

Fall 2010

Forceful Negotiations

Will Fowler

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Fowler, Will, "Forceful Negotiations" (2010). *University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters*. 51.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/unpresssamples/51>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Nebraska Press at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Nebraska Press -- Sample Books and Chapters by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Forceful *Negotiations*

[Buy the Book](#)

The Mexican Experience | William H. Beezley, series editor

[Buy the Book](#)

Forceful *Negotiations*

The Origins of the
Pronunciamiento in
Nineteenth-Century
Mexico

Edited and with an introduction by

W I L L F O W L E R

University of Nebraska Press | Lincoln & London

[Buy the Book](#)

© 2010 by the Board of Regents of the
University of Nebraska. All rights reserved
Manufactured in the United States of America



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Forceful negotiations: the origins of the pronuncia-
miento in nineteenth-century Mexico / edited and
with an introduction by Will Fowler.

p. cm. — (Mexican experience)

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-0-8032-2540-4 (pbk.: alk. paper)

1. Mexico—Politics and government—1821–1861.

2. Mexico—History—1821–1861. 3. Political
culture—Mexico—History—19th century.

4. Political violence—Mexico—History—19th
century. 5. Revolutions—Mexico—History—19th
century. 6. Government, Resistance to—Mexico—
History—19th century. 7. Legitimacy of govern-
ments—Mexico—History—19th century.

I. Fowler, Will, 1966–

F1232.F6828 2010

972 '.04—dc22

2010017777

Contents

Preface | vii

Acknowledgments | xi

Introduction: *The Nineteenth-Century Practice of the Pronunciamiento and Its Origins* | xv

Chronology of Main Events and Pronunciamientos, 1821–1853 | xli

1. Iguala: *The Prototype* | 1

TIMOTHY E. ANNA

2. Agustín de Iturbide: *From the Pronunciamiento of Iguala to the Coup of 1822* | 22

IVANA FRASQUET & MANUEL CHUST

3. Two Reactions to the Illegitimate Succession of 1828: *Campeche and Jalapa* | 47

JOSEFINA ZORAIDA VÁZQUEZ

4. Municipalities, Prefects, and Pronunciamientos: *Power and Political Mobilizations in the Huasteca during the First Federal Republic* | 74

MICHAEL T. DUCEY

5. The Origins of the Pronunciamientos of San Luis Potosí: *An Overview* | 101

KERRY MCDONALD

6. The British and an Early Pronunciamiento, 1833–1834 | 125
MICHAEL P. COSTELOE
7. The Origins of the Santiago Imán Revolt, 1838–1840:
A Reassessment | 143
SHARA ALI
8. A Reluctant Advocate: *Mariano Otero and the Revolución de Jalisco* | 162
MELISSA BOYD
9. Constitution and Congress: *A Pronunciamiento for Legality, December 1844* | 180
REYNALDO SORDO CEDEÑO
10. “The Curious Manner in Which Pronunciamientos Are Got Up in This Country”: *The Plan of Blancarte of 26 July 1852* | 203
ROSIE DOYLE
11. Inventing the Nation: *The Pronunciamiento and the Construction of Mexican National Identity, 1821–1876* | 226
GERMÁN MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ
12. “I Pronounce Thus I Exist”: *Redefining the Pronunciamiento in Independent Mexico, 1821–1876* | 246
WILL FOWLER
- Bibliography | 267
- Contributors | 309

Preface

Following the achievement of independence in 1821, Mexico entered a period of marked instability. The young nation was crippled by its eleven-year-long civil war and a hostile international context in which, apart from Britain and the United States, most European countries initially refused to recognize its independence. The following decades would be characterized by chronic turmoil. Mexico fought four international wars against Spain (1829), France (1838 and 1862–67), and the United States (1846–48). Following the Mexican-American War Mexico lost half of its national territory. Moreover, the new political order lacked authority, and its legitimacy was constantly challenged. Four different constitutions were adopted (1824, 1836, 1843, and 1857). Mexico was an empire on two occasions (1822–23 and 1864–67), a federal republic (1824–35, 1846–53, 1855–58), a central republic (1835–46), and a dictatorship (1846, 1853–55). In the wake of the War of Independence civil conflict resulted in a militarized society and a politicized army. More than fifteen hundred *pronunciamientos* erupted between the 1821 Plan of Iguala and the 1876 Plan of Tuxtepec that brought Porfirio Díaz to power. In a number of cases they degenerated into clashes of appalling violence, such as the Mexico City Parián Riot of 1828. In others they resulted in brutal civil wars (1832, 1854–55, 1858–60). In many cases, however, demands were appeased or quelled

depending on how many pronunciamientos of allegiance they received. They resulted in forceful negotiations.

Often translated as “revolt,” the pronunciamiento was a written protest or petition, often drafted as a list of grievances or demands and signed by a group of individuals and/or a corporate body (high-ranking officers, town council officials, villagers, etc.), that could result in an armed rebellion if the government did not attend to the demands. As early as the 1820s the pronunciamiento had already acquired in Spain and in Mexico the particular set of norms, procedures, and use of discursive strategies that set it apart from a common revolt or military uprising. The actual pronunciamiento texts or *actas* and plans became an integral part of the proceedings. These bureaucratic components were precisely what made the pronunciamiento such a distinctive revolutionary practice—one that, interestingly, would become significantly prevalent only in Spain, Mexico, and Central America. Although *pronunciamiento* is still defined in most dictionaries and encyclopedias as a military uprising or coup, in reality it was not always a military action, it was generally *not* concerned with overthrowing the government, and quite frequently it was *not* a response to a development in national politics. As analyzed in the essays that make up this volume, the pronunciamiento was a nineteenth-century Hispano-Mexican extra-constitutional political practice that soldiers and civilians used to negotiate or petition forcefully for political change, both at a national and at a local level, in the absence of a clearly established constitutional order.

In this first of three planned edited volumes on the nineteenth-century Mexican pronunciamiento, we provide a collection of individual yet interrelated studies on the origins of this practice. The contributors aim to explain where this forceful way of seeking to

effect change originated and how it became so widespread and popular in independent Mexico. Trendsetting pronunciamientos such as the 1821 Plan of Iguala, specific early pronunciamientos such as the 1829 Plans of Campeche and Jalapa, and the emergence of the patterns and modes of political behavior that would become a hallmark of nineteenth-century Mexico are all analyzed in individual studies that complement one another in a groundbreaking work combining essays by leading authorities in the field with the work of a new generation of scholars.

Forceful Negotiations provides an innovative and revisionist collection of essays that seek to explain the origins, nature, and dynamics of the pronunciamiento with a view to understanding the cultural-political frameworks in which an aggressive extra-constitutional practice like this could become the standard means of informing and influencing policy. We hope the volume offers readers a challenging collection of interpretations of and explanations for the ways in which Mexican political culture legitimized the threat of armed rebellion as a means of effecting political change during this turbulent period.

[Buy the Book](#)

Acknowledgments

In June 2007 I was the recipient of a major Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) research grant amounting to more than £610,000, which funded a three-year project on “The *Pronunciamiento* in Independent Mexico, 1821–1876” (2007–10). This generous award allowed me to put together a vibrant team made up of research fellows Germán Martínez Martínez and Natasha Picôt, AHRC-funded PhD students Rosie Doyle and Kerry McDonald, and database developer Sean Dooley. A further four PhD students started their doctoral programs in September 2007 on related topics under my supervision—Shara Ali, Melissa Boyd, Leticia Neria, and Ana Romero Valderrama, the last two funded by the Mexican grant-awarding body Conacyt—allowing for the emergence of a lively community of Mexicanists in the University of St. Andrews. The ultimate goals of the team were (1) to produce a major online relational database that includes transcriptions of more than fifteen hundred pronunciamientos (see <http://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/>); (2) to publish three edited volumes on the origins, experience, and memory of these forceful petitions; (3) to enable the PhD students to complete their dissertations successfully; and (4) to collate the data that will eventually be analyzed in my planned monograph on the subject.

Needless to say I am extremely grateful to the Arts and Human-

ities Research Council. Quite simply, without the AHRC's funding, this expensive project would never have taken place. It is thanks to the AHRC that there is now a research team at St. Andrews solely concerned (not to say obsessed) with nineteenth-century Mexican politics and the practice of the *pronunciamiento*. It is also thanks to the AHRC that the first of three planned international conferences was held at St. Andrews, 20–22 June 2008, bringing together the St. Andrews-based research team and a formidable group of international scholars. I would like to thank El Colegio de México, the Universidad Veracruzana, the Universitat Jaume I, and the University of Manitoba for the financial contributions they made toward the travel expenses of their respective speakers.

The conference was extremely lively, generating intense discussion, and thanks are due to our conference secretary, Barbara Fleming, as well as to St. Andrews-based scholars Henriette Partzsch, Mark Harris, Ricardo Fernández, and Leticia Neria, who kindly chaired sessions and read the papers of participants who were unable to attend. Professors Paul Garner, Brian Hamnett, and Alan Knight also deserve to be acknowledged, for being such inspirational chairs and discussants, generously contributing their thoughts to the dialectics the conference unleashed. Likewise I offer my sincere thanks to those speakers who, albeit not included in this volume, offered suggestive papers on different aspects of the origins of the Mexican *pronunciamiento*: Francisco Eissa-Barroso, Antonio Escobar Ohmstede, Luis Medina Peña, Natasha Picôt, and Ana Romero Valderrama.

As always I thank my colleagues in the Department of Spanish and the School of Modern Languages at the University of St. Andrews for their unwavering support and collegiality. I am indebted to our former students Moira Frame, Kim Gillespie, Vic-

toria Milton, and Rosanna Shaw for the translations they prepared of some of the papers. Andrea Boyd deserves to be thanked for translating Josefina Zoraida Vázquez's essay. Thanks are also due to Salvador Rueda Smithers and Hilda Sánchez at the Museo Nacional de Historia in Mexico City for allowing Natacha Buzalko to take the photograph of the painting entitled *Es proclamado Iturbide Primer Emperador de México, la mañana del 19 de mayo de 1822* and for ensuring that the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia authorized its use on the cover of the present volume. I thank Natacha for taking the photograph and Monica Hayes for organizing the shoot. And my gratitude extends, as ever, to my wife Caroline and our children for being so incredibly patient and supportive.

Last but not least I must thank Heather Lundine and her first class editorial team at the University of Nebraska Press: in particular, Bridget Barry, Joeth Zucco, and Sally E. Antrobus. It was a real pleasure to work with them on my *Santa Anna of Mexico* (2007) and I am delighted that we have been able to continue working together. I thank Heather for believing in this project and for committing herself to publishing the books it will generate.

[Buy the Book](#)

Introduction

The Nineteenth-Century Practice of the Pronunciamiento and Its Origins

What was a *pronunciamiento*? It is a question that is not easy to answer given that nineteenth-century Mexicans used the term for a whole range of political interventions. To consider as a case in point the 19 May 1822 show of force in Mexico City that resulted in Agustín de Iturbide being proclaimed emperor, it was in all senses a straightforward coup d'état. It differed little from previous and subsequent coups, such as the 1808 overthrow of Viceroy José Iturrigaray or the 1846 *golpe* (coup) that brought a swift end to Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga's dictatorship, to name but two clear-cut examples.

Imitating Napoleon Bonaparte's forceful and trendsetting coup of 18 Brumaire (9 November 1799), the 19 May action consisted of a military blow in the capital, directed in this instance at the Congress, without involving the mobilization of revolutionary armies or a long drawn-out civil war. However, as may be seen in Ivana Frasquet and Manuel Chust's chapter on Iturbide's pronunciamientos of 1821 and 1822, the actors involved in 1822 called what they did a *pronunciamiento*.

In stark contrast, and as highlighted by Germán Martínez Martínez in his cultural analysis of this practice in chapter 11, contemporary Mexicans also used the term for what we might consider nothing other than a town council's declaration of principles. There

are numerous examples of town council– and state legislature–led proclamations, initiatives, and addresses that were defined by their authors and proponents as *pronunciamientos*.

Consequently the approach adopted in this volume, almost inevitably, accepts that the *pronunciamiento* cannot be analyzed using too rigid a definition. After all, we cannot ignore what nineteenth-century Mexicans claimed it was if we are to attempt to understand how this practice came to permeate Mexican society at all levels during the five decades that followed independence. We have to take on board the view that a *pronunciamiento* could end up as a coup but that it could also be simply a statement of intent, the expression of a given political belief by a given community or group of disgruntled officers.

Yet a number of features may be seen to have been present in the great majority of conspiracies, coups, revolts, addresses, and mobilizations that were described at the time as *pronunciamientos*. Although there were exceptions, most *pronunciamientos* were in the first instance an act of insubordination or, as Miguel Alonso Baquer put it, “a gesture of rebellion.”¹ They contained an expressed intention on the part of the “pronounced ones” of rebelling or disobeying, of withdrawing their support or ceasing to recognize the authority or legitimacy of a given local and/or national government. On numerous occasions the promulgators included an explicit threat of violence in the document they used to announce their act of insubordination (*acta* and plan). Typically they claimed they would have no choice but to fight if their grievances were not addressed.

The aim of these gestures of rebellion was to force the government to listen and negotiate with the *pronunciados*. For the original *pronunciamiento* to be successful it was therefore essential that

following its declaration and circulation other garrisons and communities came out into the open with copycat pronunciamientos in support of it. The hope was that should the original pronunciamiento gain sufficient adherents, it would forcefully persuade or intimidate the government into backing down and attending to the original pronunciados' demands. These supporting pronunciamientos would become known as *pronunciamientos de adhesión* (of allegiance) and would constitute the "domino theory" model of this practice. Given that the pronunciamiento needed pronunciamientos de adhesión to succeed, most pronunciamiento cycles or series began in the periphery rather than in the capital. Time was needed to allow the constellations of pronunciamientos de adhesión to prosper and proliferate, something from which a pronunciamiento launched in the capital could not benefit because of its proximity to the national government. The pronunciamiento, therefore, was not a coup d'état since its dynamic was geared toward negotiation, even though as already noted, some cycles did end with the overthrow of government.

Army officers led the great majority of pronunciamientos. This was understandable given that the military had the means to make their threats of resorting to violence a reality. It was nonetheless a practice that involved active civilian participation, as may be seen in Michael T. Ducey, Kerry McDonald, and Rosie Doyle's chapters. In fact there was close collaboration between officers and civilians in most pronunciamientos either because the civilians used the soldiers to fulfill their ambitions or because the soldiers needed the civilians to legitimize and fund their actions.²

It was also a practice that evolved and was eventually adopted and employed by a wide range of civilian actors and subaltern groups. This can be seen, in particular, in the pronunciamientos

de adhesión that did more than cut and paste or support the demands made in the original pronunciamientos. As noted by McDonald in her chapter on the origins of the pronunciamientos of San Luis Potosí it was common for regional elites to include in their *actas de adhesión* additional demands that were aimed at addressing strictly local or regional grievances.

Regardless of the pronunciamiento's evolution, it was a remarkably formulaic and ritualistic practice. In this sense it retained over time a number of characteristics that to a certain degree make possible creating a taxonomy of the phenomenon, despite the difficulties noted in defining the pronunciamiento.

Given that there would have been a grievance shared or that could be usefully exploited by a number of officers and/or villagers, the initial stage of most pronunciamientos involved a conspiracy. The potential pronunciados sought to gain adherents and establish whether they would have sufficient support from key players in the community once their forceful protest was launched. During this preparation stage the pronunciados-to-be entered into so-called *compromisos* with potential backers. This involved promising rewards to officers, merchants, priests, etc. in exchange for their support. Once the aspiring pronunciados were persuaded that they could garner a meaningful following, a meeting was convened to discuss formally the grievance or matter at hand. In the original military-led pronunciamientos, this generally took place in the leading commander's quarters. Thereafter, and once the practice of the pronunciamiento was taken up by civilians, such a meeting went on to take place in the town council rooms (i.e., the *casas consistoriales*), main square, parish church, or even in a few cases in a particular individual's house. The holding of a supposedly spontaneous meeting in which grievances were openly discussed before

the premeditated resolution of launching the pronunciamiento was taken became customary. At this point, a secretary was appointed, who wrote down the minutes of the meeting—the *Acta*—which would go on to outline the plan, petition, or *grito* (cry) that was formally and almost ritualistically *pronunciado*.

Most of the pronunciamiento texts thus began with a preamble explaining how it had come to pass that those concerned had been compelled to gather and discuss the stated grievances and how, in turn, they had resolved unanimously and as a corporate body (specific garrison, *ayuntamiento*, etc.) to “pronounce.” In so doing they often claimed to represent an ignored or oppressed general or popular will. They outlined their demands in the petition that ensued and noted, in the more forceful cases, that they would unwillingly resort to violence if their grievances were not addressed. The pronunciamiento invariably carried the signatures of the pronunciados, who often claimed to represent the men under their orders (e.g., a specific artillery unit or all the sergeants of a given division). The text was then circulated as widely as possible, printed and distributed as a pamphlet or inserted or reproduced in the press. It was also read out to the community where the pronunciamiento was launched, an event that could be celebrated with fireworks, tolling of church bells, music, and in some instances a fiesta. If the pronunciamiento received a significant number of pronunciamientos de adhesión, and the pronunciados could hold the government to ransom by controlling a geopolitically important town, such as Veracruz, Guadalajara, or San Luis Potosí, its chances of success were indeed great. Rosie Doyle’s chapter on the 1852 Blancarte series of pronunciamientos provides a perfect case study of the dynamic outlined.³

In Mexico the pronunciamiento texts developed into a genre

in their own right. What is more, it is difficult to conceive of a pronunciamiento without a text. Worthy of note in this respect is Shara Ali's chapter on Santiago Imán's revolt of 1838–40 in Yucatán, where, atypically, the text was produced *after* the revolt had been launched. The importance of the text as a key element of the pronunciamiento cannot be overstated. The legalistic language employed is indicative in itself of how the pronunciamiento represented an alternative legality or bureaucracy that was on a par with the supposed constitutional order it was challenging.

It was also an appealing and addictive practice because it was ultimately a contained form of revolutionary action. The pronunciamiento was meant to be resolved without bloodshed. Its dynamic was one based on threats and counter-threats, in which rebels and government officials waited to see how much support the original pronunciamiento received before deciding whether negotiation would be necessary, or whether one side or the other would have no choice but to back down. As Josep Fontana has argued, the pronunciamiento opened up the possibility of effecting a contained or controlled revolutionary action, namely one that—although employing a threat of violence—forced change without actually unleashing a bloodbath in the manner of the French or Haitian revolutions: “It consecrated a new political formula which allowed the political and military ‘liberal’ minorities to carry out a controlled revolutionary process.”⁴ The degeneration into violence or civil war was therefore an aberration.

The pronunciamiento was certainly symptomatic of a context of institutional disarray and constitutional crisis. As was noted by Mariano Otero, whose views on the pronunciamiento Melissa Boyd discusses in chapter 8, the practice had arisen because while one political order had come to an end, that which was meant to

replace it was still in the making. The effect the eleven-year-long War of Independence had had on society also influenced matters. Mexico now had a politicized military, accustomed to exerting power over civilian authorities, and a society that had grown used to settling political disputes by force. The disgruntled revolutionary officers who missed out on the post-independence round of promotions would be the first to use the *pronunciamiento* to further their careers and causes.

The *pronunciamiento* came to serve numerous purposes, moreover, as discussed in the final chapter of this volume, which in turn may help explain its appeal and popularity. Successful *pronunciados* used the practice to gain accelerated promotion at an individual level. However, it also allowed communities (especially the disenfranchised) to engage in politics, enabling them to make known their political views. And as evidenced in Michael T. Ducey's chapter on the *pronunciamentos* of the Huasteca during the First Federal Republic, it could even result in a *fiesta*.

Albeit intended as an extra-constitutional means of correcting perceived political injustices on behalf of the people or the nation—in Reynaldo Sordo's chapter we find a group of congressmen pronouncing and acting extra-constitutionally in order to save the constitution—the use of *pronunciamentos* became a destabilizing force. To use Otero's words, it became a *funesta manía* (baneful habit), since it became the way of conducting politics, of bringing about change, preventing a new constitutional order from setting down long-lasting roots.

Most *pronunciamentos* failed to achieve their aims, as Josefina Zoraida Vázquez reminds us.⁵ Yet it also remains the case that most of the leading political changes of nineteenth-century Mexico were caused or provoked by *pronunciamentos*. The Plan of

Iguala of 24 February 1821 (reviewed here by Timothy E. Anna and Frasquet and Chust) resulted in the achievement of independence. The two 1822 Plans of Veracruz together with the 1823 Plan of Casa Mata (and all the pronunciamientos de adhesión the latter received) brought an end to Agustín de Iturbide's empire (1821–23). Manuel Gómez Pedraza's resignation and Vicente Guerrero's consequent rise to the presidency, similarly, were the result of the 1828 pronunciamientos of Perote and La Acordada. The following year, it was again a pronunciamiento, the 1829 Plan of Jalapa (analyzed by Vázquez in chapter 3) that brought down Guerrero's government and assisted Anastasio Bustamante's rise to power.

The Plan of Veracruz of 2 January 1832, after a year of daily pronunciamientos and civil war, eventually brought an end to Bustamante's term in office. The 25 May 1834 Plan of Cuernavaca was then responsible for generating such a wave of supporting pronunciamientos that Santa Anna felt justified in closing down the radical Congress of 1833–34 and repealing most of its laws. The dissolution of the 1824 Federal Constitution and the change to a centralist system were likewise provoked by the 1835 Plans of Orizaba (19 May) and Toluca (29 May) and the hundreds of pronunciamientos de adhesión they received.

Six years later, the concerted 1841 pronunciamientos of Guadalajara, La Ciudadela, and Perote—the so-called *Revolución de Jalisco* (touched upon in Melissa Boyd's study of Otero's writings on the practice)—ended Bustamante's second stint as president. On 11 December 1842, the pronunciamiento of Huejotzingo and its own series of plans of allegiance gave acting president Nicolás Bravo the justification to close down the Constituent Congress and abandon its proposed draft constitution. And two years later, Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga's 1844 pronunciamiento of Guadala-

jara, in tandem with the so-called Revolution of the Three Hours in Mexico City, ended Santa Anna's fourth presidency (discussed here by Reynaldo Sordo Cedeño). While the Guadalajara pronunciamientos of 1841 and 1844 did not bring Paredes y Arrillaga to power, his San Luis Potosí pronunciamiento of 14 December 1845 did. However, Paredes y Arrillaga was in turn deposed less than a year later (August 6) by a pronunciamiento in Mexico City, with the Mexican-American War (1846–48) having already started.

Following the defeat, it would take four years before another successful pronunciamiento series was launched on the back of the Plan of Blancarte of 26 July 1852 (discussed by Rosie Doyle in chapter 10), bringing about Santa Anna's return to Mexico from exile and his sixth term in office (1853–55). And it was a pronunciamiento in Ayutla, Guerrero, on 1 March 1854 that ended Santa Anna's dictatorship after a year of civil war and ushered in the mid-century reform period.

Notwithstanding the constitutionalist credentials of some of the men who rose to power in the mid-1850s, moderate president Ignacio Comonfort was responsible for the pronunciamiento of Tacubaya of 17 December 1857. This closed down Congress, rescinded the 1857 Constitution, and created the circumstances for General Félix Zuloaga to stage his own pronunciamiento in Mexico City on 11 January 1858, which gave the conservatives control of the capital and unleashed the particularly sanguinary Civil War of the Reforma (1858–60).

No individual pronunciamiento would prove successful at a national level between the end of the War of the Reforma in 1861 and Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada's reelection in 1876, with the country having become absorbed by the French Intervention for the greater part of the 1860s. But it would be once more a pronun-

ciamiento, the Plan of Tuxtepec of 10 January 1876, that would bring a young Porfirio Díaz to power.

In other words, although most pronunciamientos were unsuccessful, those that triumphed were responsible for the most important political changes of nineteenth-century Mexico. To quote François-Xavier Guerra: “All the important political changes of this period, including the constitutional ones, have their origin in pronunciamientos, starting with independence itself.”⁶ So where did this way of conducting politics originate? And how did it become so widespread and popular?

A number of historians have argued that the origin of this phenomenon is to be found in the Masonic lodges, gatherings, and activities of the 1810s and '20s.⁷ It would certainly appear to be the case that most of the conspiracies that unfolded in Spain between the return of King Ferdinand VII to the throne in 1814 and the restoration of the 1812 Constitution in 1820 were plotted, orchestrated, and led by members of secret societies, which in that period had become the main forums of enlightened or liberal opposition to absolutism, both in Spain and in many other parts of Europe.⁸ In this sense Spanish historian José Luis Comellas believes that all pronunciamientos in Spain were characterized by their liberal agenda.⁹ Raymond Carr endorsed this perspective, arguing that “the *pronunciamiento* was the instrument of liberal revolution in the nineteenth century,” a view Frassetto and Chust espouse in chapter 2 of this volume.¹⁰

However, although it is possible to trace the conspiratorial stages of the pronunciamiento and its early liberal rejection of absolutism and despotism to the Masonic practices and politics of the 1810s, worthy of note was the context of contested authority in which the pronunciamiento surfaced, both in Spain and in Mex-

ico. The constitutional crisis unleashed by the Napoleonic occupation of the Iberian Peninsula in 1808 and the usurpation of the Spanish crown, with the capture of Ferdinand VII and the imposition of Joseph Bonaparte on the throne, undoubtedly created a context of upheaval and disputed authority, raising fundamental questions about the ruling bodies' legitimacy.¹¹ At one level, the armed imposition of a new monarch, together with Napoleon Bonaparte's forceful activities in Europe, highlighted the extent to which authority was an incredibly fragile construct. As I have noted elsewhere, in this new and exciting revolutionary age, high-ranking officers in the mold of Napoleon could be choosers. Authority was now in the eye of the beholder. It could be questioned, challenged, overcome, and ultimately appropriated. For the generation of the Wars of Independence, in the wake of Napoleon's shake-up of most of Europe's monarchies, the mystique of authority lay no longer in the genealogy of kings or the prestige of hierarchy. Authority was there for the taking, and the strongest bidder could take all if he played his cards right in what had become a dog-eat-dog world by the teens of the century.¹²

The juntas that surfaced in Spain, and later in Spanish America, claiming to represent their country's sovereignty and the will of the people, in opposition to the usurper Bonaparte (and later the tyrant Ferdinand), similarly set a precedent whereby any group of people could claim, through the use of pseudo-legal proclamations, minutes, and eventually, constitutions, to be the true and legitimate source of authority.¹³ The 1812 Constitution of Cádiz, the 1814 charter of Apatzingán, and the many short-lived *magna cartas* that were drafted throughout the Hispanic world between 1810 and 1826 empowered the written word, giving the plan, the

proclama, and eventually the pronunciamiento their own mystique of legitimacy.

A key characteristic of the nineteenth-century pronunciamiento, evidently stemming from a context in which established governments or figures of authority were no longer perceived to be above or superior to the protesting garrison, town council, or pueblo, is that in the negotiations that tended to unfold between the holders of power and the petitioners, the pronunciadados behaved as if they had the same status or rights as the supposedly official representatives of the state (presidents, military commanders, governors). In other words, for the majority of nineteenth-century Spaniards and Mexicans, the post-1808 state and its institutions had not been in place for long enough to be recognized or accepted as the legitimate incarnation of the nation or its rightful government.

Therefore it was in response to the constitutional crisis unleashed by the 1808 Napoleonic occupation of Spain that the ritualized and bureaucratic revolutionary repertoire of the pronunciamiento was developed. In Spain between 1814 and 1820 a number of conspiracies and military-led rebellions erupted following Ferdinand VII's abolition of the 1812 Cádiz Constitution, and these served as precedent and inspiration for Riego's 1 January 1820 *grito*.¹⁴ As was the case with the proclamas and revolts that erupted in Mexico during these years, these early proto-pronunciamientos set down extremely important precedents. In a context of ongoing constitutional crisis brought about by the restored monarch's abolition of the 1812 Constitution, the Spanish *cuartelazos* (barrack revolts), *levantamientos* (uprisings), *conjuras* (plots), and *conspiraciones* (conspiracies) of 1814–19 ultimately provided Riego in Spain with a model of action which he then went on to consecrate and name in January 1820.

It was Riego who first launched a successful *pronunciamiento* that developed the kind of pattern of events and practices that would become widespread and common thereafter. Riego also used the term *pronunciamiento* for the first time. On 3 January 1820, two days after the *grito* had been given in Cabezas de San Juan, forty-eight kilometers south of Seville, he addressed his battalions in the main square of Arcos de la Frontera: “Soldiers: the glory you have acquired through your heroic *pronunciamiento* will not be erased in the Spaniards’ hearts whilst the sweet name of the patria is not devoid of meaning.”¹⁵

Riego’s *pronunciamiento* of 1 January 1820, extra-constitutionally yet legitimately, brought back the liberal Constitution of 1812 after a slow but effective string of copycat *pronunciamientos* of allegiance persuaded Ferdinand VII to revive the abolished charter while remaining king of Spain. In so doing, Riego established the model that would subsequently be taken up by anybody who was somebody in Spanish and Mexican politics, in a period that Stanley Payne understandably defined as the “era of *pronunciamientos*.”¹⁶

The prestige of this practice was soon consolidated in Mexico via the Plan of Iguala of 24 February 1821—a *pronunciamiento* that ultimately resulted in the independence of Mexico. Its influence as an equally trendsetting precedent cannot be overstated. The lesson was there for all to see: *pronunciamientos* could force a king to change his policies, even make him adopt a constitution he did not favor; now they could also bring about a country’s independence. Moreover, the ritual of the *pronunciamiento* was given further exposure and kudos. Having gone through a *trabajos* stage whereby Iturbide finally succeeded in bringing insurgent leader Vicente Guerrero on board, and surmised that his *grito* would

obtain significant support from key officers in the royalist army, Iturbide gathered his officers on 24 February 1821, with representatives of each military arm, and ensured that they unanimously committed themselves to backing his manifesto and plan. A secretary was appointed, who drafted the minutes of the pronunciamiento, and those present signed it. The grito of Iguala was thus launched, and copies of its pronunciamiento text or plan were dispatched to all the military and civilian authorities in the kingdom.¹⁷ The desired domino effect did not take long to unfold. As Christon I. Archer has noted: “The suddenness of the collapse of New Spain was remarkable. The proclamation of Iturbide’s Plan of Iguala and the simplicity of his message offered soldiers and civilians, royalists and insurgents, an escape from chaos and expectations of a return to prosperity.”¹⁸ Critical to the consecration of the pronunciamiento text as a legitimizing medium of change was that the eighty-five thousand men at arms who changed sides in the following months and joined Iturbide’s independence movement did so by swearing their allegiance to the Plan of Iguala, the actual text, rather than to a particular individual or idea.¹⁹

The formulistic register and structure of the pronunciamiento text as a key legitimizing source in Mexico, with its particular characteristic features (preamble, petition, and call for action and/or negotiation) were also piloted in the Plan of Iguala. Although Riego described his revolt as a pronunciamiento, the documents that accompanied the grito of Cabezas de San Juan were still more like *proclamas* (addresses) than the legalistic texts that became the norm in Mexico soon afterward. On 1 January 1820, Riego issued a proclama to the officers José Rabadán and Carlos Hoyos, two different proclamas “To the troops,” another “To the officers and the people,” a *bando* (edict or proclamation), and a *dis-*

curso (speech).²⁰ He did not produce a definitive single pronunciamiento text. Nor did he formulate as a petition his demand to have the 1812 Constitution restored. The Plan of Iguala, in this sense, would empower the actual pronunciamiento document in a way that was novel and would thus serve as the main model for the genre that would develop subsequently.

The pronunciamiento of Cabezas de San Juan transformed Riego into a legend; the Plan of Iguala eventually turned *criollo* officer Agustín de Iturbide into an emperor, following the self-termed pronunciamiento of 19 May 1822.²¹ Pronunciamientos could thus serve liberal and libertarian causes. They could also result in vertigo-inducing promotions, such as going from being a disgruntled and demoted colonel in the royalist forces to becoming not just a *libertador* but Agustín I, emperor of the Mexican Empire. The heady mix of liberal causes such as constitutionalism, freedom, and independence, paired with the adrenaline rush of the grito and the hope of an outcome that could include personal aggrandizement as well as military and political promotion, made the experience of the pronunciamiento into an irresistible and addictive practice for most politically minded nineteenth-century Mexican soldiers. It is extremely difficult to think of an officer of the time who did not, at some stage, participate in a pronunciamiento. Here was a practice that could serve the patria, make you a hero, and even help you climb the social ladder in ways previously inconceivable. Against a background of contested authority you would be a fool not to give it a try and “pronounce.” This, of course, is what happened.

The prestige of the practice was to become firmly consolidated in Mexico after the Plans of Veracruz (2 and 6 December 1822) and the Plan of Casa Mata (1 February 1823) resulted in the abdi-

cation of Agustín I. The versatility of the pronunciamiento and its ability to alter dramatically the political context of the country was there for all to emulate. Although Santa Anna and Guadalupe Victoria's 1822 *impulso* of Veracruz did not initially garner the support the pronunciados expected, it generated the context in which José Antonio Echávarri, who had been sent to crush the revolt, was able to turn against the emperor and issue his own Plan of Casa Mata in February 1823, which by creating a united front with the Veracruzans the following day finally initiated the expected pronunciamiento domino effect that forced Iturbide to abdicate.²²

Critical to the development of this practice throughout Mexico was article 9 in the Plan of Casa Mata, which temporarily empowered the provincial deputation. This article, formulated in a context in which the regional elites had greatly resented Iturbide's centralist tendencies, proved decisive in ensuring that the Plan of Casa Mata was vociferously supported by the provinces.²³ It also added a new and crucial dimension to what a pronunciamiento could do and whom it could serve. The experience of Riego's pronunciamiento had shown that this was a practice that could result in meaningful political change. The Plan of Iguala had demonstrated that it could even bring about a country's independence (and make its main instigator the emperor) and had highlighted the importance of the pronunciamiento text. The lesson to be drawn from the impact of the Plan of Casa Mata was that this was a way of ensuring that the voice of the provinces was heard and of securing devolution of power to the regions and their local governments.

Although the hundreds of pronunciamientos that erupted between 1821 and 1876 still need to be analyzed systematically, both

quantitatively and qualitatively, before we can draw any firm conclusions, an initial overview of the grievances and demands that featured in a significant number of them would appear to suggest that at least in Mexico, the pronunciamiento became first and foremost a regionally led practice. Whether it was to demand the creation or reintroduction of a federalist or a centralist constitution, a tentative glance at the plans of these five decades would appear to point toward a context in which the pronunciamiento became the favorite political practice of the provincial elites when engaging with national politics.²⁴ If this initial impression is correct, then it can be argued that this was the result in no small measure of the manner in which the Plan of Casa Mata, and the *actas de adhesión* it received, demonstrated for the first time that through the medium of the pronunciamiento the provinces—in this instance through their provincial deputations, in tandem with their garrisons—could pressurize the national government into backing down before the demands of the regions. Iturbide abdicated, a Constituent Congress was formed, and not surprisingly, the 1824 Constitution that was subsequently drafted was a federalist one.

The pronunciamientos of Cabezas de San Juan, Iguala, and Casa Mata thus established a model of political lobbying or forceful negotiation that quickly became common and widespread throughout independent Mexico. As a political practice it was emulated, adopted, and developed in a range of major and minor towns and garrisons. To name but a sample, pronunciamientos were launched to pressurize Congress into adopting a federalist political system (Guadalajara, 23 February, and San Luis Potosí, 5 June 1823); to urge it to pass laws that would result in the expulsion of the Spanish population in Mexico (Mexico City, 23 January 1824); to demand the end of secret societies (Otumba, 23 December 1827);

to challenge the electoral results (Perote, 16 September 1828); and to end Guerrero's use of emergency powers and sack some of his ministers (Jalapa, 4 December 1829). Thereafter and following the level of political participation that was inspired and motivated by the pronunciamiento of Veracruz of 2 January 1832, it can be confidently stated that the pronunciamiento was popularized as a practice to an unprecedented degree.

The chapters in this book interpret the practice of the pronunciamiento in a broad, flexible, multifaceted, and dynamic way that allows for a wide range of lines of inquiry to be pursued. They move beyond the simplistic equation of pronunciamiento equals revolt or coup and grapple with its multiple and varied objectives, consequences, and meanings, from both regional and national perspectives, exploring the practice's origins, dynamics, and nature in the early national period. What emerges is a complex interpretation that eschews easy categorizations.

Timothy E. Anna pays attention to the evolutionary context of Mexico's transition from colony to liberal republican nation-state. Seeking to interpret the pronunciamiento's resonance as the preferred instrument for fundamental political change, he analyzes the foundational 1821 Plan of Iguala as the prototype of all subsequent pronunciamientos. Worthy of note is Anna's view that the pronunciamiento was an integral part of the Mexican "national project" and that in representing an act of political co-optation, at least in the case of Iguala, it became an effective and replicated practice in a context where there was not yet a clearly defined state, the mechanisms for transfers of power had not been in place for long enough, and the country found itself in a kind of institutional vacuum.

Anna's assessment is developed in Ivana Frasquet and Manuel

Chust's chapter on the trans-Atlantic developments that brought about Riego's *grito* and the Plan of Iguala, interpreting their success and resonance by stressing the way they combined military and civilian actors and defended varying brands of liberal constitutionalism. According to Frasquet and Chust the origins of the liberal *pronunciamientos* of the nineteenth century must be traced back to the success obtained by Riego and the Spanish liberals in 1820 and by Iturbide and his men in 1821. In the view of these authors, critical to appreciating the resonance of this practice is that it originally took place in and responded to a liberal and constitutional milieu.

Josefina Zoraida Vázquez assesses the impact the events in 1828 had both at a national and at a regional level by analyzing the contexts in which the 1829 *pronunciamientos* of Campeche and Jalapa erupted. Vázquez argues that the violation of the Constitution in 1828 set a precedent that would at least presage, if not legitimize, the use of extra-constitutional means in 1829 to counter what was in essence an illegitimate government. While events in Yucatán would be marked by profoundly regional concerns, the *pronunciamiento* of Jalapa, in contrast, would respond to national grievances. Both *pronunciamientos* would be temporarily successful: Yucatán was governed by the *pronunciados* as a quasi-independent state until November 1832, and Vicente Guerrero was forcefully replaced as president by Anastasio Bustamante, though he in turn would be overthrown.

Following on from this it is interesting to see, in Michael T. Ducey's chapter on the impact national *pronunciamientos* had in the Huasteca, how small town actors responded to and participated in these national movements. Ducey's research coincides with Kerry McDonald's in highlighting how local issues were ul-

timately the key factor in accounting for the political and violent mobilizations of given groups in rural Mexico. It is also evident that national pronunciamientos had entirely unintended consequences: municipalities and village politicians exploited them to settle old scores and promote their own factional interests in strangely superimposed contexts marred by particularly violent political rivalries and ideological polarization.

Kerry McDonald provides an overview of the grievances that were voiced in the pronunciamiento-prone state of San Luis Potosí and categorizes the *potosino* pronunciamientos' origins thematically, making a distinction between nationally and locally inspired pronunciamientos. McDonald's research highlights the importance of the pronunciamiento's metatext; that is, its unstated grievances as opposed to its visible demands. Her chapter also shows that in this region, in response to externally motivated pronunciamientos, there was a tendency to launch reactive pronunciamientos that used national issues and actors to address or rectify strictly local concerns. The pronunciamientos of San Luis Potosí may have given the impression that their defenders or aggressive proponents were using this practice simply to back or reject external pronunciamientos. In reality, more often than not, they appear to have hijacked national demands to further their own regional economic and political interests.

As can be seen in Michael Costeloe's chapter on Mariano Arista's pronunciamiento of Huejotzingo of 8 June 1833, the pronunciamiento syndrome became chronic just over a decade after independence and, from a decidedly British perspective, damaged the national government's ability to guarantee the rule of law. In this instance the pronunciados' confiscation of the British United Mexican Mining Company's cash and silver, and the authorities'

inability to stop them or even to repay the money after the pronunciamiento was crushed, demonstrated that Mexican society was characterized by its lawlessness. It is no coincidence that after 1833 no new British investment went to Mexico for many years; the fallout was both symptomatic and representative of the extremely detrimental impact pronunciamientos had on the Mexican government's ability to govern the nation meaningfully or to present the republic before foreign investors as a country where the rule of law was safeguarded.

Shara Ali's chapter on Santiago Imán's revolt of 1838–40 further nuances our understanding of the origins of the pronunciamiento by analyzing what motivated Imán and his men to revolt and eventually pronounce: a concatenation of private and public concerns, micro and macro demands, concrete and general grievances. The multilayered origins of Imán's pronunciamiento, as explored in Ali's essay, provide an eloquent example of how a combination of needs could justify and legitimize a call to arms that could be both personally motivated and concerned with the general good *at the same time*, regardless of whether personal circumstances accounted for the initial urge to revolt.

Ironically—or tellingly, depending on the reader's point of view—even a constitutionalist liberal like the youthful lawyer and politician Mariano Otero from Guadalajara found ways of justifying certain pronunciamientos when these were supposedly the ones to end all others, as described in Melissa Boyd's chapter on his interpretation of the origins of the baneful Mexican national addiction to the pronunciamiento. Equally paradoxical is the manner in which Mexico's congressmen resorted to effecting political change by forceful means in December 1844, as studied in Reynaldo Sordo Cedeño's chapter on the so-called Revolution

of the Three Hours. By the mid-1840s it was evidently acceptable even to ostensibly upright and law-abiding Mexican civilian legislators to employ extra-constitutional means to safeguard the Constitution.

Rosie Doyle's anatomy of the practice of the *pronunciamiento*, as well as providing a detailed dissection of the origins and experience of the Plan of Blancarte of 26 July 1852, explores how local concerns were hijacked by national actors to address national concerns. In contrast to the *pronunciamientos* of San Luis Potosí studied by McDonald, Doyle's research into what she defines as the "Blancarte series" of *pronunciamientos* illustrates how those originating in regional concerns could be co-opted into a national movement, which in this case resulted in the end of Mariano Arista's term in office and Santa Anna's return to power.

Germán Martínez Martínez reviews the practice of the *pronunciamiento* from a cultural perspective and reflects on how it contributed as a building block in the construction of Mexican national identity. Sharing Anna's view that the *pronunciamiento* was actually part of the national project, Martínez Martínez finds in the *pronunciamiento*, and particularly in its text, a site of memory where nineteenth-century actors started to express and define their incipient sense of national identity.

The final chapter uses this cultural approach, together with the interpretations offered in this volume, to explore the numerous and different purposes this practice served, above and beyond that of effecting political change. What becomes evident is that to understand the importance of the *pronunciamiento* in the political and cultural life of nineteenth-century Mexico, it is essential that analysis is not limited to the study of military interventions. Impacts at national and at regional levels are better interpreted by adopt-

ing a multifaceted and multidisciplinary approach that can fully encompass the complex and subtle origins, nature, and dynamics of this multidimensional and evolving phenomenon.

Such assessment of the pronunciamiento is important. As Vázquez noted in a recent article: “A careful analysis of the *pronunciamientos* will surely allow us to understand the political logic of [the time] . . . the complexity of those decades in which the republic was seeking to consolidate its state, surviving foreign threats, internal divisions, economic paralysis and bankruptcy. Given that the *pronunciamientos* were the expression of the factions and later of the parties, their analysis is a task that needs to be undertaken as a matter of urgency.”²⁵

The studies that follow aim to do precisely that. They analyze the many uses and forms the pronunciamiento acquired as it went on to become the favorite means to effect change in independent Mexico. They concentrate on the origins of this practice and explore what it entailed, both nationally and regionally. The conclusions drawn are just the beginning of a journey of inquiry into what was undoubtedly the most important political practice of nineteenth-century Mexico.

Notes

1. Baquer, *El modelo español de pronunciamiento*, 40.

2. For a recent article that sets out to demonstrate that the pronunciamiento was not an exclusively military practice, see Fowler, “El pronunciamiento mexicano.”

3. For other accounts of the processes entailed in launching a pronunciamiento see Carr, *Spain 1808–1939*, 124; Vázquez, “Political Plans and Collaboration,” 21–23; Guerra, “El pronunciamiento en México,” 18; Vázquez, “El modelo de pronunciamiento mexicano,” 35.

4. Josep Fontana, “Prólogo,” in Castells, *La utopía insurreccional*, ix.

5. Vázquez, “Political Plans and Collaboration,” 19, 21–22. Notwithstanding this, as discussed in chapter 12, the question of success/failure requires fur-

ther thought. Vázquez is right if we measure their success in terms of whether they obtained what they claimed they had set out to achieve in the pronunciamiento texts themselves. However, if, for example, the pronunciadados' aim was to get noticed, to ensure that their views were aired and given coverage, as a publicity stunt of sorts, an exercise in public relations or a dramatic piece of political propaganda, then it is not so easy to determine whether they failed even if their stated demands were not satisfied.

6. Guerra, "El pronunciamiento en México," 15.

7. Vázquez, "Political Plans and Collaboration," 22. For a historiographical discussion of Vicente La Fuente and Eduardo Comín Colomer's Masonic-led interpretations see Comellas, *Los primeros pronunciamientos*, 28–29. Raymond Carr and Stanley Payne also stress the importance Masonic lodges had in organizing the civilian revolutions of 1814–20 in Spain. See Carr, *Spain 1808–1939*, 126–29, and Payne, *Politics and the Military*, 18–19.

8. See Hamnett, "Liberal Politics and Spanish Freemasonry," 222–37.

9. Comellas, *Los primeros pronunciamientos*, 24.

10. Carr, *Spain 1808–1939*, 124.

11. For a recent interpretation of these events and their consequences see Breña, *El primer liberalismo español*, especially 73–83.

12. Fowler, *Santa Anna of Mexico*, 40.

13. Jaime E. Rodríguez O.'s view that the Wars of Independence were an extension of, and part of, the constitutional crisis that arose in the Hispanic world from the dissolution of the Spanish monarchy, rather than being clear-cut anticolonial struggles, can be seen to be developed further here in the sense that the pronunciamiento was a product of this meltdown in the rules, customs, and practices that governed the Spanish orb, in Spain and in its kingdoms. See Rodríguez O., *Independence of Spanish America*.

14. For more about these early pronunciamientos in Spain see Comellas, *Los primeros pronunciamientos*; Baquer, *El modelo español de pronunciamiento*, 47–80; and Artola, *La España de Fernando VII*.

15. Gil Novales (ed.), *Rafael del Riego*, 37.

16. Payne, *Politics and the Military*, 14–30.

17. Anna, *Forging Mexico*, 79–83; Ávila, *En nombre de la nación*, 196–211; Vázquez, "El modelo de pronunciamiento mexicano," 36.

18. Archer, "Politicization of the Army of New Spain," 37.

19. For the number of men see Vázquez, "Iglesia, ejército y centralismo," 211.

20. All these documents are reproduced in Gil Novales (ed.), *Rafael de Riego*, 34–39.

21. Needless to say it was the pronunciamiento text of the Plan of Iguala that made this “legally” possible, stating “8. Si Fernando VII no se resolviere a venir a México, la Junta de la Regencia mandará a nombre de la nación mientras se resuelve la testa que debe coronarse.” See chapter 2 for a translation of the 19 May 1822 text.

22. Fowler and Ortiz Escamilla, “La revuelta de 2 de diciembre de 1822.”

23. For the response of the provincial deputations to the Plan of Casa Mata, see Benson, *La diputación provincial*, 122–37.

24. Having revised this chapter at the end of the second year of the three-year AHRC-funded project on “The *Pronunciamiento* in Independent Mexico, 1821–1876” (2007–10, <http://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/pronunciamientos/>), it is still too early to know for certain whether this impression is correct. For an early appraisal of the nature of civil conflict in Mexico (1821–57), see Fowler, “Civil Conflict in Independent Mexico,” 49–86.

25. Vázquez, “El modelo de pronunciamiento mexicano,” 49.

[Buy the Book](#)

Chronology of Main Events and Pronunciamientos, 1821–1853

1810–1821

WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

1821

24 February

Agustín de Iturbide launches the Plan of Iguala (see introduction and chapters 1 and 2)

24 August

Iturbide and Viceroy O'Donojú sign the Treaty of Córdoba

27 September

War ends with the Army of the Three Guarantees' capture of Mexico City

1822–1823

FIRST EMPIRE

1822

19 May

Iturbide becomes Emperor Agustín I following pronunciamiento of 19 May (see chapter 2)

26 August

Iturbide imprisons nineteen members of Congress

31 October

Iturbide closes down Congress

2 December

Santa Anna launches Pronunciamiento of Veracruz (see introduction)

1823

- 1 February Plan of Casa Mata (see introduction)
2 February Santa Anna joins the Plan of Casa Mata
19 March Iturbide abdicates
1823–1824

THE TRIUMVIRATE

The Federal Constitution is drafted;
triumvirate is made up of generals
Guadalupe Victoria, Nicolás Bravo, and
Pedro Celestino Negrete

1823

- 5 June Santa Anna revolts launching the Plan of
San Luis Potosí (see chapter 5)
1824–1835
1824–1829

FIRST FEDERAL REPUBLIC

Guadalupe Victoria, president

1827

- 19 January Arenas pro-Spanish conspiracy dismantled
10 May First anti-Spanish Expulsion Laws
20 December Second Expulsion Laws
23 December Plan of Montañón, General Nicolás Bravo
joins Montañón's revolt (see chapter 3)

1828

- 7 January Battle of Tulancingo; *escoceses* are defeated
September The moderate General Manuel Gómez
Pedraza wins presidential elections
14 September Santa Anna “pronounces” in Jalapa,
proclaiming Vicente Guerrero president
30 November Revolt of La Acordada (see chapter 3)
4 December Raid of the Parián Market

27 December	Manuel Gómez Pedraza escapes and goes into exile
1829	Vicente Guerrero, president
26 July	Isidro Barradas's expedition lands in Tampico to reconquer Mexico for Spain
11 September	Santa Anna defeats Barradas's expedition
6 November	Centralist pronunciamiento in Campeche (see chapter 3)
4 December	General Anastasio Bustamante leads the Revolt of Jalapa (see chapters 3, 4, and 5)
31 December	Bustamante takes Mexico City
1830–32	Anastasio Bustamante, president (Also known as the Alamán Administration)
1831	
14 February	Vicente Guerrero is executed
1832	
2 January	Santa Anna launches Plan of Veracruz (see chapters 4 and 5)
March–December	Civil war spreads across central Mexico
December	<i>Convenios</i> of Zavaleta bring an end to Bustamante's regime
1833	
January	Manuel Gómez Pedraza, president (as agreed in Zavaleta, Gómez Pedraza returns to complete his interrupted term in office while elections are held)

1 April	Santa Anna, president; however, does not take up post, leaving Vice President Valentín Gómez Farías in charge
1833–34	Gómez Farías “Radical” Administration
26 May	Pronunciamiento de Escalada
1 June	Plan of Durán
8 June	Plan of Huejotzingo calling for an end to Congress’s radical reforms and for Santa Anna to become dictator (see chapter 6)
1834	
25 May	Plan of Cuernavaca starts a series of pronunciamientos against the reforms of the Gómez Farías Administration. Santa Anna intervenes and annuls most of the reforms (see chapter 4)
1835	
January	Gómez Farías is stripped of his vice-presidential office Santa Anna, president; however, due to his absence the presidency is taken by Miguel Barragán
28 January	Miguel Barragán, president
1835	
February	Federalists revolt in Zacatecas against the rise of the centralists
11 May	Santa Anna quells the revolt in the Battle of Guadalupe
19 May	Pronunciamiento of Orizaba calls for change to centralism

29 May	Pronunciamiento of Toluca does so as well
22 June	Revolt in Texas begins
23 October	The Federal Constitution is abolished and Mexico becomes a central republic
1835–1846	THE FIRST CENTRAL REPUBLIC
1836	
27 February	José Justo Corro, president (following Barragán's death)
6 March	Battle of El Alamo
21 April	Battle of San Jacinto (Santa Anna is taken prisoner the following day)
29 December	The Siete Leyes (creating the 1836 Constitution) consolidate centralist political system and limit the suffrage
1837–1841	Anastasio Bustamante, president
1837	
April	Anastasio Bustamante, president (after winning elections)
February	Santa Anna returns from the United States in disgrace
1838	
March	French fleet starts blockade of port of Veracruz
May	Santiago Imán revolt in Yucatán begins (see chapter 7)
27 November	French Pastry War begins with the bombardment of Veracruz
5 December	Santa Anna forces the French to retreat and loses one leg in battle

1839

- April José Antonio Mejía and José Urrea start federalist revolt in Tamaulipas
- May–June Santa Anna acts as interim president
- 3 May Battle of Acajete; Santa Anna defeats rebels; Mejía is executed

1840

- 15 July Federalist pronunciamiento in the capital; Bustamante is taken prisoner in the National Palace
- 27 July Revolt ends and Bustamante is restored to power

1841

- August– October Triangular Revolt (also called Revolución de Jalisco) overthrows Bustamante's regime (see chapter 8)
- 1841–1844 Santa Anna, president

1841

- October Bases de Tacubaya approved; Santa Anna has “almost absolute power”

1842

- 9 December Pronunciamiento in San Luis Potosí demanding closure of Congress
- 11 December Pronunciamiento in Huejotzingo also demanding closure of Congress
- 18 December Congress is closed down

1843

8 June Bases Orgánicas; ultimate *santanista* constitution is accepted

1844

2 November Pronunciamiento of Guadalajara is launched by General Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga against Santa Anna
6 December Revolution of the Three Hours overthrows Santa Anna's regime in the capital (see chapter 9)

1845

June José Joaquín Herrera, president
Santa Anna goes into exile to Cuba
14 December Pronunciamiento of General Mariano Paredes y Arrillaga in San Luis Potosí leads to fall of Herrera's government (see chapter 5)

1846

April Paredes y Arrillaga's dictatorship
War with the United States begins
6 August Federalist revolt overthrows Paredes y Arrillaga and replaces the centralist republic with the Second Federal Republic; Santa Anna returns, invited by the Federalists
August José Mariano Salas, temporary president while elections are held

1846–1853 SECOND FEDERAL REPUBLIC

1846

December Santa Anna, president; however, due to the war with the United States, Valentín Gómez Farías acts as president again

1847

February Pronunciamiento of Los Polkos against Gómez Farías and anti-clerical measures

23 February Battle of Angostura–Buena Vista

9 March General Winfield Scott arrives in Veracruz

21 March Santa Anna ends Gómez Farías's administration again

18 April Battle of Cerro Gordo

August Caste War begins in Yucatán

11 Aug.–15 Sept. Campaign of the Valley of Mexico

14 September Government leaves Mexico City to become established in Querétaro

15 September The U.S. Army takes Mexico City

September Manuel de la Peña y Peña, president; forms new government

1848

2 February Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo grants half of Mexico's national territory to the United States

1848–1851 José Joaquín de Herrera, president

1851–1853 Mariano Arista, president

1852

26 July Plan of Blancarte (see chapter 10)

13 September Second Plan of Blancarte (see chapter 10)
20 October Plan del Hospicio (see chapter 10)

1853

January–February Juan Bautista Ceballos, president
February–April Manuel María Lombardini, president
1853–1855 SANTA ANNA'S DICTATORSHIP