

Rachel A. Moore
Assistant Professor
Department of History
Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina
rchico@clemson.edu
864.656.7570

From the Pulpit to the Post:
Anti-clericalism and Communication in Orizaba, 1857-1867

The passage of the Constitution of 1857 signaled a larger sea change in public life in nineteenth-century Mexico. Most famously, this federalist document assailed the institution central to the diffusion of information in Mexico up to that point: the Catholic Church. It did so principally through two provisions, both put into place prior to the passage of the constitution. The Juarez Law, passed in 1855, severely limited the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court. The Lerdo Law, passed in 1856, forced the Catholic Church to sell off all real property and later anti-clerical reforms allowed the government to seize Church holdings. The constitution remained forebodingly ambiguous about the place of the Catholic faith in public life in Mexico. The authors of the constitution designated no official state church. Thus, while the constitution did not explicitly establish freedom of religion, it did not outlaw other faiths either.

The legislative reforms folded into the constitution were promulgated in a halting and inconsistent manner. Jan Bazant has illustrated that while the requisitioning and sale of Church properties in Mexico City was “to a large extent complete in 1856,” it moved more slowly in the provinces.ⁱ This dampened momentum allowed residents of even the most parochial of communities in Mexico considerable time to process and respond to these reforms. They responded in many cases not with protest but with coping mechanisms.

For the residents of Orizaba, a then-burgeoning town between Mexico’s main Atlantic port of Veracruz and the national capital, the passage of the Lerdo Law brought with it the installation of a new post office. The post office took up residence in the former oratory of the order of San Felipe Neri. Although the friars of the order were abruptly forced to abandon the location, there was little outcry from the population itself.ⁱⁱ The litigation the event did generate involved what looks to be an intra-office squabble. Eight years after the passage of the Lerdo Law, civil servants in Orizaba remained embroiled in litigation in which the postmaster serving in 1864 objected to the self-serving ways of his predecessor, who had requisitioned a house for his father-in-law. Nowhere in the documentation did anyone take issue with the expulsion of the religious themselves. Orizaba had been characterized that same year as “one huge convent.”ⁱⁱⁱ And yet, in their reaction to the expulsion of the religious community of San Felipe Neri, there seemed to be little sign of their renowned parochial nature.

That same year, residents of Orizaba and the nearby town of Córdoba petitioned the imperial government of French interloper Maximilian for more comprehensive and reliable mail service. The following year they squabbled with one another over

jurisdiction in censorship case. Shortly after the execution of Maximilian, they continued to needle the federal government with complaints regarding the shabby appearance and vigilance of the police force. And through this all, no complaints surfaced in the same arenas regarding the treatment of the clergy or their Catholic followers.

In fact, Orizaba's intellectual community was quick to disavow the town's reputation as a mammoth monastery. In his *Essay on the history of Orizaba* (1867), Joaquín Arróniz refuted this reputation at length, writing,

He who believes that modern Orizaba had monastic and clerical origins is mistaken. Although the preponderance of religious sentiment in the town supports this viewpoint, its religiosity is often overemphasized.

The Spaniards who made Orizaba their principal residence were drawn to it neither by convent nor by cross. They were attracted by the opportunities this location offered merchants to conduct business with travelers. They also came in search of the healthy condition they had lost on the coast.

The Church, the true center of all the populations of America and Europe, came later, once the light of the true faith was known, to further strengthen the vitality of our fledgling city. In this we differ from the foundation of the rest of our nation's cities since it can be said that they were born of the altar.^{iv}

Why this comparative complacency regarding anticlerical reform? Part of the explanation lies in intellectual changes occurring on both sides of the Atlantic. In her study of conflict and rebellion in the La Purísima convent in the late eighteenth century, Margaret Chowning has illustrated how European ideals such as “rationalism, individualism, attention to the financial bottom line, competition as a positive good” brought the Mexican government to withdraw support from the convents.^v These ideals permeated the general population as well. That said, part of the explanation also lies in the ability of the residents of a nation in flux to adapt. Over the course of the first half of the nineteenth century, residents of Mexico adjusted to a Federalist constitution in 1824 and readjusted to a Centralist constitution in 1836. The Catholic religious community experienced a growing number of assaults to its authority during the same period. Impacted by these anticlerical reforms and influenced by the global intellectual environment of the time, individuals began to practice what Pamela Voekel has called a “new piety.” This more private form of piety demanded less in the way of clerical mediation between man and God. “The idea,” Voekel writes, “was not to eliminate priests' social powers, but to reconfigure them.”^{vi} Voekel sees this new piety manifest itself in the trend toward more subdued funerals in nineteenth-century Mexico.

Much has been written regarding the public outcry in protest of the anticlerical reforms of the nineteenth century. However, relatively little has been written about the ways in which anticlericalism brought individuals to recalibrate their expectations of the government. It is a trend that is under-examined but not unprecedented. Especially during the Bourbon period, subjects living in New Spain developed certain expectations of the Crown as well as certain standards for the Crown's representatives. When these expectations were not met, they sought redress from the Crown itself.^{vii} Protests during

both the Bourbon and Independence periods focused on the ways in which national leadership had failed in its God-given obligation to maintain a morally upright government. The concept of a morally accountable government was, in fact, one consistently espoused by the clergy themselves and points to continuities between Mexico's parochial past and progressive future.

I will argue here that the anticlerical reforms of the nineteenth century spurred on public debate regarding the obligations that the government assumed after depriving the public of Church counsel. Correlations can be drawn between anticlerical initiatives and demands for improved distribution, regulation and protection of private information circulating in the public sphere. However, Mexicans in the nineteenth century acclimated to secular society at a pace that only *apparently* stood at odds with their "parochial reputation." Their demands conformed to a holistic concept of church and state in which the duties of governing society were shared between the two institutions.^{viii}

While residents of Orizaba demanded the retention by the clergy of their traditional duties through the first third of the 1800s, they reconceived of their appeals beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. Rather than seek to preserve the central public place of the clergy, *orizabeños* sought to foist some of the traditional duties of the clergy, namely the diffusion of information, on the government itself. What one 1870 *orizabeño* editorial called "the vacuum left by the exit of the religious communities"^{ix} needed to be filled. If the government wanted to assume the mantle of arbiter of public life, they reasoned, then the government would also assume the obligations that came therewith. These obligations included keeping the public informed and protected, both traditional purviews of the clergy in Mexico. The process of resolving themselves to these changes and responding with altered expectations of the clergy and the government alike represented a declaration of faith in the public sphere. The public sphere, and with it public service, became sacred arenas and occupations.^x

The concept of the public sphere has rapidly come to serve as an organizing concept for those studying the "long nineteenth century" in Latin America.^{xi} It is an improvement over politically driven histories that often bog down in the flurry of regime changes that afflicted many newly independent nations. In addition, it allows for greater attentiveness to a broader swath of society than some of the economic histories of this period. That said, it remains amorphous in definition. Then again, the conflicting interpretations of its parameters and characteristics seem fitting for a concept that seeks to wrangle public opinion itself into a historically illuminating idea.

All definitions of the public sphere in Latin America, regardless of the region upon which they focus, must contend with several social and political bugaboos. First and foremost, what impact did independence have on individuals' view of the relationship between government and governed? Did independence, in effect, constitute the public sphere? Second, what happened to the legitimacy of institutions in place before independence? Third, what institutions took shape in reaction to the opportunities for new civic discourse opened by independence? And, lastly, how do the dictators who rose to prominence over the course of the nineteenth century Latin America-wide fit into this new public sphere?

Historians such as Francois-Xavier Guerra have argued that independence in Latin America forged elements of both the "traditional" and the "modern" into a uniquely

hybrid public sphere from which there was no returning. Therefore, individuals broke from their previous beliefs about government's obligations to governed and instead embarked upon a search for new sources of legitimacy. They invested print media with a great deal of authority as both voice and determinant of public opinion. In effect, newspapers articulated the parameters of the public sphere. In a slightly different vein, historians of Argentina Jorge Meyer and Hilda Sabato have argued that there are important continuities that carry over from the colonial period to the post-independence period. They complicate the idea that the "traditional" and "modern" aspects of post-independence society in Latin America are diametrically opposed. This paper will explore these contradictions in a Mexican context. In specific, I will examine one of the institutions to which individuals turned for information and security in an increasingly anticlerical age: the postal service.

David Henkin has explained the growing "mass participation" in the postal system in the United States during this period as a result of improvements in print technology, literacy and transportation. The area under study in this essay experienced improvements in both print technology and literacy in the nineteenth century. However, the demand for more comprehensive postal services in Mexico predates the completion of its first railroad by nearly two decades.^{xii} This points to the unique development of the Mexican postal system. Anticlericalism is an important additional factor that must be considered in studying the development of the postal system in any country in which the church played a central role in information diffusion. Many patronizing the postal system in the United States did so in hopes of maintaining contact with far-flung relations and friends. By contrast, those patronizing the postal system in Mexico often experienced less mobility and craved news of the wider world in the form of newspapers and, to a lesser degree, personal letters. Before the liberal reforms of the mid-nineteenth century, many individuals turned to the Church as a source of information and answers. The closing of churches deprived them of this uniquely sanctioned information.

Orizaba and Córdoba are particularly interesting cities to study because residents simultaneously bore the consequences and enjoyed the fruits of nineteenth-century modernization. The anticlerical initiatives and demands for improved government services manifested in these towns fit squarely into two larger processes at work globally in the nineteenth century – secularization and centralization. In Mexico, the Bourbon dynasty spearheaded both processes in the late eighteenth century with reforms that minimized the influence of the clergy and the autonomy of the colonial government. Secularizing and centralizing initiatives persisted after Mexican independence. They experienced renewed popular approval after several stormy years under a Federal Constitution. Michael Costeloe points to the treatment of the Church by the Mexican government from 1821 to 1857 as evidence that the "secularization of the European mind" was a process which was also occurring in Mexico.^{xiii} Jeanne-Pierre Bastian contrasts the less confrontational "secularization" efforts of this period with the more aggressive "laicization" efforts by the Mexican government in the second half of the nineteenth century.^{xiv} The harsh treatment meted out to the religious community in Orizaba resonates strongly with Bastian's "laicization."

The more pronounced persecution of the clergy in Orizaba in the second half of the nineteenth century had its origins in Orizaba's royalist reputation during the independence struggle. Beginning with the Hidalgo rebellion in 1810, insurgent forces targeted Orizaba as a haven for royalist sympathizers. The most glaring, or at least well-documented, abuses both before and after Mexico's independence from Spain were reserved for the religious community of Orizaba. William Taylor has argued that, during the independence struggle, priests "did what they could not to antagonize armed partisans – tentatively and discreetly supporting one group or another."^{xv} This ambiguity held considerable consequence for the residents of Orizaba. They became increasingly uncomfortable with the town's parochial reputation as the abuses to the clergy and – by extension – themselves escalated.

The corridor between Orizaba and Córdoba felt the impact of the independence struggle acutely. "The war of independence was a true calamity for Orizaba" wrote Arróniz in his 1898 history of the city.^{xvi} Contemporary accounts of the independence movement reflect the ambivalence *orizabeños* experienced.^{xvii} In the aftermath of the *grito*, Orizaba as well as Córdoba served as rallying points for royalist troops. The entries for May and June of 1812 in Carlos María Bustamante's journal closely follow royalist troop movements. During this period, Spanish troops consisting of "nineteen or twenty men arrived to be housed in Orizaba nearly every night."^{xviii} Bustamante himself sheltered a Spanish soldier for two weeks in the beginning of September 1813. He did so, he wrote, "to my disgrace." However, his misgivings did nothing to stave off the retaliation exacted upon the population for harboring royalists. Although Bustamante was sympathetic to the insurgent cause, his recollections of the impact it had on Orizaba are unflinching in their graphic descriptions. In an entry dated October 7, 1813, he described in detail the beating and rape of several *orizabeños* by insurgent troops:

At midnight on October 7, two American soldiers arrived at the house of José Antonio Bravo alias "The Poblano." The soldiers severely beat both he and his son, after which they tied them up and took them to the house of Christobal Eredia. The soldiers ordered Bravo to knock on the door and not state his intentions. Fearing for his life, he obeyed. A woman answered and, after entering, they asked after her husband Christobal. She responded that he was not in. Then these two ministers of Satan tied up the unfortunate woman and a young servant girl. They walked with the four bound individuals towards the banks of the river, . . . one soldier continued on with the two men and the other fell back with the two poor women. It was impossible for them to resist the soldier's advances since they were both bound. Their pleas to God and the saints were useless because the soldier was possessed. As soon as it was done, he tried to slit the throats of the two men but, thanks to the pleas of his own companion-in-arms, he took mercy on Bravo and his son, with the condition that they never mention what happened. They swore to do so and were freed. These two soldiers committed yet another crime on the same night, stabbing a man and then dragging him to the edge of the river.^{xix}

While this attack was clearly motivated by revenge and the desire to inflict harm, other insurgents targeted stores and supplies with a mind to re-provisioning. In February 1814, twenty men descended upon the shop of Manuel Valladares late one night asking him for

300 pesos. After receiving word that Valladares did not have the cash, the commander of the group ordered that they “take what there was in the store.” Similarly, three months later, a group of insurgent soldiers sacked stores and houses in Orizaba, in the process killing the owner of one establishment.^{xx} Insurgent attacks also jeopardized Orizaba and Córdoba’s lucrative tobacco industry.^{xxi}

The brutality suffered by the population at the hands of the insurgents brought imperial and local governments to deal with insurgents harshly. In May 1814, notices posted in Orizaba warned that “Every house that either hosts secret meetings of insurgents or harbors those who have contact with them will be burned and the owner of the property will be punished to the fullest extent of the law.” The notice went on to encourage individuals to monitor the activities of their neighbors by adding that it was also now within the letter of the law for authorities to also burn the *neighboring* house. In addition, each and every member of any community found to harbor insurgents would be fined.^{xxii}

Bustamante’s personal ambivalence toward royalist troops surfaced in an increasingly pronounced fashion over the course of his narration of events in Orizaba. In late November and December 1816, he noted several instances in which former, confessed insurgents were executed. “They shot a muleteer,” he wrote, “because he said he had been an insurgent.” Later that week, he added “The shot one poor man in Tixtla who had been an insurgent but now has nothing to do with them.” At the conclusion of his memoir, Bustamante listed the number of suspected insurgents killed by each Spanish general. The death toll ranged from two suspected insurgents executed by General Luis Aguila to 46 suspected insurgents executed by the infamous General Francisco Hevia. Bustamante estimated the total number of individuals sentenced to death by the Spanish army to be 285.

With the town besieged, residents consistently turned to members of the religious community to reaffirm their allegiance to an embattled imperial power. On Christmas Day 1812, *orizabeños* celebrated the publication of the liberal Constitution in Spain. Copies of the constitution were posted in “houses of worship, the theater and under a huge canopy alongside a decorated image of Ferdinand VII,” according to Bustamante. The next day the entire town, “the nobility together with the common people,” gathered in the parish church to celebrate their decision to conform to the tenets of the new constitution.^{xxiii} Residents of Orizaba received news of Ferdinand’s success in reclaiming the throne in early June 1814, almost three months after his actual re-accession. Church bells the town over announced the event.

Rejoicing with rockets and fireworks, throwing them into the air; in the evening there was an eye-catching illumination of the lights. The streets of each neighborhood were filled with music, people singing songs of celebration and many cries of “viva!” for Ferdinand; this celebration lasted until six the next morning.^{xxiv}

Such displays reflected the ability of the church to bring individuals to the streets in fervent devotion. These displays also gave government authorities a sense of the collective power of the public.

It was, no doubt, no accident that Spanish officials were a prominent feature of the street parades that accompanied the celebration of religious holidays and the transport of religious art. Their presence both asserted their continued influence in Mexico, despite the embattled state of the monarchy in Spain, and kept in check any potential dissenters to imperial rule. Spanish troops – identified as “the Patriots” – participated in such a way in an 1814 procession in honor of the Virgin of the Rosary. Troops from Asturias, Spain participated peaceably in the procession until the group passed by some prisoners housed in the tower of an Orizaba church. Upon seeing the Spanish soldiers, the prisoners overlooking the street began to tear out the weeds growing between the stones of the building and threw them at the procession. One particularly large clod of dirt found its target in an *asturiano* royalist soldier. The soldier immediately moved to enter the tower and confront the mudslinger. After forcing the lock open with his saber, the soldier dragged the prisoners from their holding cell “without asking the permission of the priest residing there.” According to Bustamante, the prisoners were “placed in a room with pews and dealt blows so that they would divulge who had thrown the dirt. After they had dealt them their punishment, they left them to die, despite being innocent of the charges since the guilty party had been placed under lock and key by the priests.” Bustamante viewed this as an example of the world-turned-upside-down atmosphere that had overtaken Mexico during the independence struggle. He concluded his description by writing, “what an unhappy time in which for our faults, men do not venerate the clergy, but instead treat them no better than a coachman. Nor do they respect the sanctuary of the Lord, instead venerating more a whorehouse.”^{xxv}

For residents of Orizaba, a series of natural disasters heightened both the millenarian atmosphere of the independence period and public devotion to the Church. “Having irritated divine justice, against the inhabitants of this town by their many sins; they have been threatened with earthquakes, plague, draught and hunger,”^{xxvi} wrote Bustamante. The destruction wreaked by these disasters made members of the religious community of Orizaba appear even more embattled and overworked as they struggled to minister to the sick and perform last rites for the dying. In March 1819, a massive earthquake severely damaged the Church of Our Lady of Guadalupe. The priests residing there were forced to flee and the damages to the Church exceeded 4,000 pesos.^{xxvii} Residents of Orizaba felt the aftershocks of the earthquake well into the month of May, prompting priests to organize a procession and a novena “begging the mercy of the Lord.” In 1833, the religious community of Orizaba played an important role in nursing and bolstering the spirits of *orizabeños* through a cholera epidemic. The epidemic infected 6,000 of Orizaba’s 16,000 inhabitants, killing 1,800.^{xxviii} As residents watched their population decimated by the disease, they filled the confessionals in the hopes that the morally upright would not be affected.

To many, the afflictions that befell Orizaba and its inhabitants were a direct result of both immoral individual behavior and the town officials’ poor treatment of their priests. As Francisco Morales has illustrated, the expulsion of Mexico’s Spaniards in 1827 profoundly impacted the Franciscan community of Orizaba. Nineteen of the 35 friars working at the Propaganda Fide College in Orizaba were forced to return to Spain, reducing their numbers by 54 percent. According to Morales, “the city’s inhabitants threatened to guard the convent to prevent the

government from expelling the Spanish friars.”^{xxix} In 1834, orizabeños would do just that.

In that year, the state government ordered that all religious houses with fewer than twenty-four residents be closed. “This,” wrote local chronicler José María Naredo, “amounted to abolishing them all since none of them had this many residents.”^{xxx} The anxieties of local residents mounted as they awaited the promulgation of the decree. The arrival of five empty carriages heightened suspicions that the religious community of Orizaba would soon be forced from their residences and the town. When authorities finally moved on the expulsion of religious, they did so in the middle of the night. However, residents noticed this activity as well. According to Naredo, one resident left her house at two in the morning alerting the town that “They are taking the priest! They are taking the priest!” Naredo wrote that,

News spread like a bolt of electricity. Townspeople came out of their houses armed and ready to act and soon the bells of the Church were ringing, sounding the alarm. At dawn the group of armed people had grown and the church bells continued sounding until noon. Upon hearing the news, many combatants left their ranches and came into town, forming a large squad with those already there. . . . At midday the uproar was horrible and everything was in disarray, so much so that some people stepped forward to impose some order. These individuals, along with Fathers Llano and Mendoza, engineered a truce with the armed forces and they put down their arms. The whole thing had come to a close by six that night, and the ringing of the church bells, as well as the fireworks, announced the triumph of the townspeople.^{xxxi}

Even in a moment of victimization the clerical community of Orizaba demonstrated the strong sway they continued to hold over popular action to this point. After diffusing the situation with government authorities, the priests implored the irate population to return to their homes. “The obedient townspeople withdrew, forming groups and singing hymns to the Lord,” wrote Naredo.

However, as the nineteenth century progressed there were an increasing number of instances in which public sentiment overrode public deference to representatives of the Church. In 1834, the priests of Orizaba had successfully prevented residents of the town from retaliating against government authorities for attempting to drive the clergy from their homes. Just four years later their entreaties were not as effective. The devaluation of currency by the Mexican government in 1837 incensed orizabeños. When they threatened to march on the textile factory at Cocolapam, located on the outskirts of Orizaba, priests attempted to dissuade them. Naredo wrote that, “The people listened to the arguments of the priests and seemed to calm down; and when it seemed like each and every one of them would return to their homes, a voice started to chant ‘To Cocolapam! To Cocolapam!’” When French workers at the factory fired warning shots at the menacing group, the demonstration escalated into open violence. Two Frenchmen were injured and the factory suffered an estimated 1,200 pesos worth of damage. Naredo described the event as a gross aberration for the people of Orizaba. “The moderation and

docility of the people here is proverbial,” he wrote.^{xxxii} However, in light of their subsequent demands of the government, this would not seem to be the case.

With the clerical community under attack, orizabeños turned to other means of gathering information. Orizabeños conceived of themselves as active participants in the burgeoning print culture and legal system of nineteenth-century Mexico. They were avid newspaper readers and frequent correspondents. Documents make reference to no less than six newspapers published or circulated within the city itself.^{xxxiii} Much of the population was keenly aware of the way in which information circulated. In addition, they had strongly held opinions regarding the quality and integrity of information to which they were entitled. In the aftermath of local and national anticlerical initiatives, residents of Orizaba became increasingly vocal in their demands for a more reliable and secure postal service. These demands grew as much from the unique intellectual environment of Orizaba as they did from the larger dialogues occurring in Mexico at the time regarding the transparency of government.

While Orizaba did not boast the same concentration of educational institutions as neighboring town Jalapa, the tobacco barons responsible for many of the improvements to the town made certain that residents had access to secondary education. The *Colegio Preparatorio de Orizaba* opened thanks to their sponsorship in 1825.^{xxxiv} For their primary education, *orizabeños* had several options of varying scholarly rigor. The two most respected primary schools in the center of town educated their students in “reading, writing, Christian doctrine, math, drawing, manners, and morals.” In addition, several schools for girls offered classes in “reading, writing, counting, cooking, keeping house, and many other manual skills appropriate for the fairer sex.”^{xxxv}

Residents of the town of Orizaba itself were as engaged as circumstances permitted with the larger literary community of Mexico. Especially after the rapid growth of the periodical press in Mexico during the nineteenth century,^{xxxvi} *orizabeños* relied to a great degree on the postal system for contact with the larger intellectual community of the nation. They often found themselves frustrated with an understaffed and underfunded post office.

The postal regulations instituted by the Bourbons in 1794 remained the foundation of Mexico’s postal code until 1883.^{xxxvii} The Bourbon administrators created two principal postal administrations with this set of laws: that of Veracruz and that of Mexico. In 1821, Mexico’s newly independent government eliminated the first eleven provisions of the Bourbon regulations, but left the larger organization of the postal system intact. Orizaba numbered among one of four principal post offices operating under the main post office in Veracruz. Campeche and Mérida also had principal post offices as did Jalapa, Orizaba’s mercantile rival to the north. However, where Campeche, Jalapa, and Mérida had three or even four full-time postal employees, Orizaba had only two. The budget of the Orizaba post office was less than half that of the Jalapa post office, despite their similar size and location.^{xxxviii} This disparity grew in large part from Jalapa’s prominent commercial role during the late colonial period as the site of Mexico’s only trade fair. In addition, Jalapa served as the major travel hub for those in transit from Veracruz to Mexico City.

While regular mail service was reinstated in Mexico in May 1823, postal patrons continued to face delays and unreliable service throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. In 1838, mail arrived to Orizaba biweekly on Tuesdays and Thursdays. However, the town lacked direct mail communication with Veracruz. Those letters bound for the port, according to Segura, “had to pass through Nopalucan and Jalapa and, for this reason, are much delayed.” By 1854, sufficient progress had been made on the route between Orizaba and Veracruz that weekly mail service existed.^{xxxix} Five years later, residents of Orizaba could both send and receive mail three days a week.^{xl} The ability to both dispatch *and* receive correspondence on Sundays – the only day on which this was possible – alluded to the anticlerical bent of the national government at the time.

However, in the years of political instability ushered in by the beginning of the French intervention in 1862, the postal system suffered near financial ruin. According to postal employee Manuel Aburto from late April to November of 1862, “the revenue of the post office was insufficient to cover our salaries and other costs, forcing us to leave nearly all employees unpaid.”^{xli} When the post office failed to return sufficient revenue, the responsibility of covering expenses often fell to the postmasters themselves. In 1863, postal employees working in Orizaba appealed to the government for financial assistance in at least two separate instances. In October, the postmaster requested that the expenses of *correos extraordinarios* be transferred from the post office of origin to the central post office in Mexico City.^{xlii} A month later, the same official petitioned the government for assistance in paying rent owed from April to November 1862. “At that point in time,” wrote the official, “this office had no income at all.”^{xliii} The post office was in such financial straits that French officials reduced their staff to just two: the postmaster and a postal inspector.^{xliv}

However, the indigence of postal workers in Orizaba does not necessarily indicate that individuals were not using the post office during this period. Rather than posting mail, orizabeños were eagerly anticipating it. After the installation of Maximilian of Austria as emperor of Mexico in 1864, the demands for postal service by both the new government and civilians increased markedly. Maximilian wanted to stay in closer contact with provincial outposts and civilians sought to apprise each other of developments through letters and the growing number of newspapers in Mexico. As a result, the frequency of mail service between Mexico City, Orizaba and Veracruz increased to six times a week.^{xlv} However, postal employees continued to be poorly paid and poorly monitored. In 1864, the postmaster of Córdoba wrote to officials in Mexico City complaining that “Being that mail is now being sent and received daily, both from above as well as from below, the duties of this office have quadrupled and I am stretched to my limit in dispatching with them. This makes it imperative that I have someone to help me.”^{xlvi} He wrote again the next year appealing to authorities for more pay since “within a short while” mail service from Córdoba was set to include Coscomatepec, Huatusco, Jalapa and the *tierra caliente*.^{xlvii} Authorities relented at this point and granted the overworked civil servant a raise in salary to 400 pesos.

Individuals living in both Córdoba and Orizaba also demanded more personalized service and convenience from the post office. They no longer wanted to report to the post office to retrieve their mail. Instead, they demanded that postal workers deliver it to their homes. In Córdoba, according to one complaint, “one local merchant went so far as

to say that if there was not a mailman available to do this the postmaster himself should deliver the letters.” The postmaster of Córdoba responded to such a request with the explanation to authorities that, “As I am sure you will understand, this would be impossible. . . . If this was done the office would have to be closed for the entire time that I spent delivering the mail that arrived from above [the west] between eight and nine in the morning, and then the mail that arrived from Veracruz at one in the afternoon.”^{xlvi} In 1865, the postmaster of Orizaba requested that an additional postman that catered exclusively to private homes be added to the staff. He described demands for “delivery of letters to private dwellings” as being “overwhelming.”^{xlix}

By 1865, postal officials had raised salaries throughout central Mexico. The postmaster of Orizaba received a fifty percent raise – from 800 to 1,200 pesos annually. The postmaster of Córdoba received a twenty-five percent raise – from 400 to 500 pesos annually. Funds were also allocated for additional workers to be hired. The Orizaba post office was budgeted to hire on a second *interventor* (postal inspector). Presumably with the greater volume of mail passing through the transit hub of Orizaba at this point it was necessary to have additional sets of eyes scrutinizing correspondence and printed matter. The Córdoba post office received funds hire a clerk and a house servant.^l These salaries and staff are similar to those outlined for the town of Jalapa, located to the north.^{li} Larger cities such as Puebla and Mexico City had considerably larger budgets and workforces. The postmaster of Puebla received 3,000 pesos annually and headed up a staff that included four postal inspectors and three mailmen.^{lii} The Mexico City post office had a total budget of 10,000 pesos. The salaries of their employees – including 3,000 pesos for the postmaster -- were publicized with large printed broadsides posted about the city.^{liii}

Postal workers in Veracruz petitioned for a budget and staff on par with that of the national capital, arguing that the demands upon them warranted it. According the postmaster, the eight employees of the Veracruz post office could barely keep up with the work accorded them. “This city is debilitating and hot,” he wrote in an appeal for additional employees, “and if but one of the employees were to fall sick, it would be physically impossible to complete the tasks with which we are charged.”^{liv}

However, even more reasonable salaries did not deter postal employees from expressing partisan bias in the workplace. Those who worked for the post office in the nineteenth century occupied ambiguous political terrain. They were expected in many cases to continue to do their jobs through partisan conflicts and foreign invasions. And, while they were an example of the type of civil servant encouraged by the Bourbon reforms in the late colonial period, they often were not accorded the privileges of an impartial government employee. This was because, unavoidably almost, they were not impartial.

Some civil servants were coerced into serving partisan aims and others eagerly seized upon the opportunity to abuse their positions for personal gain and political advancement. During his first term as president of Mexico (1861-1863), the government of Benito Juárez drafted postal employee Manuel Aburto into service to handle the correspondence of Juárez’s *Ejército de Oriente*. His wife later testified that Aburto was drafted in an “incident was highly violent and it was impossible to resist.” When French troops overran Puebla in 1863, they took Aburto prisoner as a member of the Mexican army. Despite his protests that “he had the character of a civil servant,” the invading

troops sent Aburto to France to be held. In her appeal to authorities for his salary, Aburto's wife Vicenta argued that her husband served as an "employee of the Mexican Nation and not on a particular party."^{lv}

Aburto represented the exception in the nineteenth century. Postmasters occasionally took advantage of their position as the gatekeepers of posted mail to rid deliveries of any offending correspondence or publications. Shortly after independence, both the secretary of the Orizaba post office and the head of the Ayuntamiento of Orizaba complained that mail passing through the town of Tehuacan was often not received in Mexico City or in Orizaba. The head of the Ayuntamiento wrote "these casualties, considering the circumstances, are suspicious." He urged postal authorities to route mail through the town of Nopaluca, "as it had come before, because it is a faster and more secure route."^{lvi} The exchange is briefly documented but alludes to the power local postal workers had over how – and whether – written and published correspondence circulated in and out of Orizaba. Authorities anxious to monitor the mails and control the spread of potentially seditious material established strict laws that required individuals to utilize only the national postal service. A set of laws passed in Orizaba in 1863 stated that mail conveyed outside the national postal system "not only considerably diminishes the income of the post office, but also allows one to avoid the vigilance that the authorities should have over (the postal service)." The penalties assessed for these offenses ranged from a fine of one peso per piece of mail conveyed illegally to two days of jail time for every peso left unpaid.^{lvii}

Those publications that did arrive to Orizaba were closely scrutinized for any personal ramifications they might have had for local residents. Residents of Orizaba had long been highly sensitive to the impact publicized, in specific, printed information had on their reputation. As mail service to the town improved over the course of the nineteenth century, libel cases mounted. Orizabenses did not shy away from litigiousness. According to Naredo, notaries were widely called upon in Orizaba.^{lviii}

When an individual took legal action in the aftermath of the publication of an offensive pamphlet or newspaper, he most often complained of injury to his reputation or unsubstantiated claims. He filed his grievance with the censorship judge in Mexico City, who then issued an order that all copies of the publication be recalled. The intention of these measures was to censure the author of the piece and the publisher responsible for its diffusion. However, most publishers refused to reveal the identity of their anonymous authors and bore the brunt of the punishment for offending publications. Indeed, it was good business sense to do so. Incendiary tracts were popular among the reading public and could earn a press a degree of political notoriety.

In Orizaba in 1820, Coronel Lorenzo García Noreiga had followed the legal course outlined above upon reading the pamphlet titled "And a just basic comparison and a constitution and other notable triumphs." Authorities in Orizaba informed the publisher José Mariano Benavente of García's complaint and requested the identity of the anonymous author of the pamphlet. According to a member of the local censorship board, Benavente refused to volunteer the requested information. "Our request having been ignored," he wrote, "it was impossible for the Tribunal to either carry out any judgment of the crimes or know with any certainty who to prosecute." Members of the

tribunal also demanded of Benavente that he hand over any remaining copies as well as list the individuals and vendors to whom he had sold it. Again, the inquiries proved to be unsuccessful. In the end, García's last best hope was a notice printed in newspapers and posted on street corners that informed the reading public that the publication in question "had been censured by the Provincial Censorship Board as injurious" to his reputation.^{lix} Ironically then, the resolution to García's complaint placed the offensive material even more squarely within the public eye.

The same was the case with a letter exchange printed in the newspaper *El Eco de Orizaba* in 1868.^{lx} The exchange encompassed letters printed in four newspapers in three cities and touched upon the reputations of at least as many individuals. And while some of these individuals masqueraded in the guise of anonymous correspondents, rebukes often came in the form of distinct hints at their identity. What emerges is a thinly veiled smear campaign by a prominent orizabeño publisher against foreigners seeking involvement in the national government. His letters to the publishers of newspapers in Mexico City and Veracruz – published in his own newspaper – reflect both the self-consciousness of intellectuals in Orizaba and their conflicted relationship with the Catholic Church.

The exchange began with Joaquín Arróniz, the editor of the *Eco de Orizaba*, writing to the editor of the Mexico City-based *El Siglo XIX* to insincerely commend him on the publication of an article and to encourage him to emerge from beneath the "the mask of anonymity" and take part in a "frank and reasonable discussion." Only at this point, wrote the editor of the *Eco*, would he reprint the article in his own newspaper. The editor then wrote to a correspondent for the Veracruz-based *El Correo de Sotavento*. In beginning his letter "To the correspondent in Veracruz for *El Correo de Sotavento*, the distinguished, celebrated and popular man of literature, honor of our country and glory of our glorious national literary culture, Don Nicasio Masepat (¿¿¿???)," Arróniz questions not only the accolades the correspondent has received but also his name itself. He emphasized these doubts in a postscript, writing "Mr. Masepat: Although you are very well known throughout the literary world, the splendors of your talent have not reached as far as the relative obscurity of my humble home. Such is its dullness." Arróniz later refers to the ubiquitous "Mr. Masepat" by his true name "Mr. Gagern." Having revealed his journalistic rival's identity, Arróniz went on to question his identification as a *veracruzano* again following the word with question marks. He snidely encouraged Gagern to reply to his letter "when he was able to get away from his duties as a schooner captain."

Arróniz's letters also reflected the fact that orizabeños were highly aware of how they were thought of by members of the intellectual community outside Orizaba. In addition to making passing reference to his "humble home," Arróniz signs one of the letters, "the unknown editor in chief of the *Eco de Orizaba*." At the same time that he attempts to acknowledge – and refute – Orizaba's backwater reputation, he complicates its religious one. Arróniz criticizes Gagern for being "impertinently anti-clerical whenever he has a chance." This is the same Arróniz who – in his *Essay on the History of Orizaba* published the year before – declared the "religiosity" of Orizaba to be "overemphasized."^{lxi} He is in this respect emblematic of the apparent contradictions that ran through the relationship between anti-clericalism and communication in Orizaba.

While he defended the Catholic Church against vocal (and published) detractors, he shied away from characterizing Orizaba as having a long or even particularly ardent religious pedigree. He does so to reconcile his parochialism with the progressive future of Mexico. While the Church educated, nursed and advocated for the population of Orizaba through the first half of the nineteenth century, the conservative reputation of Orizaba was also the cause of much suffering in Orizaba in the second half of the nineteenth century.

In the aftermath of the anticlerical reforms, residents of Orizaba demanded that those who had deprived them of the advice and guidance of their local clergy provide an alternate means of diffusing information. In this vein, Arróniz's heated reply to Gagern pointed both to the respect Arróniz believed the Church deserved at the same time that it reflected the power the press yielded by 1868. The reputedly deferential population of Orizaba, a town historically linked to Mexico City and royalist initiatives, had emerged by the end of the nineteenth century as a politically aware and active body of individuals. In effect, they moved to become their own arbiters of public opinion. The appearance of complaints consistently in newspapers pointed to the importance of print media as a tool with which to exercise this popular sovereignty. The pulpit from which the residents of Orizaba articulated their needs no longer involved the clergy as interlocutors, but the press as platform.

ⁱ Jan Bazant, *Alienation of Church Wealth in Mexico: Social and Economic Aspects of the Liberal Revolution 1856-1875* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 111.

ⁱⁱ Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), Correos Fomento Vol. 6 Exp. 10 fs. 39-46; In a very literal sense, anti-clerical initiatives sought to fracture the influence of the Church on public life by unseating its priests from their homes and eliminating the Church from the public landscape. Eulalia Ribera Carbó describes in detail how, in 1874, government authorities closed the Carmelite convent in downtown Orizaba and turned the one large block that the convent occupied into four by running two streets through it. *Herencia colonial y modernidad burguesa en un espacio urbano: el caso de Orizaba en el siglo XIX* (Mexico: Institution de Investigaciones Dr José María Luis Mora, 2002), p. 113.

ⁱⁱⁱ Manuel Paynó, in Fernando Tola de Habich, ed. *Museo literario tres* (Mexico: Premia, 1986), p. 152.

^{iv} “Se equivoca quien crea que la Orizaba moderna tuvo un origen monástico y clerical, aunque en apoyo de esa opinion se alegue la preponderancia en ella del sentimiento religioso, llevado á veces hasta la exaltación.

No fué una ermita, ni la cruz, símbolo de la religion que traían los españoles, las que crearon su núcleo principal, sino el aliciente que ofrecian estos lugares á algunos mercaderes, para negociar con los que contínuo pasaban, bien en busca del tráfico á de la salud que perdian en las costas.

La iglesia, verdadero centro de todas las poblaciones de América y Europa, una vez conocida la luz de la verdad evangélica, vino después, como á robustecer la vitalidad de la naciente ciudad. En esto difiere muchísimo de la fundacion del resto de nuestras poblaciones; pues ellas puede decirse que nacieron del altar.” Joaquín Arróniz, *Ensayo de una historia de Orizaba* (Mexico: Editorial Citlaltepeltl, 1959), 1: 117.

^v Margaret Chowning, *Rebellious Nuns: The Troubled History of a Mexican Convent, 1752-1863* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), p. 7. On the impact of anticlericalism in Europe during the same period, see Christopher Clark and Wolfram Kaiser, eds. *Culture Wars: Secular-Catholic Conflict in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

^{vi} Pamela Voekel, *Alone Before God: The Religious Origins of Modernity in Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), pp. 101-103.

^{vii} See François-Xavier Guerra, *Modernidad e independencias: Ensayos sobre las revoluciones hispánicas* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2000); François-Xavier Guerra, *México: del Antiguo Regimen a la Revolución* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1988).

^{viii} “Although it is generally assumed that modern Mexican nationalism is a secular product of nineteenth-century liberalism, it may be more appropriate to see it as forged by these contrary forces of Christian fulfillment and secular liberal commitments, and perched on the horns of its own dilemmas.” Brian Connaughton, *Clerical Ideology in a Revolutionary Age* (Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado, 2003), p. 19.

^{ix} “De esta manera, creemos que se llenará el vacío que dejaron las comunidades religiosas.” *Boletín del Hospicio de Orizaba*, October 27, 1870.

^x “. . . con tales recomendaciones, los intereses de los municipios se veían como cosa sagrada”; “En los gobiernos democráticos en que la soberanía reside en el pueblo” *Boletín del Hospicio de Orizaba*, October 30, 1870. Also repeated, passage from October 27, 1870.

^{xi} The “long nineteenth century” generally includes those years from 1780 to the Revolution of 1910. For an overview of works utilizing this periodization, see Pamela Murray, “Diverse Approaches to Nineteenth-Century Mexican History,” *Latin American Research Review* 32: 3 (1997), pp. 187-192. In a recent review, Jeremy Adelman argued that, in a broader sense, “the *longue durée* is back” as an approach to Latin American history. “Latin American Longues Durées,” *Latin American Research Review* 39: 1 (2004), p. 224.

^{xii} The railroad between Mexico City, Orizaba and Veracruz was completed in 1873. On the development of the railroad in Veracruz, see Peter Rees, “Route Inertia and Route Competition: An Historical Geography of Transport between Mexico City and Veracruz,” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1972); Cedric I. Escalante Sauri, *Transportes y Comunicaciones en el desarrollo del estado de Veracruz*, (Mexico: Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Transportes, 2000); Alfred H. Siemens, *Between the Summit and the Sea: Central Veracruz in the Nineteenth Century* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1990).

^{xiii} *Church and State in Independent Mexico: A Study of the Patronage Debate, 1821-1857* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978), p. x.

^{xiv} “La lucha por la modernidad religiosa y la secularización de la cultura en México durante el siglo XIX,” in Manuel Ramos Medina, ed. *Historia de la Iglesia en el Siglo XIX* (Mexico: Centro de Estudios de Historia de México Condumex, 1998), pp. 428-429.

^{xv} William B. Taylor, *Magistrates of the Sacred: Priests and Parishioners in Eighteenth-Century Mexico* (New York: Stanford University Press, 1996), p. 458.

^{xvi} Arróniz, *Ensayo de una historia de Orizaba*, 1: 71. This is a consistent refrain throughout his account of the war for independence, see also Arróniz, *Ensayo de una historia de Orizaba*, 2: 61.

^{xvii} “Situación que vive Orizaba ante el Movimiento Independentista” Archivo Municipal de Orizaba, Caja 18, f. 2.

^{xviii} Carlos María Bustamante, “Libro noticioso que contiene algunos apuntes particulares, acaesidos en esta villa de Orizava y otras noticias q.e an yegado aqui de sujetos fidedignos, Orizaba, Mexico, 1812-1821.” Manuscript. Bancroft Library., p. 4.

^{xix} Bustamante, “Libro noticioso,” p. 33.

^{xx} Bustamante, “Libro noticioso,” pp. 178, 49, 99.

^{xxi} Arróniz commented that “The Spanish government was careful to always have a respectable number of men in Orizaba so as to protect the valuable tobacco kept here by merchants.” Arróniz, 2: 61. See also Susan Deans-Smith, *Bureaucrats, Planters and Workers: the Making of the Tobacco Monopoly in Bourbon Mexico* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992), *passim.*; Ribera Carbó, *Herencia colonial*, p. 66.

^{xxii} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1, Exp. 71, F. 171.

^{xxiii} Bustamante, “Libro noticioso,” p. 15.

^{xxiv} “manifestando regosijo con coetes y bombas, tirandolas al ayre; en la noche ubo su iluminación muy bistora por el artificio de eya el Vesindario se dividio p.r todas las calles con sus musicas, cantando cansiones de Jubilo, y echando muchas vibas a Fernando; esta alegría duro asta el amanecer del día 6” Bustamante, “Libro noticioso,” p. 74.

^{xxv} “October 16, 1814 En la prosección q.e le isieron en la tarde a la Santissima Virgen del Rosario, marcharon los Patriotas: la mucha concurrencia q.e ubo de bolteadores de esquilas, en la torre, fue cause de la osidad de algunos, comensando atirar las yerbas q.e se crien en las cornisas, y entre eyas tiraron una con rais i todo (y por desgracia) como abia de caer ensima de algun paisano, cayo, sober un oficial de los de Asturias, por lo q.e inmediatamente, quisieron subir a la torre, para bengar aquel agrabio del esa Magestad, dandoles, la muerte a todos cuantos ubiera ay, pero la fortuna fue, el que estaba serrada la puerta de dha torre, por lo q.e no consiguieron su intento; a pesar de las muchas diligencias q.e hisieron en echarla abajo; ya forsegeando ya con los sables; ultimamente fueron por una Patruya, y sin pedirle licencia al Sor Cura, se yebaron presos de la Yglesia, a unos cuantos a los q.e castigaron en el cuartel con bancos, y palos, para q.e confesaran, quien les abia tirado; con el castigo q.e les dieron a estos infelises los dejaron al morir, estando inosentes de toda maldad, porque, el que le cometio, inmediatamente trato de ponerse en salbo: desdichado tiempo en que por nuestras grandes culpas, no beneran, los hombres, á los sacerdotes, pues lo trataron como a unos cocheros; ni respectan el santuario del Sor; pues mas beneracion le dan a la casa de una concubina.” Bustamante, “Libro noticioso,” p. 90. See also entries for June 4, July 25-26, 1813.

^{xxvi} “Yrritada la divina justicia, contra los abitadores de esta villa por sus muchos pecados; hes amenasada, con temblores, peste, seca, y ambre.” Bustamante, “Libro noticioso,” p. 141.

^{xxvii} Ibid.; see also Mariano Monterrosa, *Oratorios de San Felipe Neri en México, y un testimonio vivo, la fundación del Oratorio de San Felipe Neri en la villa de Orizaba* (Mexico: Centro de Asistencia y Promoción, 1992), p. 76.

^{xxviii} Manuel de Segura, “Apuntes estadísticos del distrito de Orizava, formados el año de 1839,” *Boletín de la Sociedad Mexicana de Geografía y Estadística* 4 (1854), p. 48.

^{xxix} Francisco Morales, “Mexican Society and the Franciscan Order in a Period of Transition, 1749-1859,” *The Americas* 54: 3 (January 1998), pp. 346-347.

^{xxx} José María Naredo, *Estudio geográfico, histórico y estadístico del cantón y de la ciudad de Orizaba* (Orizaba: Imprenta del hospicio, 1898), p. 96.

^{xxxi} “Como á un golpe eléctrico, comienzan á salir de las suyas muchos vecinos armados, y á poco rato se hace oír la campaña mayor de la Parroquia, tocando á rebato. Al amanecer era ya crecido el número de vecinos armados y la campaña siguió sonando hasta el medio día. A sus voces, acudieron de los ranchos inmediatos muchos guerreros á caballo, formando con los de á pié gruesos pelotones. Los cívicos por algunas horas no se atrevieron á salir del cuartel, pero más adelante salieron de él algunas guerrillas que si hacían fuego de frente, eran atacadas por los flancos y tuvieron que retirarse. Al medio día el tumulto era espantoso y todo en desórden, hasta que algunas personas de representación salieron á darle algún orden. Estas, con el Sr. Cura Llano y el P. Mendoza, concertaron una capitulación con la fuerza armada, la que depuso las armas. Todo había concluido á las seis de la tarde, y el repique á vuelo, así como los cohetes y salvas, anunciaron el triunfo del pueblo.” Ibid., 98.

^{xxxii} José María Naredo, *Estudio geográfico, histórico y estadístico del cantón y de la ciudad de Orizaba* (Orizaba: Imprenta del hospicio, 1898), pp. 104-105.

^{xxxiii} Those discussed in this chapter include *El Eco de Orizaba*, *El Orizaveño*, *El voto de Orizaba*, *El Ferrocarril*, *El Correo de Sotavento* (published in Veracruz), and *El Siglo XIX* (published in Mexico City).

^{xxxiv} Ribera Carbó, *Herencia colonial*, p. 59.

^{xxxv} Segura “Apuntes estadísticos del distrito de Orizava,” p. 50.

^{xxxvi} Miguel Ángel Castro, ed. *Tipos y caracteres: la prensa mexicana 1822-1855* (Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2001).

^{xxxvii} Servicio Postal Mexicano, *Quinta casa de correos: crónica del servicio postal en México* (Mexico: Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Transporte, Servicio Postal Mexicano, 1990), p. 92.

^{xxxviii} Enrique Cárdenas de la Peña, *El Correo* (Mexico: Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Transportes, 1987), p. 110.

^{xxxix} Segura, “Apuntes estadísticos del distrito de Orizava,” p. 58.

^{xl} AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 1, Exp. 64, F. 136.

^{xli} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 5, Exp. 71, F. 325.

^{xlii} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1 Exp. 135-136 Fol. 428-433.

^{xliii} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1 Exp. 135-136 Fol. 376.

^{xliv} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1 Exp. 135-136 Fol. 9.

^{xlv} AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 5, Exp. 73, F. 336.

^{xlvi} “Con motivo de ser diaria la entrada y salida de correos, tanto de arriba como de abajo, los trabajos de esta oficina se han cuatreplicado y me veo muy apurado para despacharlos, razo por lo cual se hace preciso uno que me ayude.” AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 6, Exp. 74, F. 394.

^{xlvii} AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 6, Exp. 72, F. 389-391.

^{xlviii} “Considero preciso este empleado porque el público se resiste a ocurrir por su correspondencia y quiere se lleve a sus respectivas casas, al estremo q.e un comerciante de esta se dejó decir que sino había cartero que el Admor. repartiera las cartas, lo que V.S. comprenderá que es imposible, tanto por la categoria que represento, cuanto porque si lo hiciera la oficina la tendria cerada todo el tiempo que dilatara en repartir la correspondencia que llega de arriba entre ocho y nueve de la mañana, y la que se recibe de Veracruz a la una de la tarde.” AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 6, Exp. 71, F. 387.

^{xlix} AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 8, Exp. 50, F. 300

^l AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 12 Exp. 21, F. 204

^{li} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1, Exp. 124, F. 385.

^{lii} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 12 Exp. 21, F. 204

^{lii} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1, Exp. 113-114, F. 333-338.

^{liv} “V.S. sabe que esta ciudad es enfermisa y muy calurosa y que, si por una casualidad alguno de los actuales empleados se enfermara, seria fisicamente imposible poder cumplir con las labores que le están encomendados.” AGN Correos Fomento, Vol. 7, Exp. 21, F. 128.

^{lv} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 4, Exp. 35, F. 139.

^{lvi} AMO Sec. Gob. Box 25.

^{lvii} AGN Correos Fomento Vol. 1, Exp. 71, F. 171-173.

^{lviii} Naredo Vol. I, 88-89

^{lix} AMO Caja 24 (1821) Sec. Gob.

^{lx} “El Eco de Orizaba” Orizaba, Noviembre 15 de 1868 in AMO Caja 83

^{lxi} Arróniz, *Ensayo de una historia de Orizaba*, I: 117.