag by enabling a "'blind reaction'": in Mexico he wanted to establish a *liberal dictatorship*.[78]

Such an imperial quest, however, was very evidently backed in a set of ideas that sought a particular embracement of local populations in both Mexico and France. Among the most notorious discrepancies was the regime's general behavior *vis-à-vis* the groups or "populations" of their Empire. It is no coincidence that these groups, "the most numerous" as well as the "least advantaged", were precisely the subject of our study: the working groups. As we shall discover, the relationship of these groups with the imperial States was no less paradoxical than with the liberal State. And underneath, behind, and through these paradoxes, a very singular form of labor internationalism emerged once we pay close attention to its institutions and imaginaries. Indeed, as was seen with the artisans and peasants of the 1860s in Mexico, the French working nation reveals important mutations of the movement that emerged in this decade.

5. The gaze on the Empire is impoverished?[79] The Atlantic working classes (1863-1867)

Napoleon III's approach to the *ville*'s administration and the measures that were promoted for the "neediest" and "most numerous" classes speak of a very particular configuration of the "disagreement" we have analyzed in this dissertation. During the 1860s the French and Mexican Empires faced an ever-troubling fate of distancing themselves from the circles that had legitimized their upheaval. Of course, this process led the regimes' emperors to approach the groups and classes that had originally struggled against the empire during their first years. The approach did not go as smoothly as they might have expected. Napoléon's "gaze" on his empire, which will appear in stark contrast to the "sociological appreciation" analyzed in part two of the dissertation,[80] may have approached the regime to the "most numerous class", the working nation,

---

[77] Rafael Castro, *La cuestión mexicana ó Esposición de las causas que hacían indispensables la intervención europea y el restablecimiento de la monarquía en México como únicos medios de salvar la nacionalidad y la independencia del país*, Mexico City, Imprenta de J. M. Andrade y F. Escalante, 1864. (Biblioteca Naciona (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF) 357 9).

[78] Quoted in: Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 207.

[79] Rephrasing of the title of Maurizio Gribaudi's chapter on the process by which the "hygienists" of the 1830s and 1840s reconsider their view of Paris by "impoverishing" their look on the "ville populaire". Maurizio Gribaudi, *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848* (Paris: La Découverte, 2014), 109–43.

[80] We follow the hypothesis developed by Sylive Aprile that sought to contest the "republican history" that had seen these years as a "tightly meshed" repression, where the "left" seemed to have disappeared altogether between 1851 and the 1860s under the repression of the Second Empire. As she convincingly argues, the left is not synonymic to republicanism, and there was much more to the former during the 1850s than meets the eye. Sylvie Aprile, "La Gauche Sous Le Second Empire," in *Histoire Des Gauches En France*,

but it was also motive for heated contestations by these same groups. We thus come to the issue mentioned above: the metamorphosis of the working nation in the 1860s through its contact with the imperial State. Significant alterations appear in the imperial relationship with the working nation when one digs deep into the archives where the workers' memories of these years lie, instituting a profound communication with the movement of "labor internationalism".

Between 1857 and 1862, republicans and some working groups began pressing for certain reforms to be discussed in the legislature. In 1857, Émile Ollivier, representing the *Cinq*, as the group of republicans that were elected as deputies were named, presented an act that sought for the legalization of "*coalitions*", commonly translated as strike.[81] Although it was met with contempt by conservatives at first, Bonapartists that sided the regime gradually became more lenient towards the workers' organization of *coalitions*. Since 1861, the *société de secours mutuels des ouvriers typographes de Paris* presented a series of reforms to their working conditions. The *chefs d'établissement*'s rejection of the workers' conditions (a 20 percent raise in their salaries regarding the tariff imposed in 1850) and the patron's general denial of any kind of negotiability was soon met with the "general desertion in all recalcitrant establishments". Even the "most devoted" workers, who had been under the orders of the same *maître* for the past twenty to thirty years, "excused" themselves as they were following a specific watchword (*mot d'ordre*): "to be obligated to abandon their work [*travail*]". The "irresistible pressure" of an "immediate ruin" led all masters to yield to the workers' conditions. The Paris police prefecture was presented with the problem of whether "we should let such a society exist", for they were nothing less than a "permanent danger". "In the hands of a small number of leaders", such societies were a "means of oppression", pushing tyranny by "prohibiting [*interdissent*] any arrangement beyond their control". The Parisian police saw it as the "resurrection of the ancient corporations" in their most "narrow" and "evil" aspects.[82]

However convinced authorities may have been that these "coalitions" were against the penal code, the "second process"[83] against the workers proved decisive for authorities, insofar as the prefecture could not "verify neither the illegitimacy or exaggerations of the workers' pretentions,

---

ed. Jean-Jacques Becker and Gilles Candar, Poche / Sciences Humaines et Sociales (Paris: La Découverte, 2005), 85–94, https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.becke.2005.01.0085. The archives analyzed here contribute to this hypothesis and further nuance this apparent sudden "break" in the left's life during the more repressive years of Napoléon III's reign. To what extent the idea that socialist activity was interrupted and its links to the supposed frailty of the worker movement shall become evident as we analyze this corpus of evidence.

[81] The other members of the *cinq* were Ernest Picard, Jules Favre, Alfred Darimon and Jacques-Louis Hénon. Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 114–15. We shall see below that workers did not necessarily conceive coalitions merely as strikes. For now, the original word will be used.

[82] "Vote présentée à M. le Préfet par M. Mettetal sur la coalition et la société de secours mutuels des ouvriers typographes de Paris", 1862 (?). (AN 45AP 6 (7)).

[83] Included in the same folder: (AN 45AP 6 (7)).

or the illicit or immoral character by which the coalition [of 1861] was formed". Even if reforms to the penal code in 1849 had made coalitions of any kind illegal.[84] In 1864, among the legislative discussions for the approval of the reform of the *loi des coalitions*, which dated back to the famous Le Chapelier law of 1791, the deputies wished to establish clearly *what kind* of coalition would become legal. The *corps législatif* recurred to the lectures delivered by a law faculty member, who drew from articles 414, 415 and 416 of the penal code that the "crime begins when several workers agree to dictate the same conditions to the patrons and, in case of refusal, sanction their demands by a desertion which is not only simultaneous, but also in concert". Discussions issued the distinction between a *coalition simple*, which was a way of freely fixing working conditions between those who work and those who "make them work" (*font travailler*), and the coalition as such, a "compelled" activity that was therefore violent and intimidatory. In sum, the coalition became legal to the extent that worker and patron, "voluntarily, without agitation, without disturbance, without infringing on the freedom of others, come to an agreement and make common resolutions on the price and conditions of work". That is, as long as it was the "consequence of freedom of work and transactions".[85] In the words of Alain Cottereau, the "rights of workers" (*droit des ouvriers*) were formally evicted through the "right to work" (*droit du travail*).[86]

Workers, however, seem to have had another idea of what the coalition really was. The coalition did not refer to the specific act of negotiation, the movement by which they met to deal with a specific revindication (*grève*), or even the demands they presented to the regime or their *chef d'établissement*. Judging by the coalition report submitted by the blacksmiths to the *préfecture de police* of Paris, it would rather seem coalitions were conceived as the *time* workers took to develop common actions such as strikes. That is, it was not so much the movement or its claims –which commonly inform the way we conceive or define strikes–, as much as it was about the action of coming together for a certain period of time. Workers were *coalisées* as long as they were taking time away from their labor: coalitions ended naturally as soon as "les ouvriers étaient rentrés"; as soon as they had abandoned the streets to use their time for their labor activities instead of other collective actions.[87] The importance of shifting the interpretation of coalitions as

---

[84] Priorly, according to the penal code reformed 1810, coalitions were illegal insofar as patrons "unjustly and abusively" lowered the worker's salaries. The suppression of the formula in 1849 made *any kind* of coalition illegal. See next note.

[85] *Projet de loi. Portant modification des articles 414, 415 et 416 du Code penal (coalitions)*, Imprimérie du corps législatif, 19/2/1864. (AN 45AP 6 (7)).

[86] Alain Cottereau, "Droit et bon droit. Un droit des ouvriers instauré, puis évincé par le droit du travail (France, XIXe siècle)," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 57, no. 6 (December 2002): 1554, https://doi.org/10.3406/ahess.2002.280123.

[87] *Coalitions. ~~Corporations des~~ ouvriers maréchaux-ferrants*, Cabinet du Préfet de Police, num. 27165, 1866. (45 AP 6 (1)). One can notice they did not conceive coalitions as the groups that made them either, for they

such is that it places the importance not so much in the action, or the ideology it enforced, as much as in the groups of people that carried such actions and movements through. They conceived coalitions as the time they took from labor to improve the conditions to exert it, of which "strikes", the *grèves*, were only a part. As labor historians note, strikes were part of the actions involved in the process of transforming labor conditions and practices, from the "collective exit" to the improvement of conditions. As workers defined them according to the period of time elapsed between one and the other, coalitions also defined their capacity of maneuverability: their negotiating power.[88]

Much like the Mexican artisans of the 1850s and 60s, French working groups established the criteria that constitute their imaginary within a definite space and time, and in relation to specific practices. More than ever, workers conceived themselves as *ouvriers*, workers that carried out the activity defined by their labor practices: the working "classes".[89] As Henri Tolain established in his candidature to the 1864 legislature, workers accepted the idea that "all were equals" before the law since the 1789 Revolution. The sixty workers that endorsed his pamphlet, however, were conscious they were doing so "as workers" (*en tant qu'ouvriers*). We may affirm that, if they signed the pamphlet, it was because of the conscience they had acquired of their claims as citizens; of the political, contractual, maneuverability they had collected within the regime. Especially within an Empire that had proven its willingness to open certain spaces of dialogue regarding revindications for freedom of labor, availability for credit, and the sustenance of class solidarity.[90] As workers were involved and not necessarily constrained by labor, these imperial

---

stroke the words "corporation of". A gesture which also clearly denotes the change in their consciousness as workers of a certain trade rather than as belonging to a corporation of a certain kind. As such, coalitions have consequences that exceed the underpinnings implicit in the historical category of strike. This echoes some of the points raised by Marcel van der Linden in his review of Charles Tilly's work. Marcel Van der Linden, "Charles Tilly's Historical Sociology," trans. Lee Mitzman, *International Review of Social History* 54, no. 2 (2009): 237–74.

[88] This conception of strike is in direct dialogue with Van der Linden, *Workers of the World*, 179, 207. The need of seeing collective action respond to an agenda does not necessary meet historical criteria. Furthermore, the occasional need of artificially detaching the existence of a group or definite actor within a time from a sequence of times, which nonetheless meet in a "contemporaneity", has been eloquently criticized by Rancière from his own "worker archives". Jacques Rancière, "The Myth of the Artisan Critical Reflections on a Category of Social History," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 24 (1983): 1–16, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0147547900008103; Jacques Rancière, "Anachronism and the Conflict of Times," *Diacritics* 48, no. 2 (2020): 110–24, https://doi.org/10.1353/dia.2020.0013. For a more classical critique of the former, the obligated reference is clearly Reinhart Koselleck. "Historia, historias y estructuras formales del tiempo," in *Futuro pasado: para una semántica de los tiempos históricos* (Barcelona: Paidós, 1993), 127–40; English version included in: Reinhart Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*, Cultural Memory in the Present (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2002).

[89] *Tailleurs*. (AN F 12 3120).

[90] Henri-Louis Tolain, *Elections des 20 et 21 Mars 1864. 5e Circonscription H. Tolain candidat de l'opposition* (Paris: imp. de Ed. Blot, 1864). (Bibliothèque Nationale de France, François Mitterand (BnF), 4-LE77-1492). See also: Raymond Huard, "Histoire intellectuelle et histoire par en bas : les candidatures

citizens claimed the "exercise of new rights". The "circles" of workers that had "stayed in the shadows" were now beginning to be noticed by police prefects.[91]

As historians recorded, these were precisely the years in which the working classes, conceivably as a proper "labor movement", "attained such a power that it became impossible to apply the anti-coalition [*anticoalition*] legislation".[92] French workers agreed with the English when, in the 1862 Universal Exhibition in London, they said that "the only thing the government can give us, the only thing we must ask of it, is freedom!".[93] Entire trades began seeing their workers form coalitions and enact strikes. Between the autumn of 1864 and the following spring, bronze workers, bookbinders, tailors, builders, drivers, cartoners, ebanists, chair-makers, cobblers, among many others formed over a hundred coalitions throughout France, sixty nine of which were in Paris alone.[94]

The negotiating capacity the worker movement acquired between 1862 and 1865 drove a wedge into the inner dynamics of imperial politics. But workers did not necessarily face the regime or the Emperor himself as much as they wanted to acquire certain capacities regarding their *patrons*.[95] Coalitions became an effective mechanism by which they could control otherwise non-negotiable labor conditions. Workers directed their claims and allegations not against the emperor but against their "society", principally against "those who are at its head" (*surtout contre ceux qui sont à sa tête*). Their petitions reached the overall mechanisms by which their labor was influenced or ruled. Institutions as the *octroi*, a levy imposed by certain regional administrations on specific products such as wine,[96] were attacked by the coalitions.

As a certain *monsieur* Devinck, a prestigious chocolate-maker who became president of the *Commission d'encouragement pour les études des ouvriers* by virtue of the advancements his machines presented in the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867,[97] argued: "nothing escapes them of what public opinion is concerned about", their "movements of miscontent were translated into

---

ouvrières de la Révolution à 1870," *Romantisme* 135, no. 1 (2007): 23–35, https://doi.org/10.3917/rom.135.0023.

[91] *Rapport du préfet de la police. Coalitions ouvriers*, 26/1/1865. (AN 45 AP 6 (1)).

[92] Jacques Droz, *Histoire Générale Du Socialisme: Des Origines à 1875*, vol. 1, Quadrige (Paris: PUF, 1997), 521.

[93] *Tailleurs*. (AN F 12 3120).

[94] Police reports of these coalitions are included in the folder: (AN 45 AP 6 (1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)). The number of coalitions, seen as "strikes", is included in: Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 349.

[95] We will keep the French expression for reasons that will become evident below.

[96] For an analysis of the relationship between the "city frontiers" and the *octroi* tax during the French Revolution, see: Momcilo Markovic, "La Révolution aux barrières : l'incendie des barrières de l'octroi à Paris en juillet 1789," *Annales historiques de la Révolution française*, no. 372 (June 1, 2013): 27–48, https://doi.org/10.4000/ahrf.12765.

[97] Further details on this *chocolatier* in: Cédric Poivret, "Les prodromes d'une pensée de la gestion commerciale : Devinck et son ouvrage de Pratique commerciale," *Bibnum. Textes fondateurs de la science*, August 1, 2016, https://journals.openedition.org/bibnum/886?lang=en.

directed complaints". Devinck, himself a former member of the working circles he was reporting about, further considered workers appraised the "popular aspirations" of the Emperor, for "they think they might obtain more from him than anyone else". The "ameliorations to the social state" of the workers "must continue" both on the side of the Emperor as on the side of the workers: if the former needed to establish direct elections of the presidents of mutualist societies at the hands of its members, the latter also needed to seek in the "results" of their coalitions the means to "reunite" their interests with that of the patrons.[98]

Of course, strikes and coalitions were not universally accepted. The velvet workers of Saint Etienne formed a coalition and were in *grève* during 1865, but quickly receded once the leaders of the collectives of workers began being persecuted and incarcerated, accused of their "incendiary rhetoric" and replacing "good reasons" with "big words".[99] Notwithstanding these repressive reactions, the general opinion regarding worker coalitions among the imperial officials in the 1860s seems to have been at least partially positive. As the Minister of the interior Paul Boudet admitted to the Paris prefect of police Joseph Marie Pietri, the regime hoped its aperture would eventually create a "respect for laws and public order".[100] The Empire's goal, according to Parisian police, was to effectively "agree on the common interests of the workers" so it could enact favoring policy in their regard.[101] As can be seen, there were contradictory approaches to the terms upon which to set this "agreement" among the imperial groups. It would seem, nonetheless, that the 1860s regimes on both sides of the Atlantic were willing to hear, favor (*favorecer*), as well as understand (*s'entendre*) the worker's trades who were persistently forming coalitions and enacting strikes.

Historians have been able to shed light on the contradictory attitude of the Mexican and French regimes *vis-à-vis* the newly bread movement of workers through the different institutions of *bienfaisance* they established. As part of their utterly paternalistic approach towards social relations in general, the Empires managed to combine "pity with a sense of responsibility" through imperial institutions, such as the *Junta Protectora de las Clases Menesterosas* engineered by Maximilian. As historians have registered for Napoléon III's regime, officials "praised the sense of responsibility displayed by paternalistic employers and longed for the spread of relationships which reinforce 'the dependence of the worker, moralise him, and release him from the passions which engender disorderly habits'". Creating legal voids through which the imperial "approach"

---

[98] Report of M. Devinck on the *Rapports ouvriers* presented for the Universal Exposition of 1867, 28/10/1868. (AN 45 AP 6 (1)).

[99] Both documents are included in: (AN 45 AP 6 (6)). On State repression, see: Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 352.

[100] Letter from Boudet to Pietri, n. d. (AN F 12 4651)

[101] The original sentence is "s'entendre sur les intérêts communs des ouvriers relieurs de la ville de Paris". Police report on the Parisian bookbinders, 31/1/1866. (AN 45AP 6 (1)). We decide to translate *s'entendre* as "agree" instead of "understand" precisely because of the frame Rancière's notion of "disagreement" has given this dissertation. Indeed, the original title of his book is *Le mésentente*.

to the working classes began to be ruled by institutions of charity, the French regime was seemingly keeping state intervention to an "absolute minimum".[102] In the famous law that legitimized mutual aid societies in 1852, for instance, a new category was created: the so-called *sociétés approuvés*. Essentially created as a state mechanism by which mutual aid societies began to be controlled by the imperial regime, their president had to be named by the State and all activities were closely observed by notables or members of the clergy that contributed to the society's *caisses*. Eventually, such societies were popularly named "imperial mutualities [*mutualités imperiales*]".[103] Despite their nearly eight hundred thousand members by the end of the 1850s, the imperial attempts of approach were met with the challenge of collectives of workers who wished to advance in other directions.[104] Their "labor" movement gradually became a "weapon against the established order" by virtue of their increasing desire and capacity of auto-organization by reason of democracy.[105]

The paradox noted for the Mexican mutual aid societies was taken to an instance of inner transformation by the French working classes. Just like their Mexican peers, the French also believed that "we should not expect or count on the concurrence of the government".[106] The

---

[102] Citation is taken from (AN BB 30 378), in: Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 46–48. As in France, Mexican historians have been able to distinguish the inner contradictions of the Second Empires "beneficial" institutions towards the local populations like the Junta Protectora de las Clases Menesterosas. See: Carlos Illades, "El Proceso de Organización de Los Artesanos de Ciudad de México, 1853-1876," *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y Del Caribe / European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, no. 59 (1995): 61–62; Erika Pani, "¿"Verdaderas figuras de Cooper" o 'pobres inditos infelices'? La política indigenista de Maximiliano," *Historia Mexicana*, January 1, 1998, 571–604; Alicia Hernández Chávez, "Monarquía-República-Nación-Pueblo," in *Ensayos Sobre La Nueva Historia Política de América Latina*, ed. Guillermo Palacios, Siglo XIX (Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2007), 147–70, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47w53q.11; Carlos Illades, *Conflicto, Dominación y Violencia: Capítulos de Historia Social* (Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa/Gedisa, 2015).

[103] Alexandre Lunel, "Les Sociétés de Secours Mutuels Sous Le Second Empire. Exemple Du Département de Seine-et-Oise," *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger (1922-)* 86, no. 1 (2008): 89–112. There are stark similarities between this imperial institutionalization of mutual-aid societies and Maximilian of Habsburgs attempt of benefiting the *clases menesterosas* through the creation of a Junta following his belief in an imperial policy of "equity within justice". See: Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 171–72; Yazmín Adriana Cruz Reyes, "Las clases menesterosas: ¿asunto de Estado o filantropía?," in *Derecho, Guerra de Reforma, intervención francesa y segundo imperio. A 160 años de las Leyes de Reforma*, ed. Miguel Ángel García Olivo et al. (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, 2020), 79–92. The contradictory appraisal by local conservatives has been analyzed, with two different perspectives, in: Erika Pani, "Dreaming of a Mexican Empire: The Political Projects of the 'Imperialistas,'" *Hispanic American Historical Review* 82, no. 1 (February 1, 2002): 1–32, https://doi.org/10.1215/00182168-82-1-1; Shawcross, *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*, 190–223.

[104] Bernard Gibaud, "Mutualité/Sécurité Sociale Un Couple Sous Tension," *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire*, no. 48 (1995): 119–30, https://doi.org/10.2307/3770218; Michel Cordillot, "Le Mouvement Ouvrier Français à La Croisée Des Chemins : Mutualisme et/Ou Résistance à La Fin Du Second Empire," in *Démocratie, Solidarité et Mutualité: Autour de La Loi de 1898*, ed. Michel Dreyfus, Bernard Gibaud, and André Gueslin (Paris: Mutualité Française, 1999), 27–39; Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 321.

[105] Nicolas Da Silva, "Mutualité et capitalisme entre 1789 et 1947 : de la subversion à l'intégration," *RECMA* 357, no. 3 (2020): 36–51, https://doi.org/10.3917/recma.357.0036.

[106] *Tailleurs*. (AN F 12 3120).

"democrat artisans" of Mexico City were appealing to their State as the French coalitions were protesting against the "heads" of their society. Behind the discussion of labor conditions and the protection of "national work" as the Mexican working groups named it, there were evident traces of political and economic claims against the establishment of certain institutions.

The movement of both collectives of working classes codified their aspirations in terms of the control of their labor conditions. Such a message is apparent in the archives of the *rapports* workers delegated to the *Commission d'encouragement pour les études des ouvriers*.[107] Within their discourses, a typical pivot was the matter of their salaries, their wage labor. Belonging to a trade was still significant, and they sought fair conditions for their retribution as workers as well. Certain trades, however, present new arguments to these conditions. The Parisian tapestry weavers thought protection of work meant protecting the members of the trade, regardless of whether the worker was a man or woman: the labor conditions of both had to be procured. Regarding women, they rhetorically asked the regime:

> Are they not part of our trade, as the skin is to the flesh, the bark to the tree? Is it not time to see what we could do to further equalize [*égaliser*] their position? Already, we know it well, several establishments [*maisons*] have given the example, but the application is not general; we reclaim it in the name of justice. Equality of the duration of work [*travail*], progressive remuneration according to merit or sorrow [*peine*], would seem to us a very good improvement to obtain.[108]

They did not stop at claiming the equal rights of women in the workplace, they extended such demands to their general status as laborers. Once again, they presented motives for a worker-controlled labor that was established on equal conditions among *all* members. In some cases this meant extending *their* control over the working, labor, processes: the associations formed in the workspace, contrary to normal logics of dependency in the workplace, should not be controlled by an external "manager". If workers were to be "happy", they needed to understand that "man belongs to himself, and that he alone can profit from his own labor [*labeur*]". New mechanisms and institutions imagined by these groups of workers were seemingly making their appearance. Throughout these same years, workers began advocating for the creation of the "*chambres syndicales*", which would be controlled by the workers and patrons. Such corporations were to be created to ameliorate and solve their difficulties among a "spirit of conciliation" that was independently mandated (*mandat avec independence*), and "disengaged from any influence". The

[107] The Commission was created by the Empire to organize the visit to the Universal Exhibition of 1867, as it did in 1862. It gathered the reports sent by the delegations of workers so these visits could be organized for leading investors, capitalists, and industrialists. See: Édouard Vasseur, "Mame et Le Play. Autour de l'Exposition universelle de 1867," *Les Études Sociales* 149–150, no. 1–2 (2009): 205–22, https://doi.org/10.3917/etsoc.149.0205.

[108] *Rapport adressé a la Commission d'encouragement par la délegation des tapissiers*, 1867. (AN F 12 3120). Henceforth, only the trade's name will be specified.

copper turners and faucet makers believed the *grève*, with its "disastrous" results, had only helped "maintain an animosity contrary to the principles that form the base of our institutions".[109]

The French worker's conviction that the *chambres syndicales* would become the new institution that would mark the agenda of the labor movement was evident. Along with the legalization of trade unions in 1868, the chambers became the watershed which enabled workers to uncover activities that were previously performed behind the curtains of mutual aid societies. Abandoning the latter due to the indirect control the elites of the regime had assured over such organizations, workers created around seventy *chambres syndicales* between 1867 and 1870 in Paris alone. By 1870, more than sixty five thousand workers, representing around thirteen percent of Parisian workers, were unionized.[110] The mechanism of claiming autonomy from the State's authority and institutions, which in Mexico was enacted through the paradoxical activity of mutualist societies, acquired a new face once the French working groups instituted their own associations.

Even some of the trades which were closer to Napoléon III's regime, such as the workers of leathers and skins, saddlery, and military equipment, posed the problem of "unrestricted independence of the worker", with unhinged "freedom of action". Albeit workers also had the impression that the patrons and masters of their workplaces had taken this precept too far. Contrary to the workers' collective convictions of independence, which would arise from favorable labor conditions as much as it would enable them, masters had used the principle of independence to establish new small businesses. What they created was thus a symptom of "social distance between themselves and their former workmates".[111] By creating this distance among the working groups in their workplaces, a hierarchy was implicitly being engineered that separated workers from their patrons but also between themselves. That is, for some, independence meant individual freedom that allowed the reproduction of asymmetrical labor relationships, while for others it meant the independence created through labor, in the workspaces, as a means of establishing greater equality.[112]

---

[109] *Tourneurs en cuivre, robinettiers*. (AN F 12 3121 A). On the *chambres syndicales*, see: Jean-William Dereymez, "Naissance Du Syndicalisme," in *Histoire Des Gauches En France*, Poche / Sciences Humaines et Sociales (Paris: La Découverte, 2005), 463–87, https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.becke.2005.01.0463.

[110] Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 325.

[111] *Cuirs et peaux, sellerie et de l'equipement militaire*. (AN F 12 3110).

[112] Recent labor historians have established that there was a "structural asymmetry" that pierced labor relationships in France. See, for example: Martino Sacchi Landriani, "Rethinking the *Livret d'ouvriers*: Time, Space and 'Free' Labor in Nineteenth Century France," *Labor History* 60, no. 6 (November 2, 2019): 854–64, https://doi.org/10.1080/0023656X.2019.1645318. A suggestive reflection on the sometimes artificial distinction between free and unfree labor can be found in: Tom Brass, "(Re-)Defining Labour Coercion?," *Critical Sociology* 44, no. 4–5 (July 1, 2018): 793–803, https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920517712368. We will continue differentiating between workplace and workspace to convey the difference between labor and work practices.

There was an evident sense of despair among the workers by virtue of the "ill-conceived good market" (*bon marché mal entendu*) of merchants and industrialists. For the hatters, it was clear that this conception emerged from "the will of industrialists". Men "whose mind is not less narrow than their heart, [men who are] for the wage worker [*salarié*] that is employed to produce it, the worst of the plagues".[113] Their relations had not always been like this, however. Nail makers in 1867 argued that in 1842, 1844, 1846, and 1848, the *ouvrier* and the *patron* shared "sympathies and a good mutual agreement [*entente*]". The 1860s presented the workers with insuperable difficulties derived from the patron's growing capitalist desires: "the patrons of today have the will to possess in a few years what our former patrons put a great part of their existence to amass". They thought such "unmoderated desire" was the cause for the demise, for "having lost the sentiment of fraternity that made patrons and workers [*ouvriers*] seem to form nothing else than a big family [*qu'un grande famille*]".[114]

As historians have proven, the relationships in the workshop were increasingly altered due to the meddling of a series of new commercial and industrial actors, such as industrial managers and commercial shopkeepers, into previous "face-to-face" relationships between the worker and his patron. Commercial capitalism reduced the autonomy of worker and master as wholesale merchants increasingly claimed control over credit that bought and loaned raw materials, as well as the market of the finished product.[115] As the practice of *marchandage* showed in chapter three, workers saw the commercialization and commodification of their labor as breaking their fraternal relations because they effectively attracted some of their workshop patrons towards more commercialized and capitalistic dynamics.[116] Indeed, most workers agreed that the "system", "at its base", was "excellent". It was at its "summit" that it "sinned [*pèche*]". The "great production

[113] *Chapeliers*. (AN F 12 3109).
[114] *Cloutiers*. (AN F 12 3110).
[115] As Sacchi mentions: "On the one hand, the credit-debt social relationship could not be waived without undermining the regime of accumulation itself. Poverty was pivotal to redirect people from subsistence farming towards dependent labor. On the other hand, it was necessary to sustain labor physical reproduction –while minimizing its costs– in order to realize returns on capital invested. The structural shifting of the worker towards the condition of insolvent debtor was necessary for capitalist social relations to reproduce but also constituted a crisis in that system". Sacchi Landriani, "Rethinking the Livret d'ouvriers," 862.
[116] For more on this highly complex process and the practice of *marchandage* as a very unique form of subcontracting, see: Casey Harison, "An Organization of Labor: Laissez-Faire and Marchandage in the Paris Building Trades through 1848," *French Historical Studies* 20, no. 3 (1997): 357–80, https://doi.org/10.2307/286850; Casey Harison, "'*La Question Du Marchandage*': The Political and Legal Struggle Against Exploitative Subcontracting in Paris, 1881—1911," *European History Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (October 1, 2002): 451–88, https://doi.org/10.1177/0269142002032004146; Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 57 and 288; Alessandro Stanziani, *Rules of Exchange: French Capitalism in Comparative Perspective, Eighteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 74–93; Arnaud Bartolomei et al., "The Embeddedness of Inter-Merchant Relations in France, 1750–1850: A Revolution in the World of Commerce?," *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales - English Edition* 72, no. 2 (June 2017): 317–53, https://doi.org/10.1017/ahsse.2019.14.

accomplished by all" fell into the fortune of a handful of people. In effect, few trades reverberated the 1848 motto of association as efficiently as the cobblers:

> Let us unite our efforts, let us group our forces, let us associate, let us oppose exploitation with association! The association which allows an equitable distribution and which, from the economic point of view of general production, is a real progress; let us oppose potency to potency [*puissance*], and, while respecting the acquired positions, let us gradually substitute it with an economic system more profitable to all.[117]

As is noticeable, it was against the lack of the actual freedom of "reunion" or assemblage[118] that workers, through their reports to the Empire's *Commission d'encouragement* at the Universal Exposition of 1867, were fundamentally fighting for. They wished to claim a right that had been annulled as soon as Louis-Napoléon had become president of the Second Republic. As in 1848, association, now expressed in the idiom of the workers' reunions or assemblage in the workspaces, was not only intended as a working association that happened in workplaces where labor relations were solved. The "right of reunion", the right to assemble, would let workers follow "instructive conferences" that could either lead his or her introduction into "professional schools" or to "make improvements at work [*dans le travail*]".[119] Though here is not the place to analyze the scope of education as part of these worker reforms, we should note that there are important continuities with the 1830s and 40s discourse.[120] Here, education may be considered as yet another symptom of the working classes' interest in establishing their own notions as the base for the control of labor conditions. If the Mexican artisans advocated for the "protection" of their work, the French coalitions reset the idiom of association as a right to protect their work through the implementation of "improvements" in the workspace.

We should notice that there are certain aspects that distinguish the French from the Mexican working groups, however. Unlike the latter, in France there had been evident interruptions due to the extensive repression of the first years of the Empire. The idiom of association seemingly resurfaced within a reconfigured context that was reproducing new inequalities amongst a collectivity that sought to eradicate them through the (re)institution of fair labor conditions. The re-institution of an imaginary of work in France, internally transformed to meet the conditions of a proper labor movement of the 1860s working classes, happened in spaces which were systematically being torn down. As mentioned, such spaces no longer properly housed worker's association in the workplace but were now more evidently placed in the "public sphere".

[117] *Cordonniers*. (AN F 12 3110).
[118] *Bourreliers*. (AN F 12 3109).
[119] *Boutonniers*. (AN F 3109).
[120] See more on education during the Second Empire in: Zind, "La Religion Dans Les Lycées Sous Le Régime de La Loi Falloux, 1850-1873"; Gilbert Nicolas, "Les instituteurs sous le Second Empire," *Histoire de l'éducation*, no. 93 (January 1, 2002), https://doi.org/10.4000/histoire-education.271; Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 45–52.

Coalitions and the *chambres syndicales* were conceived as the working spaces –workspaces– of resistance to the extent that they were external to the workshop or factory, thus placing their control of labor "in their hands", in their institutions. When comparing the logic of the Mexican and French worker movements, it seems the former wished to use the imaginary of work to introduce the protection and regulation of labor, while the latter used a circular logic of reappropriation by virtue of the experience of the Republic of Work of 1848. If one was advocating a control that might have never been consciously fulfilled, the other seems to present their claims in the wake of the experience of an effective, albeit brief, claim over the institutions of work.

To some degree, we could say that French worker collectives reproduced and transformed the mechanism the Saint-Simonian church and the Fourierist phalanges implemented in the 1830s: it was outside the workplaces that their customs of association had to be reproduced. What we here call the workspaces. In the 1860s, however, it seems workers took these practices to mark a net distinction with their claims in the spaces they increasingly identified as *labor* spaces. Their syndical, collective, actions and organization should take place where working association was actually enacted: in the new *cercles ouvriers*. As mentioned above, individual claims were taken to collective spaces like the *chambres* and the *conseils*, where they were discussed and rendered truly cooperative and collective, despite the ongoing and piercing asymmetries amongst which they lived.[121] The internal revolution of this worker movement permeated into the elite's reformation of the spaces they inhabited. They were both reinventing themselves and the spaces upon which they deposited their ideals.

Despite ongoing attempts by the Seine department's administration to demolish the densely inhabited streets of central Paris, commercial centers, workshops, baker's shops, as well as cafés attracted a growing amount of potential clients.[122] The dense network of workspaces continued to be favored by the agglomeration and vicinity of contributing workshops, textile trades being particularly benefited from these collaborative processes. The concentration and flow of activities, however, did not imply the dynamics were the same. While the *rive gauche* continued to develop activities linked to administration and university, from Oberkampf and Saint-Maur to Aubervilliers in the northeast of Paris, industries that produced machines and engines began

[121] This spirit of conciliation was very much present in other key worker institutions as the *conseils de prudhmmes*, shortly revisited in chapter 3. Indeed, as Cottereau established, these institutions are a privileged lens into the way workers thought individual problems had an "essential collective scope". Cottereau, "Droit et bon droit. Un droit des ouvriers instauré, puis évincé par le droit du travail (France, XIXe siècle)"; Alain Cottereau, "Sens du juste et usages du droit du travail : une évolution contrastée entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne au xixe siècle," *Revue d'histoire du XIXe siècle. Société d'histoire de la révolution de 1848 et des révolutions du XIXe siècle*, no. 33 (December 1, 2006): 101–20.

[122] W. Scott Haine, "'Cafe Friend': Friendship and Fraternity in Parisian Working-Class Cafes, 1850-1914," *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no. 4 (1992): 607–26.

attracting labor force that was offered increasingly poorer working conditions.[123] This net segregation was progressively accentuated as former working class districts near to the city center were displaced from Bastille or Faubourg Saint-Antoine towards Belleville and Montmartre.[124] The effervescence of growing commercial networks, unlike during the first half of the century when, as Gribaudi established, the working *reseaux* were conceivably able to resist to the hygienist's effort to "clean" the streets of Paris, started to implement unbridgeable distances for the working groups that used to inhabit those spaces. Supporting and updating Hobsbawm's thesis for this period, Sewell has lately established that this was yet another inner modification of capitalism's stride that attempted to form equally producing and consuming citizens, while actually producing "gross inequalities among legally equal citizens".[125]

The bourgeois commodity-driven economic expansion embedded in the liberal economic precepts of Napoléon III's Empire, when appraised through the eyes of the working classes, was perceived as an "effort" rather than an actual consolidation or "triumph" of this specific form of capitalism. The undeniable growth of French economy in the 1850s and 1860s, as well as the spatial and architectural reformations in Paris upon which millions of tourists still walk during their *proménades*, strode along the labor movement's defiance of the monopolistic tendency that was reassuring the "oligarchs that dominate industry".[126] The historically radical trade of the *compositeurs*, which housed the Leroux brothers among other famous socialists, was especially

[123] Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 238 and 360.

[124] Pinkney, "Money and Politics in the Rebuilding of Paris, 1860-1870"; Roger Magraw, *A History of the French Working Class* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 221. Probably the most interesting contributions in this aspect have been formulated by social and political historian Alain Faure: Alain Faure, "Spéculation et société : les grands travaux à Paris au XIXe siècle," *Histoire, économie & société* 23, no. 3 (2004): 433–48, https://doi.org/10.3917/hes.043.0433; Alain Faure, "L'industriel et Le Politique. Qui a Peur de l'industrie à Paris Au XIXe Siècle ?," *Revue Dhistoire Moderne Contemporaine* 65, no. 1 (2018): 29–69. Price sustained that despite this growth of industrial activity, around 75% of a working population of nearly half a million people was still employed in "small-scale household or workshop manufacture". Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 238.

[125] William H. Sewell, *Capitalism and the Emergence of Civic Equality in Eighteenth-Century France* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021), 365–66. One need only recall Hobsbawm's statement in *Age of capital*: "The author of this book cannot conceal a certain distaste, perhaps a certain contempt, for the age with which it deals", sentencing only a few lines later that the "bourgeois triumph was brief and impermanent. At the very moment it seemed complete, it proved to be not monolithic but full of fissures". Eric J. Hobsbawm, *The Age of Capital, 1848-1875* (London: Abacus, 2003), 17. This is in clear tension with Van der Linden's Marxist thesis that the idea of equality was established first among the "owners of capital" and then among the "owner of labor power, the workers". Van der Linden, *Workers of the World*, 60. As historians like Sacchi and Brass have identified, this idea does not give us the tools to discern internal asymmetries between supposedly free/unfree labor dynamics, and the asymmetries between one equality and the other.

[126] *Cordonniers.* (AN F 12 3110). For the economic growth of the Empire, see: Droz, *Histoire Générale Du Socialisme: Des Origines à 1875*, 1:510; François Crouzet, "The Historiography of French Economic Growth in the Nineteenth Century," *The Economic History Review* 56, no. 2 (2003): 215–42.

clear when establishing the will of the working classes.[127] The "so-called philanthropists, our economists" and their "declamations" would only leave "speculation, more speculation, always speculation". The replacement of men by women in their *ateliers*, rather than promoting equality, was actually degrading their trade for they did not "contribute to the well-being of the family". Such a substitution only served as a means of reducing their salary, which ultimately resulted in "a reduction in resources of about one third" for the whole family.[128]

Parisian workers clearly identified the mechanisms that were creating further inequalities – what we here call asymmetries– between themselves and were further leveraging the patron's income. The difference in salaries created by the introduction of lower female wages were completely "pocketed" by the *spéculateur*, yet the "shortages" were completely absorbed by the child and the parent. Rather than promote equality of labor conditions, the presence of under-paid women within the wage labor system only complicated the panorama for the working families, who saw their income perceptibly reduced. It was thus time for printers, typographers, typesetters, and compositors to rid themselves of the predominance of the "capitalist patronage [*patronat*]". Like the machine, this system was "devouring" the art that survived in the hand press: it was appropriating the means by which the worker used to control his work and labor. This was why the worker had to understand that his or her working instrument belonged to the artisan, like the land "~~belonged~~ should belong" to the *agriculteur*. Only thus could the "working masses be vigorously seized by the spirit of cooperative association".[129]

Increasingly, as the 1870s were around the corner, workers seemingly agreed on two major convictions. As can be seen by the series of testimonies gathered here, it was not only about asserting their conscience as a new set of groups which encompassed the labor movement, it was also about defining with ever more precision and clarity a "common enemy": capital.[130] Indeed, if

---

[127] Hobsbawm and Scott's classical study on the shoemakers as a "political" trade is still a relevant example for the study of the internal differences within the worker movement of these years. Eric J. Hobsbawm and Joan Wallach Scott, "Political Shoemakers," *Past & Present* 89, no. 1 (November 1, 1980): 86–114, https://doi.org/10.1093/past/89.1.86.

[128] Jarrige has assessed that the "history of printing workers in the 19th century is dominated by the fight against the feminization of the trade". This fascinating piece of work further analyzes the conflict engendered into this specific trade. François Jarrige, "The Gender of the Machine. Printing Workers and Mechanical Typesetting (France, England, 1840–1880)," *Revue Dhistoire Moderne Contemporaine* 54, no. 1 (2007): 193–221.

[129] *Typographie parisienne* (*Compositeurs*). (AN F 12 3121 A). We maintain the text as stricken in the original. While nominal wages increased in the period, historians have corroborated that unemployment rose as did living costs, while purchasing power declined especially in times where poverty hovered, like during the harvest crises of 1853-1856. Overproduction and underconsumption were the two opposites of the new market logic. The market particularly suffered during the cotton-related crisis during the U.S. civil war, for France imported ninety percent of its cotton from the former's harvest. Price, *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870*, 301–4; Sven Beckert, *Empire of Cotton: A Global History* (New York: Penguin Random House, 2014), 243–50.

[130] *Brossiers*. (AN F 12 3109).

we were to look for transversal arguments that pierce the *rapports ouvriers*, beyond certain specificities to each trade's claims, it was not so much against the imperial State, the patron, or industry that they directed their criticisms. As we shall discover below, this argument lies at the core of the "labor internationalism" mentioned above. Though it appears in another vocabulary, we should keep the Mexican working classes' argument in mind, particularly in their convection to national representatives that "foreign trade" was directly damaging "national work". More than unprotection, deprotection was the aspect upon which they asked the State's direct intervention.

Similarly with the French case, once we read the sources carefully, we may realize that they put the origin of "exploitation" elsewhere. Their patrons, the *fabricant* that introduced machinery into the production processes and established *concurrence* as the system that ruled their labor, were apparently not obeying to their own will, but to the "exigencies and the despotism of capital", as some argued. By clearly placing the problem of labor in the logics of capital-production, workers seem to have identified with ever more clarity the need to recover, reinvent, and materialize the "need of permanent association". Against the "exaggeration of benefits" for the "capitalist or fabricant", the worker could not find himself "alone in demanding a reasonable and possible salary". An *action d'ensemble* in the spaces where "the coalition of worker against patron is born" was necessary. In other words, if workers wished to prevent the assertion of capitalist conditions in their work and labor spaces, they had to institute the "spirit of cooperative association" which translated into a control of labor conditions. As the woodturners synthesized:

> Consequently:
> The freedom to strike consecrates a right.
> The freedom of assembly is indispensable for the exercise of this right.
> The freedom of association allows for its organization and complete realization.
> These freedoms go along side each other and are indispensable to each other; if only one of the three should lack, the other two become impotent for the realization of the questions or the interests they would have raised.[131]

We thus arrive to the point where the complexity and at times shady nature of labor internationalism arises. Before advancing to the conclusive remarks of the chapter, some aspects should be noted of the passage through the imperial experience. In the progressive emergence of the French labor movement, there were evident communications as well as differences regarding the arguments of the Mexican working classes. Despite the fact that the latter did not conceive the protection of "national work" in terms of an articulate defense against a "capitalist patronage", we should not lose sight of the fact that they had no interest in changing the "form of government". Accordingly, the French coalitions explicitly associated and collectivized their claims outside their places of labor. Neither exclusively denounced the State as much as the system of "speculation",

---

[131] *Tourneurs sur bois.* (AN F 12 3120).

of commercial capitalism, of dismantling the practices that once sustained their workplaces. The Mexican working classes thus withdrew the mutual aid societies from any capacity of State intervention and claimed their working class autonomy. The French organizations took the workshop associative practices to new institutions such as the *chambres syndicales*, while worker coalitions created circles that claimed the control over their labor to contest the asymmetries implemented into their shops. Following their arguments, we might imply that the imperial State was susceptible of transformation to the extent that the "capitalist patronage" had appropriated institutions such as the mutual aid societies. This may explain the tone of most *rapports ouvriers* as seeking a dialogue with the Empire because its policies were clearly favoring the "heads" of society, while the working classes were absorbing the damage in their labor places.

As we have tried to argue here, the institutional gaps left by the imperial and liberal States were crucially appropriated by the working classes. Discussing the historical concept through the eyes of labor internationalism, we will notice that the category of "labor movement" should include its subjects to incorporate the radicality of its claims, not only as control over their labor but also as control over their practices of work: association, cooperation, and collaboration. In a word, the imaginary of work. Finally, by recollecting the imaginary of work's institutions and groups, the "internationalism" of this worker movement can be traced to its actual origin: the working nation.

6. Conclusions. Atlantic worker internationalism. The interconnected nature of the worker labor movement

As we have seen in the past sections, the worker movement that emerged in the 1860s was greatly favored by a set of laws that enabled their explicit organization in the streets of Paris. Whether or not the collectivity of subjects of the French working classes "disappeared" after the 1851 coup is still up to debate. Given the disadvantage labor historians face due to the lack of sources, famously and systematically burnt, disappeared, or displaced during the most repressive years of the Empire, the Prussian siege of Paris, and the 1871 Commune,[132] the question may never be convincingly answered. Albeit, putting different collections of sources together might at least point historians to argue that something like the complete disappearance of the movement never actually happened. Imperial sources allowed us to witness certain corporations being even "appreciated" by the regime, the mutual-aid societies being perhaps the most relevant example both for Mexico and France. Napoléon III's history of rapprochement in their regard proved key for the construction of an "imperial gaze" towards *la classe la plus nombreuse et la moins favorisée*, in turn replicated by Maximilian in Mexico. Napoleon's legalization of worker coalitions in 1864 and

[132] Colette E. Wilson, *Paris and the Commune, 1871-78: The Politics of Forgetting* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).

of the chambres syndicales in 1868, and Maximilian's *Junta Protectora de las Clases Menesterosas*, however, did not entirely correspond to the interests of the working classes. Strictly speaking, we could say it did not correspond to the interest of their movement, which, if true, might imply that there was a part of it that existed beneath the surface of the scape upon which the States directed their gaze, behind the curtains of certain imperial and liberal institutions.

With all the limitations the reconstruction of such a history carries, this was evidenced through the *rapports ouvriers*, which talk of a movement whose interest was clearly placed in the improvement of their labor's conditions. In Mexico, their identity as groups, as "classes", of "democrat artisans", ushered a true alteration of the liberal State's policies that had neglected the protection of the livelihood of the "men of the pueblo". They firmly stated that such "misunderstood protection" fell nothing short of an offence against the "nation's rights and interests" caused by the inattentiveness of the "public's observations". The institutions of the Mexican working classes were the first symptom we acknowledged of a profound transformation being enacted. For the first time in the dissertation, we saw the sources evidence the formation of a "labor movement" to the effect that the working nation began reflecting on labor in new terms. There was an apparent discomfort with the State's "non-compliance" with their claims. The working nation did not wish to be integrated *into* the nation. They were seeking new ways of instituting "national work", which would be responsive to the interests of the new working classes. In other words, the working classes seem to have been reluctant to abandon the imaginary and institutions of work as regulators and protectors of their labor.

In France, workers similarly carried the movement outside of their workplaces to spaces where their association could be undertaken as part of their identity as workers. Before the 1860s, the movement remained disaggregated behind the screen of legitim forums like the mutual aid societies. Institutions like the chambres syndicales, once legalized, were the natural spaces where the collective association of work*ers* effectively emerged. In effect, they clearly placed part of their identity in the "cooperative association" that formed their coalitions. The coalitions, one of the French working nation's institutions of work in the period, were enacted by workers as a series of movements that gave them the capacity of governing their lives –the reproductivity as much as the productivity in their livelihoods– within and outside the workshops. The labor movement sought to contest the limits imposed on these workspaces by the "capitalist patronage", who reformed the workshop into spaces destined for labor-productive activities. If we wished to further accentuate the difference between the workspace and these reformed workshops, we might call the latter "labor-shops". This may explain the need of the workers to perform the "collective exits" from the labor-shops through their coalitions. As described above, such movements were imagined as the time the worker could use to reinstate and reorganize the practices and values that inhabited

their former workshops into the labor-shops. In other words, the coalitions were conceived as the possibility of reclaiming the working classes' capacity of contracting and negotiating the control over the worker's individual and collective labor. Evidently, the tension between labor and work was still present in the new set of asymmetries enacted by "civic capitalism" in France.

Of course, there were a number of symptoms where the imaginary of work re-surfaced. On the one hand, we might perceive its division from labor in the typographer's conception of their work as art. As mentioned, they were not the only trade to think in these terms. Tapestry workers noted that the "word" art did not so much "*signal*" their industry, as much as it "*designated*" the quality of the object to which their industry was applied. The "art of establishing" such an object was not only a matter of "practical science" but also had a "speculative" component. Art was precisely the act of applying that which "we attach to the denomination of liberal arts".[133] Art and work, in other words, were far more than just the reproduction of typesets; it took ingenuity *and* labor to maneuver the hand press. Tailors, in turn, clearly established that, against those who conceived work as the product of the "wage laborer" who was being converted into an "unconscious machine", work was actually the result of the "capacity of the worker" who was in the middle of the "industrial movement". In his workspace, the worker could effectively become an "associated cooperator of any cooperative society", be it mutual aid, or a chambre syndicale.[134] We noticed that the institutions of work, the workspaces inside and outside the factory and labor-shops, where the workers still enacted their collective association, were now embodied in its "cooperative" establishments. French workers defined their chambres syndicales and trade unions precisely as the niches of worker "cooperation";[135] Mexicans like Chávez and Cosío sought the "purely industrial association" in their mutual aid "associations". These were the spaces where the right of reunion or assemblage, the "national rights" of "national work", were enacted and where they should continue to spring.

The French working groups, however, took the imaginary of work to a more radical difference we might not find among the Mexican working classes. Labor was now linked to the workshop, what we here symbolically called the labor-shop. That is, the place where the worker's productivity was increasingly commodified at the hands of "capital". In the measure that labor activities were still intimately related to their imaginary of work, to their control over their daily livelihoods, to the means to produce and reproduce their families' lives, the institutions of work

---

[133] *Tapissiers*. (AN F 12 3120). For the matter of the link of work and art in the context preceding the Second Empire, see: John Tresch, *The Romantic Machine: Utopian Science and Technology after Napoleon*, *The Romantic Machine* (University of Chicago Press, 2012), 191–286, https://doi.org/10.7208/9780226812229.
[134] *Tailleurs*. (AN F 12 3120).
[135] See, in this respect: Bernard H. Moss, *The Origins of the French Labor Movement: The Socialism of Skilled Workers 1830-1914.* (Berkeley/London: University of California Press, 2018) chapter 3.

and its subjects did not want to lose control over them. The movements of the working classes, in other words, were trying to possess, or perhaps repossess, the means of governing their labor activities. This was the political commitment of what could be best called the "worker labor movement": the movement by which the worker wished to regulate his or her labor. And it is precisely in this point where we may advert labor internationalism be best conceived as worker internationalism: in the Atlantic experience of the working classes that sought to control their labor through the institutions and imaginaries of work. All of which, as mentioned, set the base for the discussions of the IWMA in Latin America half a decade afterwards.[136]

In effect, this might prove to be the most decisive point of the dissertation, for it speaks about the historical limits different historiographical conceptions carry for our understanding of the worker labor movement as a "labor movement".[137] As we have seen here, the inter-national movement[138] that emerged since the 1840s was not only linked to the labor movement, but it was also crucially dependent on the imaginary of work instituted by the Atlantic working nation and its Atlantic socialism. In other terms, it speaks of the way the working nation identified itself during the liberal and imperial experiences of the 1860s. In this sense, if we have iterated the word classes instead of class it is because most sources claimed this difference. They were not "a" class, but a movement of "classes". They did not accept a "surveillance that classifies them [the "workers in general"] as a dangerous people [*gens*]".

> No, the workers don't want to form a class, they don't want to be considered as suspicious, turbulent people with no ties [*sans feu ni lieu*], without faith or law. They want to be considered for what they are: useful citizens, living from their work, producing, contributing for the most part to the public wealth, paying heavy taxes, considering their wages, and having only a small share in the social wealth.[139]

Against those who considered them as the "dangerous class", they asserted their belonging to a wider community, to which they greatly contributed for its riches. Directly contesting views such as Alfred Darimon's, a legislator known for his stark political defense of liberal and

---

[136] Tarcus, "The First International in Latin America."

[137] As conceived, for example, by Bernard Moss who places the "labor movement" with a clear "tendency" towards an "ideology". Besides the contributions of Sewell's classic *Work and revolution*, there has been a long-standing tendency to identify the workplace as a source of the working classes' identity, gradually abandoning ideological teleologisms in the movement's definition. See, for example: Lenard R. Berlanstein, "The Distinctiveness of the Nineteenth-Century French Labor Movement," *The Journal of Modern History* 64, no. 4 (1992): 660–85; Tony Judt, "The French Labour Movement in the Nineteenth Century," in *Marxism and the French Left*, Studies on Labour and Politics in France, 1830-1981 (New York: NYU Press, 2011), 24–114. As shall be seen in the conclusions to the dissertation, the worker labor movement introduces some important nuances to the debate between Moss's conception of a "tendency" towards "trade socialism", and Judt's thesis that socialism was "not even of marginal significance" for worker organizations.

[138] In the general conclusions we shall discuss this topic in depth. It is important to keep in mind that we follow Mauss's conception of "international" relations as the "life of relations between societies". Marcel Mauss, *La Nation, Ou Le Sens Du Social*, ed. Jean Terrier and Marcel Fournier, 2nd ed. (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2018), 123.

[139] *Tailleurs*. (AN F 12 3120).

republican views within the Empire,[140] they questioned what the worker was around "all these works [*travaux*], instruments of all these fortunes". Indeed, they argued, it was "the case to say what Sieyès said about the third estate: everything and nothing!".[141] Against the expropriative logic of "capital" during the Second Empire, the working classes reconfigured their institutions of work to seek the establishment of their national imaginary upon the collaborative practices rooted in their trades' industry. As the worker E. Villeneuve established in a manuscript that circulated among the *rapports ouvriers*: the "advantages of [societies'] union" and the workers' need to "protect themselves from accidents" was the "direct cause of the formation of nations". The need of self-provision, in turn, "gave birth to industry".[142] Association and mutual aid, that is, were still the cohesive institutions of the nation. In times of imperial polities, the socialist working nation sought their implementation against the "useless" members of society, the "idle", and "unproductive" classes that undergo their lives in the "most shameful debauchery": the *patronat capitaliste*.[143] The conclusions of the dissertation will thus finally address the matter of worker internationalism, or the "intersocial" dimension, as the experience instituted by the Atlantic working nations and their Atlantic socialism. That is, as the institution of the imaginary of work and its time of innermost political radicalization.

---

[140] Miquel De la Rosa Lorente, "Liberals and the Empire : Responses to French Expansionism under Napoleon III in Algeria, Cochinchina and Mexico (c. 1858-1870)." (PhD Thesis, Florence, European University Institute, 2017), 48–67.
[141] Indeed, Darimon would later go on to publish a homonym study: *Le tiers parti sous l'Empire (1863-1866).*
[142] *Histoire du travail en France*, included in: *Tapissiers.* (AN F 12 3120).
[143] *Engegneurs du Départment du Seine.* (AN F 12 3116).

Conclusions

The Atlantic working nation and the intersocial dimension

I will not seek to repeat the conclusions we arrived at throughout the six chapters, but rather to offer some reflections on topics this dissertation may have enticed. Rather than conceive them as my way of closing some debates, they will serve to address issues that may have remained implicit in the discussions mentioned in the dissertation's body. In particular, I wish to briefly reflect on three problems that are significantly related to the my main topic, constitute the *fil rouge* of the dissertation, and as such are intimately linked between them: the place of socialism in Atlantic politics, the difference between the nation and the State and their related political principles, and finally the question on the "intersocial" relations between the Atlantic working nations.

As stated since the introduction, the dissertation seeks to unveil the historical character of socialism as a socio-political concept or, to put it otherwise, as a "modern social imaginary". We could not do this without exploring the social roots from which it sprang. Indeed, we needed to link the history of the concept to the history of the groups and societies that imagined it. Perhaps more importantly, as this dissertation strives to show, linking conceptual and social history gives us the tools to overcome, or at least avoid, certain hasty conclusions regarding the political possibility of socialism in certain contexts, by showing the existence of different forms of socialism in different societies that radically appropriated its imaginary and institutions through the active appropriation of interconnected workers. The concept of socialism we arrived at was in effect the result of an analysis of the Mexican working groups' contact with the French groups. Its introduction to the discussion of 1840s Mexican politics altered previous maps that had been historiographically drawn and projected upon nineteenth-century societies, strongly dependent on liberal and/or marxist frames of reference.

Most historians of nineteenth-century Mexico usually accept the thesis that liberalism and conservatism –with their specific historical expressions in other varied political forms such as federalism, centralism, or monarchism– were the sole political forms to have been up for grabs during the period analyzed here. In chapter five, we mentioned that this indirectly excluded socialism as a political possibility and that such an exclusion was actually a reproduction of a certain kind of "forgetfulness" of the groups that guided Mexican politics at the time. Expanding Clara Lida's affirmation that historiography sometimes neglected the manufacturing and artisanal groups under a logic of proletarianization, we could say that the indigenous and other working groups were not perceived as socialist –even though they sometimes explicitly endorsed it– because they were not perceived as capable of imagining or instituting it.

Opening the possibility for these groups to imagine a particular form of socialism within their national movements is, I believe, one way of avoiding unnecessary teleological and eurocentric accounts regarding Mexican politics altogether. To the extent that understanding the dynamicity of manufacturing and artisan populations tells us more about a society and economy that was not "industrialized", perceiving the socialist language some parts of the working groups endorsed may help us see the intricate complications they presented for the institution of a "national" politics –or indeed how they conceived such politics. Both socially, as working groups, and politically, as socialists –or at least, as groups that instituted the imaginary of work–, these collectivities speak more deeply of the radical contingency with which Mexican politics was imbued in the nineteenth century.

This entails, as was mentioned in the introduction, avoiding pre-established narratives that structure our historical thought on these periods. It means, above all, leaving aside any kind of "success/failure" rhetoric, an ultimately subjective idea, rather than an arguably objective historical concept. What these kinds of narratives may reproduce are nothing but ideologically deformed ways of perceiving the inner practical logics with which groups interacted in a given society. The Mexican working groups, for instance, were key factors in molding the experience of the Ayutla revolution and the arrival of moderate liberal groups to the presidency in 1855. Yet normally these groups are "forgotten" in the process because they were not an integral part of the moderate agenda that guided the Constituent congress. This was even more evident in cases where the working groups did not even cohere into a social movement as significantly as in Ayutla. The 1840s working groups have been excluded from most political histories because they were not formally involved in State-related questions. The historical reductionism operated on the analysis of the context without accounting for these groups should be evident once we see that they were utterly disagreeing with "national" politics, as the institution of an imaginary of work against the agenda of industrialization of the Dirección General de Industria may help evidence.

Going beyond the logics of success or failure helped weaving with more attention the intricacies of political, economic, and social contestation between the different groups that composed Mexican society. As has been insisted throughout the dissertation, it was *between*, rather than upon, the nation's groups that politics were woven. Thus, not only in contestation to, or in disagreement with, policies, but also as a way of organizing their livelihoods, and ultimately governing their communities. Politics, in other words, were weaved according to conflicts and alliances that allowed different groups, as well as individuals, to associate according to mutual interest. Florencia Mallon talked in this sense of a "three-tiered, nested process of struggle and interaction", weaved between the local villages, the regional factions, and the national level which

sought to build "supraregional" alliances. Only the analysis of all three levels and their interactions lends a better image of the internal dynamics of these politics.[1]

Perceiving these dynamics with the help of social history gives socialism a more historical face that brittles its construction as a category that may be universally valid or used as if it were. As a social institution with specific, contextual, attributes, it is more easily comprehensible as a movement that was composed of groups that built different imaginaries of their reality and, consequently, of themselves. In other words, it instituted different imaginaries that expressed the practices, the subjects of such practices, and how both were knitted into the institution which would be eventually synthesized into the word socialism. As we might draw from part II of the dissertation, socialism had a double aspect of both collectively impregnating the minds of the groups that imagined it through the socialist-sociological principle, but also becoming brittle once we extrapolate it into contexts of formal politics, as the "dem-soc" candidacy in 1848 proved. The undiscussable minority of socialist party politics throughout the period and spaces studied here, or even its inexistence in Mexico for example, could be taken as a symptom of such weakness. Yet this would be accepting only one part of the mostly "hybrid" dimension through which socialism was instituted as Atlantic politics: not only through the cooperation of different social groups but also between groups of different nations that did not even conceive their imaginaries as restricted to partisan expressions. As was shown in chapters one through four, disengaging from this limited perspective on politics is not only productive for studies on socialism but also on liberalism and conservatism. As was shown, in Mexico neither formally existed as political parties until the 1850s, but this did not mean they were not conceived as political possibilities within the political repertoire of the time.

Socialism, however, cannot be fully compared to other coexistent political imaginaries and institutions. It has an undeniably singular nature. Not so much because of the way it was represented, but principally by the way it was constituted through a social imaginary. Here, as remarked, lies the importance of what I have called the "imaginary of work". It is both the symbol and factor of the irreducibility of the groups that ushered it and the alternativity its socialist politics instituted. Work, as an imaginary that expressed both the activities of the groups that conveyed it and the capacity of associating the practices to "collective representations", was irreducible to the productive activity of value-formation imprinted into modern wage labor. The social irreducibility of work, as an imaginary that associated and at times even organized collectives of peasant, manufacturing, and different forms of working groups in different contexts, was reflected in the radical disagreement these groups conveyed *vis-à-vis* industrialization and labor policies.

[1] Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 315–16.

Considering the evidence conveyed by the sources, we might affirm that the singularity of Atlantic socialism was mirrored in the irreducibility of the imaginary of work to the formal political-economic reformations sought by the centralist, monarchist, and liberal administrations in both France and Mexico. We subscribe here the hypothesis proposed by French social scientists according to which there were actually three declinations to Modern politics –liberalism, conservatism, socialism–, as well as the thesis of Mexican(ist) historians who showed that there were "three groups" living and discussing the political future of their societies: liberals, conservatives, and the "popular" sectors.[2] With the precision that they did not so much identify themselves as "popular", but foremost as "working" sectors pertaining to their communities (commonly, *pueblos*).

As was affirmed in chapter four, socialism alters Modern politics among other things because it invites us to overcome common conceptions that enclose it in a bipolar structure, firmly dependent on certain conceptions of "the political". With Atlantic socialism, the political board acquires a triangular form, each angle being linked to defined groups and consequently to precise forms of life, with their imaginaries, practices and institutions. Socialism, in this sense, is only the tip of a social movement that was diachronically formed through the constitution of collectives and groups that built their identity in the common aspect that united them: working association and organization. This is why we think it is better to sociologically follow the formation of these groups into and for a working nation, whose politics consisted in posing and answering to a social question far more complex than the problem of poverty: the one we resumed with the idea of a socialist-sociological principle underpinning the constitution of a new nation. This is what ultimately bore socialism into the Atlantic world. A perspective like this gives historians more tools to analyze not so much the conformation of the State in correspondence or deviation from "triumphant" ideologies or political "ideas", but the constitution of nations according to the way in which social institutions of workers altered primitive dominant conceptions. In this framework, the working nation can be seen as the sociological synthesis of a common Atlantic socialist experience of the working groups.

The potential for subversiveness of workers' institutions and imaginaries appeared more radically in the Mexican nation. The experience carried by the groups of workers, peasants, indigenous pueblos, mutualist societies, the ayuntamientos, and juntas, as well as the participation in "new societies" were all crucial to subvert common-place narratives of Mexican nineteenth-

[2] Friedrich Katz, "Mexico: Restored Republic and Porfiriato, 1867–1910," in *The Cambridge History of Latin America V: 1870-1930*, ed. Leslie Bethell, vol. 5, The Cambridge History of Latin America (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 1–78, https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521245173.002.

century politics as the liberal and republican outcome of 1857 or its "consolidation" in 1876.[3] The working nation, indeed, talks of a national community that was in the process of instituting itself *before* anyone in the name of liberalism or conservatism claimed authority over the State. Even if we decide to sidestep the existence of socialist movements in the 1850s in Mexico, the organizational capacity of the working groups and the appropriation of that capacity by certain leaders to topple political systems built to structurally disaggregate those national working communities, still appear as a fundamental factor in the Ayutla Revolution which eventually ensued the presence of liberals in the State constituent congress. Reformulating Mallon's conclusions for the period, it would be worthy to reverse our perspective when studying it: instead of the nation's reaction to what the liberal or conservative State had to offer, it would be best to admit that "most of what was creative or new"[4] was a response to the working nation's unrest, pressure, and contestation, all of which instituted new forms of associative politics.

Politics, as determined by some groups who advocated their authority over its institutions, appear as a historical possibility within, and in confrontation to, other political forms instituted by other groups. The State, we argue, is thus a historical entity, a "political reality",[5] that is contingently conceived according to different ways of organizing a political community's livelihood. It does not eliminate the possibility of a liberal State, as much as it acknowledges its exceptionality among other forms of national politics that do not depend on a nation-state polity of individual inclusion/exclusion. This finally explains the irreducibility of national politics to the principle of nationality most scholars refer to when talking about the nation.

These nuances may help us consider aspects that guide the terms of the discussion on nation-building and state formation as two non-synonymic, albeit comparable, processes. Taking the 1850s as our tensioning example once again, it was not only about "incorporating" the groups into national representativity, hence the Nation-State; nation-building was also about integrating the groups into a community that played with other institutions, and thus re-settled the terms of imagining the nation altogether. The groups that composed the working nation instituted it to the extent that some of them were able to capitalize their movement for the constitution of their state –in 1848 France as in 1855 Mexico, for instance. But it was precisely the detachment of some groups from the movement instituted by the "majority" or the "most important part" of the nation that was counterproductive for the whole movement's political capitalization within the state. The

---

[3] Will Fowler, "Dreams of Stability: Mexican Political Thought during the 'Forgotten Years'. An Analysis of the Beliefs of the Creole Intelligentsia (1821-1853)," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14, no. 3 (1995): 287–312; William H. Beezley and Colin M. MacLachlan, *Mexico's Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010).

[4] Mallon, *Peasant and Nation*, 174.

[5] Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 10, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1g248v9.

logical impossibility of emptying this collective of groups into the nation, because of the limits imposed by the representational mechanisms, was the limit the working nation encountered *vis-à-vis* the Nation-State. Yet it was also the most radical motive for its organizational capacity and institutional potency: the possibility of not being restricted by the constitutional process of nationality but including the institution of a nation from the imaginary of its collectives' coalitions.

As was seen in the introduction, such an affirmation goes against commonplaces present in the historiography of the nation. At this point, we can now clearly see why: the nation, to the extent that it was irreducible to the object constructed by the State, was not conceived nor built by workers taking nationality-nationalism as its axis of constitution. The working nation in particular reverses its axis to the extent that it does not even depend on the individual, on the separation and individuation of one individual from another,[6] but on the groups that associate, to imagine itself as a community. The impossibility of constituting a nation according to the principle of nationality is consequent with the difficulty historians have encountered in explaining the nation beyond a nationalist perspective. In Mexico, the working nation's socialist-sociological principle of association may be a historical piece of evidence that further proves such impossibility, while explaining the historiographical limits of applying European and Western frames of reference when analyzing nations and their groups.[7] That is, the social history of the working nation is susceptible to becoming a field of study that opens new understandings of the nation that do not depend on our established common senses, and therefore explains differential political, economic, and cultural organizations of national communities. This takes us to our final remarks, which not coincidentally reveal the central place Marcel Mauss's sociology occupied in our inquiries.

Indeed, as global and imperial history have registered since the last couple of decades, nationalist histories are all but "national": they many times forget the groups that supposedly composed the nation; they rarely refer to sociohistorical dynamics but rather seek to explain the fulfillment of preconceived frames of Nation-State conceptions; and, paradoxically, refer to "universal" ideals of the nation, which were typically exported from the metropolis to the colonies,

---

[6] These are the basic principles that historians have adduced as constitutive of the nation, to the extent that it is defined by the conceptual limits imposed by nationalism. See Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853," in *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, ed. Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler (New York: Routledge, 2018), 20.

[7] Indeed, French historians have established with great precision the origins of the principle of nationality which would later be exported into our historiographic frames, even when studying non-French societies. Until the mid-nineteenth century, nationality and citizenship referred to two different "fields of practice". But then *nationalité* began describing the "legal link" between the individual and the State, and was thus intensely debated. "This scrutiny culminated in 1889 with the passage of the Code de la nationalité, which defined Frenchness as a complex combination of place of birth (*jus soli*) and descent (*jus sanguinis*)". Emmanuelle Saada, "Nation and Empire in the French Context," in *Sociology and Empire*, ed. George Steinmetz, The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013), 321–39, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv123x6t0.14.

first and utmost by the French Republican groups of the Revolution. As a famous historian established, "the messianic message of the Republic assumed both a universalistic and a nationalist character –a symbiosis which was most tellingly illustrated a century later in the Third Republic's ideological justification of its policy of colonial expansion". Yet what most historians neglect of this universalist ambition was the fact that the "belief in the universality of the principles of good government instituted by the Revolution also produced actions which rapidly negated the libertarian thrust of 1789".[8] As was seen here, it was not the "libertarian thrust" as such, as much as the nation's groups which were systematically torn by the universalist aspirations of the Revolution. The liberal principle of nationality, as Marcel Mauss affirmed, exerted a historical and scientific negligence *vis-à-vis* the nation's groups.[9] And this did not only happen within France.

We further developed global and imperial history by following Mauss's hypothesis according to which the life of nations is also and mainly a "life of relations" between the groups that constituted, that "integrated", the nation, as well as between the nations themselves, through these groups. As the life of nations did not obey the State's imposition of the nationalist principle, topologically cohered to a defined territoriality, the nation could not be confined to a "local" community: it had to be analyzed according to what he called an "intersocial" perspective as well. Nations were defined by an "intermediate degree of belonging", by the relations between societies that had the potential of defining both their internal and external lives. The relations between nations, the intersocial relations, were formative of national life to the extent that the latter depended upon its groups to exist.[10]

But it is Mauss's most radical sociological thesis that mostly inspired us. According to Mauss, the nation could not have been effectively organized without the "ideas, forces, and groups that tend to regulate the ensemble of economic life". The nation, for Mauss, was not constituted through a process of individual-nationality formation, the aforementioned principle of individual exclusion/inclusion, but through a true process of "nationalization", the "instauration of industrial and commercial property under the control of the nation, by the establishment of a form of collective property appropriate to the various communities of which the nation is composed and which are currently more or less deprived of it" (pp. 254-255). Such a phenomenon, marked by the moment when "nations acquired the sense of the social", was when socialism was born. Socialism, furthermore, gave politics a "color", a tone that "politics had never had". For the first

[8] Sudhir Hazareesingh, *From Subject to Citizen: The Second Empire and the Emergence of Modern French Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 72–73.
[9] Marcel Mauss, "Symposium: The Problem of Nationality," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 20 (1919): 237–65.
[10] Marcel Mauss, *La nation, ou le sens du social*, ed. Jean Terrier and Marcel Fournier (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2018), 119–24. Referred pages will be included in the text between parentheses.

time, with Saint-Simon, but also with Owen, Fourier, and Marx, thinkers "observed and meditated" the nation, with and for the mass of workers. With Saint-Simon, for the first time, the "totality of its institutions" and interests were presented to the people, weaving together the destiny of the nation to that of socialism, of the "facts and the systems" (pp. 258-259) of the nation in a non-consequential logic of facts that influenced the ideas or vice versa.

Though with more or less coherence, Mauss does distinguish a central aspect in the joint birth of the nation and socialism. What made Saint-Simon determinant in the process of this joint birth was the fact that his scientific system found a "political formula" for the industrial revolution of his time. His social science, together with socialism, wove the system to the industrial fact of the time. More precisely, against the "absurd reserves of the literate and nationalists", he did not doubt the "benefits" of the "exchanges" between societies: the history of "human industries is properly the history of civilization, and inversely". Industry developed societies, reason, sensibility, and will. It was the "third god" that ends with the "tyrants of the sky and earth", equaling man and saving him from the "moral and material crisis" on which he debated (pp. 130-131). The nation, socialism, and industrial-economic exchange were tied within an exceptional history of a much larger account of how human societies were built through a logic of intersocial exchange and composition. Here, in a nineteenth-century context, it was built by a history of inter-national exchange.

Taking up Mauss's sociological perspective, this dissertation followed the path it opened in a much more focused historical inquiry, likely to show crucial aspects that Mauss did not and could not appreciate, for lack of a detailed analysis of the sources. As mentioned in the introduction, rather than ultimately conceiving socialism as a tensioning ideal for the reformation of the nation, driving it away from the nationalist, imperialist, and colonialist tendencies developed by European nations in the first half of the twentieth century, historical sources show that the *working* nation was an international community that contested, disagreed, and built integrated contestations to capitalist imperialism *even before its conception*. What we saw here as the formation of worker internationalism was not the simple culmination of an ideal that contested the imperialist advance of Napoléon III. It was part of a much larger international history, of sensible back-and-forths between the experiences of the Mexican, Spanish, and French working nations.

This historical understanding of the intersocial dimension, woven by the working nation, may contribute to future debates that reflect on imperial and national history. As a political and historical experience, the working nation might be well compared, in its intrinsic confrontation, to empires as a socially constructed play of differential imaginaries that organize and govern societies. Empires, irreducible to conservative apparatus of Nation-State authority reproduction,

and Nations, irreducible to liberal mechanisms of Nation-State legitimation, could be two historical social forms that help explaining better the tensioned political history of the the nineteenth-century Atlantic, precisely because both escape the theoretical reductionisms of methodological nationalisms. When understood as such, nations and empires can be two socio-political forms that help us go beyond the artifices and dig into the social and economic organizations operated in a given context.

The most radical aspect revealed by the Atlantic working nation is not so much its counter-propositional nature as it stood against monarchism or political centralisms in general. I would argue that it is rather the way in which it opens, historically and scientifically, another way of thinking about the relations between the Americas and Europe in the nineteenth century. It was the connection between Sabas Sánchez and Victor Considerant's federalist principles, a form of radical republicanism that was socialist to its very core, which unveiled an "international system" that did not upend Mexican or American relationships with Europe but rather solidified them according to the principle of socialist organization, of working association. Deprived of geographical determinisms, the working nations questioned the imposition of colonial dynamics of dependency on the groups which nurtured the nation, both materially and intellectually, and upheld a socialist imaginary that contested nationalist impositions and state-centered authorities. They neither refuted the existence of foreign impositions nor the possibility that with such journeys there also traveled new techniques of governing their own lives, as subjects with control over their resources, not limited to their landed property. The working nation's international system thus escapes commonplace definitions of colonial and postcolonial subjections and is susceptible of altering the very history of Atlantic relations because it breaks through the shackles of colonial dependency by instituting a socialist fraternal chain of work.

Bibliography

Archives

Archivo General de la Nación (AGN)

Archivo Histórico de la Ciudad de México (AHCM)

Archives Nationales de France, Pierfitte-sur-Seine (AN)

Biblioteca Nacional de México-UNAM (BN), Colección Lafragua (LAF)

Hemeroteca Nacional de México (HNM), Fondo Reservado (FR)

Centro de Estudios de Historia de México-CONDUMEX (CEHM-C)

Newspapers

El Estandarte Nacional. Periódico político, literario, artístico, científico, industrial, defensor de las doctrinas y de los intereses sociales

El Monitor Republicano

El Republicano Jalisciense

El Siglo Diez y Nueve

El Universal

La Linterna de Diógenes

Revue Des Deux Mondes

Semanario Artístico Para La Educación y Progreso de Los Artesanos

Primary sources

A Collection of Pamphlets, Chiefly Political, Relating to Mexican Affairs from 1808 to 1864. Vol. 6. 8 vols., 1846. https://access.bl.uk/item/viewer/ark:/81055/vdc_100056228360.0x000001#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=6&xywh=-104%2C-1%2C3287%2C2332.

Adiciones á la Cartilla de enseñanza mutua publicada por la Compañía Lancasteriana, propuestas por el C. José Francisco Zapata, 1835.

Alamán, Lucas. *Memoria Sobre El Estado de La Agricultura é Industria de La República En El Año de 1845, Que La Dirección General de Estos Ramos Presenta al Gobierno Supremo, En El Actual, de 1846, En Cumplimiento Del Art. 26 Del Decreto Orgánico de 2 de Diciembre de 1842.* Mexico City: José Mariano Lara, 1846.

Almonte, Juan M. *Memoria del Ministro de Guerra y Marina, presentada a las Cámaras del Congreso General Mexicano, en Enero de 1840.* Mexico, Imprenta del Águila, 1840.

Álvarez, Juan. *Juan Álvarez, general de división del ejército mexicano, a sus compatriotas*, 1855.

Antonio Escovedo, gobernador constitucional del Departamento de Jalisco, á todos sus habitantes, sabed: que La Ecsma. Asamblea departamental se ha servido remitirme las

comunicaciones oficiales que siguen. Y para que llegue á noticia de todos los habitantes de este Departamento, mando se imprima, publique circule á quienes corresponda. Dado en Guadalajara en el Palacio del Gobierno á 1.o de Noviembre de 1844.

Arizcorreta, Mariano. *Manifestación que hace al público el lic. Mariano Arizcorreta contra la comunicación dirigida a los propietarios de fincas rústicas del Estado de México.* Toluca, Tipografía de Juan Quijano, 1849.

Bazard, Saint Armand, Barthélemy-Prosper Enfantin, Hyppolite Carnot, Henri Fournel, and Charles Duveyrier. *Doctrine de Saint-Simon : Exposition. Première Année 1828-1829.* 3rd ed. revised and Augmented. Paris: Au Bureau du Globe et de L'Organisateur, 1831.

Castro, Rafael. *La cuestión mexicana ó Esposición de las causas que hacían indispensables la intervención europea y el restablecimiento de la monarquía en México como únicos medios de salvar la nacionalidad y la independencia del país.* Mexico City, Imprenta de J. M. Andrade y F. Escalante, 1864.

Chávez, José María, ed. *El Artesano: Manual Enciclopédico de Industria y Artes.* Aguascalientes: Tipografía de José Ma. Chávez, 1856.

Chevalier, Michel. *Lettres Sur l'Amérique Du Nord.* II Bruxelles: Wouters & Co., 1844.

Comunicación del escmo. Sr. General, benemérito de la patria, D. Antonio López de Santa Anna, en que desconoce al poder dictatorial que se ha abrogado el Escmo. Sr. General D. Anastasio Bustamante, Mexico, Imprenta de Luis Heredia, 1841.

Decreto orgánico para el arreglo de la industria agrícola y fabril de la República. Mexico, Imprenta de José María Lara 1842.

Decreto sobre establecimiento de dos escuelas, una de agricultura y una de artes. Mexico City, Imprenta del Águila, 1843.

Enseignement Des Ouvriers : Séance Du Dimanche 18 Décembre 1831 ; Enseignement Des Ouvriers : Séance Du Dimanche 25 Décembre 1831. Paris: Bureau du Globe, 1831.

Estevan de Antuñano, *Exposición que el que suscribe dirige al Soberano Congreso Nacional, probando el prócsimo peligro que amenaza el ramo de algodón, por la subsistencia de la Ley que prohibe la importacion de algodon extranjero en rama, y proponiendo respetuosamente medios para evitar de pronto, y prevenir para lo futuro, este fatal acontecimiento*, Puebla, 1840.

Fourier, Charles. *Le Nouveau Monde Industriel et Sociétaire, Ou Invention Du Procédé d'industrie Attrayante et Naturelle Distribuée En Séries Passionnées.* Paris: Bossange Père/P. Mongie Ainé, 1829.

Gonzaga Vieyra, Luis. *El C. Luis Gonzaga Vieyra, Coronel retirado, y Gobernador Constitucional del Departamento de México*, 1840.

Guénot, Estévan. *PROYECTO de Una Sociedad Protectora de La Industria de La Seda, En La República Mexicana.* Morelia, Imprenta de Ignacio Arango, 1844.

Guénot, Estévan, and Socios. *Sociedad Benéfico-Industrial Del Estado de México, Aprobada Por El Superior Gobierno Del Mismo. Prospecto.* Mexico City: Imprenta del católico, dirigida por Mariano Arévalo, 1847

Guizot, François. *Histoire Des Origines Du Gouvernement Représentatif et Des Institutions Politiques de l'Europe : Depuis La Chute de l'Empire Romain Jusqu'au XIVe Siècle.* Vol. 1. 2 vols. Paris: Didier et Cie, libraires-éditeurs, 1880.

Mora, José María Luis. *Obras Sueltas de Jose Maria Luis Mora, Ciudadano Mejicano: Revista Politica, Credito Publico.* Paris: Libreria de Rosa, 1837.

Otero, Mariano. *Ensayo Sobre El Verdadero Estado de La Cuestion Social y Politica Que Se Agita En La República Mexicana.* Mexico City: Impreso por Ignacio Cumplido, 1842.

Representación dirigida al Congreso de la Unión por 6.124 artesanos pidiendo protección para el trabajo de los nacionales, Mexico, Tipografía de G. Torres, 1851.

Reybaud, Louis. *Études Sur Les Réformateurs Ou Socialistes Modernes. Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen.* Paris: Guillaumin et Cie, Libraires, 1849.

Saint-Simon, Claude-Henri de. *Lettres d'un Habitant de Genève à Ses Contemporains.* Geneva: Barbier, 1802.

———. *Introduction Aux Travaux Scientifiques Du XIXe Siècle.* Vol. 2. Paris: J. L. Scherff, 1808.

———. *Considérations Sur Les Mesures à Prendre Pour Terminer La Révolution, Présentées Au Roi, Ainsi Qu'a Messieurs Les Agriculteurs, Négocians, Manufactiers et Autres Industriels Qui Sont Membres de La Chambre Des Députés; Par Henri de Saint-Simon.* Paris: Imprimerie de Vigor Renaudiere, 1820.

———. *Du Système Industriel.* Paris: Antoine-Augustin Renouard, 1821.

Saint-Simon, Claude-Henri de, and Augustin Thierry. *De La Réorganisation de La Société Européenne, Ou De La Nécessité et Des Moyens de Rassembler Les Peuples de l'Europe En Un Seul Corps Politique, En Conservant à Chacun Son Indépendance Nationale.* Paris: Adrien Égron/Delaunay, 1814.

Tolain, Henri-Louis. *Elections des 20 et 21 Mars 1864. 5e Circonscription H. Tolain candidat de l'opposition.* Paris: imp. de Ed. Blot, 1864.

Turreau Liniers, Eduardo Enrique Teodoro de. *Plan de los Establecimientos Estatutos Generales de la Compañía Mexicana Científico-Industrial, que aprobó el Supremo Gobierno*, Mexico, Imprenta de Ignacio Cumplido, 1835.

Varios poblanos, *Ultimas comunicaciones habidas entre el Sr. Salas y el Sr. Rejon*, Puebla, Imprenta de José María Macias, 1846.

Primary sources in edited volumes

Alamán, Lucas. "Lucas Alamán: Estado y Posibilidades de La Industria. 1842." In *México En El Siglo XIX. Antología de Fuentes e Interpretaciones Históricas, 4a. Ed.*, by Álvaro Matute, 140–48. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, 1994.

Colin, Auguste. "Le Cri Du Peuple." In *Les Révolutions Du XIXe Siècle*, edited by Pierre Marie Sébastien Bigot de Morogues, 4: Naissance du mouvement ouvrier : 1830-1834:3–8. Paris: EDHIS, 1974.

Considerant, Victor. *Principes Du Socialisme : Manifeste de La Démocratie Au XIXe Siècle ; Procès de La Démocratie Pacifique.* Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1978.

De Laponneraye, Albert. "Pétition à La Chambre Des Députés Pour Demander La Radiation de l'article 291 Du Code Pénal Ainsi Conçu: « nulle Association de plus de Vingt Personnes. Ne Pourra Se Former Qu'avec l'agrément Du Gouvernement et Sous Les Conditions Qu'il Plaira à l'autorité Publique d'imposer á La Société [1831]." In *Les Révolutions Du XIXe*

Siècle, edited by Pierre Marie Sébastien Bigot de Morogues, 4: Naissance du mouvement ouvrier : 1830-1834:15. Paris: EDHIS, 1974.

Efrahem, Zael. "De l'association Des Ouvriers de Tous Les Corps d'état." In *Les Révolutions Du XIXe Siècle*, edited by Pierre Marie Sébastien Bigot de Morogues, 4: Naissance du mouvement ouvrier : 1830-1834:1–4. Paris: EDHIS, 1974.

Fourier, Charles. *The Utopian Vision of Charles Fourier. Selected Texts on Work, Love, and Passionate Attraction*. Edited by Jonathan Beecher and Richard Bienvenu. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Leroux, Jules. "Aux Ouvriers Typographes (1833)." In *La Parole Ouvrière: 1830-1851: Textes Rassemblés et Présentés*, edited by Alain Faure and Jacques Rancière, 90–104. Paris: Union générale d'éditions, 1976.

Leroux, Pierre. *Cartas a los filósofos, los artistas y los políticos*. Translated by Antonia Andrea García Castro. Barcelona: Gedisa, 2016.

Löwenstern, Isidore. "Oficios y Costumbres." In *Sociedad y Costumbres*, edited by José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, 275–80. Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara 2. Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1991.

Lozano, José María, and Manuel Dublán. *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*. Vol. 3. 34 vols. Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876.

———. *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*. Vol. 4. 34 vols. Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876.

———. *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*. Vol. 5. 34 vols. Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876.

———. *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*. Vol. 6. 34 vols. Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876.

———. *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*. Vol. 7. 34 vols. Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1876.

———. *Legislación mexicana; ó, colección completa de las disposiciones legislativas expedidas desde la independencia de la república ordenada por los lics. Manuel Dublan y Jose Maria Lozano*. Vol. 8. 34 vols. Mexico City: Imprenta del comercio de Dublan y Lozano, 1877.

Otero, Mariano. "Voto Particular de Mariano Otero (5 de Abril de 1847)." In *Suprema Corte de Justicia. Sus Leyes y Sus Hombres*, 127–41. Mexico City: Suprema Corte de Justicia de la Nación, 1985.

Ramírez, Ignacio. *Salario y Trabajo*. Materiales de Cultura y Divulgación Política Mexicana 9. Mexico City: Partido Revolucionario Institucional/Comité Ejecutivo Nacional, 1974.

Rivera Cambas, Manuel. *Historia de La Intervención Europea y Norteamericana En México: Y Del Imperio de Maximiliano de Habsburgo*. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1987.

Sieyès, Emmanuel Joseph. *El Tercer Estado y Otros Escritos de 1789*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1991.

Zarco, Francisco. *Historia Del Congreso Extraordinario Constituyente, 1856-1857*. Mexico: El Colegio de México, 1956.

Secondary sources and bibliography

Abramson, Pierre-Luc. *Mondes Nouveaux et Nouveau Monde : Les Utopies Sociales En Amérique Latine Au XIXe Siècle*. 2nd ed. Dijon: Les Presses du réel, 2014.

Adelman, Jeremy, and Stephen Aron. "From Borderlands to Borders: Empires, Nation-States, and the Peoples in between in North American History." *The American Historical Review* 104, no. 3 (1999): 814–41. https://doi.org/10.2307/2650990.

Adelman, Jeremy. "An Age of Imperial Revolutions." *The American Historical Review* 113, no. 2 (2008): 319–40.

Agulhon, Maurice. "1830 dans l'histoire du XIXème siècle français." *Romantisme* 10, no. 28 (1980): 15–27. https://doi.org/10.3406/roman.1980.5340.

———. *La République Au Village: Les Populations Du Var de La Révolution à La IIe République*. Paris: Seuil, 1979.

Alamán, Lucas. "Escuela de Agricultura y Artes." In *Hacer Ciudadanos: Educación Para El Trabajo Manufacturero En México En El s. XIX : Antología*, by María Estela Eguiarte Sakar, 113–18. Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, Departamento de Arte, 1989.

Altamirano, Carlos. "Izquierda(s). Breve ensayo sobre la gestación de una noción del lenguaje político moderno." *Prismas - Revista de historia intelectual* 24, no. 2 (October 1, 2020): 159–69. https://doi.org/10.48160/18520499prismas24.1168.

Amaro Peñaflores, René. "La Artesanía En Zacatecas En El Siglo XIX. De La Cultura Oral a La Instrucción Elemental y Técnica." In *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*, edited by Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores, 167–202. Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012.

Aminzade, Ronald. "Reinterpreting Capitalist Industrialization: A Study of Nineteenth-century France." *Social History* 9, no. 3 (October 1, 1984): 329–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/03071028408567600.

———. *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Anceau, Éric. *Napoléon III: Un Saint-Simon à Cheval*. Tallandier, 2020.

Anderson, Benedict Richard O'Gorman. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.

Andrews, Catherine. "El Legado de Las Siete Leyes: Una Reevaluación de Las Aportaciones Del Constitucionalismo Centralista a La Historia Constitucional Mexicana." *Historia Mexicana* 68, no. 4 (April 1, 2019): 1539–92. https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v68i4.3855.

———. "La Actitud de La Administración de Anastasio Bustamante Hacia Los Partidos y La Oposición Política (1830-1832)." In *Partidos, Facciones y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX*, edited by Alfredo Ávila and Alicia Salmerón Castro, 51–75. Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las

Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012.

———. *Entre La Espada y La Constitución: El General Anastasio Bustamante, 1780-1853.* Tamaulipas: Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas/H. Congreso del Estado de Tamaulipas, LX Legislatura, 2008.

Andrews, Naomi J. "Selective Empathy: Workers, Colonial Subjects, and the Affective Politics of French Romantic Socialism." *French Politics, Culture & Society* 36, no. 1 (March 1, 2018): 1–25. https://doi.org/10.3167/fpcs.2018.360101.

Anna, Timothy E. *The Mexican Empire of Iturbide*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1990.

———. "Demystifying Early Nineteenth-Century Mexico." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 9, no. 1 (1993): 119–37. https://doi.org/10.2307/1052103.

Annino, Antonio, and François-Xavier Guerra, eds. *Inventando La Nación: Iberoamérica Siglo XIX*. Obras de Historia. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003.

———. "Cádiz y la revolución territorial en los pueblos mexicanos, 1812-1821." In *Historia de las elecciones en Iberoamérica, siglo XIX: de la formación del espacio político nacional*, 177–266. Mexico City/Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1995.

———. "Ciudadanía 'versus' Gobernabilidad Republicana En México. Los Orígenes de Un Dilema." In *Ciudadanía Política y Formación de Las Naciones: Perspectivas Históricas de América Latina*, edited by Hilda Sábato, 62–93. Mexico City: Colegio de México/Fideicomiso Historia de las Américas/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999.

———. "Pueblos, Liberalismo y Nación En México." In *Inventando La Nación: Iberoamérica Siglo XIX*, edited by François-Xavier Guerra and Antonio Annino, 399–430. Obras de Historia. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003.

Annino, Antonio, and Rafael Rojas. *La Independencia: Los Libros de La Patria*. Herramientas Para La Historia. Mexico City: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2008.

Aprile, Sylvie. "La Gauche Sous Le Second Empire." In *Histoire Des Gauches En France*, edited by Jean-Jacques Becker and Gilles Candar, 85–94. Poche / Sciences Humaines et Sociales. Paris: La Découverte, 2005. https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.becke.2005.01.0085.

Argudín, María Luna, and Reynaldo Sordo Cedeño. "La Vida Política." In *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880:*, edited by Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, 2:33–86. América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea. Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012.

Aricó, José. *La Hipótesis de Justo: Escritos Sobre El Socialismo En América Latina.* Colección Historia y Cultura (Buenos Aires, Argentina). Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1999.

Arrangoiz, Francisco de Paula de. *México Desde 1808 Hasta 1867. Relación de Los Principales Acontecimientos Políticos Que Han Tenido Lugar Desde La Prisión Del Virey Iturrigaray Hasta La Caída Del Segundo Imperio. Tomo Segundo.* Vol. 2. 3 vols. Madrid: Imprenta a cargo de A. Pérez Dubrull, 1871.

Arrom, Silvia M. "Protesta Popular En La Ciudad de México: El Motín Del Parián En 1828." In *Revuelta En Las Ciudades: Políticas Populares En América Latina*, edited by Servando Ortoll and Silvia M. Arrom, 83–116. Biblioteca de Signos 27. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2004.

Ávila, Alfredo. “El Radicalismo Republicano En Hispanoamérica: Un Balance Historiográfico y Una Propuesta de Estudio.” *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 41 (June 1, 2011). https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.2011.41.26584.

———. “El Partido Popular En México.” *Historia y Política: Ideas, Procesos y Movimientos Sociales*, no. 11 (2004): 35–64.

———. “El Triunfo de Los Republicanos.” In *Para La Libertad: Los Republicanos En Tiempos Del Imperio 1821 - 1823*, 213–76. Historia Moderna y Contemporánea. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2004.

———. “Liberalismos Decimonónicos: De La Historia de Las Ideas a La Historia Cultural e Intelectual.” In *Ensayos Sobre La Nueva Historia Política de América Latina*, edited by Guillermo Palacios, 1st ed., 111–46. Siglo XIX. Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2007. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47w53q.10.

———. “México: Un Viejo Nombre Para Una Nueva Nación.” In *Crear La Nación: Los Nombres de Los Países de América Latina*, edited by José Carlos Chiaramonte and Carlos Marichal, 271–84. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 2008.

———. “República (México).” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, edited by Georges Lomné, 1:1332–41. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

Ávila, Alfredo, and Alicia Salmerón Castro, eds. *Partidos, Facciones y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX*. 1st ed. Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012.

Baechler, Jean. “L’universalité de La Nation.” In *La Nation*, edited by Jean Baechler, 9–26. La Pensée Politique 3. Paris: Seuil-Gallimard, 1995.

Balibar, Etienne. *Sobre la dictadura del proletariado*. Translated by Gabriel Albiac. 2nd ed. Madrid: Siglo XXI de España Editores, 2015.

Barreto Zamudio, Carlos. “¿Tata Juan o Pantera Del Sur? Presencia Del General Juan Álvarez En La Región de Morelos, 1828-1860.” In *Historia de Morelos. Tierra, Gente y Tiempos Del Sur*, edited by Horacio Crespo, 2nd ed., 6: Creación del Estado, leyvismo y porfiriato:35–54. Cuernavaca: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, 2018.

Bartolomei, Arnaud, Matthieu de Oliveira, Fabien Eloire, Claire Lemercier, and Nadège Sougy. “L’encastrement Des Relations Entre Marchands En France, 1750-1850: Une Révolution Dans Le Monde Du Commerce ?” *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 72, no. 2 (June 2017): 425–60. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0395264917000592.

———. “The Embeddedness of Inter-Merchant Relations in France, 1750–1850: A Revolution in the World of Commerce?” *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales - English Edition* 72, no. 2 (June 2017): 317–53. https://doi.org/10.1017/ahsse.2019.14.

Bazán Alarcón, Alicia. “El Real Tribunal de La Acordada y La Delincuencia En La Nueva España.” *Historia Mexicana* 13, no. 3 (1964): 317–45.

Bazant, Jan. *Antonio Haro y Tamariz y Sus Aventuras Políticas, 1811-1869*. Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 1985. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv26d8tb.

Beckert, Sven. *Empire of Cotton: A Global History*. New York: Penguin Random House, 2014.

Beecher, Jonathan. *Charles Fourier: The Visionary and His World.* Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986.

———. *Victor Considerant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism.* Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001.

———. “Le Fouriérisme Des Canuts.” In *L’Écho de La Fabrique: Naissance de La Presse Ouvrière à Lyon*, edited by Ludovic Frobert, 111–40. Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2010.

Beezley, William H., and Colin M. MacLachlan. *Mexico’s Crucial Century, 1810-1910: An Introduction.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.

Benini, Romain. “Approche historique de la chanson populaire au début du xixe siècle.” In *Filles du peuple ? : Pour une stylistique de la chanson au XIXe siècle*, 53–95. Signes. Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2021. https://doi.org/10.4000/books.enseditions.17237.

———. “La chanson, voix publique (Paris, 1816-1881).” *Romantisme* 171, no. 1 (2016): 40–52. https://doi.org/10.3917/rom.171.0040.

Bensimon, Fabrice, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, eds. *“Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth”: The First International in a Global Perspective.* Studies in Global Social History, Volume 29. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018.

Bergunder, Michael. “Comparison in the Maelstrom of Historicity: A Postcolonial Perspective on Comparative Religion.” In *Interreligious Comparisons in Religious Studies and Theology : Comparison Revisited*, edited by Perry Schmidt-Leukel and Andreas Nehring, 34–52. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2016.

Berlanstein, Lenard R. “The Distinctiveness of the Nineteenth-Century French Labor Movement.” *The Journal of Modern History* 64, no. 4 (1992): 660–85.

Bernecker, Walther L. *De Agiotistas y Empresarios: En Torno de La Temprana Industrialización Mexicana (Siglo Xix).* Mexico City: Universidad Iberoamericana, 1992.

———. “Manufacturas y Artesanos En México a Finales de La Época Colonial y a Principios de La Independencia.” In *Estudios Sobre La Historia Económica de México: Desde La Época de La Independencia Hasta La Primera Globalización*, edited by Sandra Kuntz Ficker and Reinhard Liehr, 21–48. Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana, vol. 154. Madrid/Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 2013.

Boni, Claudio de. “Le Seduzioni Della Dittatura: Positivismo e Bonapartismo.” In *Bonapartismo Cesarismo e Crisi Della Società: Luigi Napoleone e Il Colpo Di Stato Del 1851*, edited by Manuela Ceretta, 49–73. Studi e Testi 21. Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 2003.

Bouchet, Thomas, Vincent Bourdeau, Edward Castleton, Ludovic Frobert, and François Jarrige. *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l’avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860.* Paris: La Découverte, 2015.

Brading, D. A. “Creole Nationalism and Mexican Liberalism.” *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* 15, no. 2 (1973): 139–90. https://doi.org/10.2307/174695.

Brahami, Frédéric. *La Raison Du Peuple: Un Héritage de La Révolution Française (1789-1848).* Paris: Les Belles lettres, 2016.

Branca-Rosoff, Sonia, and Jacques Guilhaumou. “De ‘Société’ à ‘Socialisme’ : L’invention Néologique et Son Contexte Discursif. Essai de Colinguisme Appliqué.” *Langage & Société* 83, no. 1 (1998): 39–77. https://doi.org/10.3406/lsoc.1998.2813.

Brass, Tom. “(Re-)Defining Labour Coercion?” *Critical Sociology* 44, no. 4–5 (July 1, 2018): 793–803. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920517712368.

Breña, Roberto. “LIBERALISMO. México.” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, edited by Javier Fernández-Sebastián, 1:797–805. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

———. “Charles A. Hale, *El Pensamiento Político En México y Latinoamérica (Artículos y Escritos Breves)*, Gabriel Torres Puga y Josefina Zoraida Vázquez (Eds.), México, El Colegio de México, 2010, 515 p.” *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 43 (June 2012): 178–88.

Brennan, Thomas. “Beyond the Barriers: Popular Culture and Parisian Guinguettes.” *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 18, no. 2 (1984): 153–69. https://doi.org/10.2307/2738534.

Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1g248v9.

Buve, Raymond. “Political Patronage and Politics at the Village Level in Central Mexico: Continuity and Change in Patterns from the Late Colonial Period to the End of the French Intervention (1867).” *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 11, no. 1 (1992): 1–28. https://doi.org/10.2307/3338597.

———. “Los Municipios y El Difícil Proceso de Formación de La Nación En El Siglo XIX. Algunas Reflexiones Sobre Tlaxcala.” In *Nación y Municipio En México, Siglos XIX y XX*, edited by Sergio Miranda Pacheco, 19–54. Serie Historia Moderna y Contemporanea 59. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012.

Buve, Raymond, and Romana Falcón, eds. *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*. 1st ed. Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016.

Cabeza Sánchez-Albornoz, Sonsoles. *Los Sucesos de 1848 En España*. Madrid: Fundación Universitaria Española, 1981.

Cabral Chamorro, Antonio. *Socialismo Utópico y Revolución Burguesa: El Fourierismo Gaditano, 1834-1848*. Cadiz: Diputación Provincial de Cádiz, 1990.

Callegaro, Francesco. “Une Réaction à La Réaction. Les Sciences Sociales et l’héritage Révolutionnaire.” *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 6 (2019): 190–214.

Callegaro, Francesco, and Andrea Lanza, eds. *Le sens du socialisme: histoire et actualité d’un problème sociologique*. Vol. 11. Incidence. Philosophie, littérature, sciences humaines et sociales. Paris: Le Félin, 2015.

Camarena Ocampo, Cuauhtémoc. “Las Luchas de Los Trabajadores Textiles: 1850-1907.” In *Las Luchas Populares En México En El Siglo XIX*, edited by Leticia Reina, 173–233. Mexico City: SEP-Cultura/Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, 1983.

Cantú, Gastón García. *La Intervención Francesa En México*. Mexico City: Clío, 1998.

Capellan, Gonzalo. “Democracia. Iconografía Política de Los Conceptos Fundamentales de La Modernidad.” *Historia y Política: Ideas, Procesos y Movimientos Sociales*, no. 44 (November 19, 2020): 173–217. https://doi.org/10.18042/hp.44.07.

Carbajal Arenas, Lilia. “Los Pioneros de La Industria Textil : El Caso de Cayetano Rubio.” *Tiempo y Escritura*, no. 28 (July 2015): 37–51.

Cárdenas Ayala, Elisa. "NACIÓN. México." In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, edited by Fabio Wasserman, 1:929–40. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

Cárdenas, Enrique. *Cuando Se Originó El Atraso Económico de México: La Economía Mexicana En El Largo Siglo XIX, 1780-1920.* Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2003.

Cardoso, Ciro F. S. "Las Industrias de Transformación (1821-1880)." In *México En El Siglo XIX (1821-1910): Historia Económica y de La Estructura Social*, edited by Ciro F. S. Cardoso, 147–65. Mexico City: Nueva Imagen, 1988.

Carmagnani, Marcello. "Finanzas y Estado En México, 1820-1880." In *Las Finanzas Públicas En Los Siglos XVIII-XIX*, edited by Luis Jáuregui and José Antonio Serrano Ortega, 131–77. Mexico City: Instituto Mora/El Colegio de Michoacán/El Colegio de México/UNAM, 1998.

———. *Las Formas Del Federalismo Mexicano.* Mexico City: Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Coordinación de Investigación y Posgrado, 2005.

Carrillo Azpéitia, Rafael. *Ensayo Sobre La Historia Del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1823-1912.* Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1981.

Castañeda, Juan Carlos Pérez. "Los condueñazgos en México durante el siglo XIX." *Signos Históricos* 20, no. 40 (December 13, 2018): 178–231.

Castoriadis, Cornelius. *L'institution Imaginaire de La Société.* Points Essais 383. Paris: Éd. du Seuil, 2006.

Chaïbi, Olivier. "Le Réalisme d'un Imaginaire Social Passionné. *La Réforme Industrielle Ou Le Phalanstère.*" In *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, edited by Thomas Bouchet, 97–102. Paris: La Découverte, 2015.

Chávez Orozco, Luis. *Prehistoria Del Socialismo En México.* Mexico City: Publicaciones del Departamento de Bibliotecas de la Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1936.

———, ed. *El Comercio Exterior y El Artesano Mexicano (1825-1830).* Mexico City: Publicaciones del Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior, 1965.

Chevalier, François. "La Libertad Municipal, Antigua y Permanente Reivindicación Mexicana." Translated by Marta Pou. *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 51, no. 2 (1989): 433–49. https://doi.org/10.2307/3540696.

Chignola, Sandro, and Giuseppe Duso. *Historia de los conceptos y filosofía política.* Edited by José Luis Villacañas. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2009.

———. "Constitución y limitación del poder." In *El poder: para una historia de la filosofía política moderna*, edited by Giuseppe Duso, 159–62. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2007.

———. "Sul Paradosso Del Liberalismo Francese." *Filosofia Politica*, no. 3 (1999): 473–84. https://doi.org/10.1416/11018.

———. *Il Tempo Rovesciato: La Restaurazione e Il Governo Della Democrazia.* Bologna: Il mulino, 2011.

Chust, Manuel, and José Antonio Serrano. "Adiós a Cádiz: El Liberalismo, El Doceañismo y La Revolución En México, 1820-1835." In *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1800-1850*, edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O., 191–225. Publicaciones Del Programa Iberoamérica: 200 Años de Convivencia Independiente. Madrid: Fundación Mapfre/Instituto de Cultura, 2008.

Coatsworth, John H. *Los Orígenes Del Atraso: Nueve Ensayos de Historia Económica de México En Los Siglos XVIII y XIX.* Mexico City: Alianza Editorial, 1990.

Coilly, Nathalie, and Philippe Régnier, eds. *Le Siècle Des Saint-Simoniens: Du Nouveau Christianisme Au Canal de Suez.* Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 2006.

Collins, Jeffrey R. *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Connaughton, Brian. *Dimensiones de La Identidad Patriótica: Religión, Política y Regiones En México, Siglo XIX.* Biblioteca de Signos. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa/Miguel Ángel Porrúa, 2001.

———. "El Difícil Juego de 'Tres Dados: La Ley, La Opinión y Las Armas' En La Construcción Del Estado Mexicano, 1835-1850." In *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política*, edited by Brian Connaughton, 339–78. Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003.

———. "Los Curas y La Feligresía Ciudadana En México, Siglo XIX." In *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1800-1850*, edited by Jaime E. Rodríguez O., 241–72. Publicaciones Del Programa Iberoamérica: 200 Años de Convivencia Independiente. Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, Instituto de Cultura, 2008.

Contreras Valdéz, María, and Antonio Ibarra. "El Proceso Económico." In *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880:*, edited by Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, 2:145–95. América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea. Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012.

Cordillot, Michel. "Le Mouvement Ouvrier Français à La Croisée Des Chemins : Mutualisme et/Ou Résistance à La Fin Du Second Empire." In *Démocratie, Solidarité et Mutualité: Autour de La Loi de 1898*, edited by Michel Dreyfus, Bernard Gibaud, and André Gueslin, 27–39. Paris: Mutualité Française, 1999.

———. "Socialismo y Comunismo En Francia, 1830-1848." In *Mundos Posibles: El Primer Socialismo En Europa y América Latina*, edited by Carlos Illades and Andrey Schelchkov, 37–61. Colección "Ambas Orillas." Mexico City: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Cuajimalpa, 2014.

Costeloe, Michael P. "The Triangular Revolt in Mexico and the Fall of Anastasio Bustamante, August-October 1841." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 20, no. 2 (1988): 337–60.

———. "Los generales Santa Anna y Paredes y Arrillaga en México, 1841-1843: rivales por el poder, o una copa más." *Historia Mexicana* 39, no. 154 (October 1, 1989): 417–40.

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

———. "Mariano Arizcorreta and Peasant Unrest in the State of Mexico, 1849." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 63–79.

———. "Mariano Arista and the 1850 Presidential Election in Mexico." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 18, no. 1 (1999): 51–70. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-9856.1999.tb00187.x.

Cottereau, Alain. "The fate of collective manufactures in the industrial world: the silk industries of Lyons and London, 1800-1850." In *World of possibilities : flexibility and mass production in Western industrialization*, edited by Charles F. Sabel and Jonathan. Zeitlin, 75–172. Paris; Cambridge: Maison des sciences de l'homme ; Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. "Droit et bon droit. Un droit des ouvriers instauré, puis évincé par le droit du travail (France, XIX e siècle)." *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 57, no. 6 (December 2002): 1521–57. https://doi.org/10.3406/ahess.2002.280123.

———. "La Désincorporation Des Métiers et Leur Transformation En Publics Intermédiaires : Lyon et Elbeuf, 1790-1815." In *La France, Malade Du Corporatisme? XVIIIe-XXe Siècles*, edited by Steven L. Kaplan and Philippe Minard, 97–147. Socio-Histoires. Paris: Belin, 2004. http://cems.ehess.fr/docannexe/file/3362/cottereau_la_de_sincorporation_des_me_tiers_.pdf.

———. "Sens du juste et usages du droit du travail : une évolution contrastée entre la France et la Grande-Bretagne au xixe siècle." *Revue d'histoire du XIXe siècle. Société d'histoire de la révolution de 1848 et des révolutions du XIXe siècle*, no. 33 (December 1, 2006): 101–20.

Covarrubias, José Enrique. *La Moneda de Cobre En México, 1760-1842: Un Problema Administrativo.* Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de MéxicoI-Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas/Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2000.

Crouzet, François. "The Historiography of French Economic Growth in the Nineteenth Century." *The Economic History Review* 56, no. 2 (2003): 215–42.

Cruz Reyes, Yazmín Adriana. "Las clases menesterosas: ¿asunto de Estado o filantropía?" In *Derecho, Guerra de Reforma, intervención francesa y segundo imperio. A 160 años de las Leyes de Reforma*, edited by Miguel Ángel García Olivo, Sebastián Daniel Ojeda Bravo, Aníbal Peña, Manuel Rodríguez Baca, and José Luis Soberanes Fernández, 79–92. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, 2020.

Da Silva, Nicolas. "Mutualité et capitalisme entre 1789 et 1947 : de la subversion à l'intégration." *RECMA* 357, no. 3 (2020): 36–51. https://doi.org/10.3917/recma.357.0036.

De la Rosa Lorente, Miquel. "Liberals and the Empire : Responses to French Expansionism under Napoleon III in Algeria, Cochinchina and Mexico (c. 1858-1870)." PhD Thesis, European University Institute, 2017.

De la Torre, Federico. *El Patrimonio Industrial Jalisciense Del Siglo XIX: Entre Fábricas de Textiles, de Papel, y de Fierro.* Guadalajara: Secretaría de Cultura, Gobierno de Jalisco, 2007.

———. "Les Idées Socialistes Au Mexique Au Milieu Du XIXe Siècle. Guadalajara et Ses Liens Avec Le Fouriérisme de Victor Considerant." *Cahiers Charles Fourier*, no. 19 (2008). http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article568.

———. "Ciencia, Industrialización y Utopía Social: Notas Sobre Vicente Ortigosa de Los Ríos, 1817-1877." *Letras Históricas*, no. 5 (2012): 53–79.

———. *Entre La Quimera y La Realidad. Industrialización y Utopía Social En Jalisco (Siglo XIX).* Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara-Centro Universitario de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2021.

De Lima Grecco, Gabriela, and Sven Schuster. "Decolonizing Global History? A Latin American Perspective." *Journal of World History* 31, no. 2 (2020): 425–46. https://doi.org/10.1353/jwh.2020.0024.

De Vito, Christian G. "History Without Scale: The Micro-Spatial Perspective*." *Past & Present* 242, no. Supplement_14 (November 1, 2019): 348–72. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz048.

De Vito, Christian G, Juliane Schiel, and Matthias van Rossum. "From Bondage to Precariousness? New Perspectives on Labor and Social History." *Journal of Social History* 54, no. 2 (November 1, 2020): 644–62. https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shz057.

Del Castillo, Lina. "Inventing Columbia/Colombia." In *The First Wave of Decolonization*, edited by Mark Thurner, 48–76. Routledge Studies in Global Latin America. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2019.

Dereymez, Jean-William. "Naissance Du Syndicalisme." In *Histoire Des Gauches En France*, 463–87. Poche / Sciences Humaines et Sociales. Paris: La Découverte, 2005. https://doi.org/10.3917/dec.becke.2005.01.0463.

Descombes, Vincent. "The Problem Of Collective Identity: The Instituting We And The Instituted We." In *Recognition and Social Ontology*, edited by Arto Laitinen and Heikki Ikaheimo, 373–89. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

———. *Les Embarras de l'identité*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 2013.

———. "L'identité de groupe : identités sociales, identités collectives." *Raisons politiques* 66, no. 2 (2017): 13–28. https://doi.org/10.3917/rai.066.0013.

———. "L'institution au sens large," 19–34. Bibliothèque de la pensée juridique. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2021. https://doi.org/10.15122/isbn.978-2-406-10753-8.p.0019.

Desmars, Bernard. "À La Conquête de l'espace Public. Les Fouriéristes et *La Démocratie Pacifique*." In *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l'avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, edited by Thomas Bouchet, Vincent Bourdeau, Edward Castleton, Ludovic Frobert, and François Jarrige, 190–202. Paris: La Découverte, 2015.

Di Tella, Torcuato S. "The Dangerous Classes in Early Nineteenth Century Mexico." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 5, no. 1 (1973): 79–105.

Dreyfus, Michel. *Liberté, Égalité, Mutualité: Mutualisme et Syndicalisme, 1852-1967*. Paris: Editions de l'Atelier, 2001.

Drolet, Michael. "Industry, Class and Society: A Historiographic Reinterpretation of Michel Chevalier*." *The English Historical Review* CXXIII, no. 504 (October 1, 2008): 1229–71. https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cen252.

Droz, Jacques. *Histoire Générale Du Socialisme: Des Origines à 1875*. Vol. 1. 4 vols. Quadrige. Paris: PUF, 1997.

Dubos, Jean-Claude, and Jean-Claude Sosnowski. "Cazeaux, Pierre-Guillaume." In *Dictionnaire Biographique Du Fouriérisme*. Accessed September 3, 2022. http://www.charlesfourier.fr/spip.php?article647.

Dumont, Louis. *Homo Aequalis: Génesis y Apogeo de La Ideología Económica*. Madrid: Taurus Ediciones, S.A.-Grupo Santillana, 1982.

———. *Ensayos sobre el individualismo: una perspectiva antropológica sobre la ideología moderna*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1987.

———. *Essays on Individualism: Modern Ideology in Anthropological Perspective*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Duncan, Robert H. "Political Legitimation and Maximilian's Second Empire in Mexico, 1864-1867." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 12, no. 1 (1996): 27–66. https://doi.org/10.2307/1052077.

Durand, Jorge. “La Industria Textil En El Siglo XIX.” In *Industria y Comercio*, edited by José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, 21–32. Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara 5. Mexico: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1993.

Duso, Giuseppe. “Revolución y constitución del poder.” In *El poder: para una historia de la filosofía política moderna*, edited by Giuseppe Duso, 164–71. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2007.

———. “El Poder y El Nacimiento de Los Conceptos Políticos Modernos.” In *Historia de Los Conceptos y Filosofía Política*, 197–242. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2009.

———. *La representación política: génesis y crisis de un concepto.* San Martin: UNSAM EDITA, 2016.

Echeverria, Ignacio. “Acta Del Pronunciamiento de Cuernavaca.” The Pronunciamiento in Independent Mexico 1821-1876, May 25, 1834. https://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/dates.php?f=y&pid=1004&m=5&y=1834.

Eguiarte Sakar, María Estela, ed. *Hacer Ciudadanos. Educación Para El Trabajo Manufacturero En El s. XIX En México. Antología.* Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana, Departamento de Arte, 1989.

Escobar Ohmstede, Antonio, and Matthew Butler, eds. *Mexico in Transition: New Perspectives on Mexican Agrarian History, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries/México y Sus Transiciones : Reconsideraciones Sobre La Historia Agraria Mexicana, Siglos XIX y XX.* 1st ed. México, D.F.: CIESAS, 2013.

Estrada, Dorothy Tanck. *La Educación Ilustrada, 1786-1836: Educación Primaria En La Ciudad de México.* 2nd ed. Mexico City: Colegio de Mexico, 1984. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv233nzb.

Falcón, Romana. *Las Rasgaduras de La Descolonización: Españoles y Mexicanos a Mediados Del Siglo XIX.* Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1996.

———. *El Jefe Político: Un Dominio Negociado En El Mundo Rural Del Estado de México, 1856-1911.* Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2015.

———. “En Medio Del Asedio Bélico. Defensas Institucionales, Resistencias y Rebeliones de Los Pueblos Del Centro y Sur Del País, 1846-1856.” In *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, edited by Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 143–70. Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016.

Faure, Alain. “Spéculation et société : les grands travaux à Paris au XIXe siècle.” *Histoire, économie & société* 23, no. 3 (2004): 433–48. https://doi.org/10.3917/hes.043.0433.

———. “L’industriel et Le Politique. Qui a Peur de l’industrie à Paris Au XIXe Siècle ?,” *Revue Dhistoire Moderne Contemporaine* 65, no. 1 (2018): 29–69.

Fernández-Sebastián, Javier. “Liberalismos Nacientes En El Atlántico Iberoamericano: ‘Liberal’ Como Concepto y Como Identidad Política, 1750-1850.” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, edited by Javier Fernández-Sebastián, 1:695–731. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

———. “El Concepto de Orden En Iberoamérica. El Orden Entre Dos Voluntades: Divina y Humana.” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, edited by Carol Leal Curiel, 6:15–51. Iberconceptos 2. Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014.

———. “Tiempos de Transición En El Atlántico Ibérico. Conceptos Políticos En Revolución.” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, edited by Joao Feres Junior, 1:25–72. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014.

———. “¿Cómo clasificamos a la gente del pasado? Categorías sociales, clases e identidades anacrónicas.” *Historia y Grafía*, no. 45 (July 14, 2015): 13–56. https://doi.org/10.48102/hyg.vi45.106.

———. *Historia Conceptual En El Atlántico Ibérico: Lenguajes, Tiempos, Revoluciones*. Sección de Obras de Historia. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2021.

Fernández Sebastián, Javier, and Luis Fernández Torres. “Iberconceptos: un proyecto de investigación en red: cuestiones teórico-metodológicas y organizativas.” *Spagna contemporanea*, no. 51 (2017): 153–75.

Fernández Sebastián, Javier, and Juan Francisco Fuentes, eds. *Diccionario Político y Social Del Siglo XIX Español*. Alianza Diccionarios. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2002.

Ferreira, Melo, and Fátima Sá. “Entre Viejos y Nuevos Sentidos: ‘Pueblo’ y ‘Pueblos’ En El Mundo Iberoamericano Entre 1750 y 1850.” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, edited by Melo Ferreira and Fátima Sá, 1:1117–38. Iberconceptos 1. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended*. London: Penguin, 2003.

Fowler, Will. “Dreams of Stability: Mexican Political Thought during the ‘Forgotten Years’. An Analysis of the Beliefs of the Creole Intelligentsia (1821-1853).” *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 14, no. 3 (1995): 287–312.

———. “Valentín Gómez Farías: Perceptions of Radicalism in Independent Mexico, 1821-1847.” *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 39–62.

———. *Mexico in the Age of Proposals, 1821-1853*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1998.

———. *Tornel and Santa Anna: The Writer and the Caudillo, Mexico, 1795-1853*. Contributions in Latin American Studies. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000.

———. *Santa Anna of Mexico*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2007.

———. “El México de Los Años de La Intervención Estadounidense y La Posguerra (1846-1856).” In *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, edited by Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed., 25–40. Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016.

———. *Independent Mexico: The Pronunciamiento in the Age of Santa Anna, 1821–1858*. University of Nebraska Press, 2016.

———. “The Sierra Gorda *Pronunciamientos* of 1848–1849 and the Origins of Popular Conservatism in Mexico.” In *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, edited by Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, 116–40. New York: Routledge, 2018.

———. *The Grammar of Civil War: A Mexican Case Study, 1857–61*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2022.

Freeden, Michael. *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*. Very Short Introductions 95. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Frobert, Ludovic. “Politique et économie politique chez Pierre et Jules Leroux.” *Revue d’histoire du XIXe siècle. Société d’histoire de la révolution de 1848 et des révolutions du XIXe siècle*, no. 40 (July 15, 2010): 77–94. https://doi.org/10.4000/rh19.3992.

———. “French Utopian Socialists as the First Pioneers in Development.” *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 35, no. 4 (2011): 729–49.

Frobert, Ludovic, and François Jarrige. “The Economy of Work.” In *A Cultural History of Work in the Age of Empire*, edited by Victoria E. Thompson, 15–30. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.

Galeana, Patricia. *La Disputa Por La Soberanía (1821-1876).* 1st ed. Vol. 3. 9 vols. Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2010. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3f8nk7.

Galinzoga, Jesús Ávila, ed. *La Educación Técnica En México Desde La Independencia, 1810-2010.* Vol. I: De la enseñanza de arte y oficios a la educación técnica, 1810-1909. 3 vols. Mexico: Instituto Politécnico Nacional, Presidencia del Decanato, 2011.

García Cantú, Gastón. *El socialismo en México, siglo XIX.* Mexico City: Era, 1969.

———. *Idea de México. El Socialismo.* Vol. 2. Vida y Pensamiento de México. Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1991.

Garriga, Carlos. “Orden Jurídico y Poder Político En El Antiguo Régimen.” *Istor: Revista de Historia Internacional* IV, no. 16 (2004): 1–21.

Gayón Córdova, María. *Condiciones de Vida y de Trabajo En La Ciudad de México En El Siglo XIX.* Mexico City: Dirección de Estudios Históricos-Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1988.

Gibaud, Bernard. “Mutualité/Sécurité Sociale Un Couple Sous Tension.” *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d’histoire*, no. 48 (1995): 119–30. https://doi.org/10.2307/3770218.

Gobat, Michel. “The Invention of Latin America: A Transnational History of Anti-Imperialism, Democracy, and Race.” *The American Historical Review* 118, no. 5 (December 1, 2013): 1345–75. https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/118.5.1345.

Goldman, Noemí, ed. *Lenguaje y Revolución: Conceptos Políticos Clave En El Río de La Plata, 1780-1850.* Buenos Aires: Prometeo Libros Editorial, 2008.

———. “Soberanía En Iberoamérica. Dimensiones y Dilemas de Un Concepto Político Fundamental, 1780-1870.” In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, edited by Noemí Goldman, 10:15–41. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014.

González Navarro, Moisés. “Las Guerras de Castas.” *Historia Mexicana* 26, no. 1 (1976): 70–106.

———. *Anatomía Del Poder En México, 1848-1853.* Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1977.

———. “Tipología Del Liberalismo Mexicano.” *Historia Mexicana* 32, no. 2 (October 1, 1982): 198–225.

———. “La Era de Santa Anna.” In *Historia Documental de México*, edited by Miguel León Portilla, 4th ed., 2:207–320. Serie Documental / Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2013.

González y González, Luis. “La Unión Hace La Huelga (1867-1876).” *El Trimestre Económico* 24, no. 93(1) (1957): 22–32.

González, Héctor Oscar. “Dos Proyectos de Sociedades de Artesanos: Guadalajara, 1850.” *Relaciones. Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* 10 (1982): 97–139.

Gonzalez, Matias X. “Desde El *Sozialismus* Hacia El *Socialisme*, Ida y Vuelta. Por Una Historia Conceptual Inter-Conectada Del Socialismo.” *Conceptos Históricos* 6, no. 10 (2021): 122–53.

———. “El socialismo en su lugar. La «organización social» de la nación y los orígenes intersociales del primer socialismo mexicano hacia 1850.” *Historia Y Memoria*, no. 24 (2022): 177–224. https://doi.org/10.19053/20275137.n24.2022.13537.

———. “Altering the Nation from Within: The Mexican ‘Working Nation’ in the 1840s.” *JHI Blog* (blog), August 19, 2022. https://jhiblog.org/2022/08/19/altering-the-nation-from-within-the-mexican-working-nation-in-the-1840s/.

Gossez, Rémi. *Les Ouvriers de Paris. L’organisation, 1848-1851.* La Roche sur Yon: Imprimerie centrale de l’ouest, 1967.

Grandjonc, Jacques. *Communisme, Kommunismus, Communism: Origine et Développement International de La Terminologie Communautaire Prémarxiste Des Utopistes Aux Néo-Babouvistes : 1785-1842.* Trier: Karl-Marx-Haus, 1989.

Greenberg, Amy S. “Nicholas Trist: Diplomático Sin Autorización.” In *Embajadores de Estados Unidos En México.*, edited by Roberta Lajous, Erika Pani, Paolo Riguzzi, and María Celia Toro, 49–68. Diplomacia de Crisis y Oportunidades. El Colegio de Mexico, 2021. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2kcwnm2.7.

Gribaudi, Maurizio. *Paris, Ville Ouvrière: Une Histoire Occultée, 1789-1848.* Paris: La Découverte, 2014.

Gribaudi, Maurizio, and Michèle Riot-Sarcey. *1848, La Révolution Oubliée.* Paris: La Découverte, 2008.

Guardino, Peter. “Barbarism or Republican Law? Guerrero’s Peasants and National Politics, 1820-1846.” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 75, no. 2 (May 1995): 185–213.

———. *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico’s National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

———. “‘Me ha cabido en la fatalidad’. Gobierno indígena y gobierno republicano en los pueblos indígenas: Oaxaca,1750-1850.” *Desacatos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, no. 5 (2000): 119–30.

———. “Antonio Escobar Ohmstede and Matthew Butler (Eds.), Mexico in Transition: New Perspectives on Mexican Agrarian History, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.” *Mundo Agrario: Revista de Estudios Rurales* 16, no. 33 (2015). http://www.memoria.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/art_revistas/pr.7118/pr.7118.pdf.

———. *The Dead March: A History of the Mexican-American War.* Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press, 2017.

———. “CONNECTED COMMUNITIES: Villagers and Wider Social Systems in the Late Colonial and Early National Periods.” In *Beyond Alterity. Destabilizing the Indigenous Other in Mexico*, edited by Paula López Caballero and Ariadna Acevedo-Rodrigo, 61–83. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018.

Guerra, François-Xavier. *Modernidad e independencias: ensayos sobre las revoluciones hispánicas.* Madrid: Editorial MAPFRE, 1992.

———. “La Nation En Amérique Espagnole : Le Problème Des Origines.” In *La Nation*, edited by Jean Baechler, 85–106. La Pensée Politique 3. Paris: Seuil-Gallimard, 1995.

———. “Las Metamorfosis de La Representación En El Siglo XIX.” In *Pensar La Modernidad Política: Propuestas Desde La Nueva Historia Política : Antología*, edited by Alicia Salmerón Castro and Cecilia Noriega Elío, 183–216. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2016.

Guilhaumou, Jacques. “El Lenguaje Político y La Revolución Francesa: El Universo Discursivo de Las Nociones-Concepto.” In *El Mundo En Movimiento: El Concepto de Revolución En Iberoamérica y El Atlántico Norte (Siglos XVII-XX)*, by Fabio Wasserman, 71–102. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila, 2019.

Guillerme, André. “La Chimie Parisienne Entre Artisanat et Industrie (1760–1830).” *Comptes Rendus Chimie*, Histoire de la Chimie / The History of Chemistry, 15, no. 7 (2012): 569–79.

Guzmán Muñoz, María del Socorro. “Sotero Prieto Olasagarre. Un Visionario Decimonónico.” *Relaciones. Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* XXlX, no. 116 (2008): 117–32.

Haber, Stephen H. “La economía mexicana, 1830-1940: obstáculos a la industrialización (II).” *Revista de Historia Económica = Journal of Iberian and Latin American Economic History* 8, no. 2 (1990): 335–62.

Haine, W. Scott. “‘Cafe Friend’: Friendship and Fraternity in Parisian Working-Class Cafes, 1850-1914.” *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no. 4 (1992): 607–26.

Hale, Charles A. *El Liberalismo Mexicano En La Época de Mora: 1821-1853*. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 1982.

———. “Political and Social Ideas in Latin America, 1870–1930.” In *The Cambridge History of Latin America: Volume 4: C.1870 to 1930*, edited by Leslie Bethell, 4:367–442. The Cambridge History of Latin America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521232258.011.

Hamnett, Brian. “The Comonfort Presidency, 1855-1857.” *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 81–100.

———. “Liberales y Conservadores Ante El Mundo de Los Pueblos, 1840-1870.” In *Los Pueblos Indios y El Parteaguas de La Independencia de México*, edited by Manuel Ferrer Muñoz, 167–207. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Jurídicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1999.

Harison, Casey. “An Organization of Labor: Laissez-Faire and Marchandage in the Paris Building Trades through 1848.” *French Historical Studies* 20, no. 3 (1997): 357–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/286850.

———. “‘*La Question Du Marchandage*’: The Political and Legal Struggle Against Exploitative Subcontracting in Paris, 1881—1911.” *European History Quarterly* 32, no. 4 (October 1, 2002): 451–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269142002032004146.

Hayat, Samuel. “Running in Protest. The Impossible Candidacy of François-Vincent Raspail, December 1848.” Translated by Sarah-Louise Raillard. *Revue Française de Science Politique* 64, no. 5 (2014): 1–35.

Hayek, Friedrich August. *The Counter-Revolution of Science: Studies on the Abuse of Reason*. Indianapolis: Liberty Press, 1979.

Hazareesingh, Sudhir. *From Subject to Citizen: The Second Empire and the Emergence of Modern French Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Hermosa, Jesús. *Manual de Geografía y Estadística de La República Mexicana*. Mexico City: Instituto Mora, 1991.

Hernández Chávez, Alicia. “Monarquía-República-Nación-Pueblo.” In *Ensayos Sobre La Nueva Historia Política de América Latina*, edited by Guillermo Palacios, 147–70. Siglo XIX. Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2007. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv47w53q.11.

Herzog, Tamar. “Did European Law Turn American?: Territory, Property and Rights in an Atlantic World.” In *New Horizons in Spanish Colonial Law*, edited by Thomas Duve and Heikki Pihlajamäki, 3:75–96. Contributions to Transnational Early Modern Legal History. Frankfurt am Main: Max Planck Institute for Legal History and Legal Theory, 2015.

Hipólito Estrada, Francisco Iván. “Contrabando y rebelión: la pugna por el control de tabaco durante la primera mitad del siglo XIX en México y sus repercusiones en la Sierra Gorda.” *Oficio. Revista de historia e interdisciplina*, June 30, 2018, 79–92. https://doi.org/10.15174/orhi.v0i7.65.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Workers: Worlds of Labor*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

———. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

———. *The Age of Capital, 1848-1875*. London: Abacus, 2003.

Hobsbawm, Eric. J., and Joan Wallach Scott. “Political Shoemakers.” *Past & Present* 89, no. 1 (November 1, 1980): 86–114. https://doi.org/10.1093/past/89.1.86.

Hofmeester, Karin, and Marcel van der Linden. *Handbook Global History of Work*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2017.

Hormigo, Alfonso Sánchez. “Saint-Simonianism and Economic Thought in Spain (1834-1838).” *History of Economic Ideas* 17, no. 2 (2009): 121–54.

Huard, Raymond. “Histoire intellectuelle et histoire par en bas : les candidatures ouvrières de la Révolution à 1870.” *Romantisme* 135, no. 1 (2007): 23–35. https://doi.org/10.3917/rom.135.0023.

Hupfel, Simon, and George Sheridan. “À La Recherche d’une Démocratie d’ateliers. *L’Écho de La Fabrique* Des Canuts.” In *Quand Les Socialistes Inventaient l’avenir. Presse, Théories et Expériences, 1825-1860*, edited by Thomas Bouchet, 113–26. Paris: La Découverte, 2015.

Ibarra García, Laura. “Las ideas de Ignacio Ramírez, El Nigromante Su significado en la historia del pensamiento mexicano.” *Iztapalapa. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades* 33, no. 72/1 (2012): 153–78.

Ifversen, Jan. “The Birth of International Conceptual History.” *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 16, no. 1 (June 1, 2021): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2020.160101.

Illades, Carlos. “La Empresa Industrial de Estevan de Antuñano (1831-1847).” *Secuencia*, no. 15 (January 1, 1989): 028. https://doi.org/10.18234/secuencia.v0i15.269.

———. “De Los Gremios a Las Sociedades de Socorros Mutuos: El Artesanado Mexicano. 1814-1853.” *Historia Social*, no. 8 (1990): 73–87.

———. “El Proceso de Organización de Los Artesanos de Ciudad de México, 1853-1876.” *Revista Europea de Estudios Latinoamericanos y Del Caribe / European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, no. 59 (1995): 59–75.

———. *Las otras ideas: estudio sobre el primer socialismo en México, 1850-1935*. Mexico City: Ediciones Era : Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Cuajimalpa, 2008.

———. *Conflicto, Dominación y Violencia: Capítulos de Historia Social*. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa/Gedisa, 2015.

———. *Hacia La República Del Trabajo: El Mutualismo Artesanal Del Siglo XIX*. 2nd ed. Mexico City: Gedisa/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 2016.

Illades, Carlos, and Andrey Schelchkov, eds. *Mundos Posibles: El Primer Socialismo En Europa y América Latina*. Colección "Ambas Orillas." Mexico City: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Cuajimalpa, 2014.

Ionescu, Ghiţa. "Introducción." In *El Pensamiento Político de Saint-Simon*, 11–85. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2005.

Israel, Jonathan. "The Revolutions of 1848: Democratic Republicanism versus Socialism." In *The Expanding Blaze. How the American Revolution Ignited the World, 1775-1848*, 547–67. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400888276-022.

Jarrige, François. "The Gender of the Machine. Printing Workers and Mechanical Typesetting (France, England, 1840–1880)." *Revue Dhistoire Moderne Contemporaine* 54, no. 1 (2007): 193–221.

Jarrige, François, and Cécile Chalmin. "The Emergence of the Foreman. The Ambivalence of an Authority under Construction in the French Textile Industry (1800–1860)." *Le Mouvement Social* 224, no. 3 (September 10, 2008): 47–60.

Jaume, Lucien. *L'individu Effacé, Ou, Le Paradoxe Du Libéralisme Français*. Paris: Fayard, 1997.

Jáuregui, Luis. "Los Ministros, Las Memorias de Hacienda y El Presupuesto En México, 1825-1855 Una Visión Desde El Gasto Público." *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 48 (July 1, 2014): 3–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0185-2620(14)71426-4.

Judt, Tony. "The French Labour Movement in the Nineteenth Century." In *Marxism and the French Left*, 24–114. Studies on Labour and Politics in France, 1830-1981. New York: NYU Press, 2011.

Kaplan, Steven L., and Philippe Minard, eds. *La France, Malade Du Corporatisme?: XVIIIe-XXe Siècles*. Paris: Belin, 2004.

Karsenti, Bruno. "Introduction: radicalité du socialisme." In *Le sens du socialisme: histoire et actualité d'un problème sociologique*, edited by Francesco Callegaro and Andrea Lanza, 11:9–27. Incidence. Philosophie, littérature, sciences humaines et sociales. Paris: Le Félin, 2015.

Katz, Friedrich. "Mexico: Restored Republic and Porfiriato, 1867–1910." In *The Cambridge History of Latin America V: 1870-1930*, edited by Leslie Bethell, 5:1–78. The Cambridge History of Latin America. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521245173.002.

Kelly, Patrick J. "The North American Crisis of the 1860s." *Journal of the Civil War Era* 2, no. 3 (2012): 337–68.

Kocka, Jürgen, and Marcel van der Linden. *Capitalism: The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016.

Komlosy, Andrea. "Work and Labor Relations." In *Capitalism: The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*, edited by Jürgen Kocka and Marcel van der Linden, 33–70. New York/London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2016.

Koselleck, Reinhart. “Begriffsgeschichte Und Sozialgeschichte.” In *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik Geschichtlicher Zeiten*, 107–29. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979.

———. “‘Erfahrungsraum’ Und ‘Erwartungshorizont’: Zwei Historische Kategorien.” In *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik Geschichtlicher Zeiten*, 349–75. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979.

———. “Historia, historias y estructuras formales del tiempo.” In *Futuro pasado: para una semántica de los tiempos históricos*, 127–40. Barcelona: Paidós, 1993.

———. *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2002.

———. “Introduction and Prefaces to the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe: (Basic Concepts in History: A Historical Dictionary of Political and Social Language in Germany).” Translated by Michaela Richter. *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 6, no. 1 (June 1, 2011): 1–37. https://doi.org/10.3167/choc.2011.060102.

———. *Sediments of Time: On Possible Histories*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018.

Krauze, Enrique. *Mexico: Biography of Power*. New York: HarperCollins, 1998.

Kulstein, David I. “The Attitude of French Workers towards the Second Empire.” *French Historical Studies* 2, no. 3 (1962): 356–75. https://doi.org/10.2307/285886.

Lanza, Andrea. “1848 Comme Reconfiguration Des Discours Politiques.” *POLIS Working Papers*, no. 135 (March 2009): 1–35.

———. *All’abolizione Del Proletariato! Il Discorso Socialista Fraternitario, Parigi 1839-1847.* Studi e Ricerche Storiche. Milan: FrancoAngeli, 2010.

———. “Fraternité e Solidarité Intorno al 1848. Tracce Di Un Approccio Sociologico.” *Scienza & Politica. Per Una Storia Delle Dottrine* 26, no. 51 (December 28, 2014): 17–39. https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1825-9618/4627.

Leal, Juan Felipe. “Artesanado Urbano.” In *La Clase Obrera En La Historia de México: Del Estado Liberal a Los Inicios de La Dictadura Porfirista*, edited by Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, 2:121–201. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Ed, 1988.

Lechevalier, Jules. *Lettre Sur La Division Survenue Dans l’association Saint-Simonienne : Aux Saint-Simoniens*. Paris: Imprimerie d’Éverat, 1831.

Ledezma, Juan Real. *Enciclopedia histórica y biográfica de la Universidad de Guadalajara*. Vol. 1: La Real Universidad de Guadalajara, 1791–1821. 5 vols. Guadalajara: Editorial Universitaria, 2017. http://enciclopedia.udg.mx/articulos/maldonado-y-ocampo-francisco-severo.

Lefort, Claude. “Permanence Du Théologico-Politique?” *Le Temps de La Réflexion* 2, no. 13 (1981): 13-60.

———. “La Question de La Démocratie.” In *Le Retrait Du Politique: Travaux Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique*, edited by Jacob Rogozinski and Jean-Luc Nancy, 71–88. Cahiers Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique. Paris: Galilée, 1983.

Lehmann, Hartmut, and Melvin Richter, eds. *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte*. Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute, 1996.

Lempérière, Annick. "Avant-Propos." In *Penser l'histoire de l'Amérique Latine*, 4–17. Internationale. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2013. http://books.openedition.org/psorbonne/41856.

———. *Entre Dios y El Rey: La República: La Ciudad de México de Los Siglo XVI al XIX.* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2013.

———. "MÉXICO/NUEVA ESPAÑA." In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, edited by Annick Lempérière, 3: Estado:143–58. Iberconceptos, II. Madrid: Universidad del País Vasco, 2014.

Leteux, Sylvain. "La Société de Secours Mutuels Des Vrais Amis (1820-1898) : Comment Les Bouchers Parisiens Ont-Ils Organisé Leur Protection Sociale Au XIXe Siècle ?" *Revue d'histoire de La Protection Sociale* 3, no. 1 (2010): 9. https://doi.org/10.3917/rhps.003.0009.

Lida, Clara E. *Antecedentes y Desarrollo Del Movimiento Obrero Español, 1835-1888: Textos y Documentos.* Madrid: Siglo Veintiuno de España, 1973.

———. "Trabajo, Organización y Protesta Artesanal: México, Chile y Cuba En El Siglo XIX." *Historia Social*, no. 31 (1998): 66–75.

———. "The Democratic and Social Republic and Its Repercussions in the Hispanic World." In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*, edited by Guy P. C. Thomson, 46–75. London: Institute of Latin American Studies, 2002.

Lida, Clara E., and Sonia Pérez Toledo. *Trabajo, Ocio y Coacción: Trabajadores Urbanos En México y Guatemala En El Siglo XIX.* Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2001.

Lira González, Andrés. "Del Desastre a La Reconstrucción Republicana, 1848-1876." In *Nueva Historia General de México*, 443–86. Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 2010.

Lomné, Georges, ed. "El Feliz Momento de La Patria." In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano. Conceptos Políticos Fundamentales, 1770-1870*, 8: Patria:15–36. Iberconceptos, II. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Políticos y Constitucionales-Universidad del País Vasco, 2014.

Lomnitz, Claudio. "Hacia Una Antropología de La Nacionalidad Mexicana." *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 55, no. 2 (1993): 169–95. https://doi.org/10.2307/3541108.

———. *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico: An Anthropology of Nationalism.* Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.

Lomnitz, Claudio, and Pablo Piccato. "Building the Mexican State: The Notion of Citizenship." *Journal of International Affairs* 66, no. 2 (2013): 163–69.

Long, Tom, and Carsten-Andreas Schulz. "Republican Internationalism: The Nineteenth-Century Roots of Latin American Contributions to International Order." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, July 16, 2021, 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2021.1944983.

López Caballero, Paula. *Indígenas de La Nación. Etnografía Histórica de La Alteridad En México (Milpa Alta, Siglos XVII-XXI).* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2017.

López Cámara, Francisco. "Los Socialistas Franceses En La Reforma Mexicana." *Historia Mexicana* 34, no. 9 (October 1, 1959): 269–73.

Lorenzo, María Dolores. "Negociaciones Para La Modernización Urbana: La Demolición Del Mercado Del Parián En La Ciudad de México, 1843." *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 38 (December 2009): 85–109.

Lunel, Alexandre. "Les Sociétés de Secours Mutuels Sous Le Second Empire. Exemple Du Département de Seine-et-Oise." *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger (1922-)* 86, no. 1 (2008): 89–112.

Machuca, Laura, and Alejandro Tortolero. "From Haciendas to Rural Elites: Agriculture and Economic Development in the Historiography of Rural Mexico." *Historia Agraria Revista de Agricultura e Historia Rural*, August 1, 2020. https://doi.org/10.26882/histagrar.081e02t.

Madrigal Hernández, Erika. "El Ateneo Mexicano (1840-1850): una constelación cultural intergeneracional." *Connotas. Revista de crítica y teoría literarias*, no. 24 (June 2022): 158–200. https://doi.org/10.36798/critlit.v0i24.401.

Magallanes Delgado, María del Refugio. "Artesanos En Armas. Del Gremio de Oficios a Las Milicias En Zacatecas, 1758-1820." In *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*, edited by Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores, 127–65. Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012.

Magraw, Roger. *A History of the French Working Class*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

———. "El 'Artesano Radical': Nuevas Reflexiones Sobre Esta Categoría de La Historia Social." In *Cultura Social y Política En El Mundo Del Trabajo*, edited by José A. Piqueras and Javier Paniagua, 125–48. Valencia: Centro Francisco Tomás y Valiente UNED Alzira-Valencia, Fundación Instituto Historia Social, 1999.

———. "The Second Republic and French 'Republican Socialism', 1848-51." In *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*, edited by Guy P. C. Thomson, 19–45. London: Institute of Latin American Studies, 2002.

Mallon, Florencia E. "Peasants and State Formation in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Morelos, 1848-1858." *Political Power and Social Theory* 7 (1988): 1–54.

———. *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Maluquer de Motes, Jorge. *El Socialismo En España, 1833-1868*. Temas Hispánicos. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1977.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York/London: Harcourt, Brace & Co./Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1954.

Maremonti, Ludovico. *La Monarchia e Il Libertador. Sovranità e Istituzioni Nel Primo Impero Messicano (1821-1823)*. Milan: Mimesis Edizioni, 2021.

Margadant, Ted W. *French Peasants in Revolt: The Insurrection of 1851. French Peasants in Revolt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400820320.

Markovic, Momcilo. "La Révolution aux barrières : l'incendie des barrières de l'octroi à Paris en juillet 1789." *Annales historiques de la Révolution française*, no. 372 (June 1, 2013): 27–48. https://doi.org/10.4000/ahrf.12765.

Mauss, Marcel. "Symposium: The Problem of Nationality." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 20 (1919): 237–65.

———. *La nation, ou le sens du social.* Edited by Jean Terrier and Marcel Fournier. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France-PUF, 2018.

McPhee, Peter. "Popular Culture, Symbolism and Rural Radicalism in Nineteenth-century *France.*" *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 5, no. 2 (January 1978): 238–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066157808438046.

Medina Bustos, José Marcos, and Iván Aarón Torres Chon. "José Urrea: trayectoria política y bases de poder territorial en Durango y Sonora. 1821-1849." *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 53 (January 1, 2017): 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehmcm.2016.10.001.

Medina Peña, Luis. *Invención Del Sistema Político Mexicano: Forma de Gobierno y Gobernabilidad En México En El Siglo XIX.* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Economica, 2014.

Meglio, Gabriel Di, Tomás Guzmán, and Mariana Katz. "Artesanos Hispanoamericanos Del Siglo XIX: Identidades, Organizaciones y Acción Política." *Almanack*, no. 23 (December 2019): 275–315.

Melo Ferreira, Fátima Sá. "Entre Viejos y Nuevos Sentidos: 'Pueblo' y 'Pueblos' En El Mundo Iberoamericano Entre 1750 y 1850." In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, edited by Fátima Sá Melo Ferreira and Javier Fernández Sebastián, 1:1117–38. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

Merriman, John M. "Marginal People, Peripheral Spaces, Fearsome Faubourgs." In *The Margins of City Life: Explorations of the French Urban Frontier, 1815–1851*, edited by John M. Merriman, 59–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195064384.003.0003.

Mijangos y González, Pablo. *The Lawyer of the Church: Bishop Clemente de Jesús Munguía and the Clerical Response to the Mexican Liberal Reforma.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2015.

Miño Grijalva, Manuel. *La Manufactura Colonial: La Constitución Técnica Del Obraje.* Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 1993. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv6mtc2z.

———. "Sistemas de Trabajo y Transculturación En Hispanoamérica, 1640-1814." In *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*, edited by Sonia Pérez Toledo, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores, 27–67. Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012.

Moreno Toscano, Alejandra. "Los Trabajadores y El Proyecto de Industrialización, 1810-1867." In *La Clase Obrera En La Historia de México: De La Colonia al Imperio*, edited by Juan Felipe Leal and José Woldenberg, 1:302–49. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Ed, 1980.

Moss, Bernard H. *The Origins of the French Labor Movement: The Socialism of Skilled Workers 1830-1914.* Berkeley/London: University of California Press, 2018.

Murgueitio, Carlos Alberto. "La industria textil del centro de México, un proyecto inconcluso de modernización económica (1830 – 1845)" 7, no. 13 (2015): 43–75.

Nicolas, Gilbert. "Les instituteurs sous le Second Empire." *Histoire de l'éducation*, no. 93 (January 1, 2002). https://doi.org/10.4000/histoire-education.271.

Nutini, Hugo G., and Barry L. Isaac. *Social Stratification in Central Mexico, 1500-2000.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009.

Obregón, Arturo. *Las Obreras Tabacaleras de La Ciudad de México, 1764-1925*. Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano, 1982.

Olveda, Jaime. *La Oligarquía de Guadalajara : De Las Reformas Borbónicas a La Reforma Liberal*. Mexico City: Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes, 1991.

———. "El Monopolio Rebocero Guadalajara-Zamora." In *Industria y Comercio*, edited by José María Muriá and Jaime Olveda, 1. ed., 33–54. Lecturas Históricas de Guadalajara 5. México, D.F: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1993.

———. "Jalisco Frente a La Invasión Norteamericana de 1846-1848." In *México al Tiempo de Su Guerra Con Estados Unidos (1846-1848)*, edited by Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, 2nd ed., 281–308. Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, 1998. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3f8npp.13.

———. *Autonomía, Soberanía y Federalismo: Nueva Galicia y Jalisco*. Investigación (Colegio de Jalisco). Zapopan, Jalisco: El Colegio de Jalisco, 2014.

Orduña Carson, Miguel. "Artesanos de La Ciudad de México En La Segunda Mitad Del Siglo XIX: Luchas de Resistencia En El Marco de La Hegemonía." *Travesía*, no. 10–11 (2008): 101–20.

———. "Historiografía Social Sobre El Artesanado de La Ciudad de México En El Siglo XIX." *Trashumante. Revista Americana de Historia Social*, no. 1 (2013): 32–48.

———. "Los Artesanos En La Prensa Decimonónica de La Ciudad de México. Liberalismo, Opinión Pública e Identidad Nacional." *El Taller de La Historia* 6, no. 6 (2014): 217–45.

Ortega, Francisco A. "The Conceptual History of Independence and the Colonial Question in Spanish America." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 79, no. 1 (2018): 89–103. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2018.0005.

Palacios, Guillermo, and Erika Pani, eds. *El Poder y La Sangre: Guerra, Estado y Nación En La Década de 1860*. Mexico City: El Colegio de México–Centro de Estudios Históricos, 2014.

Palomo González, Gerardo. "La Inestabilidad Político-Militar Durante La Primera República Central, 1835-1839. La Lógica Del Pronunciamiento En La Figura Del General José Urrea." *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 36 (December 2008): 85–126.

Palti, Elías José. *La Nación Como Problema: Los Historiadores y La "Cuestión Nacional."* Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2003.

———. "The Problem of 'Misplaced Ideas' Revisited: Beyond the 'History of Ideas' in Latin America." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67, no. 1 (2006): 149–79. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhi.2006.0009.

———. *El Tiempo de La Política: El Siglo XIX Reconsiderado*. Metamorfosis. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores Argentina, 2007.

———. *La Invención de Una Legitimidad: Razón y Retórica En El Pensamiento Mexicano Del Siglo XIX ; (Un Estudio Sobre Las Formas Del Discurso Político)*. 2nd ed. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007.

———. "¿De La *Tradición* a La *Modernidad*? Revisionismo e Historia Político-Conceptual de Las Revoluciones de Independencia." In *Independencia y Revolución: Pasado, Presente y Futuro*, edited by Gustavo Leyva, Brian Connaughton, Carlos Illades, Néstor García Canclini, and Rodrigo Díaz, 174–90. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2010.

Pani, Erika. "¿'Verdaderas figuras de Cooper' o 'pobres inditos infelices'? La política indigenista de Maximiliano." *Historia Mexicana*, January 1, 1998, 571–604.

———. *Para Mexicanizar El Segundo Imperio: El Imaginario Político de Los Imperialistas*. El Imaginario Político de Los Imperialistas. El Colegio de Mexico, 2001. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv512s5w.8.

———. "Dreaming of a Mexican Empire: The Political Projects of the 'Imperialistas.'" *Hispanic American Historical Review* 82, no. 1 (February 1, 2002): 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1215/00182168-82-1-1.

———. *El Segundo Imperio: Pasados de Usos Múltiples*. Mexico City: Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, 2004.

———. "Entre La Espada y La Pared: El Partido Conservador (1848-1853)." In *Partidos, Facciones y Otras Calamidades: Debates y Propuestas Acerca de Los Partidos Políticos En México, Siglo XIX*, edited by Alfredo Ávila and Alicia Salmerón Castro, 1st ed., 76–105. Biblioteca Mexicana. Serie Historia y Antropología. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012.

———. "Monarchism and Liberalism in Mexico's Nineteenth Century." In *Institute of Latin American Studies*, 1–15. Senate House, London, 2012. https://sas-space.sas.ac.uk/4043/.

———. "Law, Allegiance, and Sovereignty in Civil War Mexico, 1857–1867." *The Journal of the Civil War Era* 7, no. 4 (2017): 570–96. https://doi.org/10.1353/cwe.2017.0083.

Pareto, Vilfredo. *Les Systèmes Socialistes: Cours Professé à l'Université de Lausanne*. Paris: Droz, 1978.

Paz, Octavio. *El Laberinto de La Soledad: Postdata/Vuelta A "El Laberinto de La Soledad."* Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2007.

Pérez Siller, Javier. "Una Contribución a La Modernidad. La Comunidad Francesa En La Ciudad de México." In *Babel, Ciudad de México*, edited by Instituto de Cultura de la Ciudad de México, 1. ed. México, D.F: Gobierno del Distrito Federal/Ciudad de México Cultura, 1999.

———. "Radiografía de Franceses En Las Urbes Mexicanas: Tránsito Del Modelo Virreinal al Nacional." In *México Francia: Memoria de Una Sensibilidad Común Siglos XIX-XX*, edited by Javier Pérez Siller and David Skerrit, III–IV:1–25. Mexico City: Centro de estudios mexicanos y centroamericanos, 2008.

Pérez Toledo, Sonia. *Los Hijos Del Trabajo: Los Artesanos de La Ciudad de México, 1780-1853*. Mexico City: Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Históricos/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Iztapalapa, 1996.

———. "Entre El Discurso y La Coacción. Las Elites y Las Clases Populares a Mediados Del Siglo XIX." In *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política*, 311–38. Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003.

———. "Una Organización Alternativa de Artesanos: La Sociedad Mexicana Protectora de Artes y Oficios, 1843-1844." *Signos Históricos* 5, no. 9 (2003).

———. *Trabajadores, Espacio Urbano y Sociabilidad En La Ciudad de México, 1790-1867*. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa-División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 2011.

———. “Población y Sociedad.” In *México. La Construcción Nacional, 1830-1880*, edited by Alicia Hernández Chávez and María Luna Argudín, 2:197–250. América Latina En La Historia Contemporánea. Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE : Santillana ediciones generales, 2012.

———. *Población y Sociedad. México (1830-1880).* Madrid: Fundación MAPFRE/Santillana ediciones generales, 2015.

Pérez Toledo, Sonia, and Carlos Illades. “El artesanado textil de la ciudad de México durante el siglo XIX.” *Historia Social*, no. 31 (1998): 77–88.

Pérez Toledo, Sonia, Manuel Miño Grijalva, and René Amaro Peñaflores, eds. *El Mundo Del Trabajo Urbano: Trabajadores, Cultura y Prácticas Laborales*. Mexico City/Zacatecas: El Colegio de México/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas Francisco García Salina, 2012.

Pérez Vejo, Tomás. “La construcción de las naciones como problema historiográfico: el caso del mundo hispánico.” *Historia Mexicana* 53, no. 2 (October 1, 2003): 275–311.

Pérez Zamarripa, Abisai. “De Monarquía de Vecinos a Nación de Ciudadanos: La Definición de La Ciudadanía En El México Borbónico e Independiente, 1780-1825.” *Relaciones Estudios de Historia y Sociedad* 40, no. 159 (March 11, 2020): 219–45. https://doi.org/10.24901/rehs.v40i159.348.

Pernau, Margrit, and Luc Wodzicki. “Entanglements, Political Communication, and Shared Temporal Layers.” *Cromohs. Cyber Review of Modern Historiography* 21 (2017): 1–17.

Peyrou, Florencia. “1848 et le Parti démocratique espagnol.” *Le Mouvement Social* 234, no. 1 (2011): 17–32. https://doi.org/10.3917/lms.234.0017.

Piguet, Marie-France. “Individualisme: Origine et Réception Initiale Du Mot.” *Oeuvres et Critiques* XXXIII, no. 1 (2008): 39–60.

Pilbeam, Pamela M. *Saint-Simonians in Nineteenth-Century France: From Free Love to Algeria*. Springer, 2014.

Pinkney, David H. “Money and Politics in the Rebuilding of Paris, 1860-1870.” *The Journal of Economic History* 17, no. 1 (1957): 45–61.

Piqueras, José A. “Cultura Radical y Socialismo En España, 1868-1914.” *Signos Históricos*, no. 9 (2003): 43–71.

———. “Estado, nación y federalismos en el siglo XIX. La contribución de José Carlos Chiaramonte.” *Boletín del Instituto de Historia Argentina y Americana Dr. Emilio Ravignani*, no. 45 (2016): 43–63.

Piqueras, José A., Javier Paniagua, and Vicent Sanz, eds. *Cultura Social y Política En El Mundo Del Trabajo*. Valencia: Centro Francisco Tomás y Valiente UNED Alzira-Valencia, Fundación Instituto Historia Social, 1999.

Poivret, Cédric. “Les prodromes d’une pensée de la gestion commerciale : Devinck et son ouvrage de Pratique commerciale.” *Bibnum. Textes fondateurs de la science*, August 1, 2016. https://journals.openedition.org/bibnum/886?lang=en.

Portillo, José M. “Del Gobierno de La Monarquía al Gobierno de La Sociedad.” *Revista de História Das Ideias* 37 (May 14, 2019): 167–85. https://doi.org/10.14195/2183-8925_37_7.

Potash, Robert. “La Fundación Del Banco de Avío.” In *La Economía Mexicana (Siglos XIX y XX)*, edited by Carlos Marichal, 37–54. Lecturas de “Historia Mexicana” 4. Mexico: Colegio de México, 1992.

Price, Roger. *People and Politics in France, 1848-1870.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

———. *Documents on the Second French Empire, 1852-1870.* London: Springer/Palgrave, 2016.

Pro, Juan. “Thinking of a Utopian Future: Fourierism in Nineteenth-Century Spain.” *Utopian Studies* 26, no. 2 (2015): 329–48.

———. “La utopía de la unidad americana en la época de las revoluciones: territorio y comunidad política.” *Ariadna Histórica. Lenguajes, conceptos, metáforas.*, no. 10 (December 16, 2021): 155–94.

Prochasson, Christophe. *Saint-Simon Ou l’anti-Marx: Figures Du Saint-Simonisme Français, XIX-XXe Siècles.* Paris: Perrin, 2004.

Ramos-Escandón, Carmen. *La Industria Textil y El Movimiento Obrero En México.* Mexico City: División de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades-Departamento de Filosofía e Historia-Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Iztapalapa, 1988.

Rancière, Jacques. “The Myth of the Artisan Critical Reflections on a Category of Social History.” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 24 (1983): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0147547900008103.

———. “La Représentation de l’ouvrier Ou La Classe Introuvable.” In *Le Retrait Du Politique: Travaux Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique*, edited by Jacob Rogozinski and Jean-Luc Nancy, 89–111. Cahiers Du Centre de Recherches Philosophiques Sur Le Politique. Paris: Galilée, 1983.

———. “La Escena Revolucionaria y El Obrero Emancipado (1830-1848).” Translated by E. Verger. *Historia Social*, no. 2 (Autumn 1988): 3–18.

———. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy.* University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

———. “Afterword: The Method of Equality: An Answer to Some Questions.” In *Jacques Rancière: History, Politics, Aesthetics*, edited by Philip Watts and Gabriel Rockhill, 273–88. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009. https://doi.org/10.1353/book.65109.

———. *Proletarian Nights: The Workers’ Dream in Nineteenth-Century France.* Verso Books, 2012.

———. “Anachronism and the Conflict of Times.” *Diacritics* 48, no. 2 (2020): 110–24. https://doi.org/10.1353/dia.2020.0013.

Rebérioux, Madeleine. “Citoyens et travailleurs.” In *Pour que vive l’histoire*, 337–48. Littérature et politique. Paris: Belin, 2017.

Reina, Leticia. *Las Rebeliones Campesinas En México, 1819-1906.* 5th ed. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1998.

———. “Construcción de La Ciudadanía a Través Del Municipio Indígena. Oaxaca En El Siglo XIX.” In *Nación y Municipio En México, Siglos XIX y XX*, edited by Sergio Miranda Pacheco, 55–74. Serie Historia Moderna y Contemporanea 59. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2012.

———. “Oaxaca En La Guerra y La Guerra En Oaxaca.” In *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, edited by Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed., 171–96. Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016.

———. “Romana Falcón, *El jefe político. Un dominio negociado en el mundo rural del Estado de México, 1856-1911*, México, El Colegio México, Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Sociales en Antropología Social, El Colegio de Michoacán, 2015, 744 pp. ISBN 978-607-462-738-1.” *Historia mexicana* 66, no. 3 (March 2017): 1628–35.

Rey, Lucie. “« Le Sphinx de La Révolution »: Pierre Leroux et La Promesse Révolutionnaire.” *Archives de Philosophie* 80, no. 1 (2017): 55–74.

Reyes Heroles, Jesús. *El Liberalismo Mexicano: Los Orígenes*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1982.

Reza, Germán A. de la. “Confederations as a Balancing Power Device: The Continental Treaty of Santiago (1856).” *Passagens* 11, no. 1 (2019): 91–110.

Richter, Melvin. “Reconstructing the History of Political Languages: Pocock, Skinner, and the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe.” *History and Theory* 29, no. 1 (1990): 38–70. https://doi.org/10.2307/2505203.

Riot-Sarcey, Michèle. *Le Réel de l’utopie: Essai Sur Le Politique Au XIXe Siècle*. Paris: A. Michel, 1998.

———. *Le Procès de La Liberté: Une Histoire Souterraine Du XIXe Siècle*. La Découverte, 2016.

Robert, Vincent. “Interdire Un Banquet, Déclencher Une Révolution (Paris, Février 1848).” In *Le Temps Des Banquets : Politique et Symbolique d’une Génération (1818-1848)*, 367–90. Histoire de La France Aux XIXe et XXe Siècles. Paris: Éditions de la Sorbonne, 2021.

Rocca, Facundo. “La modernidad democrática como límite a la historia contextual de las ideas políticas.” *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 5 (September 3, 2018): 14–46.

Rodríguez O., Jaime E. “La crisis de México en el siglo XIX.” *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 10, no. 10 (June 27, 1986). https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.1986.010.68957.

———. “Las Cortes Mexicanas y El Congreso Constituyente.” In *La Independencia de México y El Proceso Autonomista Novohispano, 1808-1824*, edited by Virginia Guedea, 286–320. Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María Luis Mora, 2001.

———, ed. *Las Nuevas Naciones: España y México, 1800-1850*. Publicaciones Del Programa Iberoamérica: 200 Años de Convivencia Independiente 21. Madrid: Fundación Mapfre, Instituto de Cultura, 2008.

Rodríguez O., Jaime E., and Kathryn Vincent Lepp, eds. *Myths, Misdeeds, and Misunderstandings: The Roots of Conflict in U.S.-Mexican Relations*. Latin American Silhouettes. Wilmington, Del: SR Books, 1997.

Rojas, Rafael. “La frustración del primer republicanismo mexicano.” In *El republicanismo en Hispanoamérica : ensayos de historia intelectual y política*, 388–423. Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas/Fondo de Culture Económica, 2002.

———. *La Escritura de La Independencia: El Surgimiento de La Opinión Pública En México*. Mexico City: Taurus/CIDE, 2003.

Ros, María Amparo. “El tabaco: del monopolio colonial a la manufactura porfiriana.” *Historias*, no. 29 (March 31, 1993): 57–70.

Rosanvallon, Pierre *La consagración del ciudadano: historia del sufragio universal en Francia*. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María’Luis Mora, 1999.

———. *El Pueblo Inalcanzable. Historia de La Representación Democrática En Francia*. Mexico City: Instituto de Investigaciones Dr. José María' Luis Mora, 2004.

———. *Pour Une Histoire Conceptuelle Du Politique: Leçon Inaugurale Au Collège de France Faite Le Jeudi 28 Mars 2002*. Paris: Seuil, 2003.

———. *La Démocratie Inachevée Histoire de La Souveraineté Du Peuple En France*. Paris: Gallimard, 2000.

Rougerie, Jacques. "Le mouvement associatif populaire comme facteur d'acculturation politique à Paris de la révolution aux années 1840 : continuité, discontinuités." *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* 297, no. 1 (1994): 493–516. https://doi.org/10.3406/ahrf.1994.1855.

———. "Entre Le Réel et l'utopie: République Démocratique et Sociale, Association, Commune, Commune." In *Essais d'histoire Critique. Textes Réunis Autour Des Travaux de Michèle Riot-Sarcey*, 273–92. Saint-Denis: Press universitaires de Vincennes, 2014.

Saada, Emmanuelle. "Nation and Empire in the French Context." In *Sociology and Empire*, edited by George Steinmetz, 321–39. The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv123x6t0.14.

Sábato, Hilda. *Republics of the New World: The Revolutionary Political Experiment in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*. Princeton Oxford: Princeton Unversity Press, 2018.

Sacchi Landriani, Martino. "Rethinking the *Livret d'ouvriers*: Time, Space and 'Free' Labor in Nineteenth Century France." *Labor History* 60, no. 6 (November 2, 2019): 854–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/0023656X.2019.1645318.

Salvucci, Richard J. *Textiles and Capitalism in Mexico: An Economic History of the Obrajes, 1539-1840*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.

———. "Algunas consideraciones económicas (1836). Análisis mexicano de la depresión a principios del siglo XIX." *Historia Mexicana* 55, no. 1 (July 1, 2005): 67–97.

Sánchez Hormigo, Alfonso. "Pierre Leroux o El Republicanismo Saint-Simoniano." In *Pensiero Critico Ed Economia Politica Nel XIX Secolo: Da Saint-Simon a Proudhon*, edited by Vitantonio Gioia, Sergio Noto, and Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo, 61–82. Bologna: Società editrice Il mulino, 2015.

Sanders, James. "Revolution and the Creation of an Atlantic Counter-Modernity: Popular and Elite Contestations of Republicanism and Progress in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Latin America." In *L'Atlantique Révolutionnaire: Une Perspective Ibéro-Américaine*, edited by Clément Thibaud, Gabriel Entin, Alejandro E. Gómez Pernía, and Federica Morelli, 233–57. Le Monde Atlantique. Bécherel: Les Perséides Éditions, 2013.

———. *The Vanguard of the Atlantic World: Creating Modernity, Nation, and Democracy in Nineteenth-Century Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.

———. "Decolonizing Europe." In *The First Wave of Decolonization*, edited by Mark Thurner, 95–117. Routledge Studies in Global Latin America. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2019.

Santibáñez, Blanca. "Condiciones de Vida y Trabajo En Los Pueblos de Tlaxcala Entre 1840 y 1867." In *El México Profundo En La Gran Década de Desesperanza (1846-1856)*, edited by Raymond Buve and Romana Falcón, 1st ed., 123–42. Mexico City/Puebla: Ediciones EyC/Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2016.

Santoni Rugiu, Antonio. *Breve Storia Dell'educazione Artigiana*. Roma: Carocci, 2008.

Santoni, Pedro. "'The Powerful Element That Would Certainly Have Saved Us': Debating the Revitalization of the National Guard in Post-War Mexico." In *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, edited by Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, 72–114. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Santoni, Pedro, and Will Fowler. "Setting the Scene: The History and Historiography of Post-War Mexico, 1848–1853." In *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*, edited by Pedro Santoni and Will Fowler, 1–34. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Santoni, Pedro, and Will Fowler, eds. *Mexico, 1848-1853: Los Años Olvidados*. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Schinkel, Anders. "Imagination as a Category of History: An Essay Concerning Koselleck's Concepts of Erfahrungsraum and Erwartungshorizont." *History and Theory* 44, no. 1 (2005): 42–54.

Scuccimarra, Luca. *La Sciabola Di Sieyès : Le Giornate Di Brumaio e La Genesi Del Regime Bonapartista*. Bologna: Il mulino, 2002.

———. "A Constitution for Europe. Saint-Simon and the *Réorganisation de La Société Européenne*." In *Pensiero Critico Ed Economia Politica Nel XIX Secolo: Da Saint-Simon a Proudhon*, edited by Vitantonio Gioia, Sergio Noto, and Alfonso Sánchez Hormigo, 83–102. Bologna: Società editrice Il mulino, 2015.

Sewell, William H. "Beyond 1793: Babeuf, Louis Blanc and the Genealogy of 'Social Revolution.'" In *The Transformation of Political Culture 1789–1848*, edited by François Furet and Mona Ozouf, 3:509–26. The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture. Amsterdam: Pergamon, 1989.

———. *A Rhetoric of Bourgeois Revolution : The Abbe Sieyes and* What Is the Third Estate*?* Bicentennial Reflections on the French Revolution. Durham/London: Duke University Press, 1994.

———. *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———. *Capitalism and the Emergence of Civic Equality in Eighteenth-Century France*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2021.

Shawcross, Edward. *France, Mexico and Informal Empire in Latin America, 1820-1867*. New York: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2018.

Sibalis, Michael David. "The Mutual Aid Societies of Paris, 1789–1848." *French History* 3, no. 1 (1989): 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1093/fh/3.1.1.

Silva Prada, Natalia. "Las Manifestaciones Políticas Indígenas Ante El Proceso de Control y Privatización de Tierras: México, 1786-1856." In *Poder y Legitimidad En México En El Siglo XIX: Instituciones y Cultura Política*, edited by Brian Connaughton, 75–135. Mexico: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Unidad Iztapalapa, 2003.

Simon, Joshua. *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought*. Problems of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316665633.

Skinner, Quentin. "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas." *History and Theory* 8, no. 1 (1969): 3–53. https://doi.org/10.2307/2504188.

Smart, Annie. "The 'École Saint-Simonienne''s Outrage to Public Morals." *Nineteenth-Century French Studies* 33, no. 3/4 (2005): 258–72.

Sotelo, María Eugenia Romero, and Luis Jáuregui. "México 1821-1867. Población y crecimiento económico." *Iberoamericana* 3, no. 12 (2003): 25–52. https://doi.org/10.18441/ibam.3.2003.12.25-52.

Stanziani, Alessandro. *Rules of Exchange: French Capitalism in Comparative Perspective, Eighteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

———. *Les métamorphoses du travail contraint. Une histoire globale (xviiie-xixe siècles)*. Paris: Sciences Po Presses, 2020.

Staples, Anne. "Secularización: Estado e Iglesia en tiempos de Gómez Farías." *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 10, no. 10 (June 27, 1986). https://doi.org/10.22201/iih.24485004e.1986.010.68958.

Stevens, Donald. *Origins of Instability in Early Republican Mexico*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Sweeney, Niamh. "'Fictitious Capital': Haussmannization and the (Un-)Making of Second-Empire Paris." *L'Esprit Créateur* 55, no. 3 (2015): 100–113.

Tarcus, Horacio. *El Socialismo Romántico En El Río de La Plata (1837-1852)*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2016.

———. "Aportes Para Una Historia Conceptual Del Socialismo En El Espacio Rioplatense (1837-1899)." *Conceptos Históricos* 4, no. 5 (2018): 122–78.

———. "The First International in Latin America." In *"Arise Ye Wretched of the Earth": The First International in a Global Perspective*, edited by Fabrice Bensimon, Quentin Deluermoz, and Jeanne Moisand, 253–69. Studies in Global Social History, Volume 29. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2018.

Tardy, Jean-Noël. *L'âge Des Ombres: Complots, Conspirations et Sociétés Secrètes Au XIXe Siècle*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2015.

Taylor, Charles. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Teitelbaum, Vanesa E. *Entre El Control y La Movilización: Honor, Trabajo y Solidaridades Artesanales En La Ciudad de México a Mediados Del Siglo XIX*. Mexico City: Colegio de México, 2008.

———. "Asociación y Protesta de Los Artesanos al Despuntar La Década de 1860." In *Los Trabajadores de La Ciudad de México 1860-1950: Textos En Homenaje a Clara E. Lida*, edited by Carlos Illades and Mario Barbosa, 51–80. Colegio de Mexico, 2013.

Teitelbaum, Vanesa E., and Florencia Gutiérrez. "De la representación a la huelga. Las trabajadoras del tabaco (ciudad de México, segunda mitad del siglo XIX)." *Boletín Americanista*, no. 59 (December 7, 2009): 265–88.

———. "Sociedades de artesanos y poder público. Ciudad de México, segunda mitad del siglo XIX." *Estudios de historia moderna y contemporánea de México*, no. 36 (2008): 127–58.

Tenenbaum, Barbara. "Formación y Desarrollo de La Burguesía En México, Siglo XIX." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 61, no. 2 (May 1, 1981): 321–22. https://doi.org/10.1215/00182168-61.2.321.

———. *México en la época de los agiotistas, 1821-1857*. Sección de obras de historia. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1985.

———. "Mexico's Money Market and the International Debt, 1821-1855." In *La Deuda Pública En América Latina En Perspectiva Histórica: The Public Debt in Latin America in*

Historical Perspective, edited by Reinhard Liehr, 257–92. Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana Vervuert, 1995.

Thibaud, Clément. "Para Una Historia Policéntrica de Los Republicanismos Atlánticos (1770-1880)." *Prismas. Revista de Historia Intelectual*, no. 23 (2019): 145–62.

Thibaud, Clément, Gabriel Entin, Alejandro E. Gómez Pernía, and Federica Morelli, eds. *L'Atlantique révolutionnaire: une perspective ibéro-américaine*. Le monde atlantique. Bécherel: Les Perséides Éditions, 2013.

Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Penguin, 2002.

Thomson, Guy P. C. "Traditional and Modern Manufacturing in Mexico, 1821-1850." In *América Latina En La Época de Simón Bolívar : La Formación de Las Economías Nacionales y Los Intereses Económicos Europeos, 1800-1850*, edited by Reinhard Liehr, 55–87. Bibliotheca Ibero-Americana 33. Berlin: Colloquium Verlag, 1989.

———. "Popular Aspects of Liberalism in Mexico, 1848-1888." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 10, no. 3 (1991): 265–92. https://doi.org/10.2307/3338671.

———. *Puebla de Los Angeles: Industria y Sociedad de Una Ciudad Mexicana, 1700-1850*. Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Dirección General de Fomento Editorial, 2002.

———. *The European Revolutions of 1848 and the Americas*. London: Institute of Latin American Studies, 2002.

Thurner, Mark. "After Spanish Rule. Writing Another After." In *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas*, edited by Mark Thurner and Andrés Guerrero, 12–57. Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003.

———, ed. *The First Wave of Decolonization*. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Thurner, Mark, and Andrés Guerrero, eds. *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas*. Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Toloudis, Nicholas. "The Carnot Commission and the Teacher Insurgency of Second Republic France." *French Politics, Culture & Society* 32, no. 3 (2014): 57–78.

Tortolero, Alejandro. *Notarios y Agricultores: Crecimiento y Atraso En El Campo Mexicano, 1780-1920 : Propiedad, Crédito, Irrigación y Conflictos Sociales En El Agro Mexicano*. Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 2008.

———. "The Mexican Path toward Agricultural Capitalism." *Études Rurales*, no. 205 (June 1, 2020). https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesrurales.22196.

Tresch, John. *The Romantic Machine: Utopian Science and Technology after Napoleon. The Romantic Machine*. University of Chicago Press, 2012. https://doi.org/10.7208/9780226812229.

Trujillo Bolio, Mario. *Empresariado y manufactura textil en la Ciudad de México y su periferia: siglo XIX*. Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social-UNAM, 2000.

Tutino, John. *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv301gv1.

———. "Agrarian Social Change and Peasant Rebellion in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: The Example of Chalco." In *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*,

edited by Friedrich Katz, 95–140. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400860128.95.

———. “The Revolution in Mexican Independence: Insurgency and the Renegotiation of Property, Production, and Patriarchy in the Bajío, 1800-1855.” *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 78, no. 3 (1998): 367–418. https://doi.org/10.2307/2518330.

———. “El debate sobre el futuro de México. Buscando una economía nueva; encontrando desafíos y límites, 1830-1845.” *Historia Mexicana*, January 2, 2016, 1119–92. https://doi.org/10.24201/hm.v65i3.3181.

———. “The Americas in the Rise of Industrial Capitalism.” In *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870*, by John Tutino and Jaymie Patricia Heilman, 26–70. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

———. *The Mexican Heartland: How Communities Shaped Capitalism, a Nation, and World History, 1500-2000*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.

Tutino, John, and Alfredo Ávila. “Becoming Mexico. The Conflictive Search for a North American Nation.” In *New Countries: Capitalism, Revolutions, and Nations in the Americas, 1750-1870*, 233–77. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Uribe Salas, José Alfredo. “La industrialización de la seda en Michoacán: Un proyecto nacional.” *Tzintzun. Revista de Estudios Históricos*, no. 9 (February 24, 2015): 239–77.

Valadés, José C. “Cartilla Socialista de Plotino C. Rhodakanaty. Noticia Sobre El Socialismo En México Durante El Siglo XIX.” *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 3 (1970): 9–66.

———. “El Nacimiento de Una Industria Mexicana.” *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México* 4, no. 04 (1979): 95–103.

———. *El Socialismo Libertario (Siglo XIX)*. Edited by Paco Ignacio Taibo II. Mexico City: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung/Para Leer en Libertad A.C., 2013.

Valero, Ricardo. “José María Lafragua En La Construcción Del Estado-Nación.” In *La Cultura y El Derecho En México: Ciclo Juristas Académicos Mexicanos*, edited by Adriana Berrueco García, Primera edición., 83–109. Serie Estudios Jurídicos, núm. 245. Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2014.

Van der Linden, Marcel. *Workers of the World: Essays toward a Global Labor History*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. “Charles Tilly’s Historical Sociology.” Translated by Lee Mitzman. *International Review of Social History* 54, no. 2 (2009): 237–74.

Van Young, Eric. “The Limits of Atlantic-World Nationalism in a Revolutionary Age: Imagined Communities and Lived Communities in Mexico, 1810-1821.” In *Empire to Nation: Historical Perspectives on the Making of the Modern World*, edited by Joseph Esherick, Hasan Kayalı, and Eric Van Young, 35–67. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.

———. “Vidas Privadas y Mitos Públicos: Lucas Alamán y La Independencia Mexicana.” *20/10 Memoria de Las Revoluciones En México*, no. 9 (2010): 43–54.

———. *Writing Mexican History*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.

———. *A Life Together: Lucas Alaman and Mexico, 1792-1853*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021.

Vasseur, Édouard. "Mame et Le Play. Autour de l'Exposition universelle de 1867." *Les Études Sociales* 149–150, no. 1–2 (2009): 205–22. https://doi.org/10.3917/etsoc.149.0205.

Vázquez Mantecón, Carmen. *Santa Anna y La Encrucijada Del Estado: La Dictadura, 1853-1855*. Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1986.

Vázquez Semadeni, María Eugenia. "Las obediencias masónicas del rito de York como centros de acción política, México, 1825-1830." *LiminaR* 7, no. 2 (December 2009): 41–55.

———. "Masonería, Papeles Públicos y Cultura Política En El Primer México Independiente, 1821-1828." *Estudios de Historia Moderna y Contemporánea de México*, no. 38 (December 2009): 35–83.

Vázquez, Josefina Zoraida. "Los Años Olvidados." *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* 5, no. 2 (1989): 313–26. https://doi.org/10.2307/1052093.

———. "Political Plans and Collaboration between Civilians and the Military, 1821-1846." Translated by Caroline Fowler. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 15, no. 1 (1996): 19–38.

———. "México y La Guerra Con Estados Unidos." In *México al Tiempo de Su Guerra Con Estados Unidos (1846-1848)*, edited by Josefina Zoraida Vázquez, 2nd ed., 17–46. El Colegio de Mexico, 1998. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv3f8npp.4.

Vila Martínez, Juan Antonio. "El asociacionismo en la ciudad de Cádiz (1800-1874)." PhD Thesis, Universidad de Cádiz, 2007.

Vinçard, Jules. *Mémoires Épisodiques d'un Vieux Chansonnier Saint-Simonien / Par Vinçard Aîné*. Paris: E. Dentu Libraire/Grassart Libraire, 1878.

Vries, Jan de. "Playing with Scales: The Global and the Micro, the Macro and the Nano*." *Past & Present* 242, no. Supplement_14 (November 1, 2019): 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz043.

Walker, David W. "Business As Usual: The Empresa Del Tabaco in Mexico, 1837-44." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 64, no. 4 (November 1, 1984): 675–705. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1215/00182168-64.4.675.

Wasserman, Fabio. "El Concepto de Nación y Las Transformaciones Del Orden Político En Iberoamérica, 1750-1850." In *Diccionario Político y Social Del Mundo Iberoamericano: La Era de Las Revoluciones, 1750-1850*, 1:851–69. Iberconceptos. Madrid: Fundación Carolina, 2009.

Wasserman, Mark. "All Politics Are Local: Nineteenth-Century Mexico Revisited." *Latin American Research Review* 52, no. 5 (December 12, 2017): 901–9. https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.265.

Williams, Raymond. "Notes on British Marxism since 1945." *New Left Review*, no. I/100 (December 1, 1976): 81–94.

———. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Wilson, Colette E. *Paris and the Commune, 1871-78: The Politics of Forgetting*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Winfield Capitaine, Fernando. "Les Paysans d'origine Française à Jicaltepec et San Rafael." *Villes En Parallèle* 47, no. 1 (2013): 247–49. https://doi.org/10.3406/vilpa.2013.1515.

Winnebeck, Julia, Ove Sutter, Adrian Hermann, Christoph Antweiler, and Stephan Conermann. "The Analytical Concept of Asymmetrical Dependency", *Journal of Global Slavery* 8, 1 (2023): 1-59, doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/2405836X-00801002.

Wittman, Richard. "Space, Networks, and the Saint-Simonians." *Grey Room*, no. 40 (2010): 24–49.

Zavala, Silvio. "Victor Considérant ante el problema social de México." *Historia Mexicana* 7, no. 27 (January 1, 1958): 309–28.

Zeltsman, Corinna. "Defining Responsibility: Printers, Politics, and the Law in Early Republican Mexico City." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 98, no. 2 (May 1, 2018): 189–222. https://doi.org/10.1215/00182168-4376666.

———. *Ink Under the Fingernails: Printing Politics in Nineteenth-Century Mexico*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2021.

Zind, Pierre. "La Religion Dans Les Lycées Sous Le Régime de La Loi Falloux, 1850-1873." *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques* 7, no. 2/3 (1980): 249–73.