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Dear Esteemed Delegates,

Welcome to the Mexican Revolution historical crisis committee! It is our pleasure to offer you an experience that we hope will give insight into a complex and contentious piece of international relations history. As part of the constitutionalist provisional government of Venustiano Carranza you will have the opportunity to bring peace to Mexico, address the pressing needs of the people, and interact with the broader international community as you strive to achieve your goals.

It is expected and imperative that delegates in the committee research and the general topic as well as their assigned role. A keen awareness of not only the history of the Mexican revolution, but the history of global geopolitics in the early 20th century will be of great value to delegates. Our committee will appreciate familiarization with the topic in making for smooth and rigorous deliberations over nuanced issues.

We look expectantly on delegates assuming their roles with a demonstrable understanding of the issues and making the most of the crisis committee format. This background guide should help to give a sense of the time, place, and issues, but is by no means an exhaustive resource. Leading Mexico out of revolution and possibly changing history is no easy task. It will take some research to accomplish it.

Your Crisis Director Rohan and I are both excited to offer you the chance to participate in our historical crisis committee at PMUNC 2017! While you will see a lot more of us at the conference we would like to briefly introduce ourselves. Ryan Chavez ’19 is your chair. He’s a Junior in the
Department of History and President of the International Relations Council. When he’s not studying, or doing MUN, he plays bass guitar in a band, has dabbled in Mock Trial, writes opinion columns for The Daily Princetonian, and occasionally naps. Rohan Shah, your crisis Director is a sophomore.

We can’t wait to see you at conference and hope you will enjoy this participating in this committee as we enjoyed preparing it for you.

Sincerely,

Ryan Chavez & Rohan Shah
The Mexican Revolution was a brutal civil war complicated by politics, economics, and external influences in Mexico. The conflict saw regimes change, foreign forces enter and occupy Mexican territory, business interests struggle to maintain holdings, populist movements fight for socialist programs, constitutionalists push for the curtailing of rampant power, and created more than a decade of turmoil.

This committee asks you to interact and create what might have been. It will entrench you in the realities of the early 20th century and challenge you to make history. We’ll be going back to 1914 as the Mexican Revolution enters its final phase.

In the last four years we have seen the Diaz, Madero, and Huerta regimes collapse. The United States under President Woodrow Wilson occupies the port of Veracruz. All the while the Great War has pitted the great powers of Europe against each other in devastating conflict. Germany and United States have poured arms into the hands of different Mexican factions and regimes and have much to gain from the natural resources of the land and the rest of Mexico’s productive forces. The Convention of Aguascalientes called to bring stability after Huerta’s defeat has failed to reach a consensus for Mexico’s future.

Delegates, ¡Bienvenidos a Veracruz! (Welcome to Veracruz!)

It is November of 1914. With United States support, the government of Victoriano Huerta has been ousted by the Constitutionalist Coalition. Under the chief leadership of Venustiano Carranza, the armies of Francisco (Pancho) Villa, Emiliano Zapata, and Álvaro Obregón succeeded in defeating Huerta’s government and Federal Army. Venustiano Carranza has come to Veracruz to negotiate the withdrawal of United States troops occupying the port city. Villa and Zapata have broken from the coalition and control areas in the northern and southern regions of Mexico.
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respectively. The Convention of Aguascalientes, supposed to begin the process of replacing the
government of Huerta, was of no avail.

This situation leaves us with the compelling problem of not only restoring peace to all of
Mexico but additionally creating a lasting political stability and forming a new constitution. At this
precarious moment, the future is tenuous and uncertain. Mexico has been host to economic interests
of both American and European powers since colonization by Spain. Since gaining independence
from Spain in 1810 Mexico has undergone multiple changes in government and suffered the
humiliating territorial and military loss to the United States finalized by the 1848 Treaty of
Guadalupe Hidalgo. It was invaded by France in the 1860’s and successfully repelled the French
attempt to make Mexico a colonial holding over the course of 7 years. From 1876 to the dawn of the
Mexican Revolution in 1910 the government of Porfirio Diaz facilitated great economic growth
bringing more foreign investment, industrialization, the construction of railroads and infrastructure
to Mexico. The stability of the Porfiriato however came at the price of political repression and
uneven gains from economic growth. The last years of the Porfiriato set the stage for the Mexican
Revolution we find ourselves in the midst of.

This committee is a crisis committee, and, as such, will be responsible for responding to
various challenges as they arise. Your leader Venustiano Carranza has called for the assembly of this
ad-hoc executive committee, comprised of respected generals, diplomats and politicians, and other
august members of the constitutionalist movement. This committee will submit recommendations
to Venustiano Carranza (not present in the room) through committee-wide directives and press
releases.
Each member of the committee will also have portfolio powers to conduct operations through his or her personal capacity. The nature of the crises will range from military to social to economic -- reflecting the multidimensional nature of concerns facing our struggle to create the future of Mexico.

The struggle to end the revolution, bring peace to the country, and construct a new lasting system of government is in your hands now.
The Mexican Revolution

Background on the political history of Mexico

The modern state of Mexico arose in the territory held before European colonization by the ancient Aztec Empire, Maya, and Toltec civilizations before 1519.¹ The Aztec Empire centered in Tenochtitlan, what is now Mexico City, was at its height when Hernan Cortez with the assistance of indigenous peoples previously subjected to the Aztecs overthrew the Aztec Empire and established Spanish rule. These indigenous populations were then subjected to Spanish colonial rule as the Aztec Empire was replaced in its hegemony over the region. The period of New Spain from 1620-1770 brought drastic changes to the foundations and structure of Mexican Society. The Spanish imposed the Catholic Religion (with substantial mixing with indigenous religious elements) and Mexico witnessed the rise and fall of the encomienda system.² The encomienda system was the first of lasting societal changes that created a mixed and racially stratified society.³ The economic structure changed as well becoming based in the export of silver as well as agriculture structured in a hacienda system.⁴ New Spain became the largest exporter of silver from its northern mines while also serving for some time as a proxy to reach the far east and Spanish territory in the Philippines.⁵ This period of international trade and Spanish viceroyship came to an end in 1821 with the dawn of Mexican independence. The revolution struggle took place following the Bourbon Reforms emanating from the changes in the royalty of Spain as a result of Napoleonic conquests.⁶ These reforms and the changing regimes in Europe influenced the timing of the war of independence that

² Ibid., 69-70.
⁴ Hamnett, *A Concise History of Mexico*, 83-84.
⁵ Burkholder, “An Empire Beyond Compare,” 114.
created the independent state of Mexico. The first federal constitution of Mexico, not without internal strife, was formed in 1824. However, this document failed to bring lasting peace and stability to the country. Instead a system of regional factions arose in the early years and strong national institutions were not developed for various reasons. One such reason was described by historian Chirston Archer:

The presence of external enemies such as Spain (and later, France and the United states) created an ideal atmosphere for the rise of individual caudillos and caciques… The regular army and provincial civil militias became tools of ambitious politician-commanders who took on dual roles, defending both the new nation and their regional fiefdoms. Politics and attitudes would be hardened by unwavering principles, narrow philosophies, stubborn regional interests, and a palpable unwillingness by Mexicans of different views to make the concessions necessary for national consensus.7

This pattern of weak consensus was dotted by flares of nationalism such as the successful repulsion of a Spanish attempt to reconquer Mexico in 1829, but also contributed to the territorial losses of Mexico to Texas as it became independent and as the United States embarked on its expansionist project in the Americas.8

The Mexican American war of 1846 to 1848 saw the great embarrassment of Mexico as it lost upper California and New Mexico to the United States and saw United States troops occupy Mexico City. It was an unsurprising result as the Mexican military apparatus had not been equipped or brought to leading contemporary standards. The Mexicans found themselves outclassed and outnumbered.9 The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the humiliating war. The Mexican American War did however sow the seeds of change forcing Mexicans to recover and face new political realities. In the 1850’s Mexico witnessed a rebellion ousting the dictatorship of General Santa Anna which then resulted in the constitution of 1856. The new liberal constitution ushered in promises of

9 Hamnett, A Concise History of Mexico, 151.
democratic rights and freedoms as well as stripped the Catholic Church of its prominent place in the
governing structure of prior Mexican governments. This was followed by a civil war between
politically liberal and conservative factions.\textsuperscript{10} In 1861 Benito Juarez, a liberal ultimately won victory
in this struggle.

This set the stage for the short lived French incursion. With the United States beginning its
own Civil War and Mexico having accumulated masses of European debt that it was unable to
service, Emperor Napoleon III of France embarked on the mission to add Mexico to its colonial
holdings and install a European monarch.\textsuperscript{11} This French incursion propping up the Hapsburg
Emperor Maximillian III of Mexico was able to control much of the country through military
superiority. This control was not without fierce outright resistance and notable Mexican victories
such as the Battle of Puebla on May 5, 1862. Fierce guerilla resistance from Mexicans lasted
throughout French occupation. The culmination of this occupation was the execution of
Maximilian. According to historian Brian Hamnett, “The symbolism of an Austrian Habsburg,
descendant of the Emperor Charles V, put to death on a hill in central Mexico by a squad of dark
Mestizo soldiers was lost on no one.”\textsuperscript{12} Mexico was a restored republic under liberal leadership as
the civil war and French occupation (supported by some conservatives) had thoroughly discredited
the conservatives.

The liberal control of the republican government under the 1856 constitution nevertheless
gave way to the rise of Porfirio Diaz. As head of the government, he would steadily move Mexico
from any hope of constitutionalism to being dominated by his own form of personal control.

\textbf{The Seeds of Revolution}

\textsuperscript{10} Paul Vanderwood, “For the Betterment of Whom? The Reform Period: 1855-75” in \textit{The Oxford History of Mexico}, ed.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 358.
\textsuperscript{12} Hamnett, \textit{A Concise History of Mexico}, 175.
In 1876 Porfirio Diaz came into power via a coup d'état. Under his leadership Mexico entered its economic gilded age. His time in power would underscore the changes and development which would help fuel revolution in the last years of his presidency. The Diaz regime held the strategic vision of turning Mexico into a modern industrialized state in the image of European states and the United States of America. Diaz along with his technocratic advisors known (later disparagingly) as “cientificos” (scientists) were able to help stabilize Mexico from political strife of the earlier 19th century and bolster the economy during his time in power. One of the hallmarks of this period was extensive foreign investment in Mexican development. The Mexican government under Diaz was able to successfully recognize existing debt owed to the Europeans from earlier in the century and begin to service such debt. Attracting investment and showing stability was key to attracting investment. Mexico’s GNP grew at 8% between 1884 and 1900 largely due to this investment. This investment was paired with large infrastructure development to service Mexico’s industries. As Hamnet notes, “the total railroad length grew from only 472 km to 19,205 km between 1873 and 1910…” These railroads were made possible by foreigners as “American agents received concessions on extremely favorable terms to build trunk lines from Mexico City to the U.S. border, as well as regional routes.” The growth of these railroads was also key to helping the growth of the burgeoning export economy of Mexico. In addition to the concession of railways, Mexico witnessed a large change in the ownership of land. Laws passed in 1883 allowed for the surveying, purchasing, and taking of various lands that help to concentrate power over real-estate in the hands of fewer people with larger haciendas and estates.

---

18 Ibid., 393.
This land consolidation helped to facilitate the production of export crops such as henequen, cotton, sugar, tobacco, and guayule at the expense of staples. Such was the situation that Mexico was importing corn from both America and Argentina due to a lack of domestic productive capacity in staple foods.

The development brought about under the Porfiriato manifested in very unequal ways. The North of the country which had great growth of mining industry as part of the world economy was producing copper, zinc, lead, and silver in unprecedented quantities. The mines however were 70% controlled by United States companies at the beginning of the Mexican Revolution. In addition to mines, a textile industry, cattle ranches, cotton farms, and even breweries sprung up in the North of Mexico. The southern parts of the country saw its fair share of large export crop plantations spring up but remained much more rooted in traditional farming structures than the rapidly developing North. A virtual duopoly was given to American and British firms on oil production in Mexico, an industry taking off around Veracruz and Tampico.

While the national economy was certainly growing, both the gains from that growth and the political power during the reign of Diaz were far from evenly distributed. Political power in the Porfiriato was dependent entirely on the whims of those already in power. As explained by Ruiz, “cliquish control of politics extends down to the lowest levels. Governors named the jefes politicos, the political bosses, of municipalities without consulting the local citizenry.” This top down politics of control however existed as a network of loyalties from the top to the bottom that locked many out.

20 Ibid., 79.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., 377.
26 Ibid., 28.
of opportunity and created disaffection among a rising middle class created by the economic success of the Porfiriato.  

    In the final years of the Porfiriato, the success of its heyday started to wane significantly. Political opposition had begun to flourish as Ricardo Flores Magon protested the Porfiriato attacking Diaz as a dictator. Magon became leader of the opposition party to Diaz, the Partido Liberal Mexicano (Liberal Mexican Party). The economic situation was also worsening. Droughts in the country starting in 1907 and lasting until 1910 damaged crops destroying harvests of wheat and other food stuffs. This paired with the sagging pace of wages to keep up with the cost of living for Mexican workers and the drastic rise in food cost created economic strife for working Mexicans. On top of this agricultural crisis, the United States’ financial panic of 1907 caused upheaval in the internationally connected industrial sectors of the Mexican economy particularly mining. This put tens of thousands of workers out of work furthering the economic woes of the country and creating listless population. During the same period of years, labor activism and strikes had started to gain momentum. Notable strikes on foreign owned facilities over unequal wages for foreign and domestic workers, poor working conditions, and lack of access to better jobs occurred. Perhaps the most notable was the strike at Cananea in Sonora at an American owned mine. Federal troops and American rangers were brought in to end the strike causing national outcry and fueling an already rising anti-foreign and pro-nationalistic sentiment in Mexico. Anti-foreign and anti-American sentiment began to spread far and wide and was combined with a culpability assigned to the Diaz regime for having sold Mexico to the yankees.

27 Ibid., 27.
29 Ruiz, The Great Rebellion, 79.
30 Ibid., 82.
31 Hamnett, A Concise History of Mexico, 186-7.
33 Ibid., 106-7.
A Brief History of the Revolution

The economics, politics, and social pressures of the day finally came to a boil in 1910 with Francisco Madero, an idealist from the upper classes of Coahuila.\textsuperscript{34} His challenge to the sham re-election of Diaz in 1910 ended in his jailing, escape, and subsequent open rebellion. His Plan of San Luis Potosí promised only modest political reforms regarding free press, open elections, and enfranchisement, but also contained a small segment regarding peasant lands being returned to the peasants.\textsuperscript{35} This turned out to be enough to launch a revolution in the state of Chihuahua. Rebellion broke out with early factional leaders such as Francisco Villa and Pasqual Orozco launching small attacks and taking cities.\textsuperscript{36} The revolt was far from unified however and did not become national or a credible threat to Diaz until March of 1911.\textsuperscript{37} The spark of revolution in Chihuahua spread to other states and eventually the Federal Army was unable to put down the revolt leading to Diaz abdicating the presidency. Francisco Madero was elected in elections held in October 1911 but assumed charge of a government retaining the same structure and bodies as the Porfiriato. For all this however, Madero was far from leading a stable constitutional republic. Within the year revolutionaries in both the South and the North were in open rebellion against Madero.\textsuperscript{38} This phase of the revolution persisted until the ten day incident known as La Decena Trágica. At this point United States Ambassador to Mexico, Henry Lane Wilson, successfully assisted a coup d’état involving Victoriano Huerta, an old member of the Diaz regime and Federal Army General. Huerta with the help of elements in opposition to Madero seized the presidency and executed Madero.\textsuperscript{39} The immediate

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 139.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Friedrich Katz, \textit{The Life and Times of Pancho Villa} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 54- 55.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 94.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Hart, “The Mexican Revolution,” 425.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Raymond L. Shoemaker \textit{Indiana Magazine of History} Vol. 76, No. 2 (JUNE 1980), pp. 103-122
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
response to this change in regime came in non-recognition of Huerta’s legitimacy by Venustiano Carranza, Governor of Coahuila.\textsuperscript{40} The states of Sonora and Coahuila in the North openly started fighting the government while Emiliano Zapata in the South continued his fight against the federal government from the days of Madero.\textsuperscript{41} The revolution quickly brought Pancho Villa back into the fold as he returned to Mexico from spending some time in the United States.\textsuperscript{42} Whereas Carranza was the governor of the state of Coahuila, Villa needed to and did quickly amass forces, money, and arms to raise what would become his army, Division Del Norte, through capturing and appropriating land and other resources. He luckily captured a train with a car full of silver, and purchased weapons and munitions from across the United States border in spite of a barely enforced arms embargo.\textsuperscript{43} The alliance of Villa, Zapata, and Carranza under the banner of the Constitutionalist Army through a series of military victories deposed the Huerta regime causing Huerta to leave for exile in July of 1914.\textsuperscript{44} Following the Constitutionalist victory, the Convention of Aguascalientes was called to end the revolutionary violence and bring together the factions of Villa, Zapata, and Carranza. This convention failed due to the increasingly radical reforms desired by the Zapatistas and Villistas which caused a break with the Carrancista Constitutionalists. This is where we pick up our story in November of 1914.

**The Veracruz Incident, The United States, and Europe**

The Mexican Revolution did not take place in a vacuum. Both the United States and other European powers were involved diplomatically and economically with the situation unfolding in

\textsuperscript{40} Katz, *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*, 200-202.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 203.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 206.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 212.
Mexico. While it was the Americans who brought Huerta into power, the arrival of American President Woodrow Wilson to office in 1913 drastically altered the outlook for the Huerta regime. Wilson would work actively to unseat Huerta. Wilson, at first in favor of more diplomatic solutions, simply demanded that Huerta hold elections to install a democratically legitimate president or agree to American mediation between Huerta and rebelling elements. However, upon Huerta’s dissolution of the Mexican Parliament in September of 1913, Wilson fully committed to toppling the regime. Unlike Wilson’s America, European powers and industry found themselves in a strengthened position of influence with Huerta in power. It should be noted, non-recognition of Huerta’s government by the American government did not prevent American firms from selling arms to the Huerta government. Huerta in an attempt to balance United States hegemony in Mexico became much more favorable to European capital and financial institutions. This outlook was paired with a generally favorable outlook on a pro-business interest Huerta dictatorship by the imperialist European powers. American business interests recognized the threat to their own influence and power as Huerta seemed to be falling into greater European influence. As such, American firms began to throw their political and financial support behind the Constitutionalists under Carranza. Despite the split in support between European and American business during the Huerta regime, European governments after their initial recognition of the Huerta government began to turn away. Upon greater American diplomatic pressure, with the desire to maintain a close relationship with the United States, and concerns rising in Europe with regards to Germany, Britain withdrew promises to support the Huerta regime in December 1913. Similarly, Germany, while at first ambivalent to Huerta, would become strongly for the Huerta government with its anti-American overtones before

46 Ibid., 162.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid., 160-161.
49 Ibid., 178
officially moving away from directly supporting the regime as a measure to avoid conflict with the United States. Nevertheless, German industry would maintain strong ties to the regime as it became a main vendor of munitions and armaments to the Huerta government after the United States ceased arms sales. It should be noted however, the Germans were also selling arms to the Constitutionalists fighting against Huerta. This set of complicated private and governmental relations to the Huerta regime and was ongoing as the United States began its occupation of Veracruz and positioned itself militarily in the Mexican Revolution.

On April 21, 1914, President Wilson was informed that the shipping vessel Ypiranga was headed for Veracruz. The Ypiranga, owned and operated by a German company, carried arms manufactured in France bought with capital supplied to the Huerta government by European financial intuitions. On the same day, Wilson ordered American marines to land in the city. A brief skirmish with Mexican naval cadets ended with 19 dead Americans and 126 dead Mexicans. Venustiano Carranza, decried this action of the American government as a violation of Mexican sovereignty. As of November 1914, the Americans have not pushed further inland but still control the port. Our government must negotiate their exit from Mexico or else deal with their ever present influence on one of our most important port cities.

The Constitutionalists

The Constitutionalists under Venustiano Carranza before the break at the Convention of Aguastcalientes represented an amalgam of ideological and revolutionary forces. Carranza was far

---

50 Ibid., 211, 217.
51 Ibid., 207.
52 Ibid.
53 Ibid., 234.
54 Ibid., 197.
55 Ibid.
from a radical revolutionary in his ideology. His personal roots remained in the political ideologies of the Reforma under Benito Juarez in the 19th century more so than the more radical ideologies held by other revolutionaries. His call to the revolution came from less of an apostolic purity and more from a political expediency. He was connected to the old guard of the Porfiriato politically and from a wealthy family of Coahuila. He served as governor of Coahuila under Madero having politically fallen out politically with Diaz in the last years of the Porfirato. Under his declaration of the Plan de Guadalupe proclaimed publically on March 26, 1913, no great social reforms or promises were made. The sole purpose of the plan was to attain power in government and depose the Huerta regime. Now that the Huerta dictatorship has been removed, it will be the direction and decisions of this committee that drives the ideological development of the Constitutionalists.

The Villistas and Zapatistas

Francisco Villa on Horseback  Emiliano Zapata

Now that Huerta has been deposed, Pancho Villa and Emiliano Zapata remain the two most prominent rebels in power outside of the Constitutionalists.

57 Ibid., 154.
58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., 159.
Emiliano Zapata was a humble but respected man born in a village of no more than 400 people. He worked and lived in the largely agricultural state of Morelos where large sugar plantations put significant economic pressure on the common farmer. When revolution came, Zapata rose to the fore in Morelos. His Plan de Ayala declared in November of 1911 centered its ideological heart in land reform calling for the redistribution of lands taken and the break up (at least partially) of large haciendas. The issue of land seems to be the cross upon which Zapata and the Zapatistas are willing to die. In August of 1914, a delegation of Carranza’s Constitutionalists met with Zapata in Morelos to discuss the land issue. The result of this meeting was an unwavering commitment on the part of the Zapatistas to the complete adoption of the Plan of Ayala. Zapata enjoys almost unanimous support of the lower working classes in Morelos and has proven to be a stubborn fighter in guerilla-style warfare against both Madero and Huerta.

Francisco Villa came from humble origins being born into a sharecropping family in Durango. While there are disputed histories, myths, and legends about Villa’s early life, most portray him as some kind of criminal with a certain shady past as a countryside robber. These myths and confusions are however a result of his more clearly understood meteoric rise during the Mexican Revolution. Francisco Villa started his revolutionary career in the first uprising against Diaz working with pro-Madero rebels. Despite having little military background he quickly rose to command a large number of men in that time and became an important figure to the revolutionaries in Chihuahua. After the Huerta coup and the second rise of rebellion in the state of Chihuahua as Carranza rose to fight Huerta, Villa returned to Chihuahua to rejoin the revolution. Villa became
the leader of revolutionary forces in Chihuahua and Durango in September of 1913 and by the end of the year controlled the state of Chihuahua. Villa was able to gain widespread popularity in Chihuahua by appealing to the lower and middle classes of society with promises of land in return for military service and implementing administrative policies such as lowering the price of meat. In the struggle against Huerta, Villa and his Division del Norte became the largest and most powerful army in Mexico. Addressing Villa’s forces and the influence he holds in the North will be another challenge for this committee.

---

68 Ibid., 215.
69 Ibid., 238-40.
Positions

You will be assigned a character for the duration of this committee of advisors to Venustiano Carranza. Our leader Carranza will not be present in the room. Instead, the chair will coordinate the committee on his behalf.

Below are brief introductions to the characters. This is in no way exhaustive. And in fact, you will be responsible for carrying out your own independent research into your characters as well as the general topic. Remember, please ignore details of these individuals’ lives after the start date of our simulation.

Álvaro Obregón: A General in the Constitutionalist Army and Chief of the Sonoran War department. Born and raised in Sonora, Obregón ran a garbanzo bean farm before turning to politics. He is the head of the Constitutionalist Army.

Plutarco Elías Calles: A well respected colonel in the Constitutionalist Army, Calles is a liberal reformer from humble origins.

Felipe Ángeles: Sub-secretary of war in the Sonoran War Department, Angeles was schooled in military academies both in Mexico and France.

Roberto V. Pesqueira: A diplomat eloquent in both English and Spanish, Pesquiera is the diplomatic envoy of the Carrancistas to the United States. He is serving as a general in the Constitutionalist Army.

Francisco José Múgica: From Michoacán, Mugica was an anti-Diaz journalist and newspaperman before turning to become a revolutionary with far left politics and personal advisor to Carranza.

Cándido Aguilar Vargas: A native of the state of Veracruz, Aguilar Vargas has become Governor of Veracruz under the Constitutionalist cause. He controls the policy and Departments of the Veracruz State Government and its important port.

Benjamin Hill: A Sonoran, Hill was educated in Chihuahua city before attending further schooling in both Germany and Italy. Hill is serving as the Governor of Sonora and controls the policies and departments of the Sonoran State Government.

Ignacio Enríquez Jr.: A Chihuahuan, Enríquez joined Carranza’s forces in Sonora instead of his own state and is a close aid to Carranza. He is known to have close connections to many of the well established families of Chihuahua such as the Creel-Terrazas.
Manuel M. Diéguez: A man of humble origins from Guadalajara, Diéguez formed his far left politics as a labor activist before joining the anti-Huerta movement. He is the provisional governor of Jalisco.

Francisco Murguía: From Zacatecas, Murguía is the Governor of Querétaro and a general in the Constitutionalist Army.

Luis Cabrera Lobato: Lobato was a writer, teacher, and lawyer. He is an aide to el primer jefe Carranza. He was a prominent anti-Diaz writer and still retains connections to the presses across Mexico.

Felix F. Palavicini: a civil engineer and journalist, Palavicini is an aide to Carranza as well as Secretary of Public Education and Fine Arts.

Heriberto Barron: A very prominent journalist and newspaperman, Barron was director of the well known journal El Pueblo. He is an aide to Carranza.

Alfonso Cravioto: A writer, activist, and lawyer, Cravioto is an aide to Carranza after having begun in politics as an anti-Diaz agitator. He has had a extremely successful career in the courts.