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This article examines the political discourse of Trinidad Sánchez Santos, a leading voice in the Catholic opposition movement that emerged during the last decade of Díaz’s reign. Since the age was marked by monopoly capitalism, economic imperialism, and the “social question,” it is hardly surprizing that he villianained the market. He forged his political identity around the image of the market, for he constructed it as a social demon that had to be exorcised. While his imagery was unique, his focus on the economic realm was not. The symbol of the market was at the center of the ideological struggle for power waged by liberals, radicals, and conservatives in Porfiriian Mexico.

Este artículo examina el discurso político de Trinidad Sánchez Santos, una voz muy importante en el movimiento de la oposición católica que surgió en la última década del Porfiriato. Siendo que la época estuvo marcada por el monopolio capitalista, el imperialismo económico y la “cuestión social,” no es de sorpresa que Sánchez Santos se lanzara contra el mercado. Sánchez Santos forjó su identidad política alrededor de la imagen del mercado y lo erigió como un demonio social que debía ser exorcizado. Mientras que su imaginaria acerca del mercado era original, su enfoque en lo económico no lo era. El símbolo del mercado estaba en el centro de la lucha ideológica librada por el poder entre liberales, radicales, y conservadores en el México del Porfiriato.

The political mobilization of opposition groups is a central theme in the historiography of late Porfiriian Mexico. Ricardo Flores Magón and the radical left have been studied extensively. Francisco Madero and the liberal...
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opposition have also been examined.\textsuperscript{1} In contrast to this comprehensive study of radicals and liberals, historians have almost totally neglected the conservative opposition in the form of social Catholicism, the dominant strand of Mexican Catholicism during the last decade of the Porfiriato.\textsuperscript{2}

This lack of attention to social Catholic mobilization during the end of Díaz’s regime is particularly surprising given the intense battles between Church and state that were fought during the Revolutionary period. As Jean Meyer has shown, the state attacked the Church because it was a powerful adversary.\textsuperscript{3} Manuel Ceballos Ramírez’s fine study of social Catholicism during the Porfiriato reveals that the Church’s political mobilization began during the last decade of Díaz’s reign.\textsuperscript{4} Thus, the late Porfiriato was clearly an important chapter in the history of Catholic mobilization in Mexico. Furthermore, Catholic ideology during the 1930s and beyond echoed some themes in Porfiriian social Catholic thought.\textsuperscript{5}


4. Ceballos Ramírez, \textit{El catolicismo social}.

5. A number of the themes in Porfirián social Catholic thought were also stressed by Mexico’s semi-fascist Catholic integralist movement of the 1930s and 1940s, which labeled
To gain insights into social Catholicism’s popular appeal during the Porfriato, this essay examines the movement’s political rhetoric, a topic that has received little attention. The study analyzes the discourse of social Catholicism’s leading publicist, Trinidad Sánchez Santos. *El País*, the periodical he edited, was named the official organ of social Catholicism. (Nevertheless, he had complete control over his paper’s content.)

In keeping with Mexican social Catholics’ assessment of the age of Díaz, Sánchez Santos’s principal critique of Porfriano Mexico was economic. The market economy, more specifically, was the central symbol in his discourse. The market was nothing less than a “trademark” for Sánchez Santos. Thus, Sánchez Santos’ market discourse had a political significance that was similar to cases in nineteenth-century Europe. Historian Ricardo Salvatore explains the European case:

> It was in relation to the market, constructed as a force able to erode community values, to destroy traditional ways of life, and to impart an unsavory materialism to social relations that important social movements of the nineteenth century built their identity and political strategy.\(^8\)


\(^7\) Ceballos Ramírez, *Catholicismo Social*, 195–6.

In Sánchez Santos’s discourse, too, the market was the principal monster—the root cause of poverty, economic inequality, capital-labor strife, radicalism, and the dissolution of the family. The symbol of the market also figured in his reform agenda, for he constructed the moral economic order he championed as the other of the hellish market. Thus, the image of the market played a key role in the formation of his political identity. It was a demon that needed to be exorcised.

Sánchez Santos’s discourse was popular because he did not operate in an ideological vacuum. Indeed, the market economy was not a theme restricted to Sánchez Santos and the social Catholics. To the contrary, it was the central topic in elite discourse in late Porfirián Mexico. Economic factors, in part, accounted for this focus on the symbol of the market.

Economic conditions during the last decade of the Porfirián served to draw increased critical attention to the market. The age was marked by economic recession, the emergence of trusts and monopoly capitalism, increased foreign economic penetration, intensified conflict between capital and labor, the persistence of poverty despite significant material progress, and the privatization of communal lands, which resulted in the expropriation of Indian village dwellers.

Political developments, too, resulted in heightened attention to the market. After decades of intense political strife, Mexico finally achieved political peace during the Porfirián. With political problems solved, the national discourse shifted from political to economic themes. Thus,

---


11. Salvatore’s study of elite discourse concludes that politics as opposed to economics dominated during the first half of the nineteenth century. Salvatore, “Strength of Markets.” Maria del Refugio González’s study of the press leads to similar conclusions. She maintains that the Mexican press paid little attention to commerce at mid century. Rather, social and political themes received attention. This stands in stark contrast to the Porfiri-
during the Porfiriato, a developmentalist market-oriented discourse eclipsed the political discourse of state building that had prevailed during the nineteenth-century.

Not only the Porfirián elite, but also conservative, liberal, and radical critics of the regime focused on economic themes. In fact, social Catholics’ focus on economics was so pronounced that it drew the attention of contemporaries. (El Imparcial, the premier semi-official periodical, commenting on a 1903 Catholic Congress in Puebla, stated that, judging from the topics covered—“credit, capital investment, and interest”—that “one would believe it was a monetary conference.”12 Similarly, social Catholics’ theories on banking attracted critical attention from El Economista Mexicano, a financial weekly.)13

The Mexican Liberal Party (PLM), an anarchist opposition group, too stressed economics. The central problem in society, according to the PLM, was economic as opposed to political. Capitalism was the root cause of social malaise.14 Some factions of the liberal opposition, too, emphasized economics.15 In contrast to the radical solutions the PLM championed to ameliorate the social ills caused by capitalism, liberals espoused social liberalism, a reformist doctrine.16 Other liberal opponents to Díaz, however, focused on politics and particularly the issue of reelection.17 Thus, while economic themes dominated, politics was not neglected.

One of the trademarks of Porfirián elites’ economic discourse was market worship, for científicos, a small political clique that directed official policy during the last two decades of the Porfiriato, celebrated material progress. They were economic determinists who believed that economic prosperity was a cure-all. They claimed that it would not only strengthen national sovereignty, but also create social harmony.18

---

12. Not surprisingly, the Porfirián paper criticized the Congress’s economic proposals: “The financiers of the monetary conference in Puebla have clearly understood the grand forces that move humanity in the twentieth century [i.e., economics], but they have forgotten their complete incapacity to move those forces.” “La Conferencia Monetaria Clerical de Puebla: El Proyecto de un Banco,” El Imparcial, 7 March 1903, 1.
15. See, for example, the periodical El Paladín.
17. For example, see El Diario del Hogar, the famous liberal opposition paper.
Not all assessments of the market were positive, however. If a celebration of market expansion and material progress was one hallmark of Porfirián discourse, another was growing criticism of the social impact of the market. Opposition groups’ demonization of the market was not lost on contemporaries. *El Imparcial*, for example, noted social Catholics’ hostility towards economic liberalism. The daily criticized a Catholic Congress’ assertions that liberalism was the root cause of workers’ poverty and that contemporary Mexican workers were worse off than in the days of slavery.19

Opposition groups’ focus on the market, in part, was dictated by the dominant Porfirián discourse. Científicos’ stress on material progress was so pronounced that critics of the Díaz regime viewed it as an ideology that legitimized Porfirián rule.20 To undermine the government’s legitimation, critics attacked the notion that material progress had been achieved.21 Conservative, liberal, and radical critics of the market contended that capitalism resulted in social ills. Social Catholics and the PLM maintained that the market was responsible for workers’ impoverishment, economic inequality, and capital’s domination of labor.22 The PLM charged that market expansion resulted in land concentration and the expropriation of Indian villagers. And even científicos warned about the potential dangers of foreign domination of the economic sphere.23 The fact that the 1917 Constitution addressed the issues of exploitative labor conditions, inequitable land distribution, and foreign domination is a testament to the immense attention these issues received during the late Porfiriato. Ironically, then, despite Díaz’s long tenure in office and the political opposition to his reelection, economic rather than political themes dominated the national discourse in late Porfirián Mexico.

This essay’s stress on the economic realm, and particularly dissent on economic grounds, counters conventional wisdom, which underscores the compatibility between the economic visions of Díaz and his

22. Dumas noted that the Catholic opposition press condemned liberalism. Dumas, “Prensa Clerical.”
opponents. If this work revises one historiographical literature, it also builds on another. Some scholars maintain that a significant strand in Latin America’s political culture is Thomist and corporatist. Sánchez Santos’ discourse is a case in point. The case of Sánchez Santos, however, highlights a form Thomism in Latin America that has received less scholarly attention. While scholars have stressed a Thomist political culture, the case of Sánchez Santos highlights the influence of Catholic corporate thought on the realm of economics.

**Social Catholicism**

Sánchez Santos was heavily influenced by European social Catholicism, a movement which developed in the nineteenth century. It was a religious response to the “social question,” which became more pronounced with the emergence of industrial capitalism and the formation of a working class in Europe. The movement’s defining feature was its effort to address the problem of poverty in the contemporary world. Social Catholics promoted social reform on behalf of the masses. They organized social and educational programs, workers’ organizations, and civic groups. While these general assertions can be made about social Catholicism, it is important to note that it was not a monolithic movement.

Social Catholicism was the dominant strand in Mexican Catholicism during the last decade of the Porfiriato. It contrasted significantly with the liberal Catholicism which had reigned in Mexico during the 1890s.


27. There were a number of currents in the crusade which differed over issues such as the degree of state intervention, the role of Christian trade unions, and the extent to which the liberal order should be challenged. On differences over the role of the state and trade unions see Misner, *Social Catholicism*. 


The rise of liberal Catholicism was aided by Díaz’s policy of reconciliation between Church and state. Rather than challenge the liberal order, liberal Catholics sought to adapt to it. They found ways to reconcile Catholicism with the economic, political, and social doctrines of liberalism. For instance, they embraced the concepts of freedom and equality, two tenets of liberalism. Not surprisingly, they did not attempt to undermine the Díaz regime. Social Catholicism, in contrast, took a much more defiant stance toward the liberal order. Given social Catholics’ antagonism towards liberalism, it is not surprising that they chastised liberal Catholicism’s comfortable relationship with the Díaz regime. Contrary to liberal Catholics’ acceptance of some aspects of liberalism, social Catholics were heavily influenced by neo-Thomist corporate thought, which came back into vogue during the second half of the nineteenth century.28

Social and economic problems which existed in late Porfirian Mexico—such as economic recession, capital-labor conflict, and inadequate wages for urban and rural workers—made social Catholicism particularly appealing. After all, the movement focused on the plight of workers and the poor. Social Catholics played an important role in raising awareness and consciousness about these issues. In fact, their emphasis on problems in Mexican society helped make the “social problem” a major theme in the national discourse. Between 1903 and 1909 they held a series of highly publicized Catholic congresses which discussed social and economic problems such as low wages, exploitative labor conditions, and problems with the credit system.29 They also developed a national and regional press that emphasized the “social problem.”30 And Social Catholics raised awareness about social problems in study groups and Catholic schools.31 In addition to discussing problems, social Catholics took some active steps to ameliorate them. They championed the family wage and organized Catholic labor unions, which mostly represented artisans.32

The radical threat posed by the PLM was yet another issue that made social Catholicism attractive. Following the lead of European social Catholicism, the Mexican movement represented itself as the only alternative to two failed ideologies, liberalism and socialism. Ironically, social Catholics’ critique had much in common with radicals’ analysis, for both

28. Ceballos Ramírez, Catolicismo social, ch. 1.
30. Ceballos Ramírez, Catolicismo social, 272–78.
31. Ceballos Ramírez, Catolicismo social, 268–71; and Adame Goddard, Católicos mexicanos, 189–94.
groups stressed the problems of inequitable distribution of wealth and labor exploitation. However, radicals also championed a pressing issue that social Catholics ignored: the need for land redistribution.33

Even though social Catholics, the liberal opposition, and the radical opposition all emerged at about the turn of the century, the Díaz regime did not respond to the three movements consistently. Whereas Díaz severely repressed the liberal and radical opposition he did not hamper the activities of social Catholics. Most likely this was because in contrast to the liberal and radical opposition, Díaz did not see social Catholicism as a direct threat to the regime. After all, it was public knowledge that one of the main goals of the liberal and radical opposition was to oust Díaz from power, albeit by different means. In contrast, the social Catholic movement did not single out the president; it had a less specific opponent, namely, the liberal order.

Even if social Catholicism was not openly repressed, it did have many critics. A salient issue for both the liberal and radical opposition was reducing the Church’s power in secular society. Reflecting concern about this issue, liberals, radicals, and Protestants attacked the Díaz regime for not implementing Reform laws which restricted the Church’s power.34 This goal directly clashed with social Catholics’ overarching design: increasing the Church’s role in civil society. After all, social Catholicism focused on contemporary material issues as opposed to spiritual themes.

It is hardly surprising that liberals and radicals rejected social Catholicism. But some segments of the Catholic Church also failed to embrace it. Some of the clergy resisted the movement and continued to adhere to the philosophy of liberal Catholicism.35 In addition, spiritual currents in Mexican Catholicism did not focus on social issues.36 Furthermore, social Catholicism had more impact in central Mexico than other regions of the country.37

35. Ceballos Ramírez, Catolicismo social, 144.
36. Ibid., 152.
37. Ibid., 420–1.
Trinidad Sánchez Santos

Trinidad Sánchez Santos was social Catholicism’s most vocal publicist. His views were widely disseminated on a daily basis in *El País*, the Mexico City-based newspaper he edited. He founded the daily in 1899 and continued publishing it until his death in 1912. Even though he was only forty when he founded the paper, he had already had nearly two decades of experience working in journalism. Not only had he written for several periodicals, but he had also served as editor for *El Nacional*, *La Voz de México*, and *El Heraldo*.

*El País* had a very wide readership. Sánchez Santos had his sights on challenging Rafael Reyes Spindola’s periodical, *El Imparcial*, which, with the aid of financial support from the Porfirian government, was the most widely distributed paper in Mexico. While *El País* never reached the circulation of *El Imparcial*, its distribution was nevertheless very impressive. It not only eclipsed *El Tiempo* and *La Voz de México*, the other Catholic dailies based in Mexico City, in importance, but also became one the most influential papers of the era. It started with a circulation of eight thousand in 1899 and by 1910 it had expanded to thirty thousand. According to one of Sánchez Santos’ biographers, during the first two years of the Revolution the paper’s circulation expanded significantly. By early 1911 circulation had reached one hundred thousand and in 1912, the year Sánchez Santos died, circulation reached two hundred thousand. While the paper was most heavily distributed in Mexico City, it also circulated in more remote regions.

Perhaps it was the flamboyant way that Sánchez Santos delivered his message that made his paper so popular. Sánchez Santos espoused social Catholic doctrine in the form of passionate editorials, which were lengthy and prominently featured on the front page. He was clearly a political force to be reckoned with. *El País* debated with prominent Porfirian periodicals, such as *El Imparcial* and *Semana Mercantil*. Further,


40. Ceballos Ramírez, *Catolicismo social*, 146.


Sánchez Santos engaged in polemical exchanges with Francisco Bulnes and Justo Sierra, two famous members of the científico clique. After Madero came to power, Sánchez Santos had serious conflicts with him. Sánchez Santos debated with La Nueva Era, a maderista periodical, and was eventually jailed for his attacks on Madero's government. It appears that Sánchez Santos held influence not only with people of power, but also with the masses. When the Díaz government fell and huge demonstrations were held in Mexico City, a biographer of Sánchez Santos reports, one hundred thousand people gathered outside his office and cheered him.

Sánchez Santos and Mexican Discourse

Sánchez Santos did not attack the dominant ideology in Mexico, namely, a derivation of liberalism which was heavily influenced by positivism and social Darwinism. Científicos articulated this eclectic brand of liberalism. Stressing the “social organism” as opposed to the individual, científicos’ embraced collectivism, not individualism. Reflecting the influence of positivism, científicos’ emphasized order as opposed to freedom.

In contrast, Sánchez Santos critiqued an individualist and egalitarian brand of economic liberalism. One might characterize the form of liberalism he attacked as a blend of laissez-faire economic doctrine and egalitarian strands of political liberalism. He stressed the individual, not the collective. Further ignoring científicos’ brand of liberalism, he emphasized freedom, emancipation, and equality, not order and social control. The only issue that the científicos’ variant and the brand of liberalism that Sánchez Santos critiqued were in agreement on was materialism, both embraced it.

Why didn’t Sánchez Santos attack the positivist variant of liberalism that was dominant in Mexico? The influence of social Catholicism was a major factor. An intransigent stance towards a laissez-faire brand of economic liberalism was a trend in European social Catholic thought, which became more pronounced in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The works of Pope Leo XIII and Wilhelm Von Ketteler, two giants of the movement, clearly illustrate this trend. Wilhem von Ketteler’s pio-

neering 1864 work, The Labor Problem and Christianity, harshly condemned economic liberalism, and particularly the commodification of labor and free and unrestricted trade, as the principal cause of workers’ plight. 48 Leo XIII’s 1891 encyclical, Rerum Novarum, was another key document in social Catholicism. 49 The encyclical forcefully rejected an individualist brand of liberalism. In its stead the encyclical championed a Thomist corporate social order in which not the market but moral and religious principles would regulate economic processes. This corporate-religious system, in which social “justice” was the divine regulator, would relieve workers from the plight they faced under capitalism. 50 Sánchez Santos, who cited both Bishop von Ketteler and (especially) Leo XIII, was strongly influenced by this corporatist and anti-liberal trend in social Catholic thought.

Sánchez Santos also cited radical and liberal critics of capitalism in his anti-market diatribe, such as Henry George and John Kells Ingram. Whether he was actually influenced by these thinkers or just cited them to gain greater support for his assertions is unclear. Whatever the case may be, the important point is that this radical and liberal critique also attacked a laissez-faire brand of liberalism, as we will see below. The international anti-capitalist discourse which Sánchez Santos integrated into his social critique, naturally, did not focus on the specific variant of liberalism that reigned in Mexico.

Perhaps there were also rhetorical reasons why Sánchez Santos did not critique the dominant form of liberalism in Mexico. In an age marked by economic inequality, economic imperialism, intense capital-labor strife, and the concentration of wealth in the form of mergers and trusts, he constantly pointed out the contradictions in liberalism’s emancipatory egalitarian doctrine. During this age of monopoly capitalism, the emancipatory brand of liberalism that Sánchez Santos attacked was an excellent straw man.

His association between monopoly capitalism and feudalism is a case in point. Pointing to an irony in liberalism, Sánchez Santos contended that features of feudalism and monarchy that liberalism had supposedly dissolved actually reemerged, albeit in new forms. “Tyranny,” the politi-

cal force associated with absolute rule and supposedly destroyed by liberalism, for instance, endured. More importantly, a new nobility emerged under liberalism, namely, the kings of capital. He labeled the new nobility the “aristocrats” of “oil” and “railroads” and maintained that even though they did not have royal titles they were even mightier than conquistadors and feudal lords: “No feudal lord had the power of Rothschild, no monarch ruled more than Hanna; no conquistador was more terrible than Cecil Rhodes.” “Privileges and fueros,” entitlements that were destroyed by the leveling force of the market in a liberal narrative, also survived intact under market society in Sánchez Santos’ analysis. He cited “usury” and “speculation” as modern “privileges.” According to Sánchez Santos, the market was directly responsible for the formation of the economic aristocrats, for the “liberty of association and commerce” had facilitated their creation. This contention stood classic liberal dogma on its head. But it fit well with Catholic dogma: Individual materialist freedom was a license which led to sin. Thus, Sánchez Santos portrayed liberalism’s emancipatory doctrine as an illusion, for while liberalism “proclaimed equality,” it really “invented methods to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.”

The Basis of Political Economy: Not Materialism but Moralism

The cornerstone of Sánchez Santos’s attack on market society focused on materialism and individualism, for he claimed that they had grave social consequences. According to him, these two components of market ideology were intertwined. Indeed, the main social evil he associated with materialism was promoting individual interests over the common good. Thus, materialism and individualism reinforced each other. Sánchez Santos claimed that there were dire consequences to excessive materialism and unchecked individualism. In fact, he attributed what might be termed a “laundry list” of negative repercussions to unrestrained individualism:

It [unchecked individualism] explains the growing lack of discipline and corruption in youths world wide, the favorable reputation of divorce, the increase in illegitimate births, privileges that support speculation, monopolies, immense wealth of a few and the bitter poverty of workers; the

51. Supporting this contention, he complained that during “obscure” times interest rates were 6 percent, but that in modern times they were as high as “12% 18% and 30%” “Somos masfelices?,” El País, 8 May 1901, 1.
52. Ibid.
economic disequilibrium, the anarchism in towns and the imperialism of governments; in a word, the destruction of order... which is the triumph of barbarism.  

In keeping with this critique, Sánchez Santos lamented that liberal economic ideology had stripped morality from the economic sphere. He expanded upon this critique when he discussed political economists’ notions of human nature. He chastised them for conceiving of humans as material beings. He claimed that they had “complete ignorance of true notions of the human personality.” He offered a corrective: “man is necessarily a MORAL [emphasis in original] being.”

Sánchez Santos offered an alternative to liberal political economy which was consistent with his conception of human nature. Indeed, the central platform of his economic program was reinserting morality into the economic realm. Sánchez Santos, quoting a work on economic doctrines written by the Irish economist John Kells Ingram, invoked the authority of political economy to promote infusing economics with morality. Sánchez Santos cited a section of Ingram’s work that criticized Adam Smith for overlooking man’s moral side. Sánchez Santos, echoing Ingram’s critique, reprimanded liberal political economy for its “materialist current.” Further countering the materialist focus of liberal political economy, he championed “Christian political economy,” which, in contrast, did “not find it necessary to divorce the moral truths and religious principles, nor was it influenced by materialism.”

Sánchez Santos, in essence, protested against intellectual developments which had occurred in the field of economics during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. During this period the discipline of economics emerged as an individual field that was divorced from politics and morality. By arguing that self-interested economic actors unwittingly served the greater good, Bernard de Mandeville and Adam Smith liberated economics from morality. Moral regulation of the economy was unnecessary. This conceptual development—that is, the emergence of economics as a distinct discipline that was separate from morality—

55. El País, 29 April 1903, 1.
provided the theoretical framework upon which Sánchez Santos structured his critique.  

Sánchez Santos articulated a theory about the social order that supported his contention that morality needed to be reinserted into the economic realm. According to him, social harmony was created by striking a proper balance between individual desires and societal obligations:

What is the ‘condition’ of the existence of human society, knowing that its object is the happiness of the individual and society? Well, this condition can not be anything but securing the order, which provides each individual his proper sphere of action . . . [and is] limited by the rights of others. True liberty is nothing but ‘order’ in which, like the physical order, balance is obtained by two opposing forces which are: the centrifugal force of individual impulses, and the centripetal of society.

Liberal ideology, however, had upset this harmonious order. “Modern ideas,” which Sánchez Santos associated with the “Anglo-Saxon race,” had “destroy[ed] the balance between the two powerful social forces, developing . . . individual impulses at the expense of . . . society.”

Sánchez Santos challenged some of the basic assumptions of classical political economy. Not self-interest, but morality, which he defined as responsibility to the social order, governed the economic system. Sánchez Santos, then, countered a Smithian formulation in which unrestrained individualism unintentionally resulted in the greater good. To the contrary, a healthy social body could only be realized if individual desires were restrained.

Despite this fundamental difference, there was a similarity between Sánchez Santos’s and classical political economy. Both doctrines called for limited state intervention in the economic system, albeit for different reasons. Sánchez Santos, while not confronting the issue directly, implicitly rejected a significant role for the state in the economic system by arguing that countering the reigning ideology of materialism with a strong dose of moralism would largely solve the problems caused by the market. While it would be inaccurate to claim he never supported intervention, he clearly placed less emphasis on it than Rerum Novarum did. Sánchez Santos’s critique of individualism was not totally at odds with the analyses made by científicos and the PLM. Even if these groups

---

59. “Las ‘ideas modernas’ y sus frutos,” El País, 23 June 1900, 1. This association between Anglo ideas and materialism was by no means unique to Sánchez Santos. For the most well-known critique of Anglo materialism see José Enrique Rodó, Ariel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).
60. See León XIII, Rerum Novarum. According to scholar Paul Misner, the Pope took
did not, for the most part, openly attack individualism, their ideologies, at least, stressed the collective.

On the other hand, Sánchez Santos’ position on materialism was in conflict with other Mexican ideologies. Científicos embraced a materialist conception of human nature. Científico Francisco Bulnes put it bluntly: “Man, before being a religious, moral or political animal, is an economic animal.” Not surprisingly, científicos’ overarching discourse about materialism was at odds with that of Sánchez Santos. Científicos’ social critique, which focused on Indians, contended that there was not too much materialism, but rather too little. Inculcating Indians with a materialist ethic was one of científicos’ major concerns.

There were also significant differences between Sánchez Santos and the liberal and radical opposition. But the bone of contention was not materialism. Rather, it was the Church’s role in society. Sánchez Santos’s moral solution required a greater role for Christian values in civil society. Liberal and radical opponents, in contrast, made a major issue out of reducing the Church’s influence.

**Market Society and the Labor Force**

In keeping with European social Catholicism, the most prominent theme in Sánchez Santos’ discourse was workers’ plight under capitalism. Social Catholics and Sánchez Santos were not alone in this focus, for the PLM, too, highlighted labor exploitation. And in 1906 labor conditions became a major theme in the national discourse because of increased tensions between capital and labor and highly publicized strong arm tactics used by the government to break labor.

Sánchez Santos’s labor discourse employed a similar rhetorical strategy as his feudal treatise. He explicitly challenged a liberal tale which associated a capitalist labor market with workers’ emancipation. He utilized a variety of rhetorical strategies to counter a liberal narrative. One tactic was to represent the driving force in the creation of the proletariat as coercion: “Machines absorb small work shops everywhere, workers are regrouped in factories, the independent artisan of earlier days is abased and proletarianized.” In this passage, proletarianization was the

---

*a middle position regarding the state’s role, for there were currents in social Catholicism that advocated both more and less intervention than he championed. See Misner’s work, Social Catholicism.*


antithesis of freedom. Artisans were forced into the market by the transformation in the process of production. Moreover, by describing artisans as “independent” the passage suggests that the factory signifies dependence. His rhetorical questions emphasized the negative impact of proletarianization: “Is the worker happier? Is the work more worthwhile, is the cost of living cheaper and easier?”

Further contesting the association between the market and worker emancipation, he inverted the meaning of the liberal phrase “freedom of work.” He showed that, in reality, labor was controlled by capital. Powerful magnates called the tune by “raising or lowering wages, opening or closing avenues of work.” In Sánchez Santos’s discourse, capital had the upper hand. He quoted a Spanish Catholic journal that made this same point. The journal argued that labor was not paid for all it produced and maintained that this unequal distribution of wealth was “protected by the very principles of the classical economy.” Hence the journal implied that while liberal market rhetoric spoke the language of equality and fairness, it really resulted in worker exploitation.

Completely reversing the association between the market and freedom, Sánchez Santos claimed that the conditions of the modern wage worker were akin to those of slaves. He quoted an author that boldly made this claim: “It can be clearly seen that the condition of the modern worker is similar to the old slave, for both of them are obligated, in order to live, to serve machines that produce wealth for the boss, without obtaining the elements necessary for meeting their needs.”

Sánchez Santos pointed to the irony in this similarity between slavery and liberalism, for the latter “proclaimed equality of man and rights for all.”

Sánchez Santos made yet another charge against the market: it stripped the humanity from the relationship between workers and own-
ers. The implied villain in this critique was capital’s overriding desire for profits. Sánchez Santos, invoking the authority of political economy by citing John Kells Ingram, contended that owners viewed labor not “as humans, but as machines.” This critique had similarities to Pope Leo XIII’s analysis, which criticized capital for conceptualizing labor as a “thing.” According to social Catholic doctrine, then, the market divested humanity from the relationship between workers and owners, for capital, guided by materialist desires, viewed workers exclusively as a source of profit, or, in other words, a commodity.

But the market did more than exploit and degrade workers. It also generated heated conflict between capital and labor. Mexican social Catholics did not argue this point forcefully until 1906, when the “worker question”—a term that referred to heightened tensions between capital and labor—became a national issue. Sánchez Santos applied his materialism run amuck thesis to explain the conflict:

Egoism from above [that is, capital] has ignited egoism from below [that is, workers], and the fight between these two forms of egoism is inevitable, like the collision of two locomotives that come at each other from opposite direction on the same track and have no brakes.

Thus, materialist ideology inevitably resulted in capital-labor conflict.

At the same time as capital-labor conflict became an issue of national debate, a related topic, radicalism, also received extensive attention in the press. In the context of increased conflict between capital and labor and the emergence of the PLM, the question of the possibility of the emergence of radical worker movements became a popular topic of discussion. In Sánchez Santos’ rhetoric on the causes of radicalism, the market was the principal villain. In an editorial entitled “Anarchism and its Economic Factors” Sánchez Santos explained that anarchism followed from a “feeling of desperation in the masses of proletariat caused by the poverty that results from a system of distribution of wealth under which the riches are accumulated in the hands of a few . . . while the majority

68. “El hombre maquina de los economistas: errores y errores; necesidad de su corrección dentro de la ciencia—texto de John Kells Ingram,” *El País*, 29 April, 1903, 1.
70. “La caridad y el egoísmo,” *El País*, 16 April 1903, 1. *El Tiempo* had a similar analysis. The paper represented materialism as the reigning ideology for both the working class and capital. The paper maintained these groups were driven by a thirst for “gold.” The dominance of a materialist ethic made conflict inevitable: “From here the owner’s desire to pay little and gain much and the worker’s desire to work little and gain much, and from here the war that is insensible to reason between the worker and owner. “La Cuestión Obrera—Sus Causas y Remedios,” *El Tiempo*, 30 January 1907, 2.
remain unable to provide for . . . their necessities.”

He contended that poverty radicalized workers. The poor came to hate the rich and falsely believe that their salvation lay not in God, but in socialism. By portraying radicalism as a consequence of economic liberalism Sánchez Santos was following an argument made in *Rerum Novarum*. In contrast, the Díaz regime blamed radicalism on foreign agitators.

In addition to material factors, Sánchez Santos also maintained that a lack of religiosity caused radicalism. He quoted a passage from Victor Hugo to make this point. It stated that when humans’ sole purpose was to satisfy material needs, they became desperate, for they lacked religious faith, which revealed that suffering was a “law of God.” He interpreted Hugo, contending that people needed to have faith in something more than “material well being.” The dominance of the materialist ideology, then, made Mexicans susceptible to radical doctrines.

In keeping with Sánchez Santos’s central thesis, infusing Mexicans with proper moral values was the main solution he offered to resolve the conflict between capital and labor. Given that he contended materialist ideology caused the problem, his solution made sense. He voiced this moral solution in a critique of *El Imparcial*. He claimed that the financial solution that *El Imparcial* advocated to resolve the conflict between capital and labor was unworkable. He contended that “[t]he primary [answer to the conflict] is the restoration of Christian customs, for without them all solutions are illusions.” Inculcating Mexicans with a moral ethic, it appears, would resolve tensions by encouraging capital and labor to focus on their responsibilities to society as opposed to their individual desires.

Sánchez Santos’s construction of the social order made his solution to the worker problem appear reasonable. He depicted humans, and in particular capital and labor, not as individuals but as a part of a corporate order. He was following Pope Leo XIII, who cited Saint Thomas to support his claim that workers and owners were not individuals but part of “the same thing” or a corporate whole. This social body was not egalitarian and horizontal, but rather a vertical and hierarchical. A com-

---

plete social leveling was not only impossible but against God’s plan. Despite inequalities, in social Catholics’ construction, capital and labor were not antagonistic, but rather complementary. As Pope Leo XIII explained, they were interdependent. One could not exist without the other. If each group knew its proper station and fulfilled its social obligations then harmony could be achieved.

Even after the conflict between capital and labor emerged as a national problem in 1906, pro-Porfirian ideologues attempted to downplay the issue, contending that capital-labor relations were harmonious. They contrasted Mexico with Europe, arguing that conditions in the latter which resulted in labor strife were absent in Mexico.

Despite this attempt to sweep this issue under the rug, Sánchez Santos and the social Catholics were not the only ones that discussed the exploitation of workers. The PLM was largely in agreement with Sánchez Santos’s claim that capital exploited labor. The two were not in agreement about the ways to improve conditions for workers, however. *Re-generación*, the PLM’s periodical, disagreed with social Catholics’ solution, which stressed capital-labor harmony: “How can you reconcile these two interests [those of capital and labor] diametrically opposed? In no way.” The paper went on to charge that social Catholics’ policy of reconciliation weakened the labor movement: “friars . . . want to divert the tendencies of the Mexican workers’ movement.”

**The Market, the Family, and the Family Wage**

Sánchez Santos discussed the ways in which the market economy hurt not only workers, but also families. The family was a central theme for him. Sánchez Santos posited an organic society composed of families rather than individuals. Stressing the immense significance of the integrity of the family unit, Sánchez Santos claimed that it was the foundation of civil society. He stressed the family much more than científicos and radicals did. Científicos emphasized a larger collective identity, the social organism. The PLM highlighted the working class rather than the family, even if the group occasionally noted the ways in which the market had a negative impact on the family.

Sánchez Santos demonized the market in his discourse about the family. He argued that the low wages earned under industrial capitalism were destroying the family unit because they were insufficient to support it. It should be noted, however, that the prominence of the market in the discourse about the destruction of the family varied. Sometimes

the market was an explicit villain, but more often it was implicit, for low wages were not always directly linked to market capitalism. In fact, on one occasion Sánchez Santos even subscribed to a liberal explanation for low wages: limited productivity.\textsuperscript{78}

Sánchez Santos’s discourse on the family was based upon his gendered constructions of the public and private spheres. He represented the public realm of the market as male and the domestic domain as female. He explained that women reigned in the “home.”\textsuperscript{79} Sánchez Santos’s position followed the \textit{Rerum Novarum}, which contended that women were “born for domestic affairs.”\textsuperscript{80} In this construction, women were responsible for reproduction and the moral education of the family. Women’s moral influence extended over their husbands as well as their children. Men, on the other hand, were the breadwinners.

There was a dynamic relationship between the public and private spheres. Women’s moral domestic role, Sánchez Santos contended, had a profound influence on the public sphere. Stressing this influence, he explained workers’ unacceptable behavior—he complained that unmarried workers were promiscuous and transient laborers, shifting from job to job in search of new lovers—by pointing to deficiencies in the domestic sphere. He explained that “the family does not exist.” To right this situation he explained that the workers “needed to be civilized,” a task he delegated to the domestic sphere, asserting “civil society begins in the home.” The private sphere had a profound impact on the public realm. Not only did it restrain males’ sexuality, but it also created a stable workforce.

Conversely, the existence of the domestic sphere was largely dependent upon the male worker, for only if men provided for the family’s economic needs could women perform their domestic duties. Hence the male breadwinner was key to the proper development of the moral domestic sphere.\textsuperscript{81}

The market, however, was breaking down this proper division between the public and private spheres. Sánchez Santos quoted an author who explained the way this breakdown was occurring in Europe. The author maintained that “the conditions of the market and the law of capital do not always permit the worker, with only his salary, to satisfy the needs of his [family].” Consequently, mothers and children were forced into the workforce. The result was the dissolution of the family:

\textsuperscript{78} See Trinidad Sánchez Santos, “El problema agrícola . . . ,” 3–4.
\textsuperscript{79} Sánchez Santos, \textit{Obras Selectas de Trinidad Sánchez Santos}, vol. 1, 86.
\textsuperscript{80} Pope León XIII, \textit{Rerum Novarum}, 22–3, 45.
\textsuperscript{81} See Trinidad Sánchez Santos, “El problema agrícola . . . ,” 4–8.
Since the moment this [the wife is forced to work] happens, the family is seriously threatened. The worker only sees his [family] brief moments. The woman is obligated to give the care of her children and the domestic work to strange hands, almost always hired. Who can be surprised that in these conditions that the working family has disappeared from some industrial regions of Germany, and will disappear from other regions of Europe?

Hence low wages paid in capitalist society forced mothers into the public sphere of work. Thus they could not fulfill their domestic duties and, consequently, the family unit deteriorated. Sánchez Santos, contending that “these reflections by a celebrated author have suggested very important ideas which we will explain further another day,” clearly thought the issues discussed had relevance for Mexico.  

The insufficient wages received by men—particularly “Indian” males—also forced their children into the labor force, according to Sánchez Santos. He maintained that under the current wage levels there were no alternatives to child labor. He made this point forcefully in a debate about the education of Indian children. He countered an argument which represented education as the best way to modernize Indian children. Sánchez Santos claimed that low wages made child labor a necessity to the survival of the Indian family. Thus, education was useless, since Indians could not afford to attend school. He argued that once the economic problem was solved Indians would not have to be compelled to attend school. They would go on their own initiative.  

Children, then, faced the same problem that women, and particularly mothers, confronted. They were forced into the market by economic necessity and thus were unable to engage in appropriate activities. The quality of family life deteriorated in the market society, which forced women and children to abandon their proper roles.

In contrast to científicos, Sánchez Santos’s analysis suggested that the root of the “Indian” problem was economic as opposed to racial. Per-
haps Catholic doctrine steered Sánchez Santos away from racial explanations. After all, the most radical forms of racial determinism were grounded in the notion of polygenism, a concept that was totally at odds with the Christian notion of creation.\(^{85}\) True, polygenism had been rejected by the second half of the 19th century. However, theories of racial hierarchy which replaced it were based in the Darwinian notion of evolution, a concept that was also at odds with a Christian view.\(^{86}\)

Sánchez Santos argued that low wages threatened the very existence of the family. Male workers were electing not to marry and raise families because they did not have the financial means to support a wife and children. The problem was not that men wanted lives of luxury for their families. Rather, they were not able to provide the basic necessities of food, clothing, shelter, and education. Sánchez Santos stressed the gravity of the problem, claiming that the very basis of human society—that is, the reproduction of the population—was seriously threatened.\(^{87}\)

To counter the problem of low salaries Sánchez Santos championed the family wage. Stressing the immense significance of the issue as well as the importance of the family unit to social stability, he stated, “It is necessary to incessantly repeat it: the question of salaries is intimately linked to the whole social order.”\(^{88}\)

His discourse on wages further illustrates that he rejected liberal notions of worker commodification and individualism. His position on wages differed sharply from that of El Imparcial, for the pro-Porfirian periodical contended that wages were determined by the “laws of supply and demand.”\(^{89}\) Sánchez Santos’s position was in keeping with Pope Leo XIII, who explicitly attacked the notion that the market should be the divine arbiter, contending that the “unchecked greed of competition” was one of the forces that caused the deterioration of workers’ existence.\(^{90}\) The Pope argued that not the market, but rather workers’ needs

---


\(^{86}\) Ibid., 73–112.


\(^{88}\) “Unicos medios de promover el alza de los salarios,” *El País*, 16 June, 1910.

\(^{89}\) See “El Gobierno y los Salarios,” *El Imparcial*, 8 August 1906, 1.

should dictate wages. He maintained that wages “should be sufficient for the sustenance of a frugal worker.” Sánchez Santos, reprinting an article from a Catholic journal from Madrid, echoed the Pope’s position, contending workers were not “goods,” and that wages should not be determined by the laws of “supply and demand.” Rather, wages, considered as recompense for human work, should be sufficient to meet “the necessities for the conservation of the worker’s existence.” Impersonal market mechanisms should not determine wages, for labor was not a commodity.

**Systems of Exchange: The Market and Morality**

Not only the worker and the family, but also society were negatively affected by the market, according to Sánchez Santos. His societal analysis condemned the capitalist distribution system, for he maintained that under it Mexicans did not have access to basic necessities. While his analysis of the problem was unique, Mexicans of all political stripes were concerned about the issue. Rising prices placed basic goods out of the economic reach of many Mexicans during the last years of the Porfiriato.

Neo-Thomist thought informed his analysis. He conceived of society as a hierarchical corporate body. Social equilibrium was realized when all parts of the corporate body functioned properly. Disequilibrium occurred when one of the parts malfunctioned. Based on this theoretical edifice, Sánchez Santos defined Mexicans’ inability to gain access to basic goods (food, shelter, clothing, education) as an “economic disequilibrium.” From Sánchez Santos’s corporate worldview, the disequilibrium had a negative impact on the entire society. No wonder he spilled much ink on the problem.

The economic disequilibrium was a grave problem, for Sánchez San-
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92. The journal went on to define this “necessity” as sufficient wages to provide for the family’s moral and physical needs. See “Las grandes cuestiones sociales,” originally published in the Madrid publication Revista Católica de las Cuestiones Sociales, directed by José Ignacio Urbina, and reprinted in El País, 24 August 1901, 1.

93. Following the Pope’s encyclical Rerum Novarum, Sánchez Santos advocated a combination of “indirect” state intervention, employer initiative, and workers’ unions to increase wages. He contended that relying on “charity” alone was insufficient. “Unicos medios de promover el alza de los salarios.” El País, 16 June 1910.


95. For this aspect of Thomist thought, see Ceballos Ramírez, *Catolicismo social*, 46.

96. “Causas de l actual desequilibrio económico: la depreciación de la plata y la especulación,” El País, 13 June 1903, 1; “El actual desequilibrio económico,” El País, 6 June 1899, 1; “El desequilibrio económico,” El País, 13 July 1899, 1; “El abismo del dese-
tos equated exchange (that is, equilibrium) not merely with social well-being but even national existence:

The prime necessity, the supreme condition of social life, is commerce in its fullest expression. Only by exchange of products, services, and ideas between men can there be a society and nation, and they will be more prosperous and stronger when this exchange—commerce—is more active, for the facilities that it has.  

In another passage, which he based on the ideas of St. Paul and St. Thomas, he made a similar claim: “It [society] can not exist but for the mutual exchange of services between its members, and it is more perfect when the services given from one to another are more varied and facile.”  

Sánchez Santos was clearly not referring to capitalist commodity exchange. Rather, exchange was a form of organic reciprocity, for it expressed the mutual interdependence of all members of society.

Sánchez Santos represented the absence of exchange (i.e., the economic disequilibrium) as the antithesis of a healthy society. Indeed, he claimed that the inability to exchange resulted in social “dissolution.”  

Supporting this claim, he repeatedly listed a number of social ills that economic disequilibrium generated: health problems such as epidemics, increased infant mortality, and population decline, since Mexican men were electing not to marry because they could not afford to support a family.

Sánchez Santos cited “bestial egoism” as the cause of the “economic disequilibrium.” He contended that the “economic disequilibrium” existed because “egotistical” Mexicans did not fulfill their obligations to society. Hence he applied the unbridled materialism thesis to explain the problem. Unrestrained materialism—in the form of “speculation”—resulted in overpriced goods that were out of the economic reach of


100. “Causas del actual desequilibrio económico: la depreciación de la plata y la especulación,” El País, 13 June 1903, 1.


the masses. Charges of speculation are usually part of a liberal discourse, but this was not the case. Speculation was a consequence of the market as opposed to an aberration from it, for it was a result of too much freedom. Indeed, the article linked speculation to “abused freedom of commerce.”

By putting freedom of commerce in quotations, it is clear that he was contesting the liberal concept as opposed to reinforcing it. “Free” meant, it appears, a free hand to exploit. On another occasion he made the same claim but singled out railroad companies, charging that they jacked up prices because they had too much “liberty.”

The free market was equated with high prices and impoverishment of the masses.

His formulation implied that a commercial system guided by morality as opposed to self-interest would go a long way towards solving distribution problems. His rhetoric supported this position. Self-interest was the other against which morality was constructed. Avarice was associated with economic disequilibrium. Morality, in contrast, implied balance, or access to goods. For Sánchez Santos, this moral role entailed placing the needs of the whole society before individual interests. He explained it this way: “Before the interest of the merchant . . . is the life of society; before the interests of . . . unchecked speculation, is the health and development of the population and the . . . nation.”

He quoted economist John Kells Ingram to make this same point. Ingram criticized political economy’s concept of commerce precisely because it placed too much stress on profits and not enough on morality: “avarice, the doctrine that has legitimated in large part the commercial and economic movement of modern times, hailing profits the supreme criteria for commercial life, until the point that it seems they have forgotten the moral precepts that guide the commercial order.” Morality—that is societal, as opposed to individual interests—then, should regulate distribution.
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Social Catholics’ distributive system was predicated on the existence of haves and have-nots. As Pope Leo XIII put it, “it is not possible to overcome social inequality.” Accordingly, the Pope gave a key role to the state, Church, and the wealthy in the distribution process. Guided by Jesus’ proverb, “It is better to give than receive” the powerful were expected to redistribute their wealth to the poor. Charity, pious social works, and morality, then, played a key role in the Pope’s program of distributive justice. Sánchez Santos’s discourse on distribution, which stressed morality, was in keeping with the Pope’s position.

Scientificos and the PLM attacked social Catholics’ theories of distribution. Científico Francisco Bulnes contended that the Church’s practice of hoarding all the wealth and then (“supposedly,” according to Bulnes) redistributing it to the poor led to economic “ruin.” He invoked the laws of “political economy” to support his criticism. Regeneración, asserting that the Catholic Church amassed immense wealth, too, implicitly critiqued Sánchez Santos’ ideas about redistribution.

Conclusions

The ideological battle for power in late Porfirian Mexico was largely waged on the economic front. Since it was an age of unprecedented political peace and economic expansion, this focus is hardly surprising. Both supporters and detractors of the regime employed economic symbols to legitimate their movements. Thus, the market and economic progress were at the center of ideological controversy.

Scientificos stressed the level of national wealth as opposed to the distribution of wealth. They celebrated Mexico’s economic progress and assumed it had positive social consequences. Their buzzwords were progress, productivity, technology, finance, investment, trade, and industry. Detractors, in contrast, emphasized the distribution of wealth. From that vantage point, they painted a negative picture of Mexico’s economic performance. Their watchwords were meager wages, labor exploitation, capital-labor conflict, economic concentration, and social impoverishment.


The PLM’s radical doctrine, which championed the overthrow of capitalism, has been well documented. Social Catholics’ corporatist economic critique of the Díaz regime, however, has received little attention. Since social Catholics’ critique held much popular appeal and Catholic mobilization remained a significant force after the Porfiriató, this is a serious oversight.

This paper has examined Trinidad Sánchez Santos, social Catholicism’s leading publicist in Mexico. The particular nature of his oppositional discourse is a testament to the powerful influence of Thomist corporate thought in Mexico. In an age in which economics dominated the national and international discourse, his neo-Thomist critique highlighted the problems associated with the market economy. His analysis was heavily influenced by European social Catholicism. Reflecting this influence, his critique attacked an egalitarian and laissez-faire brand of liberalism as opposed to the positivist variant of liberalism that científicos adhered to.

Sánchez Santos built his political identity around the image of the market, for it was the principal villain in his discourse. His rhetoric debunked a liberal tale which associated the market with an egalitarian and harmonious social body. Countering this version, he maintained that the market resulted in social malaise and inequality. In his discourse, the hegemony of materialism, individualism, and freedom, that is, the ideological tenets of economic liberalism, were the main culprits. The ideology of freedom resulted in economic concentration in the form of trusts and monopoly capitalism. Powerful capitalists, armed with a materialist-individualist ideology, exploited workers, which resulted in the impoverishment of the laboring classes. A grave effect of the impoverishment of the masses was the dissolution of the family. Not only was poverty so great that adults rejected the idea of raising families for lack of economic means, but also poverty also drove mothers into the wage economy, forcing them to abandon their crucial domestic roles as teachers of morality. Tensions between capital and labor also stemmed from the market. Sánchez Santos warned that these tensions were a seedbed for an even greater problem, the widespread appeal of radicalism. The market was an unmitigated social evil.

But Sánchez Santos used the symbol of the market to define not only what he stood against, but also what he stood for. The Christian political economy that he championed was the other of liberal political economy. Rejecting a horizontal social body associated with market society, he embraced a vertical social organization. A corporate order in which people knew their proper social station would result in social harmony if individualism and materialism, the mainstays of liberal ideology, were
eschewed. Placing society’s needs in front of individual desires and stressing moralism as opposed to materialism would go a long way towards ameliorating social ills. Protesting against the liberal intellectual movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which divorced morality from the market, Sánchez Santos sought to reinsert Christian ethics into the economy. Thus, his reformist doctrine called for expanding the Church’s role in civil society.