



Convergencia. Revista de Ciencias Sociales
ISSN: 1405-1435
revistaconvergencia@yahoo.com.mx
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México
México

Flores, María de los Ángeles
Film vs. Television Versions of the Mexican Revolution: a Comparative Analysis of Political Ideology
Convergencia. Revista de Ciencias Sociales, vol. 7, núm. 23, septiembre, 2000, pp. 177-195
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México
Toluca, México

Disponible en: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=10502307>

- Cómo citar el artículo
- Número completo
- Más información del artículo
- Página de la revista en redalyc.org

redalyc.org

Sistema de Información Científica
Red de Revistas Científicas de América Latina, el Caribe, España y Portugal
Proyecto académico sin fines de lucro, desarrollado bajo la iniciativa de acceso abierto

Film Vs. Television Versions of the Mexican Revolution: a Comparative Analysis of Political Ideology¹

María de los Ángeles Flores Gutiérrez

Universidad de Texas en Austin, USA

Resumen: El objetivo de este artículo es presentar un análisis comparativo entre la manera que la televisión y el cine representan la ideología política de la Revolución Mexicana. Francisco I. Madero y Ricardo Flores Magón son considerados los más importantes precursores ideológicos de la lucha armada. En este estudio presentamos sus principales líneas de pensamiento, igualmente se analiza la forma en que el cine y la televisión han representado en pantalla sus ideas revolucionarias. La muestra de este estudio es la película de la época de oro del cine mexicano "Enamorada" (1946) y la telenovela "Senda de Gloria" (1987). Las categorías de análisis para este texto son: objetivo principal de la producción; representación del folklore mexicano; ideología presentada como motivo justificador del movimiento armado; héroes y villanos; y finalmente, el tema religioso.

Palabras clave: Análisis comparativo, televisión y cine, ideología política de la Revolución Mexicana, Enamorada (1946) y Senda de Gloria (1987).

Abstract: *This research presents a comparative analysis between the way two media texts portray Mexico's Revolutionary political ideology. Francisco I. Madero and Ricardo Flores Magón are considered Mexican revolution's most significant thinkers. This study exposes their principal thoughts and analyzes the way film and television had portrayed those ideas. The golden age motion picture Enamorada (1946) and his toric telenovela Senda de Gloria (1987) are this study's sample. The main categories used in this investigation are primary purpose of the media text; Mexican folklore; theme or narrative's main topic of the media text; motivation and ideology behind the revolution; heroes and villains; and religion issues.*

Key words: *Comparative analysis, Mexico's Revolutionary political ideology, film and television, Enamorada (1946) and his toric telenovela Senda de Gloria (1987).*

¹ Algunas palabras del texto se encuentran en itálicas; debido a que son palabras en español y el texto está escrito en inglés, según lo señala el Chicago manual of style.

Introduction

The Mexican Revolution of 1910 is the most recent Mexican civil war initiated by the citizens of Mexico. Over the years many Mexican mass media industries, such as the literature and film industries, have portrayed versions of this historical period; most recently television has presented its version. Each of these cultural products represents a certain ideological approach to the Mexican Revolution. In order to explore differing approaches taken in cultural products of the film and television industries, this study will undertake an ideological comparative analysis between two media texts, the film *Enamorada* (1946) and the telenovela *Senda de Gloria* (1987).

There is a 31-year gap between the productions of these cultural products. Even so, they share the same subject, that of the Mexican Revolution. It is implicit that each also provides an ideological explication regarding the civil war movement. The regime that the revolutionary movement was positioned against is known as *Porfiriato* regime. With respect to the ideology of the *Porfiriato* administration at this time, during this era the predominant ideology was positivism. The positivist group, called *Los Científicos*, (the Scientists) had the most influence on the Díaz government. During the revolutionary era, in contrast, two differing ideologies fought for dominance. Francisco I. Madero and Ricardo Flores Magón proposed very different solutions to the problems of the dictatorship. Madero believed in democracy and in his efforts created the democratic Anti-Re-election Party. Flores Magón, in contrast, felt that anarchy was the nation's solution. He created the Mexican Liberal Party and introduced a new approach to proletarian's rights based on anarchist philosophy. These different ideological frameworks provide the basis for this investigation. The purpose of this research is to analyze the film *Enamorada* and the telenovela *Senda de Gloria* with respect to ideological similarities and differences in their narratives and point of view, particularly regarding how the ideology of the Mexican Revolutionary movement is portrayed in each media text.

Literature review

In 1910, the Mexican Revolution began. It was the first nation's civil war of the Twentieth Century. The dominant ideology of this era was represented by two main figures. The first was Francisco I. Madero,

who led the democracy party, *El Antirreeleccionista* (The Anti-Re-election Party.) He was convinced that Mexico had to bring about change through the polls. For Madero, the vote was the most important democratic weapon. The other figure was Ricardo Flores Magón, who led the *Partido Liberal Mexicano* (Mexican Liberal Party). He was disturbed by the struggles of the poor and influenced by anarchist philosophy. He believed that Mexico needed a revolution that would result in the emergence of a new political, economic, and social system.

Francisco I. Madero González (1873-1913) is known as “the apostle of democracy”. He proposed “organizing into political parties to represent the national will, and to ensure that citizens are respected during the next electoral dispute” (Madero, 1973:222). For Madero the real battle was for democracy, based on a belief in the power of and respect for the vote as a sign of national will. Madero’s ideological posture was in response to his beliefs that the worst problems of the country were militarism and absolutist power. For him militarism was the cause of the absolutist power and together they did not leave space for democracy. As Fernández Bravo points out, “militarism has always been freedom’s enemy and the principal obstacle of democratic functions” (Fernández, 1973:22). The apostle of democracy believed that any society ruled by a military government would eventually lead to absolutist power. He defined absolutism:

... as one man’s domination without any other law than his own will, without any limits besides those from his own conscience, his personal interests and some times the resistance he may find in the people he governs (Madero, 1973:179).

In other words, there was no law or political power superior to Porfirio Díaz’s. He was like a king or God who ruled the country without any limit other than his own wishes and conscience.

Everything that Díaz said was automatically understood as unwritten law. Everyone had to obey this unwritten law or be classified as a “problem person” and dealt with through a method described by Madero as “*pan o palo*” (bread or stick) (Madero, 1973:4). People who wished to oppose the Díaz government were offered choices. First, the dictator might tempt them into dropping their resistance by offering easy wealth. Second, if the person didn’t agree, Díaz would use more severe forms of persuasion. This method of inducement frequently in-

volved imprisonment or physical punishment. *Pan o palo* was a popular way to repress political resistance.

Madero classified the political situation under the government of President Díaz as militaristic and absolutist in power. Specific facts about political life, especially regarding presidential and other political campaigns, led him to the conclusion that there was not democracy in Mexico. He argued that first,

... there was not substantial opposition. [Second,] there was no existing variation in political parties. [Third,] the independent press was hardly surviving and was fairly passive. [Fourth,] the political leaders were always elected by unanimous vote and [Finally,] with this same unanimity the congress approved all government acts (Madero, 1973:181).

From Madero's point of view, there was no doubt that absolutist power was Mexico's reality, with no important ideological opposition and an absence of new political parties during local, state, and national political campaigns. The independent press was persecuted and thus passive; the custom was to cut the tongue of any independent journalist who said something negative about Porfirio Díaz. The dictator occasionally allowed the press to criticize his collaborators, but never himself or his commands. Unanimous votes in elections and by congress reflected the fact that no one wanted to oppose the Díaz government.

This political regime of militarism and absolutist power did bring apparent peace to the nation. It functioned to instill fear in people; they respected the government's rules and lived peacefully. This peace also supported economic development. Nevertheless, Madero suggests a new kind of peace "not supported by weapons like the Porfirista dictatorship, his peace was founded on liberty and justice" (Fernández, 1973:22). The Constitution, laws and codes were important to Madero. He believed the country should be ruled under laws that assumed every one was equal. He believed that the freedom to vote and elect governmental leaders would reflect the nation's will and prove Mexico's political liberty. Ironically, at this time Porfirio Díaz judged Madero as "inoffensive; smiling, he approved his ideas and encouraged [Madero] to preserve them" (Mancisidor, 1973:93). The dictator never imagined the consequences of his words and attitude or that a new ideology was already filtering in.

In 1908, Madero published the book *La Sucesión Presidencial en 1910*. This book had a tremendous national impact; in it Madero

describes the nation's general situation and suggests a solution to national problems, the creation of a democratic political party called *El Antirreeleccionista*. Madero's principal objective was to urge Mexicans "to organize a new political party that would be the salvation of institutions, liberty and perhaps of national integrity" (Madero, 1973:160). He believed that the *Antirreeleccionista* party would over time take over Díaz's absolutist government and lead over a Constitutional government for all citizens.

The main focus of the *Antirreeleccionista* party was to fight against "anti-re-election tendencies, with the motto of *Libertad de Sufragio; No Reelección* (voting freedom; not re-election)" (Mancisidor, 1973:57). Standing as a political party against the re-election process was Madero's main goal. The motto of the party summarized Madero's thinking, on one hand that the freedom to vote was the most important democratic exercise and on the other hand, that re-election could not be present in order to eradicate any possibility of returning to absolutism. For Madero, the fact that Porfirio Díaz was re-elected for so many terms made the consolidation and prolongation of his dictatorship viable.

In his book Madero established *El Antirreeleccionista's* main agenda. He highlighted five principal points. These were first, that "the people should go to the polls able to freely support their chief executive and their congressional representatives" (Madero, 1973:218). Second, that everyone should be able to "work for the decree of any necessary laws in order to avoid that one man be able to concentrate in his hands all of the [nation's] power keeping it for a long era" (Madero, 1973:218). Third, Madero proposed as principles of the party "voting freedom; not re-election" (Madero, 1973:218). Fourth, he proposed

... to establish an electoral law and study the possibility of modifying the Constitution by adopting the parliament style of government with a responsible minister and one president who should not govern, rather he will only preside as political figure over the nation's destiny (Madero, 1973:218).

Finally, he proposed that the Anti-Re-election Party:

... divide into two political parties that in all parts of the world have been represented as two opposite tendencies of opinion; the liberal and the conservative, the first party always willing to develop new ideas with feverish enthusiasm and the second with an impulse of moderation, making decisions with strong and deliberate steps. As a result, these two political parties would form a

constant equilibrium that would make slow but powerful progress (Madero, 1973:218).

In short, Madero was proposing a peaceful political change. He wanted to have the battles at the polls, with the people given the freedom to vote in favor of the politician they liked best. Madero intended to install an election law to ensure that the nation's power would not be concentrated again in one person. The apostle of democracy had the intention of a peaceful change of government style from republic to parliament. He contemplated that Porfirio Díaz might remain in power, but only as a political figure who could not intervene in the parliament's concerns. Madero highlighted that "when the *Antirreeleccionista* party possessed a strong organization, a transition with the government of General Díaz could be attempted. Madero wanted to keep President Díaz in power and have the *Antirreeleccionista* party slowly take over key political positions. This way the change would be gradual but strong and not affect the nation's economy. The apostle of democracy knew that a war would have enormous economic consequences and bring about international complications. Francisco Madero wanted to carry out his fight through democratic procedure. He wanted the battle to take place at the polls, respecting the Mexican citizens' will. He preferred that "General Díaz would continue as president, but the vice-president and members of congress and state governors would be from the *Antirreeleccionista* party" (Madero, 1973:222).

Another strategy that Madero suggested for fighting absolutist power was making the nation's social and organizational structures more powerful. He "claimed respect up to the same level for the governed and governing as an efficient medium to establish in the country the predominance of institutions over individuals" (Mancisidor, 1973:579). From this perspective, Madero demanded the same political rights for the common people, whose demands were usually not taken into account, and the commanding group. For Madero, yet another way to make sure that the nation would not revert to absolutist power was through making institutions more powerful than political leaders. He emphasized that people can change or die, but that institutions could stay constant through establishment of specific codes.

The *Antirreeleccionista* Party later proclaimed Madero as its presidential candidate. He began traveling with his wife across the country, campaigning. However, President Díaz wanted Madero to stop cam-

paigning; people working for the dictator harassed and caused trouble to people who supported Madero's candidacy in every town he visited. Díaz eventually had Madero jailed. Madero was later released and established temporary residency in San Antonio, Texas. After a few days, Madero returned to Mexico and traveled to San Luis Potosí City. On October 5, 1910, his *Plan de San Luis* (San Luis Plan) was released.

This plan that was written primarily by Madero, was a call to the people to take up weapons and bring down the Porfirista dictatorship, because through peaceful measures the people had not been able to recapture democratic life (Fernández, 1973:29).

After the democratic apostle had exhausted all potentiality for peaceful change, Madero proclaimed war against Díaz's government. On November 20, 1910, the Mexican revolutionary war officially began. This conflict took place only a century after Mexico's independence.

Francisco I. Madero represented one of the two political-ideological movements against General Porfirio Díaz's dictatorship; Ricardo Flores Magón and his *Partido Liberal Mexicano* (Mexican Liberal Party) led the other. Flores Magón (1873-1922) was influenced by rational positivist thinking in his studies at the Gabino Barreda Institute². During the *Porfiriato* era, positivism was still in fashion. The dominant political, social and economic environment at the time that Flores Magón was born, Ethel Duffy Turner explains, was:

... on the cusp of dictatorship. This was promoted when the clamor of the war against the Austrian Empire ended, then the Constitution [of 1857] and the Reform laws were the Mexican people's sole craving for a democratic life (Duffy, 1984:1).

Ricardo Flores Magón experienced drastic changes of government in his childhood, from the emperor style, represented by the Austrian empires of Maximiliano and Carlota, to the republic style, which was promoted by the 1857 Constitution and the Benito Juárez's Reform

² Gabino Barreda (1818-1881), was the first and most prominent positivist in Mexico. He was known for reorganiz[ing] Mexican education under President Juárez's government. An ardent follower of Comte, Barreda made positivism the basis of these educational reforms. Barreda also founded an education institution that named after himself; Flores Magón studied there during its heyday.

Laws. Flores Magón also experienced war as the way to bring about political and social change. These experiences influenced him to believe that the only way to take over the Díaz government was through a revolutionary war that would bring about the complete collapse of the dictatorship.

Flores Magón's ideology can be understood, as Jesús Muñoz Rosas asserts, as going through three main intellectual stages during his political career. These stages can be called *La progresista* (progressive), *La acción revolucionaria* (revolutionary action), and *El anarquismo* (anarchy). During Flores Magón's first, *La progresista* intellectual stage, he was

...filled to overflowing with traditional liberal ideas. Flores Magón defended the 1857 Constitution and the Reform Laws, which he supported as conditions for order and progress and the people's political education (Muñoz, 1965:1).

At this time, Flores Magón was enrolled in several law courses. He wanted to become a lawyer, but he never completed his bachelor's degree. Nevertheless, citizens' knowledge of their individual rights was a crucial issue for Flores Magón during this era.

For Magón, the lack of civilian individual consciousness in order to encourage the growth of awareness among Mexican citizens, he edited a newspaper called *Regeneración* (Regeneration) that had as its motto, *El Periódico de Combate* (The Fighting Newspaper). Flores Magón started his journalism career. According to Jerónimo Muñoz Rosas, Flores Magón's progressive stage continues from "Ricardo's initiation as a journalist in 1900 until 1906, when the Mexican Liberal Party's agenda were released" (Muñoz, 1965:1). The emergence of this new political party marked the start of his next intellectual stage.

In Ricardo Flores Magón's second stage, known as "*La acción revolucionaria*", (Muñoz, 1965:1), he participated in the creation of the Mexican Liberal Party. In 1901 in San Luis Potosí City, Camilo Arriaga, president of the liberal club, *Ponciano Arriaga*, convened the first liberal conference. From this conference the Mexican Liberal Party emerged. "This political party name was taken from Benito Juárez's party, the liberal" (Duffy, 1984:24). The main goals of the party were "those of the proletarian: economic well being and social emancipation" (Muñoz, 1965:59), in other words, fighting for the proletarian people and individual rights, for the farmer and for industrial labor rights.

This line of approach was more specifically expressed when the Mexican Liberal Party's main manifesto was made public.

On July 1st, 1906, at San Luis, Missouri, the Partido Liberal Mexicano's agenda was signed by Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magón, Antonio I. Villarreal, Juan y Manuel Sarabia, Librado Rivera and Rosalío Bustamante (Fernández, 1973:13).

The party platform proposed 11 goals. First was:

... the establishment of eight hours of work as work day and bringing up the living standards of the working class. [Second,] domestic work and [address] work regulations. [Third,] the guarantee of maximum work hours and of minimum salaries. [Fourth,] prohibition of employment of children under fourteen years old. [Fifth,] bosses' obligation to maintain hygienic conditions for their workers and to protect them from danger. [Sixth,] the establishment of reimbursement for work accidents. [Seventh,] enforcement of worker compensation only in cash (Mancisidor, 1973:55).

[Eighth] that government leaders rule honestly and justly... [Ninth,] free dom of the press;. [Ten] mandatory education for children provided by the state as well as good salaries for teachers. [Eleventh,] disapproval of the Catholic clergy for their anti-patriotic behavior (Fernández, 1973:14).

The Catholic Church was perceived as anti-patriotic because their members helped Porfirio Díaz stay in power. The clergy had involved themselves in politics rather than staying out. The *Partido Liberal Mexicano* felt strongly that the education of children was a state responsibility because religious education could incite intolerance or fanaticism in the young; on the other hand the clergy considered all people who were not "God's servants" to be enemies. The party also asserted that churches were businesses with the obligation of book-keeping and paying taxes. The Mexican Liberal Party also emphasized businesses' low salaries to workers. Party members declared that Mexico was in danger of developing a foreign debt without limit. Another Mexican Liberal Party suggestion was to replace prisons with neighborhood jails. They demanded to "protect the indigenous race that with education and dignity could make a powerful contribution with our nation's strength" (Fernández, 1973:14). And finally, the party's most transcendental contribution was to demand reparations by paid to the *ejido* farmers³ by the government.

Flores Magón was an active member of the Mexican Liberal Party. He mainly spoke "in the name of the *Partido Liberal Mexicano*, [and] concentrated his attention on the land problem as the first step to to tal workers' emancipation" (Muñoz, 1965:53). This line of thinking re-

calls Emiliano Zapata's beliefs. Zapata's fight, the struggle of farmers for their land, can be described as the most old of all. He was considered the leader of the most important revolutionary force of the South. His motto was "Land and Liberty;" such a phrase apparently was Flores Magón's inspiration. Flores Magón's followers always found a space for themselves in Zapata's military.

Finally, Ricardo Flores Magón third intellectual stage is known as *El anarquismo*. During this period, Flores Magón declared Mexico's necessity for radical political change.

He described the [Mexican upper class] world as a system created by capitalism, exhibited its limitations and grave mistakes, [and] declared the necessary procedures for its destruction and the establishment of a superior society, a society of free men and without private property, without the state and without religion (Muñoz, 1965:2).

Flores Magón thought that Mexico's economic system was capitalistic. He believed that capitalism should be replaced by a new kind of society that would offer to men complete freedom, a society without private property, government, or religion. According to an anarchist philosophy, these social institutions limited men's freedom. The anarchist ideal was that men could live in a superior society. This superior stage of society was described as total freedom. Flores Magón had come to believe that "if humankind were to sometime enjoy truth, fraternity, liberty, and social justice, it would be through anarchy" (Zertuche, 1955:63). He did not want to bring down the Díaz government that he saw as tyrannous, in order to replace it with another tyranny. He rather wanted to collapse the whole system. Flores Magón's radical thinking was a strong ideological difference with Madero that placed them at a distance from each other.

From Flores Magón's perspective, Madero was only an agitator, not a revolutionary, because he did not propose socially radical change. Madero wanted to continue with the same political system, but to make changes that would encourage capitalism. In contrast, Flores Magón's proposals emerged from an entirely new worldview. As Jeronimo Muñoz Rosas explained,

³ Ejidos; means a small land owner by a farmer who must work on it.

... the revolution would necessarily be initiated in one of two ways. [Either] the revolution could be conceived as an exclusive political movement that would guarantee for the rich class the joy of privilege, keeping the poor in the same conditions that they had always suffered. Or it could continue as a powerful movement that would transform into a true economic revolution (Zertuche, 1955:60).

With this in mind, the way that revolutionary ideology first emerged, as a political movement to guarantee rich people their social position, reflected Madero's point of view. The second way, a movement proposing powerful radical transformation, reflected Flores Magón's proposal for change.

Conflicts increasingly began to emerge between Madero and Flores Magón. This was not always the case. In 1904, Madero had made contact with Liberal Party members and Flores Magón's followers. He admired and was in favor of the liberal's causes, and donated money several times to bail out Flores Magón's newspaper, *Regeneración*. But in 1906, Madero started keeping his distance. The disagreement over ideology had begun. As Fernando Zertuche Muñoz points out, Madero was "disturbed and alarmed by [Flores Magón's] confrontation with Porfirio Díaz and fundamentally for his proposition of destroying the system" (Zertuche, 1955:50). In short, Francisco Madero became worried about Flores Magón radicalism. The idea of getting rid of the whole political economic and social system was difficult for him to conceive and alarmed him. Up to this point, Madero had been open to political change, as long as it affected the system and economic activities as little as possible.

In addition to the ideological conflict, the fact that Madero was from a wealthy background became a heated issue. In Flores Magón's eyes, the bourgeoisie class was the eternal enemy of the working class. This contributed to their ideological separation. Madero started his political campaign and raised support from his campaign across the country. And on November 20, 1910, Madero initiated the revolutionary movement. At this point, Flores Magón ordered his followers to not join Madero's military forces. Over time, he had come to consider "liberals to be the true instigators of General Díaz's fall" (González, 1960:438). The anarchist, at this time, was living outside Mexico. In the United States, he felt he would have the political freedom to keep publishing his newspaper. But Flores Magón did not find the political freedom in the United States that he was expecting. His association and activism

with several international anarchist groups caused him problems as well. After several publications, he was physically attacked and jailed. He remained in prison the rest of this life because he did not want to ask the United States government for a pardon, the American government's condition for his freedom.

Madero and Flores Magón's ideas later were crystallized and included in the 1917 Constitution, Mexico's most important post-revolutionary political document. This Constitution currently stills guides Mexican law. *Senda de Gloria* highlights the 1917 Constitution as a document that tells the Mexican people who they are as nation and as citizens. It is a description of Mexican self-identity and ideology.

Discussion

Discussion in this section will be structured in accordance with the content of the film *Enamorada* and the telenovela *Senda de Gloria*. Relevant categories have been created for the exploration of this content. These categories are primary purpose of the media text; Mexican folklore; theme or narrative's main topic of the media text; motivation and ideology behind the revolution; heroes and villains; and religion issues.

- The **primary purpose** of the film and television industries is entertainment. Entertainment, according to Barnouw and Kirkland, can be defined as "any narrative, performance or other experience that can be sold to and enjoyed by large and heterogeneous groups of people" (Barnouw and Kirkland, 1992:50). Cultural commodities produced for the purpose of entertainment are those geared toward a broad general audience. The movie *Enamorada* was produced during the Mexican Cinema period known as *La Época de Oro* or Golden Era (1936-1958). Its main purpose was commercial. This motion picture was produced on 1946, twelve years before the end of the Mexican cinema Golden Era period. This is a film about a revolutionary General named José Juan Reyes (Pedro Armendariz) who falls in love with a wealthy woman named Beatriz (María Félix). She is member of a family that supports the *Porfiriato*, precisely the regimen that the General was fighting against. On the contrary, the telenovela *Senda de Gloria* was created to fulfill two main purposes. On one hand, it was produced to educate its audience about Mexican

history. On the other hand, the melodrama was developed with a more ambitious objective. This is the combination of the commercial telenovela format with educational content.

- Folklore means “the traditional cultural forms [expressed for a particular society] and the discipline devoted to their study” (Bauman, 1992:29). According with Richard Bauman prospective, folklore is the traditional cultural representation of a certain society such as costume, music, dance, life style, clothing, social structure and so on that makes this particular nation different and unique from others. Folklore is also area of study and a research field. The **Mexican folklore** can be seen as playing a large part in both versions of revolutionary history. *Enamorada* presents the most well known image of Mexico worldwide. The story takes place in a village named Cholula and presents a semi feudal context. The *hacendados* (land-owners) are presented dressed mostly in European clothing and the *campesinos* (farmers) in white cotton clothing. The only group that wears the *charro* style of clothing are the revolutionaries. All women are portrayed as wearing the *rebozo* (shawl) of the era. The church is presented as the center for many reunions and the priest as the person who will protect the rich from the revolutionaries. Three well-defined types of music are prominent. These are the revolutionary *corrido* ballads, trios, and the revolutionary military war band.

In contrast, the story line of *Senda de Gloria* is set mainly in Mexico City. The majority of the characters wear military uniforms or suits; Emiliano Zapata and Pancho Villa are the only characters who wear *Charro* clothing. Upper-class women rarely wear *rebozos*; instead the hat is the mandatory accessory. Parisian fashion is presented as the trend in clothing, decoration, and so on, until Vasconcelos begins his campaign to reconstruct Mexico’s image with an emphasis on “the real Mexican roots,” the indigenous people. The telenovela’s musical soundtrack is an orchestral score, usually with European songs and rhythms and the Charleston music that was in fashion at this point in time; traditional village bands, a distinct kind from that presented in *Enamorada*.

Enamorada and *Senda de Gloria* both present the Mexican lifestyle and social roles similarly. Women and men are supposed to stay apart from each other at social gatherings, except at weddings.

Breakfast, lunch and dinner are important family gatherings. They both present a patriarchal society. The father rules the family and leads society. The wife and children are his followers. Both stories present men in charge of the economy and politics and women in charge of the household, the food and children.

- With respect to **theme or narrative's main topic of the media text**, the motion picture *Enamorada* is a love story, as well as a story of social class struggle. The love story is between Beatriz Peñafiel and General José Juan Reyes. Beatriz, who Father Sierra classified as "different" from the rest of Cholula's women, is a member of a wealthy family. She has a terrible temper, likes to be rich and is engaged to Mr. Robinson. Beatriz is not afraid in front of men. On the contrary, she likes to challenge them and come out the winner. José Juan Reyes is from a lower social class. He is the leader of the revolutionary group. Reyes has strong convictions about his responsibilities and commitment to his cause. He has come to Cholula searching for money, food and some rest. Reyes and Father Sierra had met back at the seminary; Reyes apparently dropped out while Sierra continued until he became a priest. General Reyes has never been in love before meeting Beatriz. He is crazy about her but she does not like him, for several reasons. First, because he has put her father under detention. And second, Beatriz considers him lower than her; she wants to marry "up" by marrying Mr. Robinson, instead of marrying "down" to the general. In the story there is no way for Reyes to rise socially and bring himself up to the level of Beatriz's family. This is impossible for the general because he is fighting against the upper class to strip its members of its hold on the political power. Reyes believes that the social elite consists of "unpatriotic" Mexicans because of their flight from the country when the revolution begins. Based on this belief, the first question that Reyes asks of the wealthy Carlos Peñafiel are his reasons for not abandoning the country. Thus, *Enamorada* is presenting the story of a love that was prohibited or impossible. In terms of ideology and social consciousness, Beatriz and José Juan are opposites. Beatriz becomes aware of revolutionary ideas, however, when she visits Father Sierra and he explains the meaning, according to José Juan, of the famous 1698 painting by Nicolás Rodríguez Juárez, "*La Adoración de los Reyes*." In this painting the three wealthy kings that for Reyes represent the Porfiriato upper class were kneeling down

in front of little baby who is representing—according to Reyes—the low class. Only after Beatriz understands the meaning of the revolution as the fight to make all the people equal, does she decide to marry down. The social class struggle for Beatriz has to do with how she will marry—up or down—and to whom—Mr. Robertson or General Reyes.

In the case of *Senda de Gloria*, the telenovela is also a love story as well as a story of social struggle. A new element appears, the criteria of homogenization of the story of the Mexican Revolution for viewers. The method in this case is the mixing of the commercial format of the telenovela with an educational format. As was previously mentioned, the telenovela has two main goals. These are to present Mexican history from 1917 to 1938, creating a national standardization of facts. By the time the telenovela was produced in 1987, it has been 77 years since the revolution began in 1910. Few people were living who had experienced this history first hand. This privileged position gives *Senda de Gloria* a freedom of interpretation as well as of representation of that historical information. In contrast, *Enamorada* was produced in 1946, when many people who participated in the armament movement were still alive.

The love story in *Senda de Gloria* is between Andrea Alvarez (Julieta Rosen), a member of a wealthy revolutionary family, and Manuel Fortuna (Eduardo Yáñez), who is from the lower class. Because of their social differences, they cannot marry; Andrea believes that her mother will never approve of the relationship. The social struggle of the telenovela is represented by Manuel's social class struggles and eventual social mobility. In other words, Andrea represents the mainstream of society while Manuel is the margin; the telenovela is presenting Manuel's journey of acculturation from the margins into the center of society. The element that enables this social mobility is education, brought about mainly by Manuel's will to read. After he makes this transformation he is awarded with Andrea's love and her parents approval of it. The educational element to viewers from this telenovela is a character whose I de n o m i n a t e "the teacher." This is the character of General Eduardo Alvarez (Ignacio López Tarso), Andrea's father. He represents the ideological framework that this telenovela is working from. Alvarez is the "good guy" of the telenovela. He is also the telenovela's narrator; through his eyes, viewers understand revolutionary history. The general has more screen

time, in fact, than the romantic couple. In the beginning it is hard to discern the male protagonist of the story. In short, *Senda de Gloria* has in its dramatic narrative two different kinds of heroes, the mythical hero, who get the girl as his trophy, and the political hero, who get his ideology across to the audience.

- The **motivation and ideology behind the revolution** is markedly distinct for each media text. In *Enamorada*, the motivation behind the revolution only serves as a social context for the dramatic narrative. The revolutionary movement provides the atmosphere of the film; the love story is the “real” subject of the movie. The film also highlights as important revolutionary leader José Juan Reyes. *Enamorada* is portraying how hard it was to be a leader during this period and that only people with a real commitment to the revolution were successful leaders. General Reyes is presented in a way that encourages viewers to draw correlations with actual revolutionary leaders Pancho Villa and Emiliano Zapata. He wears bullet belts crossing his chest as Villa and Zapata were known to do. Beatriz also calls Reyes a cattle thief several times; before joining the revolutionary forces, Pancho Villa was known to be a cattle thief. Villa even changed his name from Doroteo Arambula to Pancho Villa because of military police persecution. Reyes has characteristics of a poor man and makes clear that he is fighting for the equality of people of all social classes, which underscores that the film is basing the motivation for the revolution on the ideological beliefs of Ricardo Flores Magón and his Mexican Liberal Party. Emiliano Zapata in fact was the only revolutionary leader who gave protection as well as economic support to Flores Magón’s group. Zapata’s revolutionary principles are considered worldwide to be the true ideals of social revolution. In fact, as I mentioned in the literature review section, Zapata’s movement motto, “Land and Liberty,” are words from Flores Magón’s writings. In summary, the film *Enamorada* is portraying the ideology of Ricardo Flores Magón.

In contrast, the telenovela *Senda de Gloria* is reinforcing Francisco I. Madero’s ideology. General Eduardo Alvarez is Madero’s follower. He repeats several times during the series that Madero has expressed to the revolutionaries the right way to go, democracy. The other hero of the telenovela, Manuel Fortuna, enters the social mainstream when he comes to understand Mexican history and comprehend Madero’s

ideals. His political expertise is guided by democracy and thus Manuel Fortuna is Madero's ideal follower. Several times during the telenovela, he repeats that if the system has problems, these are the errors of individuals, not ideological errors. Fortuna argues that the people who make those errors are people who don't fully understand Madero's ideas.

- Who are the **heroes**? And who are the **villains**? of these two versions of revolutionary history. In the movie *Enamorada*, the heroes are General José Juan Reyes and his group of revolutionaries. The villains are the wealthy, because they represent the Porfiriato regime, meaning the exploitation and hunger of the poor people and the Catholic clergy who have forgotten that their mission is the same as that of the Sixteenth Century missionaries. In the telenovela *Senda de Gloria*, the heroes are General Eduardo Alvarez, his daughter Julieta Alvarez and Manuel Fortuna. They believe and support democracy and do not let the clergy manipulate their minds. The villains are on one hand, anarchy, and on the other, the Catholic clergy, because both doctrines manipulate the mind to abandon faith in the system, converting followers into problem people.
- Finally, the film and television versions take distinct approaches to **religious issues**. Religion played an important role in revolutionary history and ideology. Madero was not quite clear about the subject but Flores Magón considered religion dangerous. To Flores Magón, an anarchist, religion took the freedom to think away from citizens. *Enamorada* was produced 20 years after the *Cristeros* Rebellion. This conflict between the state and some Catholics began in 1926. In the film, the Catholic clergy are criticized for not helping the revolutionary cause. In fact, Reyes makes a comparison between his duty and Father Sierra's. He concludes that they are the same, only carried out through different methods. The general makes Father Sierra remember the goals of the Sixteenth Century missionaries; he realizes that the Church has walked away from those holy commitments and that it is time to return to them. The fact that Reyes attended the seminary before joining the revolutionary forces means that the revolutionary cannot maintain both religious interests and an interest in revolution, that one has to transcend the other. This is the reason why Reyes tells Father Sierra that the clergy has made good generals. Reyes does not mention any names but he is clearly re-

ferring to Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, José María Morelos, and many others who fought as leaders for Mexico's independence and were priests as well. In short, the film's message regarding religion is that the Church must revisit the commitments of the Sixteenth Century missionaries, and "stop making problem people" and fighting the political system.

In the case of *Senda de Gloria*, religious life is presented as a world divided by religious privileges and ranks. On one hand, there are "good priests," who are usually poor, in charge of a Church, and care about the spiritual life of their community. On the other hand, there are "bad priests," those of a higher rank and who never sacrifice of themselves for their religious community. Their only commitment is to the wealthy, to individuals with power, or in the case of *Senda de Gloria*, to themselves. For example, the Catholic clergy was against Article number 3 of the 1917 constitution, which specified that education in Mexico was under the charge of the state and not the church, as it had been in the past. The clergy also was against the teaching of sexual education in the schools, they classified it as "*porquerías*" (trash) and prohibit many parents sending their children to school. In fact, according to the melodrama, it's considered "anti-patriotic" to be a close follower of religion or to develop a fanatical attitude. The political system is afraid that the clergy can influence their members' minds.

Conclusion

Several conclusions can be made in response to the research question of this study, what picture of Mexican revolutionary ideology is portrayed in these media texts? It becomes clear from the discussion of the categories of analysis that the film *Enamorada*, in its portrayal of the revolution, is re-telling this history from an ideological approach in accordance with Ricardo Flores Magón's philosophy and the Mexican Liberal Party's ideals. This can be seen in its main character, General José Juan Reyes, who is poor and fighting for the social equality of all men. These also were the goals of Flores Magón and more precisely provided Emiliano Zapata's motivation with respect to the rebellion. In contrast, the telenovela *Senda de Gloria* portrays the revolution in accordance with Francisco I. Madero's and his Anti-Re-election Party's ideals. Its main character, General Alvarez, is presented as wealthy and educated, a citizen who loves his country, and not a fanatic follower of religion; as a matter of fact, he almost never goes to church.

This personal situation makes Alvarez a character whose revolutionary ideology is inspired by Madero's life.

mariaflores00@yahoo.com

Recepción: 30 de agosto del 2000

Aceptación: 20 de octubre del 2000

Bibliography

- Barnouw, Erik and Catherine E., Kirkland (1992), "Chapter 4 Entertainment" Richard Bauman editor of *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainment: A communications-centered handbook*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bauman, Richard (1992), "Chapter 3 Folklore" Richard Bauman editor of *Folklore, Cultural Performances, and Popular Entertainment: A communications-centered handbook*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Duffy Turner, Ethel (1984), *Ricardo Flores Magón y El Partido Liberal Mexicano*, México: Comisión Nacional Editorial del C.E.N.
- Fernández Bravo, Vicente (1973), *El Ideario de la Revolución Mexicana*, México: Costa-Amic.
- González Ramírez, Manuel (1960), "La Revolución Social en México", en *Las Ideas-la Violencia, tomo 1, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica*.
- Madero, Francisco I. (1973), *Pensamiento y Acción de Francisco I. Madero*, México: Patronato del Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana.
- Mancisidor, José (1973), *Historia de la Revolución Mexicana*, México: Costa-Amic.
- Muñoz Rosas, Jerónimo (1965) "La Ideología de Ricardo Flores Magón", en *Exposición y Estudio de sus Orígenes Teóricos*, México: Unpublished thesis.
- Zertuche Muñoz, Fernando (1995), *Ricardo Flores Magón: El Sueño Alternativo*, México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.