

**The Cross and the Compass - The Civic Religion of Benito Juárez**

by

Sara Frahm

## The Cross and the Compass The Civic Religion of Benito Juárez

### Beginnings in England

The cross and the compass. What do they represent? Who have been the players on the Mexican stage? Catholic priests and Catholic politicians? Despite excommunication for taking Masonic vows? What role has Freemasonry had in introducing religious tolerance and freedom? Why do they pursue separation of church and state?

The cross represents the crucifixion, resurrection and atonement of Jesus Christ of Nazareth. For Freemasons the compass and the square depict man's ability to achieve perfection and progress on this earth, through intellectual and spiritual enlightenment. Christianity speaks of one way to salvation, the death of the God-man Jesus Christ, paying the penalty for man's sin. Freemasonry acknowledges truth in all religions. "Masonry, of no one age, belongs to all time; of no one religion; it finds its great truths in all."<sup>1</sup>

It may seem somewhat far afield to turn to England. Nevertheless, a brief look at Britain during the era when Freemasonry began will be helpful to understand Masonic beliefs, especially as they deal with religious tolerance and separation of church and state, a concept so intimately linked to struggles for independence in the new world.

Although "operative" Freemasonry was linked to the medieval guild system, only in 1717 did "speculative" Freemasonry, Freemasonry as a secret philosophical society, have its beginnings. Rev. John Desaguliers and others revised the rites of operative Masonry to teach enlightenment concepts. London Masons saw Masonry as the basis of a civil religion in which God, the Supreme Architect, was the source of a universal moral system.<sup>2</sup>

Britain was seen as the hallmark of freedom. John Locke, author of essays on religious tolerance, set trends for centuries to come. His ideas impacted Matthew Tindal, a deist whose writings influenced Freemasonry. Deism and natural religion, prevalent in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in England, were likely the basis for Freemasonry. Tindal defined natural religion as a law of nature or reason given by God which when obeyed made man acceptable to God.<sup>3</sup>

Deism defined by Webster is "[1] the belief that God exists and created the world but thereafter assumed no control over it...[2] the belief that reason is sufficient to prove the existence of God, with the consequent rejection of revelation and authority." Deists claimed a tradition more ancient than Christianity, drawing from Druidic, Egyptian and Babylonian sources. Marcia Schuchard stated that while English Freemasonry became increasingly deistic,

French Freemasonry emphasized the old occult traditions. Here were the beginnings of two strains in Freemasonry, deism and the occult.<sup>4</sup>

At the time of the founding of Freemasonry there was weariness of religious quarrels, confessional debates. Religious tolerance became fashionable. John Locke (1623-1704), not so radical as following deists, advocated freedom of religious belief rather than a state church. His "Letter Concerning Toleration," declared that although there was one truth and one way to heaven, men should be free to join any church.<sup>5</sup>

The Church of England accommodated to the new thought. Christians were encouraged to come under the umbrella of Anglicanism. Freemasons were welcomed into the fold. Original sin was minimized, as were the atonement and the incarnation. There was discussion concerning the Trinity.<sup>6</sup>

Matthew Tindal's book, referred to as the deist Bible, published in 1730, was titled Christianity as Old as the Creation, or the Gospel, a Republication of the Religion of Nature. It marked the climax of the deist controversy. Tindal discredited all miracles, opposing the triune God, the incarnation, and the resurrection, believing that priests and the pope were enemies of true religion. He attempted to show that liberal Anglicans agreed. His first book, published in 1707, The Rights of the Christian Church, attacked the high Anglican church. Later deists imitated him.<sup>7</sup>

Knoop and Jones, Masonic historians, concluded that Tindal, especially in Christianity as Old as the Creation, summarized the theology of earlier deists.<sup>8</sup> They acknowledged that Reverend Anderson's first charge in the Masonic Constitutions was strongly influenced by deism. It reads as follows:

A Mason is oblig'd by his Tenure to obey the moral Law; and if he rightly understands the Art, he will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine. But though in ancient times Masons were changed in every country to be of the Religion of that Country or Nation, whatever it was, yet 'tis now thought more expedient only to oblige them to that Religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves that is, to be good Men and true or Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Denominations or Persuasions they may be distinguished; whereby Masonry becomes the Center of Union, and the Means of conciliating true friendship...<sup>9</sup>

Deism was not so prominent by the middle of the century. However, it found its place within Masonry. On the continent Freemasonry was perceived as a threat to the church and monarchy, but not in England! Many Anglican ministers preached at Masonic funerals and feasts. Bernard Fay wrote that many clergy joined. Why not, he said, many of the cloth were unbelievers!<sup>10</sup>

Freemasons claim not to discuss politics or religion, stating that their beliefs are neither political or religious. It would appear this is purposely told to novices, in order not to offend. Anyone studying writings of Masonic authorities realizes the adept are religious. In every country, Freemasons have been politically involved.

The Trinity was removed from the Masonic invocation between 1670 and 1708. Knoop noted, "Anderson's first charge (1723) replaced Christianity by deism." A Freemason could hold two varying religious beliefs, that of his country and "the (Masonic) religion in which all men agree." Masonry is often seen as patriotic. Many, surprisingly, found no conflict between Christianity and Masonry.<sup>11</sup>

Freemasons support separation of church and state. Some Roman Catholics identified Masonry as an extension of Protestantism, as Protestants often cooperated with Masons to obtain religious freedom. Protestants, however, supported separation of church and state, for different reasons. They believed faith and a state religion did not walk easily together.

From England Freemasonry spread to the continent. France and Spain influenced Mexico. Margaret Jacob stated, "The history of this Masonic coterie, in effect, provides one link between the English Revolution of the seventeenth Century and...the democratic revolutions of the late eighteenth." She commented, "It now seems increasingly clear that from its earliest formation as an international culture, the social world of the Radical Enlightenment, although not necessarily all of its adherents, was Masonic." According to J.M. Roberts, the character and ritual of English Freemasonry" shaped directly or indirectly almost every secret society in Western Europe or America down to the nineteenth century."<sup>12</sup>

### Masonry comes to Mexico

The first two political parties in Mexico were based on Masonic rites. The escoceses were conservative, favoring centralism, ties with Spain. The yorkinos looked to the United States and to federalism. Many have wondered how these rites differ. All Masons (at least in principle) regardless of rite, hold similar beliefs about liberty, progress, and man's perfectibility. The York Rite, developed in England and the United States, consists of nine degrees. The Scottish Rite, with thirty-three degrees, began in France and was completed in Charleston, South Carolina. The York Rite is sometimes identified with Protestantism and the Scottish Rite with Catholicism. However, neither can properly be called Christian. Both borrow from many religions and are eclectic.<sup>13</sup>

Two of the most thorough histories of Mexican Masonry were written by José María Mateos, founder of the National Mexican Rite, and Luis J. Zalce y Rodríguez, Grand Master of

the Lodge of Valle de México and Lieutenant Grand Commander of the Supreme Council in Mexico. Mateos was a contemporary of the independence generation, but his book was not published until 1884. Zalce's history was published in 1950.

In 1825 a Mexican York Rite Grand Lodge was established to organize York Rite lodges. Escoceses were mainly Spanish or Creoles with strong Spanish ties. The years between 1826-1828 were turbulent, with conflict between the two rites. The yorkinos emerged victorious; many claimed victory was accomplished by force. In 1826 all seemed peaceful, until the yorkinos blamed the escoceses for attachment to monarchy. The yorkinos persuaded people that the escoceses were enemies of liberty. Masons abused the press, each party with one or more newspapers. Seeds of anarchy were sown. Abuses culminated in civil war. When the deputies were elected the yorkinos had a majority. The government asked for the opinion of the state governors, who claimed opposition to Masonry. In reality, many were members of one or the other party.<sup>14</sup>

Finally a law was passed on October 25, 1828, outlawing secret societies. Joel Poinsett, the first U.S. ambassador and a Mason involved in establishing the York Rite, was expelled. Zalce related that, "against the Protestant Poinsett,...was unleashed the hatred of the clergy and their faithful. The demand for legal religious liberty was attributed to him. It was believed that the purpose was to destroy the influence of the Catholic clergy as well as the traditional religious sentiment of the people of Mexico."<sup>15</sup> Catholics failed to realize that separation of church and state had been a tenet of Masonry, not necessarily Protestantism, from the beginning.

The National Mexican Rite, founded by Mateos in 1825, began shortly after the founding of the yorkinos. This rite was concerned about the intrusion of religion into Masonry. This was a familiar complaint, both by Masons and non-Masons, all powerless to do anything about it! The National Rite disliked the requirement of the other rites which stated that members had to be Roman Catholic. This was not Masonry! They wished to see Masonry restored, promoting happiness for all men, perfecting mankind.<sup>16</sup>

The other rites, wrote Mateos, gave in to Roman Catholicism, which controlled the consciences of thousands. A state subjected to the church was against progress. It was contrary to Masonic principles to insist that Masons belong to the religion of the country in which they lived; this was inconsistent with the philosophical principles of Masonry. Mateos believed the Constitution of 1824 was a futile attempt to unite opposing principles. Freedom of thought and freedom of the press could not be reconciled with religious intolerance.<sup>17</sup> The York Rite had all but disappeared since Poinsett's departure. El Rito Nacional had the "high honor of establishing the foundation for the political and social reforms..." through Dr. Mora.<sup>18</sup>

In 1833 Santa Ana won the election, but left the presidency to vice-president Gómez Farías, who initiated reforms with Dr. Mora at his side. These two influenced the development

of The National Rite between 1832-1833. There was a General Assembly in which they declared unity with all Masons, hoping to form the basis for a national party.<sup>19</sup>

The immediate cause of the reform was the question of the patronato, the question of who would rule the church. The Mexican government hoped to name bishops, inheriting Spanish rights. The Papacy, however, had other ideas. Sierra was convinced the reform would have been less drastic had the church been more open to new ideas.

The reformers of '33 were apostles of these ideas; they weren't anti-Christian...the majority were good Catholics; but, desirous of equality..they had three goals that weren't realized until the following generation: to destroy the ecclesiastical fueros, to secularize church property and to transform the new generation by means of education; without which they would not be able to achieve religious liberty or freedom of conscience, basis of the other liberties. The Church would never agree...the negation of freedom of conscience was the essence of her authority.<sup>20</sup>

No doubt most Mexican Masons considered themselves good Catholics. Many saw no contradiction between Christianity and Masonry, just as many Masons today are oblivious to holding two varying sets of beliefs. Masons are told by their local leaders that Masonry is not a religion, merely religious. Nevertheless, accepted published Masonic authorities are not hesitant to declare that it is a religion, and that its religion is not Christianity.<sup>21</sup>

The reformers discussed many measures not realized until twenty years later. The proposed changes were short-lived, suspended by Santa Anna, when in April of 1834 he returned to the presidency, dissolved Congress, exiling Gómez Farías. The liberal reform was put on hold for over a decade. Santa Anna was warmly welcomed by the people, who were little in favor of the new liberal directions.<sup>22</sup>

#### Masonry: a Civil Religion

Juárez spoke of the law as "my sword and my shield." Mateos wrote that the National Mexican Rite, of which Juárez was a member, promoted the Constitution as the banner of the progressive party. Zalce, favoring the Scottish Rite, did not believe Juárez was a member of the National Mexican Rite.<sup>23</sup>

Masons speak of the "work" they do in the lodge. Albert G. Mackey, a Masonic authority, explained it in his Lexicon. From the opening to the closing the lodge is at labor..."as our operative ancestors...were engaged in the building of material edifices, so ...Masons are.. employed in the erection of a superstructure of virtue and morality, upon the foundation of Masonic principles.." <sup>24</sup> Labor was the most important word in Freemasonry. "As Masons we

labor..to make ourselves a perfect building, without blemish, working hopefully for the consummation, when the house of our earthly tabernacle shall be finished, .....when we shall be found by our own efforts at perfection to have done God service."<sup>25</sup>

Mateos believed the good Mason owed all to his country. Besides "spreading the light," patriotism was the highest good. Masons should support the government against the clergy and military, the privileged classes, who were in opposition to constitutional principles and the representative system. He was amazed that some claimed Masonry was apolitical. How could Masonry influence the destiny of the country if it was indifferent, isolating itself from political emergencies?<sup>26</sup>

What is Masonic light? Mackey wrote, "light is an important word in the Masonic system." It is the first symbol presented to the neophyte, and continues through future degrees. Freemasons are called "sons of light," and non-Masons are in darkness. "Light was the object and its attainment the end of all the ancient mysteries." The Druids worshipped the sun as the eternal source of light. Light was "a principal object of adoration, as the primordial source of knowledge and goodness.." Light was a representative of the highest human good, and darkness represented evil.<sup>27</sup>

Margaret Jacob, in her book, Living the Enlightenment, brings new evidence indicating the importance of Masonry in spreading constitutional government. Since World II Masonic records have been available. She had access to the archives of La Bien Aimée in Amsterdam, a lodge with extraordinary records, the Grand Lodge of the Netherlands, the Masonic collection in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, as well as various collections in England.<sup>28</sup>

Britain was the birthplace of a civil society with a constitutional structure, and in the lodges men became legislators and constitution makers. Police records in Paris registered alarm and concern about legislation occurring within the lodges. "The lodge, the philosophical society, the scientific academy became the underpinning...for the republican and democratic forms of government that evolved slowly and fitfully in Western Europe from the late 18th Century on."<sup>29</sup>

"The lodges became microscopic civil polities,...schools for constitutional government." Men were taught public speaking, record keeping, debate, tolerance and lifelong devotion to other brothers. They gained civic consciousness and came to embody "a stance that was secular and philosophical as distinct from religious and doctrinal....their ideas were woven into a tapestry of rituals and oaths...there is an all-pervasive religiosity about Masonic sociability."<sup>30</sup>

British origins of Freemasonry caused it to be suspect in Europe where parliaments, constitutions, tolerance and bills of rights were considered subversive. The British constitution was empowered by the people. Sovereignty of the people was a theme Juárez often reiterated. Jacob quoted The London Journal of 1734 which stated, "The constitution of England is King, Lords and Commons making laws."<sup>31</sup>

Zalce commented that the constitutions were inadequate if they departed from the interpretation of "universal principals, dynamically transmitted from the first operative Masons, condensed in one fundamental law that serves as a basis for the lodges of the early degrees..."<sup>32</sup> It may be that "one fundamental law," refers to the Golden Rule, "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Masons have seen this as the basis of all religions, and they hope to combine all religions into one glorious whole, which would be Masonry, or at least have a Masonic basis.

Between 1945 and the present the study of Freemasonry was dismissed by serious scholars, with some exceptions. The reasons are complex, secrecy being only one factor. Twentieth Century lodges were not "enclaves of liberal and progressive" movements, at least in comparison with the nineteenth Century.<sup>33</sup>

#### Benito Juárez: Prior to his Presidency

A full-blooded Zapotec Indian, Benito Pablo Juárez was born March 21, 1806, in San Pablo Guelatao, a village in the state of Oaxaca. Orphaned at age three, he was cared for by grandparents and later an uncle. His uncle encouraged him to learn Spanish, hoping that one day he would become a priest. Benito longed to experience life in the big city of Oaxaca. His opportunity arrived when one of his uncle's sheep was stolen. At the young age of twelve he was frightened to return home, and so walked the forty miles to Oaxaca. He was taken into the home of Don Antonio Salanueva, a lay brother of the order of St. Francis. Salanueva became his godfather, enabling him to go to school.<sup>34</sup>

Juárez, early noting the injustice of teachers who favored children of the respectable Spanish-speaking classes, decided to leave school. At age fifteen he entered the seminary, Seminario Conciliar de la Cruz, as becoming a priest was a prestigious and laudable career. It was also the only career available in Oaxaca!<sup>35</sup>

Many desired a new type of education to prepare young men for lay careers, especially civil law. In 1827 the Institute of Sciences and Arts was established, and Juárez began to study law in 1828. The director and professors were of the liberal party. Reactionary clergy referred to the Institute as a "house of prostitution;" professors and students were labeled "heretics and libertines."<sup>36</sup>

Brioso y Candiani wrote, "We must not forget that the Institute was...the driving agent of the ideas which would promote separation of church and state in Oaxaca. It was also the home of the men that in 1859 would change the orientation of the Republic with the laws of Reform." Sierra commented that the Institute was founded under the flag of religion; the real goal being emancipation of the state from the church. "...it was there that the spirit broke free and the ideas

of reform gained rapid advance. Lawyers rallied around the flag of the laity." Students from the seminary entered the Institute; the struggle between reformers and conservative clergy began. The Institute in Oaxaca was like "the Prometheus that launched flames in two directions, towards the secret clubs, and to the columns of valiant newspapers....it could be said it struck in all the places which whistled with the whip of the tyrant." <sup>37</sup>

Jorge Fernando Iturrigarria, in his history of Oaxaca, didn't believe the intent was to provoke conflict with the church. The Institute functioned as a means of emancipation, but not in a preconceived manner. It was governed in the first twenty years by clergy imbued with French and English thought. They "unknowingly gave wings to the thought that later changed the orientation of the Institute and the face of the Republic." <sup>38</sup>

Miguel Méndez, one of the first professors at the Institute, greatly influenced Juárez. Méndez realized that although the Institute had been founded by Yorkinos to oppose the clerical party, there were still professors encumbered by the old way of thinking. An avid fan of French enlightenment thought, he opened his home to students. Learning French enabled students to be in contact with encyclopedists of the eighteenth century, with the works of Rousseau and Voltaire, two French Masons. Inviting students to tea in early 1829, Méndez encouraged his disciples to found a state based on the sovereignty of the people. He undertook a psychological exam of his guests. <sup>39</sup>

A prophecy was given about Juárez. "And this one that you see here, so reserved and serious; who seems inferior to us...this one will be a great politician,...he will become one of our famous men and the glory of the fatherland." In the opinion of Manuel Martínez those words heralded the founding of the liberal party, the party which would profoundly influence the republic. Everyone was surprised, "...because Juárez was only taking the first steps toward the holy City and justice." <sup>40</sup>

In 1831 Juárez began practice of law and in 1833 was elected to the state congress. During this time the first reforms took place, under Gómez Farías. The civil government was no longer willing to support the church, enforcing monastic vows and payment of tithes. Juárez remarked that few ecclesiastics charged what was right. Lamenting the fate of the people whose work and time satisfied the greed of their "so-called pastors." He himself was a victim, when the parishioners of a neighboring village complained their curate was charging too much. Juárez took their pleas to the court of justice, with the result that the curate was ordered not to return to his parish until the complaint was settled. <sup>41</sup>

The tables turned when the liberal government collapsed. The parishioners and Juárez were imprisoned. He remained in jail nine days. After his release he resolved "to work constantly to destroy the pernicious power of the privileged classes....When Juárez took the case he was a professor, a deputy ...when he dropped it, he was a reformer for life." <sup>42</sup>

On July 31, 1843, Juárez married Doña Margarita Maza. She was seventeen, her new husband twice her age. They had twelve children, nine girls and three boys. The marriage into a family of Italian descent was a rise in social status for Juárez. Roeder told that Margarita commented about her husband, "He is very homely but very good."<sup>43</sup>

Elected again to the state legislature in 1845, Juárez was involved in El Rito Nacional Mexicano, (the National Mexican Rite) the Rite succeeding the Yorkinos, fallen into disfavor following the 1828 election.<sup>44</sup> Many Yorkinos became members of the National Mexican Rite, the Rite which upheld Masonic principles of separation of church and state and religious tolerance for all faiths.

The first lodge in Oaxaca was established in April 1828, according to Iturribarria. This is also recorded in Mateo's History of Mexican Masonry. The founder and first worthy master was Coronel Don Antonio de León. It was a lodge of the York Rite, called esfuerzo de la virtud (spirit of virtue).<sup>45</sup> Zalce told of his visit to Oaxaca in 1926, helping to reestablish the Oaxacan Grand Lodge. He chatted with brother Hernández, an old Mason who had been secretary of the Grand Lodge for many years. Hernández, a living history of Masonry in Oaxaca, claimed that Juárez was initiated into the lodge of Oaxaca between 1833 and 1834, probably esfuerzo de la virtud. He was a Mason when he became governor.<sup>46</sup>

According to his biography, Juárez was one of those named to rewrite the Mexican Constitution of 1824. He declared the liberal party desired, "principles of liberty and progress that made the neighboring Republic, the United States of the north, happy and prosperous." The Constitution of 1824 limited progress, declaring the state religion to be Catholic. The civil authority should determine the national will without any control or abuse by religion.<sup>47</sup>

Santa Anna, overthrown in 1843, escaped to Havana. Sending a messenger to Washington, he offered to sell Mexican land north of the Rio Grande and the Colorado of the West for thirty million dollars! The United States was agreeable, with the condition that the offer be made by a recognized authority in Mexico. Santa Anna's agent remarked that no government in Mexico could stay in office and make such an offer! Therefore, the United States suggested that pressure be applied through forces in the north and a naval detachment to Veracruz. The sad story of the invasion and victory in successive cities ending in Mexico City is well known.<sup>48</sup>

Santa Anna, a convincing character, persuaded Gómez Farías that he favored federalism and wished to serve against the United States invading forces. Duplicitous, he assured President Polk his return to Mexico would be valuable for the United States, and so he was allowed past the naval blockage at Veracruz. On December 6, 1846, he was elected president with Gómez Farías as vice-president.<sup>49</sup>

Masons, with no confidence in Santa Anna, were delighted about Farías, under whose government reforms took place, reforms inspired by the ex-Scottish Rite Mason, José María Luis Mora. Mora's reforms had become the program of the National Rite. The majority of congress was made up of Masons. They authorized the government to mortgage the wealth of the clergy to support the war effort.<sup>50</sup>

According to Spanish tradition church possessions acquired through donations were revocable in time of national need. When the decree was announced the cathedral was closed. The clergy appeared to be indifferent to Mexico's danger. Excommunication was threatened for those who favored sequestering church funds. The church was unwilling to give up its wealth, even though Mexico might lose half its territory to the invasion of Protestantism.<sup>51</sup>

Masons supported the war effort, leaving their "work" in the lodges. When the U.S. invaded the capital in September, 1847, the government moved to Querétaro. Zalce noted the fraternal courtesies exchanged between Mexicans and U.S. Masons..."more than one prisoner from both sides were saved from death by the opportune use of some known (Masonic) gesture, and thus the horrors of war were slightly mitigated."<sup>52</sup>

The treaty ending the war was signed February 2, 1848. Mexico's territory was cut in half for a payment of \$15,000,000. This unjust settlement added insult to injury, as Texas had earlier changed the boundaries recognized for centuries. Disillusionment set in. "It was a dread, for our poor nation exhausted and weak, it was a nightmare ... manifest destiny was our downfall, it was the misfortune, the great tragedy of the Mexican nation."<sup>53</sup>

The Mexican-American war of 1846-48 brought a crisis, resulting in twenty years of heartache, civil war and foreign intervention. Mexicans analyzed their humiliating defeat. It was lamented that when Farías ordered fifteen million pesos expropriated from ecclesiastical authorities, troops loyal to the conservative party revolted. Mexico thus lost the war and one-half her territory. Liberals saw this as a betrayal of the nation by the church party. "...the church planted the seed of its defeat; it irrevocably alienated the liberals and linked itself with treason."<sup>54</sup>

Santa Anna returned, sending Farías into exile. Juárez' time in the capital ended abruptly; he returned to Oaxaca to practice law. He worked to see the law obeyed, the law "that has always been my sword and shield." Concerned about Oaxacan liberals, Santa Anna soon removed Juárez from his post as Institute Director. Juárez was exiled with other liberals to New Orleans, where he was to live for a year and a half. According to Richard Sinkin, "They (the liberals) might never have met had not misfortune lumped them in the infested climate of New Orleans."<sup>55</sup>

In New Orleans an exiled revolutionary government was formed to overthrow Santa Anna. Ocampo was the leader, Juárez second in command. The exiles studied and analyzed

Mexico, formulating the reform. There seemed no alternative but to destroy the power of the church, at least in any matter not of the spiritual realm. Dominated by Ocampo, the group decided to suppress the fueros, the religious communities and to nationalize the clergy's wealth. According to Ocampo it was necessary to get rid of the privileges of the clergy and the military, and also the privileged classes themselves!<sup>56</sup>

Who was this man? Melchor Ocampo, twice governor of Michoacán, had a lasting impact on Benito Juárez. Juárez made peace with the clergy while governor; Ocampo caused an uproar. Ocampo was infuriated that the clergy charged set fees, yet failed to fulfill their duties. They disregarded the funerals of the poor, who were buried like animals. Freedom of conscience was not compatible with the authority of the church.<sup>57</sup>

Don Antonio Gibaja y Patron had another theory. A lawyer and probably a Mexican Jesuit, he believed Masonry was involved in worldwide revolutionary movements. According to him, the revolutionary plan was formed by a Masonic society, la junta anfictyonica de Nueva Orleans, (amphictyonic has a religious connotation, associated with ancient Greece) with the purpose of giving freedom to Mexicans. Díaz, author of La masonería en México, believed the laws of Reform were incubated in North American lodges and Mexican Masons executed them.<sup>58</sup>

Ocampo became governor of Michoacán in 1846. Due to his radical position on religious freedom and secular education, he came under intense fire, receiving death threats. His writings contained the ideas for the laws of reform, the Constitution of 1857, separation of church and state, and freedom of religion.<sup>59</sup> He was convinced the civil government had no role to play in saving souls. Carrying on a written dialogue with a curate, Ocampo wrote:

...what should I do when I see dancing and shouting in the church; when I see a Protestant gather his family together to read the Bible; when...I see a rabbi enter the Holy of Holies...when I see a devout Muslim conduct his absolutions...What do you believe we should do with this unfortunate part of humanity that God has not yet conceded the benefit of Catholicism?. Should we forbid him to worship his conception of Divine Majesty until he knows the method determined by God and taught by the Church? We ought...to subject all these nations, more than 400 million people, and make them Atheists; they ought not to approach their Creator until they learn the correct way...<sup>60</sup>

He compared the reformers to the first apostles, who at times had doubts, at times were weak. The new principles were conducted by love and reason. Its apostles were as persecuted as those of Christ. Jesus only struggled against the vices of the altar; the reformers struggled also against the vices of the throne.<sup>61</sup> Ocampo held to Masonic doctrine as it was originally intended, not accepting the sinful nature of man or the atonement of Christ. All religions were equally good, as long as they caused no harm to their neighbor. Respectful of religion, he spoke of

Divine Providence, of Jesus Christ and His church. Nevertheless, at heart he was a pantheist like Rousseau, a French Mason he admired.<sup>62</sup>

While the exiles in New Orleans and Brownsville formulated plans for revolution, a revolutionary plan was proclaimed in the village of Ayutla on March 1, 1854. A year later many leaders of northern Mexico endorsed this plan, opposing Santa Anna, supporting a republican government. Sinkin saw the Plan of Ayutla as a "catalyst for a ten year holocaust that involved both a civil war and foreign intervention."<sup>63</sup>

News of the revolution arrived in New Orleans. Ocampo financed the return of Juárez, to be the voice of the exiled group. Juárez now professed the philosophy of the reform. He was ready to engage in battle to free Mexico from clerical dominance. In Cuernavaca Juan Alvarez was elected president of the republic. Juárez was named Minister of Justice and Public Instruction. During this time Juárez was already contemplating the reform of certain laws.<sup>64</sup>

The meeting in Cuernavaca was a regrouping for lodges. "...Masonry...declared itself united to the progressive party, and in the bosom of the lodges began to prepare projects of reform, hoping that when the government was installed...there would be a proper occasion and an adequate method to present these reforms." All of Alvarez's ministers were Masons, not true when Comonfort took over on December 11, 1855, "...a circumstance that was not foreseen by the members of the National Rite."<sup>65</sup>

In his new position Juárez considered reforming the judicial system. This became the impetus for Ley Juárez, of November 23, 1855. The only possible progress was the removal of fueros. Clergy and military would stand trial in civil courts, allowing the fuero to remain only in criminal cases. According to Juárez this was "...the spark that produced the flame of the Reform that in later times would consume the decaying structure of abuse and prejudice..." Roeder told that the Ley Juárez was the cornerstone of the future constitution, giving Juárez national prestige.<sup>66</sup>

On June 25, 1856, the second reform law was passed. Ley Lerdo was named for its author, the Minister of the Treasury, Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, who was also a member of the Mexican National Rite. The purpose was not to confiscate church property, but to put it on the market, hoping that small landowners would profit. Instead, it was gobbled up by the wealthy.<sup>67</sup>

Had the Pope been more flexible, the church would have accepted Lerdo's Law, which merely required the sale of their property, with a five percent tax going to the state. "With their coffers stuffed with easily negotiable mortgages, ..civil war could have been averted, and the country's progress and the church's prosperity could have joined hands." But the law was a battle cry. War was declared between church and state.<sup>68</sup>

Deputies gathered in Mexico City in February, 1856 to write the Constitution of 1857. In July the Archbishop of Mexico went before the congress, pleading that Article 15 not be made

into law, the article which would guarantee freedom of religion. As there could be only one true religion and one true God, it was not possible for Mexicans to embrace just any faith.

Ecclesiastical representatives implored the delegates, "There is only one faith...without doubt the Catholic religion is the exclusive depository of this precious treasure. It is the great tree sheltering the people who want to enjoy true liberty. Millions of believers and centuries attest to the veracity of Catholicism."<sup>69</sup>

One of the deputies, Guillermo Prieto, looked forward to an age "without fanaticism, inequality, hatreds...the Constitution symbolizes all our dreams of good, all our hopes for happiness." As pagans had to be purified before entering their temples, so we must wash our spirits corrupted by colonial tradition and fanaticism. All men were brothers, and el partido de la Fraternidad could not depart from this dogma. Gibaja y Patron referred to Prieto as an exalted Mason who hated the Catholic Church, implanting the principles of 1833 and the French Revolution. If you didn't know Prieto and read parts of his speech you would have thought he was a mystic. "Quite to the contrary, he was a Mason of extreme passion."<sup>70</sup>

The National Rite had lodges throughout the republic, attentive to suspicious military movements and destructive preaching of priests and bishops. They informed their leaders, who informed the Supreme Grand Orient. Masonic deputies were encouraged to double their efforts to finish the constitution.<sup>71</sup>

Some felt that men of this Congress were not representative of the people, however much they claimed to be. Nevertheless, people gradually accepted their ideas. They stressed absolute rights, the freedom of natural man, and the dogma of a social religion.<sup>72</sup>

Not a new concept, Richard Overton, an Englishman writing in 1646, wrote concerning the relationship between rights and the principles of nature. By natural birth, all men were equal, born to liberty and freedom. Each was given by God (or nature) innate freedom as his birthright, "God by nature hath made him free." These ideas gave birth to the Age of Rights, expressed in the United States Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.<sup>73</sup> The concepts of the enlightenment were disseminated and popularized through Masonic lodges

In opposition to these ideas was the Christian belief that man, although created free, lost this freedom upon falling from grace. The concept of original sin inherited from Adam and of man needing a Redeemer, a reconciliation with his maker, had come into disfavor during the time of the enlightenment. To the Christian rights were God-given, purchased by the blood of God's only Son, and ideally a Christian should be in the business of defending his brother's right but laying down his own.

The first subject considered was the rights of man. Article 1 declared: "The Mexican nation recognizes that the rights of man are the base and the object of social institutions.."

Twenty nine articles defined these rights. The debate as to whether or not man could worship as he pleased became intense.<sup>74</sup>

This debate was recorded in Cronica del congreso constituyente (1856-1857) by Francisco Zarco. According to Diaz, Mateos, and Zalce the majority of the liberals were Masons. José María Mata from Jalapa, son-in-law of Juárez, took an active part. Mata spoke against the claim of religious unity in Mexico, stating that the population was divided into three groups of people: Catholic, indifferent and idolatrous. Hypocrisy was the only unity, which was disappearing as society became enlightened. He felt the spirit of God was guiding the "the apostles of democracy." Gibaja y Patron referred to Mata as a "fanatic Mason because of his ideas". The exalted liberals only pretended to be true Catholics.<sup>75</sup>

Following is a portion of the heated debate between July 25, 1856 and August 5, 1856. The theological content is quite remarkable. Reactionary notes were tossed from crowded galleries: "May the Roman Pope live. The people do not want tolerance. May the enemies of the Catholic religion die!"<sup>76</sup> During the session of July 30, Mata took the floor. He spoke of the most powerful weapon, the weapon of reason. If the supporters of the reform had to suffer, what was that in comparison to the death of Christ on the cross? (At this point there was coughing, sneezing, loud murmurings and shouts, "get rid of the priests!") Mata continued,

Democracy is also a religion that has its apostles and martyrs. Those that defend progress accept this apostolate and we also accept martyrdom...in the United States and in England and all countries where there is liberty of conscience there is enviable order and tranquillity. If the majority of the people are against the reform, I will not vote for the article, but neither will I contribute to the intolerance. I will leave this hall and say to the people: if you want to drive a dagger into your breast, I will not be your assassin. Look for him elsewhere...Onward, onward, progress and civilization. This is our banner: the dogma of democracy, the truth of the Gospel, liberty, equality, fraternity.<sup>77</sup>

Some argued that the Mexican people didn't want religious tolerance, and therefore Catholicism should be maintained as the national religion. After days of debate the vote on August 5 was 65-44 against religious freedom (Article 15), which caused a great uproar in the galleries.<sup>78</sup> Zarco believed triumph of religious freedom was only a question of time. Even the debate about Article 15 was a victory. His prediction was accurate as the law of December 4, 1860, and the reforms of September 25, 1873, finally completed the legal struggle for religious tolerance.<sup>79</sup>

In concession to the cries for religious liberty, Article 123 was adopted by a vote of 82-4, granting the federal government power to intervene in religious matters. Also included in the constitution were Ley Juárez and Ley Lerdo. Radical reform was not accomplished;

nevertheless, Catholicism lost influence. Zalce noted that Masons saw this as finally a separation of the church from the state, a goal for which they had worked long and hard.<sup>80</sup>

Gibaja y Patron declared that the principles of the 1789 French Revolution, among which were separation of church and state, sovereignty of the people, absolutism of human law, liberty, equality, and fraternity, should be called instead "the suppression of the rights of God." The Constitution of 1857 was the supremacy of the state over the church "in the name of separation of the two." Deputies and senators received their appointments from lodges. The people in the concept of the constitution were Masons, liberals, and the auxiliary societies of Masonry. "...thus it is that the authority of the Mexican people to formulate the constitution is only the authority of the supreme government of Masonry." He questioned whether the suffrage of the people was effective when eighty five percent were illiterate.<sup>81</sup>

The Constitution was promulgated February 5, 1857. The Constituent Congress issued a proclamation.

Mexicans: Today the great promise is complete...to return the country to constitutional law. Thanking Divine Providence...the Congress...offers today the promised Constitution...to be the rainbow of peace, the symbol of reconciliation between our brothers...our representatives...this has encouraged our faith in God, in God who does not protect iniquity or injustice. Our guide as been public opinion...and far from being miserable slaves, redeemed, freed, we will bring new vitality, new energy to the Republic.... Congress proudly proclaimed the dogma of the sovereignty of the people and wished that every constitutional system would be the logical consequence of this glowing and incontrovertible truth....and thus the Constitution will be the banner of the Republic...it has been faithful to the spirit of the age, to the radiant inspiration of Christianity...We plead with the supreme ruler of societies to make the new Constitution acceptable to the Mexican people and to prodigiously render the benefits of peace, justice, and liberty!<sup>82</sup>

By the end of 1856 the religious controversy was dividing homes. The Pope denounced the entire Reform program. Civil war was on the horizon. Zalce believed one sentence in the constitution reflected the conflict between the opposing sides, "In the name of God and with the authority of the Mexican people..." He realized this was a disconcerting sentence.<sup>83</sup>

Government employees were required by law to swear allegiance to the constitution or risk losing jobs. The Archbishop of Mexico ordered clergy not to take the oath. Catholics supporting the constitution would not receive burial, nor would priests hear dying confessions. Catholics who held government posts should resign. It was a grave sin to make God a witness by swearing to the constitution, against the very church He had founded. The Archbishop wanted the constitution abolished, lamenting that the faithful must choose between obedience to ecclesiastical authorities or the government, which Scripture also commanded to obey. Masons

declared they would continue with reforms. There was no need to seek the approval of the Pope; with or without that approval they must continue. The National Rite saw the Constitution as the coronation of their work, even though it was not all they desired.<sup>84</sup>

One of the outstanding conservative thinkers was J.J. Pesado whose writing was published in La Cruz. He believed laws were insufficient to change man's heart. Catholicism taught man his true origin, fall and atonement. The best one could expect from civil government was to support the Catholic church. The idea of the people's sovereignty was of Protestantism. Ley Juárez implied rejection of the Pope as the head of the church. The Pope condemned the constitution, declaring it void three months before it was approved.<sup>85</sup>

Thus Pesado confused Luther's teaching on the priesthood of all believers with the enlightenment concept of innate freedom, bestowed on all men by the God of nature, not necessarily the God of the Bible. Protestants did not deny man's sinfulness and would have agreed with Pesado's assessment concerning the danger of unlimited human will, the need for the state to support the church, albeit a church devoid of the Papacy.

Mateos described the emotion Masons experienced as the famous Mexican Mason, the father of the reform, Valentín Gómez Farías, took his oath on the Bible and the constitution. Reforms begun by Farías and Mora in 1833 had seen partial fulfillment! Zarco told how Alvarez lay prostrate before the church altar, one hand on the Bible, one on the constitution. Priests threatened that those supporting the government would be dragged off at night by Satan. Sinkin believed the opposition from the church caused liberals to further identify the clergy as an enemy. Hope for reconciliation was lost.<sup>86</sup>

A three year civil war followed. During this time conservatives in Mexico City published cartoons ridiculing Masons. One showed them assaulting the church, with cannons pointed at the doors of the main cathedral!<sup>87</sup> In February of 1906 Miramón, the conservative general, unsuccessfully seiged the city of Veracruz. He was welcomed in Guadalajara the previous December by the clergy, who composed a special liturgy, "likening the sacred name of Miguel Miramón to all the politicians of the Old Testament, hailing him with each swing of the censer as their heaven-sent savior." However, liberals were beginning to win military victories. On December 22 the liberal general Ortega defeated Miramón, and on December 25 the capital was occupied. Juárez and his family were in Veracruz attending the play Les Huguenots. The news was brought by courier and the "man of destiny who consummated the emancipation of his country..." announced the victory and the end of the war.<sup>88</sup>

The conservatives were not yet ready to yield. The years from 1861-1867 brought the intervention of France. At the invitation of the conservatives, Maximilian, Archduke of Austria, was offered the throne of the Mexican empire on October 3, 1863. Conservatives were surprised to learn he was a Mason. Despite being a Masonic brother, he did not find favor with Juárez, as

he had invaded the sovereignty of Mexico. Another six years of war followed, with Juárez and his supporters pushed to the northern frontier. The French abandoned Maximilian, leaving him to his fate. He was executed June 19, 1867.<sup>89</sup>

When Juárez entered Mexico City July 15, 1867 following four years of wandering, he entered in the name of the Constitution of 1857. "The Government left in order to defend the flag of the patria...to obtain the triumph of the holy cause of independence and the institutions of the Republic. After a decade the liberals had been victorious and the constitution became "the most revered document in Mexican history."<sup>90</sup>

Margarita died in 1871. She was only forty-five. The president mourned deeply for his wife, and during the following year his letters were edged in black. His own death was to follow shortly thereafter. On July 18, 1872 he succumbed to a series of heart attacks, despite the efforts of the doctor, who poured boiling water over his chest in the area of the heart.<sup>91</sup>

The Official Bulletin of the Grand Orient of Spain published the Masonic obituary of Benito Juárez in October 1872. The funeral carriage displayed a Masonic star of yellow metal. Brother Masons approached his body, lifted the tunic, and gave three shouts of grief. They shook his body and shouted in his ear the symbolic words. They repeated them, but Juárez didn't hear. They put the utensils of work in his hand, but he couldn't hold them. They raised him and he fell. They palpitated his heart, but it didn't beat. They knew that the hope of Mexico had departed to heaven.<sup>92</sup> Included was a speech by C. Francisco T. Gordillo in the name of Masonry, sections of which follow:

The voice of Gómez Farías, of Rejon, of Zubeta, of Ocampo, of Degollado and many others sowed the seed in the heart of the only one that could complete the idea of the reform. Secretly among Masons the happy thought was given to destroy the fueros, abolishing titles and bringing equality to the masses....Juárez returned to his brothers and deposited with them the laws that made up the fundamental code, telling them "The work that you have given me is here...look, these words that you baptized me with are now without mystery and without fear. You can pronounce them as a slogan of our fraternity." The Masons read and there it was written: liberty, equality and fraternity. The Mexicans never forgot the name of their chief...embracing it along with the flag, the constitution and the laws of reform ....Juárez was the savior of Mexican autonomy....We respect his memory with our deeds, and if peace is established in our republic by work, morality and obedience to the law that he recommended to us, we can say to our sons what the first Christians said about Christ..."with his death he has redeemed us."<sup>93</sup>

Strong words for Catholics to swallow! Who is the Redeemer? Christ or Juárez? Masonry is often seen as a national religion. Much as George Washington was a redeemer from the tyranny of England, so Benito Juárez accomplished the final emancipation from the colonial

age. Masonry was the vehicle enabling these men to bring about freedom and independence. The difficulty for Christians would be the confusion of terms. Redemption, freedom, equality, liberty, independence, fraternity all have double meanings. Interesting that because Catholicism competed with Masonry to build a temporal kingdom, the battle was lost.

Juárez, since January 1858 had been "...the standard-bearer of the liberal cause; he had kept the movement together in the northern desert...directing six years of guerrilla warfare until Maximilian was executed." The Constitution of 1857 endured until the revolutionary constitution of 1917. The nation-state replaced the church as "the ultimate arbiter of human affairs."<sup>94</sup>

Some felt the church regained power under Porfirio Díaz, but Sinkin disagreed, believing the three year Reform War was crucial. "All political activity after the restoration of the Republic was in the name of the Constitution of 1857." Even when Venustiano Carranza saw the need for a new constitution during the Revolution of 1910-20, there was only a slight modification of the 1857 constitution.<sup>95</sup> Masonry had been successful in bringing in constitutional rule, elevating the constitution and government by law to a new level of prestige.

Juárez became the "object of a patriotic cult and the subject of poems and statues...on stated occasions the rites were performed and the debt of honor paid;...periodically at the equinox and the solstice, he returned with the cycles of passing years to receive his pension of immortality from the living."<sup>96</sup>

From the time of Juárez until recent Mexican president Carlos Salinas de Gortari there were few constitutional reforms regarding religious freedom. Under Salinas rights were restored to the church. Most of those lost rights were the result of the Reform War and legislation under Benito Juárez. The law of July 15, 1992, promoted by Salinas and approved by the congress gave churches a legal status, the right to own property, the right to conduct religious education, the right to hold religious events outside the church with appropriate permits, and the freedom of publication. Religious broadcasts are still forbidden, as is the right for ministers or priests to hold political office, although they are allowed to vote.<sup>97</sup>

On September 21, 1992, Mexico restored full ties with the Vatican. This relationship was broken one hundred and twenty five years earlier. Mexico had been the only Latin American country without a full relationship to the Holy See. In a telephone interview with The New York Times, the secretary general of the Mexican Bishop's Conference, Msgr. Ramón Godínez Flores, called it a "very important step."<sup>98</sup>

Roderic Ai Camp, in his contribution to the book, The Evolution of the Mexican Political System, had this to say:

As for the Catholic Church, Salinas has taken the controversial step of reviving more formalized relations between it and the government. One of the

reasons he has done so is a belief that more open, established relations form part of his conception of modernizing Mexican politics....Salinas is developing his own political constituency. One of those constituencies that he hopes to co-opt or at least neutralize,...is the Catholic hierarchy.....More Mexicans presently belong to Catholic-affiliated organizations than to any social or political organizations, including labor unions and political parties.....The Catholic church is unique among Mexican interest groups...to the extent that it is financially autonomous and has both grass-roots and external foreign support.<sup>99</sup>

The Austin American-Statesman, on September 22, 1992, quoted Roman Catholic Bishop Genaro Alamilla, remarking that Mexico would benefit from relations with the Vatican, "...a state that has no armies, no economic power, but the moral power to speak out and say what is good or bad." Historian Enrique Krauze called it "an act of political maturity on the part of Mexico. The government recognizes it already has enough problems at present without having to keep dragging in those of the nineteenth century," Krauze said. "Freemason leader Carlos Vazquez Rangel, whose organization fought church influence in the last century, warned that 'we must be very careful the Holy See does not meddle in Mexico's internal affairs and vice versa.'"<sup>100</sup>

The claim that the Vatican has no economic power is debatable, and whether it is possible to keep from "dragging in problems of the nineteenth century," problems that have a way of reappearing, remains to be seen. Freemasons will be on the lookout for interference from the church in civil affairs. The church will continue to press for more authority. If the church were really to believe the words of Jesus Christ, "my kingdom is not of this world," perhaps the situation would be happier, but hopefully the reforms will bring greater religious freedom for all Mexicans.

---

<sup>1</sup>Albert Pike, Morals and Dogma, ancient and accepted rite, p. 524

<sup>2</sup>James Carter, "Freemasonry in Texas," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1954), p. 19; and Richard William Weisberger, "The Cultural and Organizational Functions of Speculative Freemasonry During the Enlightenment: A Study of the Craft in London, Paris, Prague, and Vienna," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1980), pp. 51-54, 94.

<sup>3</sup>Douglas Knoop and G.P. Jones, "Freemasonry and the Idea of Natural Religion," Ars Quatuor Coronatorum, LVI, pp. 42-43 (1946). (Ars Quatuor Coronatorum is a publication of the historical research lodge in London, Quatuor Coronati Lodge no. 1076, available from the Masonic Library in Waco, Texas) Also see Matthew Tindal, Christianity as Old as the Creation, or the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature, pp. 3,8.

<sup>4</sup>Webster's New World Dictionary, college ed., (1956), s.v. "Deism."; Bernard Fay, Revolution and Freemasonry, p. 63; and Marsha Keith Manatt Schuchard, "Freemasonry, Secret Societies and the Continuity of the Occult Traditions in English Literature," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1975), p. 183.

<sup>5</sup>S. G. Hefelbower, The Relation of John Locke to English Deism, p. 5, and John Locke, A Letter Concerning Toleration, p. 4.

<sup>6</sup>Robert E. Sullivan, John Toland and the Deist Controversy, p. 253.

- <sup>7</sup>Hefelbower, The Relation of John Locke to English Deism, pp. 114, 160; and Stephen, English Thought in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 134, 141.
- <sup>8</sup>Knoop and Jones, "Freemasonry and the Idea of Natural Religion," p. 42.
- <sup>9</sup>James Anderson, Anderson's Constitutions of 1723, p. 80.
- <sup>10</sup>Fay, Revolution and Freemasonry, p. 170, and Jacob, The Radical Enlightenment, p. 113.
- <sup>11</sup>Knoop, The Genesis of Freemasonry, pp. 182, 257.
- <sup>12</sup>Jacob, The Radical Enlightenment, pp. 156, 240; and Roberts, The Mythology of Secret Societies, p. 28.
- <sup>13</sup>Further information can be obtained in Henry Ridgely Evans, Litt.D., History of the York and Scottish Rites of Freemasonry, Washington, D.C.: The Masonic Service Association of the United States, 1924.
- <sup>14</sup>Gutiérrez García, Jesús [Félix Navarrette], La Masonería en la historia y en las leyes de Méjico, p. 38; and Manuel Gomez Pedraza, Manifiesto que Manuel Gomez Pedraza, ciudadano de la república de méjico, dedica a sus compatriotas ó sea una reseña de su vida pública, pp. 31, 33, 35.
- <sup>15</sup>Mateos, Historia de la masonería de México, p. 33; and Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería, p. 99.
- <sup>16</sup>Mateos, Historia de la masonería de México, pp. 41-42.
- <sup>17</sup>Mateos, Historia de la masonería de México, pp. 21, 41.
- <sup>18</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería, p. 112.
- <sup>19</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería, p. 101.
- <sup>20</sup>Justo Sierra, Evolución política del pueblo mexicano, 2nd Spanish edition, pp. 205-206.
- <sup>21</sup>An Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, 1916, s.v., "Religion of Masonry," A.G. Mackey.
- <sup>22</sup>Sierra, Evolución política del pueblo mexicano, p. 208.
- <sup>23</sup>Benito Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, ed. Florencio Zamarripa M., p. 27; José María Mateos, Historia de la Masonería de México, p. 154; and Luis J. Zalce y Rodríguez, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería en México, 1:163.
- <sup>24</sup>Albert G. Mackey, Lexicon, s.v. "Labour," p. 269.
- <sup>25</sup>Albert G. Mackey, The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, vol. 1, s.v. "Lost Word," p. 419.
- <sup>26</sup>José María Mateos, Historia de la Masonería de México, pp. 55, 62, 76.
- <sup>27</sup>Mackey, The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry, vol. 1, s.v. "Light," pp. 446-447, and Albert G. Mackey, Lexicon, s.v., "Light," pp. 278-279.
- <sup>28</sup>Margaret C. Jacob, Living the Enlightenment, pp. vii.
- <sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 4-5.
- <sup>30</sup>Margaret C. Jacob, Living the Enlightenment, pp. 20-24.
- <sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 24-26.
- <sup>32</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería en México, 1:229.
- <sup>33</sup>Jacob, Living the Enlightenment, p. 222.
- <sup>34</sup>Ralph Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 1:5-8.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., 1:9.
- <sup>36</sup>Benito Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, ed. Florencio Zamarripa M., pp. 17-18.
- <sup>37</sup>Manuel Brioso y Candiani, La evolución del pueblo oajaqueño desde la independencia hasta el plan de Ayutla 1821-1855, p. 64; and Sierra, Juárez, Su Obra y Su Tiempo, pp. 6-7, 31.
- <sup>38</sup>Jorge Fernando Iturribarria, Historia de Oaxaca 1821-1854, p. 76.
- <sup>39</sup>Manuel Brioso y Candiani, La evolución del pueblo oajaqueño desde la independencia hasta el plan de Ayutla 1821-1855, pp. 29, 45.
- <sup>40</sup>Martinez Gracida and Brioso y Candiani, El Precursor de Juárez, Miguel Méndez, p. 12.
- <sup>41</sup>Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, pp. 19-20.
- <sup>42</sup>Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, pp. 20-23; and Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 1:57.
- <sup>43</sup>Cadenhead, Jr. Benito Juárez, p. 29; and Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 1:67.
- <sup>44</sup>Cadenhead, Jr., Benito Juárez, p. 30.
- <sup>45</sup>Iturribarria, Historia de Oaxaca 1821-1854, 1:98.
- <sup>46</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la masonería en México, 1:163.
- <sup>47</sup>Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, pp. 15-16.
- <sup>48</sup>Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 1:64-65.
- <sup>49</sup>Cadenhead, Jr., Benito Juárez, p. 33.
- <sup>50</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la masonería en México, 1:147-148.
- <sup>51</sup>Sierra, The Political Evolution of the Mexican People, pp. 239-240, Iturribarria, Historia de Oaxaca, p. 339.
- <sup>52</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la masonería en México, 1:151, 156.

- <sup>53</sup>Iturrubaria, Historia de Oaxaca p. 303.
- <sup>54</sup>Richard N. Sinkin, The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876, a study in Liberal Nation-Building, pp. 24, 120-121.
- <sup>55</sup>Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, pp. 27-28; and Sinkin, The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876, a study in Liberal Nation-Building, p. 52.
- <sup>56</sup>Sierra, Benito Juárez, Su Obra y su Tiempo, p. 69.
- <sup>57</sup>Justo Sierra as cited in Iturrubaria, Historia de Oaxaca, pp.69-70, p. 399.
- <sup>58</sup>Don Antonio Gibaja y Patron, Comentario critico, historico, autentico a las revoluciones de Mexico, 4:9; and Diaz,Silvano, La masonería en México, pp. 140-141 (Diaz says that proof of American involvement is in El Pais, 1899).
- <sup>59</sup>Melchor Ocampo, La religion, la iglesia y el clero, p.11.
- <sup>60</sup>Ibid., pp. 42-43.
- <sup>61</sup>Ibid., p 188.
- <sup>62</sup>Sierra, Juárez, su obra y su tiempo, p. 66.
- <sup>63</sup>Cadenhead, Jr. Benito Juárez, pp. 42-43; and Sinkin, The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876, a study in Liberal Nation-Building, p. 34.
- <sup>64</sup>Iturrubaria, Historia de Oaxaca, p. 397; Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, pp. 32-33; and Juárez, Documentos, discursos y correspondencia, 2:39.
- <sup>65</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería en México, 1:177, 181.
- <sup>66</sup>Juárez, Los apuntes para mis hijos, pp. 34-35; Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 1:127.
- <sup>67</sup>Mateos, Historia de la Masonería en México, p. 149; and Scholes, Mexican Politics During the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872, pp. 15-16.
- <sup>68</sup>Sierra, The Political Evolution of the Mexican People, p. 270.
- <sup>69</sup>Cajica, Jr., Rocafuerte, Juárez y la Libertad de conciencia en México, pp. 403, 407-408.
- <sup>70</sup>Gibaja y Patron, Comentario a las revoluciones de México, 4:51-53; and Guillermo Prieto to Ignacio Comonfort, 14 July 1857, University of Texas, Austin, Latin American Center, Comonfort Papers, folder 17 as cited in Sinkin, p. 73.
- <sup>71</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería en México, 1:191.
- <sup>72</sup>Sierra, The Political Evolution of the Mexican People, p. 274.
- <sup>73</sup>Richard Dagger, "Rights," in Political Innovation and Conceptual Change, p. 301.
- <sup>74</sup>Scholes, Mexican Politics During the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872, p. 11.
- <sup>75</sup>Francisco Zarco, Cronica del congreso constituyente (1856-1857), pp. 331-332; Gibaja y Patron, Comentario a las revoluciones de México, 4:50.
- <sup>76</sup>Francisco Zarco, Cronica del congreso constituyente (1856-1857), p. 346.
- <sup>77</sup>Ibid., 360-361.
- <sup>78</sup>Scholes, Mexican Politics During the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872, p. 13.
- <sup>79</sup>Gibaja y Patron, Comentario a las revoluciones de México, 4:54.
- <sup>80</sup>Sinkin, The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876, a Study in Liberal Nation-Building, p. 130, and Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería en México, 1:192.
- <sup>81</sup>Gibaja y Patron, Comentario a las revoluciones de México, 4:76, 77, 82, 84.
- <sup>82</sup>El Congreso constituyente a la nacion al proclamar la nueva constitucion federal, in Juárez, Documentos, discursos y correspondencia, II:233-236.
- <sup>83</sup>Sierra, The Political Evolution of the Mexican People, pp. 272-273; and Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la Masonería en México, 1:192.
- <sup>84</sup>Díaz, La masonería en México, pp. 163-168; Felix Navarrette, La Masonería en la Historia y en las Leyes de Méjico, p. 106, and Scholes, Mexican Politics During the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872, pp. 21-22.
- <sup>85</sup>J.J. Pesado, "La Cruz," July 9, 1857, August 20, 1857, September 3, 1857, as cited in Scholes, Mexican Politics During the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872, pp. 18-19.
- <sup>86</sup>Mateos, Historia de la Masonería en México, p. 154; and Franciso Zarco, Cronica del congreso constituyente (1856-1857), p. 136, as cited by Sinkin; and Sinkin, The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876, a Study in Liberal Nation-Building, pp. 73, 134-135.
- <sup>87</sup>Zalce, Apuntes para la historia de la masonería en México, 1:200.
- <sup>88</sup>Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 1:223, 264
- <sup>89</sup>Cadenhead, Benito Juárez, pp. 95, 112.
- <sup>90</sup>Richard Sinkin, The Mexican Reform: 1855-1876: a Study in Liberal Nation Building, pp. 81-82.
- <sup>91</sup>Antologia de Benito Juárez, notes by Jorge L. Tamayo, p.xxxvii; and Juárez, Documentos, discursos y correspondencia, 1:3.

<sup>92</sup>"Testimonio: el obituario masónico de Benito Juárez," Diálogos (vol. 18, n. 105 May-June 1982), pp. 53-58

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., pp. 55-56.

<sup>94</sup>Sinkin, The Mexican Reform: 1855-1876: a Study in Liberal Nation Building, pp. 4-5, 8.

<sup>95</sup>Ibid., pp. 144, 177.

<sup>96</sup>Roeder, Juárez and his Mexico, 2:730-732.

<sup>97</sup>"Mexico Restores full Vatican Ties," New York Times, 22 September, 1992, and "Freedoms made Official," Open Doors News Brief, November 1992.

<sup>98</sup>"Mexico Restores full Vatican Ties," New York Times, 22 September, 1992.

<sup>99</sup>Camp, Roderic Ai, "Political Modernization in Mexico: Through a Looking Glass," in The Evolution of the Mexican Political System, Ed. Jaime E. Rodriguez O., pp. 257, 261. Camp cited a personal interview with Bishop Méndez Arceo, México, June 21, 1989.

<sup>100</sup>"Mexico restores diplomatic ties with Vatican after 125-year break", Austin American-Statesman, 22 September, 1992.

## **Bibliography**

### **I. Primary Sources**

Anderson, James. Anderson's Constitutions of 1723. Forward by Bro. Lionel Vibert. Washington, D.C.: The Masonic Service Association of the United States, 1924.

Chism, Richard E. Una contribución a la historia masónica de México. México: Impre. del minero mexicano, 1899.

Gómez Pedraza, Manuel. Manifiesto que Manuel Gómez Pedraza, ciudadano de la república de méjico, dedica a sus compatriotas ó sea una reseña de su vida pública. Impreso en New Orleans y reimpreso en Guadalajara en la oficina de Brambilas, 1931.

Juárez, Benito. Los apuntes para mis hijos. 4th ed., Florencio Zamarripa M., comp. Editorial Futuro: México, D.F., 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. Documentos, discursos y correspondencia. 15 vols. Selección y notas de Jorge L. Tamayo. Secretaria del patrimonio nacional: México, 1964.

Locke, John. "A Letter Concerning Toleration." in Great Books of the Western World 35, ed. R.M. Hutchins. Chicago: William Benton, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952

Mateos, José María. Historia de la masonería de México, desde 1806 hasta 1884. México, 1884.

Ocampo, Melchor. La religión, la iglesia y el clero. El liberalismo mexicano en pensamiento, no. 6, colección dirigida por Martín Luis Guzmán. México:Empresas Editoriales, S.A., 1948.

Paine, Thomas. Complete Writings of Thomas Paine, Edited by Philip S. Foner, 2 vols. New York: Citadel Press, 1945. Vol. 2, "Origin of Freemasonry," 829-841.

Pike, Albert. Morals and Dogma, Ancient and Accepted Rite. Charleston: 1871; reprint ed., Richmond, Va.: L.H. Jenkins, Inc., 1950.

Tindal, Matthew. Christianity as Old as the Creation, or the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature. London: 1730.

---

Zalce y Rodríguez, Luis J. Apuntes para la historia de la masonería en México, de mis lecturas y mis recuerdos. 2 vols. México: 1950.

Zarco, Francisco. Cronica del congreso constituyente (1856-1857). México: El Colegio de México, 1957.

## **II. Secondary Sources**

Blanchard, J. Masonry Illustrated - The Complete Ritual of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite. Chicago: Ezra A. Cook, 1887.

Brioso y Candiani, Manuel. La evolucion del pueblo oajaqueño hasta el plan de ayutla 1821-1855. Tacubaya, D.F.:Imprenta a su orden, 1941.

Cabrelli, Alfonso Fernandez. Masonería y sociedades secretas en las luchas emancipadoras de la patria grande. La Paz, Argentina: Editorial America Una, 1975.

Cadenhead, Ivie E., Jr. Benito Juárez. Tulsa: University of Tulsa, Twayne publishers, Inc. New York, 1973.

Cajica, José M., Jr., S.A. Rocafuerte, Juárez y la libertad de conciencia en México. Puebla, México: Editorial Cajica, 1972.

Camp, Roderic Ai. "Political Modernization in Mexico: Through a Looking Glass." In The Evolution of the Mexican Political System. Ed. Jaime E. Rodriguez O. Los Angeles: Regents of the University of California, 1993.

Carter, James David. "Freemasonry in Texas, Background, History and Influence to 1846." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Texas, Austin, 1954.

Clarke, J.R. "The Change from Christianity to Deism in Freemasonry." Ars Quatuor Coronatorum 78 (1965 ) 49-73. Ars Quatuor Coronatorum is a publication of the historical research lodge in London, Quatuor Coronati Lodge no. 1076. These are available from the Masonic Library in Waco, Texas.

Dagger, Richard. "Rights," in Political Innovation and Conceptual Change. Ed. Terrance Ball, James Farr, Russell L. Hanson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Diaz, Silvino. La Masonería en México, apuntes históricos. N.p., 1927.

Fay, Bernard. Revolution and Freemasonry. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1935.

Ferrar Benimeli, José A. Los archivos secretos vaticanos y la masonería. Caracas: Universidad Católica "Andres Bellos," 1976.

Gibaja y Patron, Don Antonio. Comentario crítico, histórico, auténtico a las revoluciones de México. 5 vols. Librería Editorial, San Ignacio de Loyola: México, 1926.

Greenleaf, Richard E. "The Mexican Inquisition and the Masonic Movement: 1751-1820." New Mexico Historical Review 44, no. 2 , (April, 1969): 107-111.

Gutiérrez García, Jesús [Félix Navarrette]. La masonería en la historia y en las leyes de Méjico. Figuras y episodios de la historia de Méjico, no. 46. México: Editorial Jus, S.A., 1957.

- 
- Hamnett, Brian R. Revolución y contrarrevolución en México y el Perú. Trans. Roberto Gómez Ciriza. México: Fondo de cultura económica, 1978.
- Harris, Jack. Freemasonry: The Invisible Cult in our Midst. Towson, Md: By the author, 1983.
- Hazard, Paul. European Thought in the Eighteenth Century. Trans. J. Lewis May. Cleveland, Ohio: Meridian Books, 1967.
- Hefelbower, S.G. The Relation of John Locke to English Deism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918.
- Ituribarria, Jorge Fernando. Historia de Oaxaca, 1821-1854. Vol. 1. N.p.: Ediciones E.R. B., 1935.
- Jacob, Margaret. Living the Enlightenment. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans. London: George Allen and UNWIN, 1981.
- Knoop, Douglas and Jones, G.P. "Freemasonry and the Idea of Natural Religion." Ars Quatuor Coronatorum LVI (1946) 38-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Genesis of Freemasonry. Manchester: Manchester University press. 1947.
- Mackey, Albert G., M.D. A Lexicon of Freemasonry. Philadelphia: Moss & Co., 1872.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Encyclopedia of Freemasonry. New York and London: The Masonic History Company, 1916.
- Martinez Gracida, Manuel, and Manuel Brioso y Candiani. El Precursor de Juárez, Miguel Méndez. Guadalajara: Tip. de la escuela de artes y oficios del estado, 1911.
- Meyer, Michael C. and William L. Sherman. The Course of Mexican History. 2nd ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Molina Enríquez, Andrés. Juárez y la Reforma. México: Libro-Mex., editores, S de N.L., 1956.
- Open Doors News Brief. "Freedoms made Official." November, 1992.
- Phelan, John Leddy. El reino milenario de los franciscanos en el nuevo mundo. Translated by Josefina Vázquez de Knauth. México: UNAM, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Neo-Aztecism in the 18th Century and the Genesis of Mexican Nationalism," in Culture in History. Edited by Stanley Diamond. New York: published for Brandeis University by Columbia University Press, 1960.
- Roberts, J.M. The Mythology of Secret Societies. London: Secker and Warbury, 1972.
- Roeder, Ralph. Juárez and his Mexico. 2 vols. New York: Viking Press, 1947.
- Scholes, Walter V. Mexican Politics during the Juárez Regime, 1855-1872. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1969.
- Schuchard, Marsha Keith Manatt. "Freemasonry, Secret Societies and the Continuity of the Occult Traditions in English Literature." Ph.D. dissertation. U. of Texas, 1975.
- Sierra, Justo. Evolución política del pueblo mexicano, 2nd ed., Vol 12, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Political Evolution of the Mexican People. Trans. Charles Ramsdell. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1969.

---

\_\_\_\_\_. Juárez, su obra y su tiempo. Mexico, D.F.: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1974..

Sinkin, Richard N. The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876, a study in Liberal Nation-Building. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1979.

Stephen, Leslie, K.C. B. English Thought in the 18th Century. 2 vols. 1876, reprint ed., New York: Peter Smith, 1949.

Sullivan, Robert E. John Toland and the Deist Controversy. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Tamayo, Jorge L., ed. Antología de Benito Juárez. México: Universidad nacional autónoma de México, 1972.

Webster's New World Dictionary, college ed. (1956) , s.v. "Deism."

Weisberger, Richard William. "The Cultural and Organizational Functions of Speculative Freemasonry during the Enlightenment: A Study of the Craft in London, Paris, Prague, and Vienna." Ph.D. dissertation. U. of Pittsburgh, 1980.