
Constructing a Historiography of Mexican Women and Gender

Sarah A. Buck

The Mexican Revolution (1910–17) and the post-revolutionary decades that followed have provided rich fodder for recent additions and revisions to Mexican Women's and Gender History.¹ An important factor encouraging and resulting from this historical production has been the creation of the International Colloquium on the History of Women and Gender in Mexico, which has met four times between 2001 and 2007.² Although the initial motivation for the first conference was to bring together scholars working on Mexican women's history in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary period, largely in order to publish a much-needed comprehensive collection about women's experiences during this period of Mexican history, subsequent conferences have expanded to explore women's *and* gender history (including the history of masculinity as well as femininity and the history of sexuality) over a much broader period: from the colonial era up to the present, widening its impact on Mexican historiography. However, since my work, which I used as a base for formal presentations and less formal discussions at the first and second conferences, focuses on women's organising and representations of women and femininity in the post-revolutionary period, my discussion of the impact of these conferences focuses on the first two conferences and the exchanges they encouraged regarding women's and gender history in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary periods.

The Mexican Revolution was a bloody civil war between classes, 'Indians' and Mestizos, regions and political orientations and approaches to reform. Historians have long debated both the causes and consequences of this war, arguing especially over the degree to which the Revolution and the post-revolutionary reform process which followed represented a popular movement giving agency to subaltern groups such as peasants, labour, indigenous groups and women; or constituted a populist and/or authoritarian political and social phenomenon – which served merely to co-opt these popular forces to serve the interests of middle and upper class elites.³

Certainly the Revolution was a reaction to the authoritarian and oligarchical tendencies of the 'Porfiriato' (the period in which Porfirio Díaz served as Mexico's president, 1876–1911). Further, during the first decade of the twentieth century, political and economic trends combined to exacerbate such tendencies, and many working class Mexicans became increasingly angered by their inability to benefit from the Porfiriato's alleged modernisation. At the same time, middle-sector Mexicans became frustrated

with the authoritarian and oligarchical tendencies of national and regional Porfirian politics, as they found their political and economic ambitions stymied by others who enjoyed the state's favour in acquiring credit, economic contracts, land, government licenses, and positions in government bureaucracy.

Such groups became hopeful of change with President Díaz's 1908 announcement that he planned to retire at the end of his term. Middle-class and elite dissidents began to organise into political clubs expressing their opposition to Díaz and their desire for political reform. Soon, this political reform movement converted into an armed rebellion, forcing Díaz to resign in May 1911.

During the following six years, many opposition armies, each with their own goals and visions of an ideal post-revolutionary society and political regime appeared, transforming the Revolution into a civil war. By the autumn of 1915 the constitutionalists had become the strongest faction, aided in part by US military support. In 1917, they issued a new political constitution and held special elections allowing their leader, Venustiano Carranza, to become Mexico's first post-revolutionary president.⁴ Women participated in this event in many ways, working as propagandists, spies, traffickers, cooks and nurses.⁵ After the Revolution, women became foot soldiers of new revolutionary social programmes, playing important roles in the consolidation of a one-party state. As the majority of schoolteachers, they built revolutionary schools and carried out cultural missions, literacy campaigns, and public health and job training workshops.⁶

The important role played by women in revolutionary education and welfare initiatives is also seen in the fact that women comprised ten to twenty per cent of the delegates to Mexico's first Child Welfare Conferences in 1921 and 1923, which gathered medical professionals, eugenicists, social workers and teachers together to identify welfare policy priorities for the following decade.⁷ Such social action allowed women to take on new public political and economic roles, fuelling a feminist movement that secured new rights and responsibilities for women. The link between such women's professional, revolutionary activities and feminist activism can also be seen in the demographics of the delegates to two major feminist conferences in the 1920s: the 1923 Pan American Women's Conference in Mexico City and the 1925 Congress of Women of the Race. Out of 174 delegates to the 1923 Pan American Women's Conference, the occupations of ninety-one are stated. Forty-eight of these were teachers, nine were doctors, three were writers, two worked for the government's Department of Public Health, one was a librarian, five combined various professions, and twenty three were factory workers. Out of 165 delegates to the 1925 Congress of the race, thirty-two were teachers, two were lawyers, eight were doctors, one was a nurse, five were writers, one was a librarian, six combined these professions, nineteen were factory workers, and one was a typist.⁸ Thus, the majority of working women at the conferences were professionals, yet they joined and collaborated with working-class women as well. Women from both classes played leadership roles, and at times this resulted in significant debate over approaches to reform.⁹

Despite their differences, delegates were able to build upon the papers presented and the discussions which followed to formulate resolutions related to education, including proposals to implement sex education and co-education for girls and boys, to promote collaboration between parents and teachers, to expand educational opportunities for women, and to encourage the education of Mexicans in general, via literacy, temperance and hygiene campaigns, and through the establishment of new schools and

libraries. They called for the defence and reform of legislation regulating female and child labour, and for aid to working mothers specifically and to women and children in general through the establishment of maternal and child welfare institutions, such as child care facilities at work places, public dining rooms, affordable health services and juvenile courts. They aimed to create cooperative societies to obtain basic goods at low prices to aid women in their function as economic administrators in the home and to implement campaigns to combat prostitution. They also demanded the reform of family codes and divorce law to give women more independence and equal rights in the home; of electoral law and civil codes; and the augmentation of women's public political influence.¹⁰ Delegates' presentations at these conferences also demonstrate their emphasis on women's roles and women's work to benefit child welfare.¹¹

I began to examine this post-revolutionary Mexican feminist movement in the early stages of my graduate work, when a global history course ignited an interest in women acting as moralising reformers and state builders in colonial and post-colonial societies, leading to tensions between educated, white, foreign women and poorer, indigenous women. I wondered if such a dynamic existed in post-revolutionary Mexico, and turned to schoolteachers and then feminists to investigate. At the same time, I read the few works in English on Mexican feminism, especially books by Anna Macías and Shirlene Ann Soto.¹² I was struck in particular by two characteristics of these studies. First, they glorified feminist leaders as heroines, without interrogating the subject positions of such women through attention to the class and race hierarchies that set the climate for their activism and which those feminists must have either helped to reify and/or break down. Second, they sought to determine whether feminism had succeeded in Mexico and what the causes for its success or failure might be. They argued that feminists were limited by the fact they stood at odds with the state. This orientation raised new questions for me: Had feminism failed? Can its success be measured? What had *Mexican* feminists set out to achieve and had they succeeded according to *their* standards? I also sought to explore feminists' relationship to the state further to see if I could identify official and competing feminisms.

With this base of motivations established, I set out to find out who such organising women were; what kinds of activities they carried out, what they achieved and how this compared to their goals; what kinds of tactics they used; how their organising helped to shape and to reflect changes in popular prescriptions for and representations of women; and what kinds of relationships they developed with the post-revolutionary Mexican state. I found that Mexico's feminists were primarily urban, middle class, educated professionals, who mobilised rural and urban working-class women. They provided social services for women and Mexicans more generally, especially as educators (school teachers and organisers of hygiene, family planning, home economics and job training campaigns), welfare providers (of food, healthcare and cooperative economic resources such as cornmills and sewing machines) and campaigners to change women's legal rights and political-economic status.

In exploring feminists' organisational tactics, I drew upon the distinction made in North American and European literature on feminism between equality- and difference-oriented, especially maternalist, approaches to feminist action and argument.¹³ I asked, in the Mexican case, if one kind of argument dominated, if there were certain advantages to using one approach or the other, and if there were implications for such arguments in class and race relationships.

These questions also sought to test the claims of several historians that in Latin America, difference-based arguments, especially maternalist ones, have prevailed.¹⁴ My research both challenged and affirmed this assertion. My doctoral dissertation examined the work of women who were members of a feminist movement broadly conceived: women seeking to advance women's opportunities and status in public political, economic and social realms in the three decades following the Mexican Revolution. In Mexico, difference- and equality-based activism and arguments often coexisted. Organisers often used both kinds of tactics to acquire support for their actions. Yet, at the same time, the use of maternalism increased rather than decreased in the 1940s, when women finally got the vote (the quintessential equal right, which they previously had argued for primarily with rights-based arguments). Indeed, maternalism was a compelling model for female activism and it overlapped in interesting ways with equality-oriented approaches.

In my paper at the first 2001 conference of the International Colloquium on the History of Women and Gender in Mexico, I stated that 'it is very important . . . to determine when difference and rights oriented approaches [to activism are] being used, how they are being used, and how they rise and fall – so that we don't naturalise or essentialise based on these claims (for example, conclude that Latin American women are naturally more maternal or value motherhood more than Anglo women)' and also to try to figure out through comparative analyses and comparing studies of different regions and historical moments, why rights or difference approaches apply in different moments and different contexts.¹⁵ In response to this statement, Sonya Michel pointed out that it is important to define maternalism as a form of 'strategic essentialism' or to think of maternalism itself as strategic.

Similarly to their negotiation of progress and tradition articulated via maternalism, such women carefully negotiated their relationship to Mexico's post-revolutionary state. Rather than clashing with state culture, virtually all of the 'feminists' who left a paper trail defined themselves as working *with* the state. Furthermore, such women often played important official roles in post-revolutionary state-building and reform projects.¹⁶

The concept of citizenship proved to be central to my charting of feminist achievements, discussion of their engagement with equality and difference approaches to activism, and examination of their relationship to the state.¹⁷ Feminists advanced women's opportunities by expanding the definition of female citizenship to encompass new social, political and economic roles.¹⁸

These expanded citizenship rights were achieved and can be measured in two ways. The first is by reviewing the history of women's activism, which demonstrates that Mexican women acquired increased citizenship rights by *acting* as citizens, thereby proving that they could carry out the responsibilities of citizenship. The second lies in examining how popular representations reflected changing ideals for women, with the symbol of the mother playing a central role.

Such changing ideals are evident in feminist and non-feminist representations of women throughout the years under study. Between the 1920s and 1950s, motherhood remained women's most glorified role. Yet single professional women and feminists increasingly offered alternative forms of femininity that competed and interacted with motherhood. In the 1920s, feminists focused on educational, moralising reforms, epitomised in hygiene and literacy campaigns, which transmitted moral codes along with

skills. Likewise, popular images of women emphasised mothers and babies and condemned infanticide and abortion.¹⁹ In the 1930s, feminists' emphasis shifted to the mobilisation of women as workers and members of socialist leagues, through the establishment of workers' cooperatives and attention to rights outlined in the 1931 labour code.²⁰ The national women's suffrage campaign also emerged in this decade.²¹ At the same time, child and maternal welfare institutions actually increased in number;²² and the celebration of Mother's Day (created in the 1920s) adopted increasingly compassionate postures toward single and working mothers.²³

In the 1940s, several seemingly contradictory trends converged to aid women in finally acquiring the right to vote. A rise in pronatalism and motherhood is clear in increased attention to the celebration of Mother's Day,²⁴ the construction of monuments to mothers,²⁵ and a continued insistence on male-headed, nuclear families with middle-class housewives in popular media²⁶ and labour and land grant legislation.²⁷ Yet, women's presence in the workforce,²⁸ welfare advocacy, and civil defence activities, and the corporatisation of women's roles as functionaries in political parties, labour syndicates and community organisations increased.²⁹ Thus, even more than their arguments about suffrage, women's action as workers, feminists and welfare providers, demonstrating that women could effectively combine their maternal and civic functions in the contradictory context described above, resulted in their acquisition of the vote. Maternalism effectively ameliorated the contradictions of female Mexican citizenship.³⁰ At the 2001 conference, comments by Mary Kay Vaughan and Nichole Sanders confirmed this increasing emphasis on maternity – including that by single mothers, and the nuclear family and the state's willingness to help women meet their responsibilities as mothers, civic actors and wage earners in the 1940s.

Cathy Rakowski's work complicates the relationship between maternalism and citizenship in Latin America.³¹ In a review essay, she suggests that a change over time occurred in which women abandoned maternalism for citizenship rights as a tactic in political organising. She asserts that 'overall, the books' surveyed, 'indicate both the importance of the language of motherhood in the past and its declining relevance in light of the growing legitimacy of claims to citizen rights by previously marginalised groups, including women . . . The many case studies suggest that researchers and students must use caution in assuming that women's social roles as mothers can explain their political behaviour or goals, and they should search for other explanations'.³²

This claim is thought-provoking but problematic. Rakowski implies that maternalism and citizenship are mutually exclusive tactics for organising. Yet she never defines maternalism or citizenship. Instead, she alludes to maternalism as an identity or organisational tactic 'thrust on women by men in politics and by society',³³ motherhood as an issue 'around which women mobilise',³⁴ 'the use of the language of motherhood by activists',³⁵ the relationship between 'motherhood and citizenship and the extent to which the two are compatible',³⁶ the 'representation of motherhood in feminism',³⁷ 'maternal feminism' as a 'type of feminism',³⁸ and 'the role that motherhood or 'maternalism' plays in women's and Latin America's political life'.³⁹

In my understanding, maternalism and citizenship are not mutually exclusive. Although historically both have functioned as tactics or organising principals to bring people into or legitimise their membership and action in political communities, maternalism has provided one avenue toward or one way of defining citizenship which women have used strategically for specific ends. Thus, maternalism can be viewed as

embedded within, not parallel to, the concept of citizenship. Historically, maternalism's uses and successes as a path to citizenship have waxed and waned. Maternalism and citizenship have co-existed – not superseded – one another as categories. One example of this is found in the simultaneous rise in the importance of maternalism and citizenship in 1940s Mexico. Contemporary examples of maternalism coexisting with the language of citizenship can be found in several of the very works reviewed by Rakowski.⁴⁰

Nonetheless, Rakowski points to an interesting phenomenon – increasing attention by scholars to difference-based, including maternalist, versus equality, rights-based, citizenship approaches to women's activism. More than an *historical* shift (change over time), she identifies a *historiographical* one – increased scholarly interest in the ways that the categories of maternalism and citizenship, and difference and equality, have coexisted and intersected historically.

I have reached these conclusions within the supportive network of scholars that has created and sustained the International Colloquium of Women's and Gender History in Mexico. Others' work has identified the same changes over time that I have observed: from an emphasis on moralising reform in the 1920s; to labour in the 1930s; to a simultaneous disjunction and collaboration between the promotion of an ideal of a male-headed nuclear family sustained by official and popular elements and the ascendancy of maternalism, and private realities of female-headed households and an increased presence of women in political and economic spheres in the 1940s.⁴¹ The study of women's actions is necessary to determine such patterns, yet their stories also emphasise the need for gender history.

My research has benefited greatly from participation in the 2001 and 2003 sessions of the International Colloquium of Women's and Gender History in Mexico. These meetings epitomised the most exciting aspects of being a graduate student, academic and scholar of Mexican women's and gender history. When I began Graduate School in 1995, I had no idea that a conference focusing on *Mexican* women's and gender history was possible as my undergraduate studies emphasised US Women's History, and I had naively assumed that in shifting my focus to Latin America Women's and Gender history, I was entering a relatively open field. Although to some degree I was correct as, compared with the amount written on the US or Europe, there was certainly much less Latin American women's history published in 1995. Yet I was also (fortuitously) wrong. There *were* scholars writing Latin American women's history, and fortunately, many of them have been involved in these conferences. Additionally, a growing number of others entering graduate school had the same idea I did: to help chart a purportedly wide-open field! I soon found myself lucky enough to be working within a growing network of scholars of different generations, willing to exchange ideas and documents, and to create and sustain this forum: the International Colloquium on the History of Women and Gender in Mexico.

The two conferences that established this colloquium have revealed exciting and meaningful convergences between participants' work and the *unique* narratives of Mexican Women's and Gender History. In my case, I have been challenged to clarify my methodological categories, especially the separate but related fields of Women's and Gender History and the frameworks for studying women's activism of feminism, maternalism and citizenship. My excitement at watching the affirmations and challenges that different conference participants have posed to one another has solidified my belief in the need for a field of Women's History separate from, but related to,

Gender History. Just as these conferences strengthened a growing network of scholars, they exposed a vast network of the historical subjects under study, including workers, organisers, family members, and religious believers who competed and collaborated with one another in important and fascinating ways. For example, in Mexico between the 1920s and 1940s, leftist-leaning suffrage advocates Hermila Galindo and Margarita Robles de Mendoza advocated freedom of sexual expression, family planning and companionate marriage while also defending Catholicism as an empowering means for women's expression and activism.⁴² It is interesting to note that women who belonged to explicitly socialist and anticlerical leagues in 1930s Yucatán also proudly acknowledged their simultaneous participation in Catholic *gremios*.⁴³ At the same time, leftist-leaning, single women, such as Elena Torres could launch vociferous defences of traditional female roles, particularly motherhood.⁴⁴ And they could be joined by other single and married women, ranging from the extreme left to the extreme right.⁴⁵

Such women's belief systems and actions destabilise broader historical categories that have helped to shape frameworks to study women's activism, and which have emanated from US and European historiography. Examples include definitions of liberal and conservative and anti- and pro-clerical. Because of this, at the 2003 Colloquium, Joan Scott commented that the papers in this Feature raised the question of what the terms 'liberal' and 'conservative' meant in Mexico, during the Revolutionary and Post-Revolutionary period and beyond. Exposing the need to rethink such definitions and categories of analysis provides one example of how these conferences, in contributing at a crucial stage to the construction of a historiography of Mexican Women's and Gender History, have pushed for reconceptualisations of Global (including Western) History, not just Mexican.

Notes

1. See, for example, Katherine Elaine Bliss, *Compromised Positions: Prostitution, Public Health, and Gender Politics in Revolutionary Mexico City* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001); Heather Fowler-Salamini and Mary Kay Vaughan (eds), *Women of the Mexican Countryside, 1850–1990* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1994); Jocelyn Olcott, *Revolutionary Women in Postrevolutionary Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Susie Porter, *Working Women in Mexico City: Public Discourses and Material Conditions, 1879–1931* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003); Anne Rubenstein, *Bad Language, Naked Ladies, and Other Threats to the Nation: A Political History of Comic Books in Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Patience A. Schell, *Church and State Education in Revolutionary Mexico City* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003); Mary Kay Vaughan, *Cultural Politics in Revolution: Teachers, Peasants, and Schools in Mexico, 1930–1940* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1997). Also, the following unpublished doctoral theses: Ann Shelby Blum, 'Children Without Parents: Law, Charity and Social Practice, Mexico City, 1867–1940,' (University of California, Berkeley, 1998); Kristina A. Boylan, 'Mexican Catholic Women's Activism, 1929–1940' (University of Oxford, 2000); Sarah Anne Buck, 'Activists and Mothers: Feminist and Maternalist Politics in Mexico, 1923–1953' (Rutgers University, 2002); María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, 'The Political Mobilization of Women in Revolutionary Guadalajara, 1910–1940' (University of Illinois at Chicago, 2000); Susan Marie Gaus, 'Made in Mexico: the Rise of Mexican Industrialism, 1938–1952' (State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2002); S.E. Mitchell, 'La noble mujer organizada: The 1930s Women's Movement in Mexico' (University of Oxford, 2002); Kristin A. Harper, 'Revolutionary Tabasco in the time of Tomás Garrido Canabal, 1922–1935: A Mexican House Divided' (University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2004); Nicholle Marie Sanders, 'Gender, Welfare and the "Mexican Miracle": The Politics of Modernization in Postrevolutionary Mexico, 1937–1958' (University of California, Irvine, 2003); Stephanie Jo Smith, 'Engendering the Revolution: Women and State Formation in Yucatan, Mexico, 1872–1930' (State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2002).

2. The first meeting was in New Haven, Connecticut in 2001; the second in Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico in 2003; the third in Salt Lake City, Utah, in 2005, and the most recent in Zamora, Michoacán, Mexico in 2007.
3. See for example, the editors' introduction in Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel J. Nugent (eds), *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), especially pp. 5–10.
4. This narrative draws on Alan Knight, *The Mexican Revolution*, 2 vols., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Michael C. Meyer and William L. Sherman, *The Course of Mexican History*, 5th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Wasserman, *Everyday Life and Politics in Nineteenth Century Mexico: Men, Women, and War* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000); and Alan Wells and Gilbert M. Joseph, *Summer of Discontent, Seasons of Upheaval: Elite Politics and Rural Insurgency in Yucatán, 1876–1915* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).
5. See Anna Macías, *Against All Odds: The Feminist Movement in Mexico to 1940* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982); Elena Poniatowska, *Las Soldaderas* (Mexico, DF: Conaculta, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, 1999); Elizabeth Salas, *Soldaderas in the Mexican Military: Myth and History* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990).
6. Patience Schell (*Church and State Education*, p. 71) writes that 'in both day and night schools, women continued to dominate the profession: In the early 1920s, women primary-school teachers outnumbered men nationally by nearly three to one'; Mary Kay Vaughan, *Cultural Politics in Revolution*, pp. 31–2.
7. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 242–8.
8. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', p. 603 (Table I.III) and p. 605 (Table I.IV).
9. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 113–14, 118–20, 125–6.
10. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 97 and 102.
11. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 153–4.
12. Macías, *Against All Odds*; Shirlene Ann Soto, *Emergence of the Modern Mexican Woman: Her Participation in the Revolution and Struggle for Equality, 1910–1940* (Denver, CO: Arden Press, 1990).
13. I define maternalism as the practice of glorifying motherhood for political ends, or, in the words of Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, 'exalt[ing] women's capacity to mother and apply[ng] to society as a whole the values ... attached to that role: care, nurturance, and morality', in Seth Koven and Sonya Michel (eds), *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of the Welfare States* (New York: Routledge Press, 1993), p. 4.
14. Asunción Lavrin (*Women, Feminism, and Social Change in Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, 1890–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995), p. 7) has written that South American 'feminists embraced motherhood wholeheartedly as the highest signifier of womanhood'. Although 'women's rights as individuals were also important' ultimately a compensatory form of feminism which relied on protective legislation and state-sanctioned maternal and child welfare services emerged as dominant. See also Lynn K. Stoner, *From the House to the Streets: The Cuban Woman's Movement for Legal Reform, 1898–1940* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), pp. 2–3; Francesca Miller, *Latin American Women and the Search for Social Justice* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1991), p. 74; and Donna Guy, *White Slavery and Mothers Alive and Dead: The Troubled Meeting of Sex, Gender, Public Health, and Progress in Latin America* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), pp. 11–12.
15. Sarah A. Buck, 'The Meaning of the Women's Vote in Mexico: 1917–1953', paper delivered at 'La Olvidadas: Gender and Women's History in Postrevolutionary Mexico', 11 May 2001, New Haven, Connecticut.
16. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 132–3, 355–6, 377–8.
17. See the articles by Carmen Ramos Escandón, Erika Pani, Kif Augustine Adams and Patrick J. McNamara in 'Forum: Citizenship in Modern Mexico', *Gender & History* 18 (2006), 1–49.
18. These discussions pointed me to two works which became seminal to my efforts to define citizenship: T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950) and Joan W. Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996).
19. See Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 205–8, 266–9, 287–91.
20. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 353–76.
21. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 414–41, 552–62.
22. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 252–3.
23. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 272–4.
24. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 273–4.
25. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 274–82.
26. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 296–303.

27. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 482–4.
28. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', p. 472.
29. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 445–8.
30. For a discussion of how these activists and organisations contributed to women's acquisition of the vote, see Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 564–75.
31. Cathy A. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors: The Move from Maternalism to Citizenship Rights and Power', *Latin American Research Review* 38 (2003), pp. 180–94.
32. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 191.
33. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 181.
34. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 181.
35. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 189.
36. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 183.
37. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 183.
38. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 184.
39. Rakowski, 'Women as Political Actors', p. 191.
40. See especially Nikki Craske, *Women and Politics in Latin America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999); Maxine Molyneux, *Women's Movements in International Perspective: Latin America and Beyond* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Nikki Craske and Maxine Molyneux (eds), *Gender and the Politics of Rights and Democracy in Latin America* (New York: Palgrave, 2002); Victoria González and Karen Kampwirth (eds), *Radical Women in Latin America: Left and Right* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000).
41. For introductions to these arguments and the scholars making them, see the anthologies produced by these colloquia: Jocelyn Olcott, Mary Kay Vaughan and Gabriela Cano (eds), *Sex in Revolution: Gender, Politics, and Power in Modern Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, Carmen Ramos- Escandón and Susie S. Porter (eds), *Orden social e identidad de género: México, siglos XIX y XX* (Mexico, DF: Ciesas: Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, 2006); Stephanie Mitchell and Patience Schell (eds), *The Women's Revolution in Mexico, 1910–1953* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007).
42. Laura Orellana Trinidad, "'La mujer del porvenir": Raíces intelectuales y alcances del pensamiento feminista de Hermila Galindo, 1915–1919', *Signos históricos* 5 (2001), pp. 124–5; Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 67–8, 316–18; and Boylan, 'Mexican Catholic Women's Activism', p. 132.
43. Interviews with Juana Gorocica Muxupip (9 May 2000); Buenaventura Méndez Méndez and Candida Cruz (10 May 2000); Florentina Noh and Cecilia Martín Cam, Muxupip (11 May 2000): discussed in Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', p. 438.
44. Naomi Cortés Ramírez, 'Elena Torres Cuellar: Revolucionaria, feminista y educadora mexicana (1893–1970)', Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1993, pp. 16–19, 22–4, and 146–9; Anna Macías, 'Felipe Carrillo Puerto and Women's Liberation in Mexico', in Asunción Lavrin (ed.), *Latin American Women: Historical Perspectives* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978), p. 294; and Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 146–50, 310–12, 405.
45. Buck, 'Activists and Mothers', pp. 104, 114, 312–13, 403, 456–60; also Monique J., Lemaitre, *Elivra Carrillo Puerto: La monja roja del Mayab* (Monterrey, Nuevo León: Ediciones Castillo, 1998).