
Rethinking Twentieth-Century Guadalajara

María Teresa Fernández-Aceves

In the year 2000, a group of graduate students and young faculty working on a gendered history of Mexican women organised a conference to discuss new research in the field and to strengthen international ties among scholars of twentieth-century Mexico. The conference, '*Las Olvidadas* [The Forgotten Women]: Gender and Women's History in Post-Revolutionary Mexico', took place at Yale University, in May 2001. There, I presented a paper that explored how women workers in the tortilla industry responded to the mechanisation of the corn mills and why they allied with a women's political organisation to resist being displaced by skilled male workers. I pointed out that in Mexico, women have made tortillas (corn griddle cakes) since pre-Hispanic times. For centuries, women prepared tortillas at home and their production process took at least six hours. Their manufacture began to change in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with the introduction of corn mills. The mill effected a technological revolution and generated significant changes within and outside the domestic realm. In a subsequent article, I analysed the different social, political and labour processes that created the conditions for militant feminist working-class politics in Mexico in the late 1920s and 1930s. I identified how different social actors – men and women workers, entrepreneurs, male and female labour leaders, and state agents – attributed different cultural meanings to sexual difference, work, and politics. Through this case, I illustrated how distinctions in gender and class became culturally significant and why specific gender differences changed and became politicised when the mechanisation of the industry accelerated in the 1930s.¹ I argue that 'the mechanisation of the tortilla industry, which accelerated in the 1930s, ended to empower male corn mill workers and relegated women, whose labour was defined as non-skilled and non-productive, to feminised enclaves . . . It confirms the recent findings of Latin American women's and gendered labour history: that policymakers, industrialists, legislators, employers, educators, labour leaders, and even some feminists reinforced and reproduced the nineteenth-century category of woman worker'.² At the Yale conference, Tom Kublock invited me to think about how industrialists' labour policies were shaped by gender ideologies and how specific management labour policies shaped segmented labour processes and work cultures. Did mechanisation erode domestic patriarchy? Did it establish new forms of patriarchy?

This essay drew on my doctoral thesis.³ In both works, I put women at the centre of the historical analysis to examine the political mobilisation of secular and Catholic women during the revolutionary decades of the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s in

Guadalajara, Mexico. I argued that these women became politicised through four dynamic and interrelated factors: the formation of the revolutionary state, the emergence of secular and Catholic labour movements, the struggle between Church and state for dominance at the regional and national levels and the changes in the labour force that displaced women in industries that were modernised. These processes opened the way for women's mobilisation and led to a more active political role for women than either the Church or state had envisioned. As a result, women secured new spaces within both institutions, which nonetheless remained under new conditions but still under male domination.

I argued that the post-revolutionary mobilisations produced alliances between middle-class and working-class women, of both secular and religious backgrounds, that had lasting effects. Both Catholic and secular women went beyond the role of public mothers and introduced new notions of strong public femininity. Their actions challenged their assigned gender roles and transformed the male conception of politics by expanding the areas of action for women – by organising labour, political and women's organisations.

I challenged the stereotype, portrayed in the Mexican historiography, that women of Guadalajara and the state of Jalisco were passive, pious and apolitical Catholics.⁴ The region's women represented two opposed yet strong cultural traditions – the Catholic and liberal – which have influenced the lives of Jaliscans and Guadalarajans since the early nineteenth century. These traditions clashed during the Mexican Revolution (1910–17), a rural and popular movement that destroyed the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz (1876–1911), post-revolutionary decades of state building (1920–40) and Church-state conflict that followed. The process opened the way for women's political mobilisation. By using life histories and archival material, I investigated women's roles in politics, labour organising and welfare reform.

The Yale conference forced me, and motivated me, to think beyond the Guadalarajan women. It helped me to extend my analysis on the gendered cultures of the state and state agencies, organised labour, and political and religious organisations. It pushed me to incorporate a male perspective into my work and to understand why both men and women negotiated alliances during the organisation of unions and large labour federations.

To expand my analysis, I returned to my archival data and my oral histories to better understand how women and men entered politics, exercised power and used violence and corrupt practices when they needed. To analyse these practices and negotiations, I examined the *Círculo Feminista de Occidente* (CFO), a women's organisation of schoolteachers and workers. Created in 1927, the CFO promoted women's political, social and civil rights, and allied with the rising political group of Heliodoro Hernández Loza, a former bus driver, who dominated organised labour in Jalisco for more than four decades. The CFO worked with tortilla workers, seamstresses, domestic servants, employees and housewives. Its membership fluctuated between 100 and 300 women, from 1927 to 2000.

The CFO arose at the beginning of the Cristero War (1927–29), a regional Catholic rebellion centred in Jalisco that opposed the State's anticlerical policies.⁵ At the time, the Catholic Church saw its influence on women's organisations diminish. Moreover, the revolutionary state and organised labour promoted a traditional role for women that contrasted with the active political participation of women workers.

In my doctoral dissertation, I argued out that within the labour movement there were political groups that competed for the control of all unions. Now, in order to expand my gender perspective, I focused on the emerging group led by Heliodoro Hernández Loza (1898–1990). He offered support to the women affiliated to the CFO in order to gain from their demands for collective labour contracts and protect women's jobs. This alliance was very important for both Hernández and the CFO because it allowed them to consolidate a strong political group, even though women were still not enfranchised. I decided to develop my analysis about the gender, labour and political relationships between men and women. I pondered the question why the women of the CFO allied with Hernández and why he coalesced with these women. I inferred that Hernández thought that after he had gained the control of the unions, he could then promote the return of women workers to their traditional gender roles as housewives. Hernández came from a rural area, where women have been more visible in reproductive labour than participating in politics. However, this did not happen because the women of the CFO maintained an active role in politics and in the labour market. In order to preserve their place, they had to change from an autonomous organisation in the late 1920s to a more submissive organisation affiliated to organised labour and the official party. The CFO joined the Hernández group to dominate the *Federación de Trabajadores de Jalisco* (FTJ) until 1990. Together they built a union *cacicazgo*, a political bossism.⁶

How many women workers did the FTJ have to control and attract? In the 1940s, Guadalajara had 511,215 women workers, most in domestic service with a smaller number in industries (7,514) and in commerce (7,988). By the end of the 1930s and early 1940s, there were forty-three women's organisations in Guadalajara that included Catholic (2), labour (25), professional (7) and political (9). Women's unions in Guadalajara were a small number (25), which were concentrated mainly in the tortilla industry (13) and garment industry (9), while clerks, tobacco and food had only one respectively.⁷ In contrast, at the national level, there were 6,700,479 female workers. Women's presence in agriculture and mining was a small number. As in the case of tortilla women in Guadalajara, other women workers were displaced by the mechanisation in industries such as tobacco, textiles and chocolate. There were women's unions in agriculture (coffee), manufacture (textiles, tortilla, tobacco, and garments) and service sector (teachers, telephone and clerks).⁸

Under their leadership, Hernández and the CFO were the political intermediaries between the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), governors, mayors and other large federations and their base. They negotiated with male and female labour leaders and their rank-and-file during strikes, the mobility of their rank-and-file into elective positions, the promotion of schools, housing, sports and recreational areas. They developed a labour social policy that would reproduce traditional gender roles. On the one hand, Hernández and his male labour leaders and male base were asked to complete grammar school because education would allow them to have social and political mobility. They could become future labour leaders, state deputies and part of the state bureaucracy. They promoted the family wage and the distribution of housing for male workers. On the other hand, the women of the CFO contributed significantly in the establishment of schools for workers. There, they taught the basic skills – reading and writing – to the future male leaders. They tried to keep alive the needs of single mothers, but this issue was overshadowed by a policy that favoured male workers, who were

seen as head of households in need of family wages to support their families. These were the new developments I began to notice.

After I identified the nature of the CFO's and Hernández Loza's union leadership, I reviewed the theoretical and ethnographical literature on *cacicazgos*. I detected that authors had not hitherto recognised the role of women. Therefore, the challenge was to combine the history of *caciquismo* and gender studies. I found that both perspectives worked with different theoretical perspectives about power and none had established a bridge to communicate between them.

Within the historiography of Mexico, there is a rich literature on *caciquismo*, discussing the origins of the word, the genesis and functions of *caciques*, and their evolution as political authors in Mexico.⁹ In general terms, historians characterise the *cacique* as a strong boss, whose authority derives from informal sources, who wields a personal and arbitrary political power in a region or locality because he is able to mediate between political, economic, social and cultural structures and his base of support. This literature always refers to *caciques* as masculine figures. Sometimes, a *cacique* uses his political power through violence to dominate; other times, he utilises paternalistic and clientelistic means. The *cacique* manages to control wealth, honour, public posts and political power.¹⁰ His family networks, godfathers, friends, fighters and dependants support a *cacique*.¹¹ Likewise, he has been seen as a political and cultural intermediary between his superiors and subordinates because he is capable of articulating different political cultures, and creating links between these differences.¹² To his superiors, he has to show obedience, information and political support; whereas his subordinates must be loyal and faithful and have to fulfil obligations and positions assigned to them.¹³ The various studies of *caciquismo* have used distinct categories to examine the use of power – political intermediation and articulation, local and regional politics, control, centralisation, patronage, clientelism, influence, legitimacy, authority and domination. The term dates back to the colonial times and has traditionally referred to rural bosses.

Both the male origin of the word *cacique* and the male academic analyses that have studied this theme have led to a narrow focus upon only the role of men and have not taken into account women as part of the *caciquil* power. Correctly, the historian Raymond Buve¹⁴ has stated that many of the studies about *caciques* have centred on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and have forgotten that in the colonial period there were also indigenous women who inherited and played the role of *caciques*.¹⁵ Therefore, this male perspective has contributed to the maintenance and reproduction a 'natural' distinction between the different traditional roles of men – identified with the public sphere and politics – and women – associated with domesticity and the private realm – in society. These studies did not explicitly give an explanation of why women were not included; however, male academics have conceived politics as a realm exclusively for men. Rightly, Joan Scott has argued that 'the terms of exclusion repeatedly produce "sexual difference" as a fixed, natural boundary between the political and the domestic, or the self-representing and the represented, or the autonomous and the dependent'.¹⁶

In contrast, studies about women, and especially those adopting a gendered perspective challenge this male vision. Joan Scott's pioneering study about the use of gender as a category of analysis has shown 'how politics constructs gender and how gender constructs politics'.¹⁷ Similarly, recent studies about gender have criticised

liberal political theorists because they have not included gendered relations in their analyses.¹⁸

Studies about gender, power and citizenship in twentieth-century Latin America have used other kinds of theoretical challenges to place women in politics and to expand the very concept of politics through categories such as empowerment – the process by which subalterns control their lives and the structures that allow them to participate in issues that concern them – female consciousness, gender interests and maternalism.¹⁹

These issues and concepts led me back to Guadalajara. What about the women of the CFO inside the labour *caciquismo*? They were not passive and apolitical housewives. Rather, they not only fought violently among themselves and with men, they were also an important part of the building of a political family in Jalisco. They were included in Heliodoro Hernández Loza's political group because they changed their rhetoric from autonomous and combatant women to a maternalist one. For instance, on 15 October 1957, after a FTJ's assembly, Hernández and Martínez agreed to create a school for young women where they would learn embroidery, painting, dancing and cooking.²⁰ There was no emphasis on political militancy. Rather, these labour leaders sought unity and disliked dissent. Yet, the women of the CFO did not give up everything. At certain moments, they did not agree about the role of women in politics. A clear example was in 1953, when the main leader of the largest labour organisation, the Confederación de Trabajadores de México (CTM), Fidel Velásquez openly opposed the granting of women's suffrage and proposed a traditional role for women.²¹ According to Velásquez, it was more important to solve the survival needs of people, to finish with the problem of hunger, than to grant women the vote. Despite Velásquez's conservative point of view, almost all the CTM's female labour leaders and rank-and-file workers joined the campaign that achieved the women's vote in 1953.

The women of the CFO had had political experience in the building of unions and fighting for labour, social, civil and political rights since the late 1910s. By the 1950s, they distinguished themselves as those who could enter politics and those that had to be only mothers. Women with political experience could fight to have access to public elective posts. But those women workers with husbands and family had to emphasise their main role as mothers. An article in their labour press expressed how women could work correctly and safety at home not only by taking care of their families, but also by running a garment sweatshop.²² In the long run, these female leaders had assimilated the maternalist policies promoted by the state and male labour leaders, as a press article illustrates by pointing out that 'women have shown maturity because they have interpreted adequately the principles of sindical unity; they understand their role in the Revolution, exercise their civic rights as well as fulfil their social role and duties with dignity to the Fatherland'.²³

With the analysis of the CFO and Hernández's political and labour family, I concluded that studies about *caciques*, women and politics have used very different analytical categories that led to distinct conclusions. Studies about *caciques* have tended to examine them only as a masculine phenomenon. The incorporation of the feminist critique and a gender perspective opens the path to question this work. The concept of *cacique* should not be used to include women as heroines or to compensate for their absence in the political system. Rather, the concepts of *cacique* and gender can contribute to elaborate a more nuanced analysis and recognise the distinct power relations between men and women within the *cacicazgos*, and in politics in general. Intertwining

these categories helps to clarify how these power relationships and conceptions about men and women changed over time within organised labour, the ruling party (PRI) and political organisations. The case of the CFO is now part of a broader comparative study of women in similar situations: one example is Guadalupe Buendía, alias La Loba, an urban female leader affiliated to the official party from Chimalhuacán, Mexico, who controlled that rural town during the 1990s.²⁴ Simultaneously, I have continued working on how and why the FTJ labour and political group was very interested in preserving their own political and cultural experiences and practices through civil field trips, memorials, songs, rituals and plays. I have investigated through primary sources their civic culture, narratives and cultural memory. Regarding their civic culture, the FTJ promoted the principles of duty and discipline, hygiene, teamwork, mutual service and collaboration.²⁵ I have used recent literature on revolutionary Mexico and labour movements that placed women and gender at the centre of analyses, challenging the revisionist vision of the Mexican Revolution (1910–17) and labour studies that focused primarily on male leaders and on the male industrial proletariat.²⁶ I have pointed out how male-biased historiography reproduces the voices of the pioneer labour leaders,²⁷ who wrote their own memoirs from a triumphant point of view,²⁸ while the voices and experiences of pioneer working-class women can only be reconstructed from oral histories and biographies written by other women: mostly female labour inspectors and teachers.²⁹ I have compared three militant working-class women – a textile worker (María A. Díaz), a teacher (Guadalupe Martínez) and a tortilla maker (Anita Hernández Lucas), who joined the ranks of secular organised labour, the feminist movement in Guadalajara, and became part of the FTJs political and labour leadership group. I examined their narratives through different genres (the script of a play, a teacher's scrapbook and an oral history) and how they kept the political work of a pioneer woman alive through plays, memorials and songs in order to teach a third generation of women to be disciplined and loyal to organised labour. I have argued that these new sources for women's labour history, together with a long-term perspective, help us to understand the changing and dynamic character of 'cultural narratives', subjectivities and gender identities that contrast sharply with the Mexican representation of the 'woman worker', who was seen in male labour historiography, as single, weak, unskilled and apolitical. The narratives of these women show their changing gendered notions of politics, labour and power. They also allow us to understand how these women made accommodations and compromises in order to have a legitimised political culture that could preserve their historical experiences and memories.

Recently, I have begun to study what happened with women after the granting of women's suffrage in 1953. I have reconstructed the life histories and political trajectories of Guadalupe Martínez (1905–2002) and Guadalupe Urzúa (1912–2004). Each one had distinct notions of politics and controlled different female sectors (workers and peasants) within and outside the official party. These two cases illuminate how they built their own political group by organising and representing women workers and peasants within the PRI and the state, and by holding public posts (federal congresswoman, senator and mayor). These cases shed light upon how women attain and maintain positions of power, and how they exercise that power. Guadalupe Martínez's example demonstrates that being part of a political network and *cacicazgo* was crucial to run and be elected several times for congresswoman and senator, due to support brought about by her political base and connections. They also help to identify and

distinguish the different moments and processes of twentieth-century Mexican politics – from the construction of the new revolutionary State and the building of modern corporatist institutions, to the fall of the ruling party. Likewise, these political trajectories and life histories contribute to the understanding of the diverse practices and representations about women and politics. But above all, the historical periodisation of women in politics – organising women and unions, joining state, labour and party politics, and running for electoral posts.

The discussions and questions raised at the *Las Olvidadas* conference in 2001 have helped to deepen my analysis in women's and gender history, and to include a comparative perspective. Similarly, the editorial work of *Orden social e identidad de género. México, siglos XIX y XX* introduced me to new notions and concepts to analyse Mexican history.³⁰ Now, there is a growing literature on Mexican women's and gender history that has been nurtured thanks to the theoretical, methodological and empirical innovations of US, British, Latin American and Mexican scholars and their efforts to build a transnational dialogue.

Notes

I would like to thank Mary Kay Vaughan, Heather Fowler-Salamini, Alan Knight, Wil Pansters, Thomas Miller Klubock, Raymond Buve and Michael Snodgrass for their helpful feedback.

1. María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, 'Once We Were Corn Grinders: Women and Labor in the Tortilla Industry of Guadalajara, 1920-1940', *International Labor and Working-Class History* 63 (2003), pp. 81-101.
2. Fernández-Aceves, 'Once We Were Corn Grinders', pp. 81-2; Barbara Weinstein, 'Unskilled Workers, Skilled Housewife: Constructing The Working-Class Woman in São Paulo, Brazil', in John D. French and Daniel James (eds), *The Gendered Worlds of Latin American Women Workers: From the Household and Factory to the Union Hall and Ballot Box* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997), pp. 72-99; Thomas Klubock, *Contested Communities: Class, Gender, and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Cooper Mine, 1904-1951* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998); Ann Farnsworth-Alvear, *Dulcinea in the Factory: Myths, Morals, Men And Women in Colombia Industrial Experiment, 1905-1960* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999), pp. 1-35; Karin Alejandra Roseblatt, *Gendered Compromises: Political Culture and State in Chile, 1920-1950* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina University Press, 2000); Elizabeth Quay Hutchison, *Labors Appropriate to their Sex: Gender and Labor Politics in Urban Chile, 1900-1930* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001); Heidi Tinsman, *Partners in Conflict: The Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950-1973* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).
3. María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, 'Political Mobilization of Women in Revolutionary Guadalajara, 1910-1940' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 2000).
4. Anna Macías, *Against All Odds: The Feminist Movement in Mexico to 1940* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982), pp. 72-5.
5. Jean Meyer, *La cristiada*, 3 vols (Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores, 1974).
6. In Spanish, *cacique* refers to the legal indigenous representatives of the Indian republics; in the early twentieth century it meant political boss. It is discussed by Guillermo de la Peña, 'Poder local, poder regional: Perspectivas socio-antropológicas', in Jorge Padua and Alan Vanneph (eds), *Poder local, poder regional* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México-CEMCA, 1986), p. 28.
7. Fernández-Aceves, 'Political Mobilization,' pp. 242, 354-6.
8. María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, 'El trabajo femenino en México', in Isabel Moran (ed.), *Historia de las mujeres en España y América Latina*, vol. 4 (Madrid: Cátedra, 2006), pp. 845-59.
9. As the bibliography is very large, I cite only some. Paul Friedrich *Agrarian Revolt in a Mexican Village* (Englewood: Prentice Hall, 1970); Wayne Cornelius, 'El México contemporáneo: análisis estructural del caciquismo urbano', in Luis Unikel and Andrés Necochea (eds), *Desarrollo urbano y regional en América Latina* (Mexico City: FCE, 1976); Gilbert M. Joseph, *Revolution from Without: Yucatán, México, and the United States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1983); Romana Falcón, *Política y caciquismo en San Luis Potosí, 1918-1939* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1984); Roger Bartra, et al., *Caciquismo y poder político en el México rural* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI Editores, 1986); David Brading (eds), *Caudillo y campesinos en la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: FCE, 1985); Alan Knight, *The Mexican Revolution*

- (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986); Knight, 'Cultura política y caciquismo', *Letras Libres* 24 (2000), pp. 16–20; François-Xavier Guerra, *México: Del antiguo régimen a la revolución* (Mexico City: FCE, 1988); Carlos Martínez Assad (ed.), *Estadistas, caciques y caudillos* (Mexico City: UNAM-IIS, 1988); Fernando I. Salmerón Castro, 'Caciques: Una revisión teórica sobre el control político local', *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales* 30 (1984), pp. 107–41; Salmerón Castro, *Los límites del agrarismo* (Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán, 1989); Claudio Lomnitz-Adler, *Exits from the Labyrinth: Culture and Ideology in the Mexican National Space* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992); Guillermo de la Peña, 'Populism, Regional Power, and Political Mediation: Southern Jalisco, 1900–1980', in Eric Van Young (ed.), *Mexico's Regions: Comparative History and Development* (San Diego: University of California, 1992), pp. 191–223; Will Pansters, *Política y poder en Puebla: Formación y ocaso del cacicazgo avilacamachista, 1937–1987* (Mexico City: FCE, 1998); Jennie Purnell, *Popular Movements and State Formation in Revolutionary Mexico: The Agraristas and Cristeros of Michoacán* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Ben Fallaw, *Cárdenas Compromised: The Failure of Reform in Postrevolutionary Yucatán* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001).
10. Salmerón Castro, 'Caciques', p. 109.
 11. Salmerón Castro, 'Caciques', p. 109.
 12. De la Peña, 'Poder local, poder regional', pp. 32–5; Salmerón Castro, 'Caciques', p. 121; Gil Joseph, 'El caciquismo y la revolución: Carrillo Puerto en Yucatán', in David Brading (ed.), *Caudillos y campesinos en la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico City: FCE, 1985), p. 245.
 13. Knight, 'Cárdenas, Caciquismo', p. 2.
 14. Raymond Buve made these comments at the *Caciquismo* Conference at the University of Oxford in September 2002.
 15. For a very interesting analysis of indigenous widow women *caciques* in the colonial period see Josefina Muriel, 'Las viudas en el desarrollo de la vida novohispana', in Manuel Ramos Medina (ed.), *Viudas en la historia* (Mexico City: Condumex, 2002), pp. 93–111.
 16. Joan W. Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), p. 14.
 17. Joan W. Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 44–50.
 18. Judith Squires, *Gender in Political Theory* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999).
 19. For a feminist perspective and a critique of the Foucauldian vision see, Nancy Hartsock, 'Foucault on Power: A Theory for Women', in Linda J. Nicholson (ed.), *Feminism and Postmodernism* (New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 137–75; Sandra Bartky, *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression* (New York: Routledge, 1990), pp. 63–82; Jana Sawicki, 'Foucault and Feminism: Toward a Politics of Difference', in Mary Lyndon Shanley and Carole Pateman (eds), *Feminist Interpretations and Political Theory* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), pp. 217–31. For empowerment see, Srilatha Batliwala, 'The Meaning of Women's Empowerment: New Concepts from Action', in Gita Sen, Adrienne Germain and Lincoln C. Chen (eds), *Population Policies Reconsidered: Health, Empowerment, and Rights* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), pp. 127–38; Naila Kabeer, *Realidades trastocadas: Las jerarquías de género en el pensamiento del desarrollo* (Mexico City: Paidós, 1998), pp. 235–72; Iva Ellen Deutchman, 'Feminist Theory and the Politics of Empowerment', in Lois Lovelace Duke (ed.), *Women in Politics: Outsiders or Insiders?* (Pule Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 1996), pp. 4–17; Sharon McClenaghan, 'Women, Work, and Empowerment: Romanticising the Reality', in Elizabeth Dore (ed.), *Gender Politics in Latin America* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997), pp. 9–18. For mobilisation of women see, Temma Kaplan, 'Female Consciousness and Collective Action: The Case of Barcelona, 1910–1918', *Signs* 7 (1982), pp. 545–66; Maxine Molyneux, 'Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State, and Revolution in Nicaragua', *Feminist Studies* 11 (1985), pp. 227–54; Sarah A. Radcliffe and Sallie Westwood, 'Viva': *Women and Popular Protest in Latin America* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Sonia Alvarez, *Engendering Democracy in Brazil: Women's Movements in Transition Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990); Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Jocelyn Olcott, *Revolutionary Women in Postrevolutionary Mexico* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).
 20. 'Tomó posesión la directiva femenil juvenil del SUTAJ', *Ceteme*, 15 October 1957, p. 8.
 21. 'Fidel y sus corifeso se oponen al voto femenino', *El Occidental*, 24 December 1952, p. 1.
 22. 'La FTJ colaboró en la V campaña de seguridad', *Ceteme*, 14 December 1957, pp. 3, 7. For a discussion in México City and Monterrey see Susie S. Porter, *Working Women in Mexico City: Public Discourses and Material conditions, 1879–1931* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2003); Michael Snodgrass, *Deference and Defiance in Monterrey: Workers, Paternalism, and Revolution in Mexico, 1890–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

23. 'Editorial. Rompiendo cadenas', *Ceteme*, 15 August 1957, p. 5.
24. Greco Sotelo, 'Arqueología de la ilegalidad', *Letras Libres* 24 (2000), pp. 48–51; Lorenzo Meyer, 'Los caciques: ayer y hoy. ¿Y mañana?', *Letras Libres* 24 (2000), pp. 26–7.
25. María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, 'Guadalajaran Women and the Construction of National Identity', in Mary Kay Vaughan and Steve Lewis (eds), *The Eagle and the Virgin: Identity and National Unity in Mexico, 1920–1940* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 297–313.
26. The revisionist analyses argue that after the Mexican Revolution a strong state rose, which imposed vertically its policies and power and manipulated the masses and the peasantry through the official party. Post-revisionists challenge this vision and state that the Mexican state in the 1920s and 1930s was built through negotiations between state agencies and the masses. For a critical analysis of the revisionist vision see Alan Knight, 'The Mexican Revolution: Bourgeois? Nationalist? Or Just a "Great Rebellion"?', *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 4 (1985), pp. 1–37. For gendered perspectives of the Mexican Revolution see Mary Kay Vaughan, *Cultural Politics in Revolution: Teachers, Peasants, and Schools in Mexico, 1930–1940* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997); Mary Kay Vaughan, Gabriela Cano and Jocelyn Olcott, *Sex in Revolution: Gender, Politics, and Power in Modern Mexico* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006); Vaughan and Lewis, *The Eagle and the Virgin*.
27. By male-biased I refer to the fact that these studies were written by and about men.
28. Jacinto Huitrón, *Orígenes e historia del movimiento obrero en México* (2nd edn, Mexico City: Editores Mexicanos Unidos, 1978); José Ortiz Petricoli, *El compañero Morones: biografía de un gran líder* (Mexico City: Costa-Amic, 1968); Rosendo Salazar, *Antecedentes del movimiento obrero revolucionario en México: Los años convulsos* (Mexico City: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1973); Rosendo Salazar, *Historia de las luchas proletarias de México, 1922–1936* (Mexico City: Publicaciones Avante, 1938); Rosendo Salazar, *Historia de las luchas proletarias de México, 1930–1936* (Mexico City: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1956); Rosendo Salazar, *La Casa del Obrero Mundial* (Mexico City: Editorial B. Costa-AMIC, 1962); Rosendo Salazar, *Líderes y sindicatos* (Mexico City: Ediciones T. C. Modelo S. C. L., 1953); Rosendo Salazar, *Los primeros de mayo en México: Contribución a la historia de la revolución* (Mexico City: B. Costa-Amic, Editor, 1965); Rosendo Salazar, *México: En pensamiento y en acción* (Mexico City: Editorial Avante, 1971); Rosendo Salazar and José Escobedo, *Las pugnas de la gleba: Los albores del movimiento obrero en México* (Mexico City: Comisión Nacional Editorial, 1972).
29. For women workers voices and interviews conducted in the 1970s and 1980s see Jorge Basurto, *Vivencias femeninas de la Revolución* (Mexico City: INHERM, 1993); Ana María Hernández, *La mujer mexicana en la industria textil* (Mexico City: Tip. Moderna, 1940); Archivo Particular Guadalupe Martínez (APGM), Guadalajara, 1974; Dolores Martínez, 'Una mujer y su destino'; Verena Radkau, *'La fama' y la vida* (Mexico City: CIESAS-Casa Chata, 1984).
30. María Teresa Fernández-Aceves, Carmen Ramos Escandón and Susie S. Porter (eds), *Orden social e identidad de género: México, siglos XIX y XX* (Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, CIESAS, 2006).