

# RECENT REGIONAL STUDIES OF THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION

*Barry Carr*

*La Trobe University (Australia)*

Historians have long complained that research on the regional and local impact of the Mexican Revolution has been eclipsed by macro-level analysis of national politics, including studies of formal institutions (the army, the Church, political parties) and biographies of "great men."<sup>1</sup> Very few of the global studies of the Revolution published in English have paid more than token attention to its regional complexity. It is ironic, for example, that until recently the most detailed, if idiosyncratic, treatment of regional politics in the 1920s was provided by Ernest Gruening's *Mexico and Its Heritage* (London: Stanley Paul & Co., 1928). Its devastatingly drawn picture of violence at the local level was richly documented from official archives opened to the author by the Calles government in an effort to discredit its enemies. More recently, Jean Meyer's study of the period 1910–40 has provided historians with an analysis that offers both a general characterization of the revolutionary process and a narrative that is informed throughout by a keen appreciation of the Revolution's regional and local variations. Another particular merit of this and other work by Meyer is its iconoclastic vigor and insistence on viewing the Revolution as an event that deepened Mexico's dependence upon international capitalism, providing revolutionary leaders with abundant opportunities for personal enrichment.<sup>2</sup>

Yet if there is any phenomenon in Mexican history that demands close study at the regional and local level it must surely be the epic Revolution and its immediate aftermath. The first decade of revolutionary struggles brought about a temporary interruption of the process of centralization and "nationalization" of Mexican society inaugurated during the *porfiriato*. The weakening of the central state, particularly evident during the period 1910–17, created a power vacuum that was filled by new forms of authority exercised by a multitude of local military commanders, *cabecillas*, and *caciques*. Research on revolutionary *caudillismo* at least has been obliged to wrestle with a number of questions posed by this temporary fragmentation of the authority of the central

state. A pivotal issue in the debate concerns the degree of continuity between the new forms of authority and those of the old Porfirian order. Other questions concern the means by which the "new men" recruited and maintained their followers and the manner in which expropriated resources were distributed, if at all, among different strata of the population. The pioneering research on *villismo* of Friedrich Katz and Raymond Buve's writings on Tlaxcala are perhaps the outstanding examples of recent research in this latter area.<sup>3</sup>

Not least among the benefits accruing from regional level studies is the disaggregating of general truths, as exemplified by Jean Meyer's study of the *Cristiada*.<sup>4</sup> Prior to its publication, resistance to *callista* anti-clericalism was epitomized by the bourgeois Catholics of the Liga Nacional Defensora de la Libertad Religiosa. Meyer convincingly demonstrated that a vast gulf separated the popular aspirations of the *cristero* peasantry from the more conservative and accessible world of the LNDLR.

As far as income and resource distribution are concerned, the few regional economic studies that have appeared would suggest that in spite of the apparently widespread dislocation of the Mexican economy associated with the Revolution of 1910–20, surprisingly little change occurred in the pattern of distribution of resources among classes and regions. There were, of course, exceptions, the best known being the case of Morelos between 1916 and 1920.<sup>5</sup> On the whole, however, it would seem that, if anything, regional and class disparities of income and wealth became more rather than less pronounced during this period. Indeed the "Mexican Miracle" of the 1950s and 1960s owes a great deal to this classic example of capitalist accumulation through uneven development.<sup>6</sup>

One of the central tenets of this emerging revisionist historiography of twentieth-century Mexico has been the belief that the Revolution provided participants with a space large enough to permit action on a variety of levels. On the one hand, individuals responded to political, ideological, and socioeconomic issues raised in the national and international arenas. On the other, the Revolution created abundant opportunities for the resolution of age-old conflicts within and among local communities. These included the settlement of familial and clan disputes and struggles between rival communities over the siting of local seats of government.<sup>7</sup>

On occasion, local-level studies allow us to view the preliminary working out of novel political policies and styles that later were to be implemented nationally. Much of the Bonapartist genius of the Sonoran presidential regimes of the 1920s, for example, can be glimpsed in embryo form in the programs of Calles and de la Huerta as constitutionalist

governors of Sonora.<sup>8</sup> In the same way, a study of the labor and agrarian policies of the Portes Gil governorship of Tamaulipas, and of the rudimentary corporatist character of his Partido Socialista Fronterizo, might throw light on the intellectual origins and development of the first of Mexico's national revolutionary parties, the PNR.

In the area of labor history, a veritable explosion of regional studies has appeared in recent years. Slowly they are displacing the institutionalist bias present until now in Mexican labor history and are adding to our knowledge of the social and economic formation of the working class in the areas of greatest mining and industrial importance, particularly Puebla, Veracruz, Tamaulipas, and Nuevo León. In September 1977, the Centro de Estudios Históricos del Movimiento Obrero Mexicano (CEHSMO) organized the first of what will be a series of regional labor history workshops. Fifteen of the papers presented at the meeting dealt specifically with nonmetropolitan themes.<sup>9</sup>

If the professional historian's interest in regional studies is relatively recent, the same cannot be said of the rich tradition of amateur (in the true sense of the word) historical scholarship that has developed in Mexico during this century. As Luis González has explained recently, the contemporary academic concern with *microhistoria* has its origins to a very real degree in the personal and affectionate relationship the investigator enjoys with his "terruño." The collection of more than one thousand local history titles appended to González' *Invitación a la Microhistoria*, indeed represents a treasure trove of data and interpretation as yet relatively unexplored by most professional historians.<sup>10</sup> Inevitably, however, a large part of "amateur" scholarship, although based on rich if poorly documented sources, does not go much beyond the confines of traditional *histoire événementielle*.<sup>11</sup>

Part of the attraction of local history research, as opposed to studies at the level of the region and state, has always been the opportunities it provides for the construction of community portraits in which economic, cultural, religious, and other levels of activity are integrated in a complex whole. Studies of the "ethnographic present" have long occupied an important place in the extensive body of sociological and anthropological literature on rural Mexico produced by North American scholars. Yet for the historian, the methodological limitations of the community study approach have created a number of problems.<sup>12</sup> Prime among these is the refusal to speculate about the past or to indulge in "conjectural history," a stance which is partially explained by the dominant role of structural-functionalist theory in anthropological investigation. The tendency to treat communities as discrete units on the margin of regional or national political and economic structures is another prob-

lem. As a consequence of this distaste for "historicism," relatively few village or community studies have made any effort to reconstruct the historical processes that have made the present what it is. Often the only acknowledgement of the relevance of historical process consists of a rapid and mechanical race through several centuries of complex change designed to whet the appetite for the real meat of the study, namely a synchronic account of the present-day structure of a given community. The result is often a tendency to explain behavioral traits (e.g., peasant conservatism) in purely cultural terms, graspable only through the operation of supra-historical constructs such as "amoral familism" and the "image of the limited good."<sup>13</sup>

Within the last decade, however, and partly due to the influence of scholars like Eric Wolf and Sidney Mintz, anthropological studies have become considerably more concerned with the historical dimension of change and with the interface between local and national spheres. Given the explosion of interest in the operations of middlemen and "cultural brokers," it is not surprising that one of the most stimulating local-level studies to have appeared in recent years examined the nature of agrarian struggle in a Tarascan community and the phenomenon of the leadership of peasant movements.<sup>14</sup> Paul Friedrich's account of the emergence of Primo Tapia as a community leader is masterly, as is his careful handling of the interlocking network of local, state, and national politics. In *Princes of the Earth*, another Indian community, this time in the state of Mexico, has found an author who goes beyond participant-observation to an elucidation of those features of national society that define the cultural identity of peasants and limit the scope of action of *campesino* communities. "The so-called problem of peasant villages," as Barbara Margolies concludes her study, "is not their static state perpetuated through non-disposable cognitive orientations, but their exclusion from the benefits of the wider society. . . ." <sup>15</sup>

The proliferation of regional studies of the Mexican Revolution is not only a response to the methodological limitations of national-level research; it also attests to a growing use of state and local archives. Outstanding recent examples of this trend are Hector Aguilar's study of revolutionary Sonora, Jean Meyer's exploration of the *cristero* movement, and Heather Fowler Salamini's research into the origins and development of *agrarismo* in Veracruz.<sup>16</sup> Research is still handicapped, however, by the fragmentary and inadequate information on the status and condition of many regional and local archives. The decentralization program being carried out by the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (INAH), which involves the establishment of a number of regional centers, is one of many signs that action on this front is being

taken in Mexico. At present, regional centers have been opened in Guadalajara, Hermosillo, Puebla, Oaxaca, and Guanajuato. At the same time, the reorganization of the Archivo General de la Nación (AGN), currently taking place under the direction of Alejandra Moreno Toscano, is providing historians with a wealth of new resources. Since the beginning of 1977, the AGN's *Boletín* has devoted considerable space to twentieth-century topics, and a long-term project commenced early in 1978 by the AGN to locate, renovate, and catalog municipal and state archives should transform our knowledge of Mexico's regional and local archival resources.<sup>17</sup>

United States scholars have also published a number of important guides to local and state archives in Mexico, and the journal *The Americas* has published descriptions of local archival resources in its "Inter-American Notes" section.<sup>18</sup> It is hoped that an updated edition of the immensely useful *Guide to Research in Mexican History* will provide yet more material on research opportunities outside of the Federal District.<sup>19</sup> Further evidence that the metropolitan stranglehold on historical research is being broken is provided by the appearance of a number of new regional journals in Veracruz, Jalisco, Yucatán, and Michoacán.<sup>20</sup> These developments in the field of regional and local history have been accompanied by the kinds of innovation in technical procedures becoming common among historians of Mexico. A growing use of oral history is one example: the work of INAH's Archivo de la Palabra (formerly, Programa de Historia Oral) on villismo is particularly significant in this field.<sup>21</sup>

The once widespread admiration expressed for the "Mexican model" of progress towards national integration, political stability, and other goals of capitalist modernization is dissipating. Accordingly, the recent historiography of the Mexican Revolution largely identifies itself as being in the "revisionist" camp.<sup>22</sup> Indeed we are rapidly reaching a point where it can be said "We are all revisionists now." Despite the absence of any clearly identifiable core theoretical stance in revisionist scholarship, there does seem to be a general consensus on the importance of isolating continuities as well as discontinuities in the transition from the porfiriato to the revolutionary and postrevolutionary eras. The Revolution of 1910–17 is here viewed as a temporary interruption in the process of political and economic centralization inaugurated by Díaz. More controversially, the impact of much revisionist scholarship has been to downplay the "popular" character of the first decade of the revolutionary period and to emphasize the hegemony exercised by bourgeois groupings over most of the revolutionary coalitions. As one critic of this changing mood of interpretation has put it, the tendency

has been to posit “a revolution initiated, controlled and consummated by bourgeois leadership.”<sup>23</sup>

One of the virtues of recent studies on the regional origins of the 1910 Revolution is that they throw light on these two issues and also on the social composition of the first generation revolutionary leadership. Not unsurprisingly, it is northern Mexico that has received most attention, as witness the studies on Sonora by Voss, Aguilar, and Hu-DeHart, and on Chihuahua by Meyer, Katz, and Beezley.<sup>24</sup> This northern bias of recent research has almost certainly been one of the key factors contributing to the shift in interpretation already mentioned. For while “the pattern of peasants subordinating their movements to a nonpeasant leadership” was visible in most of Mexico, except for Morelos, there was no area in which the pattern was clearer than in the northern states of Chihuahua and Sonora.<sup>25</sup> In the Sonoran case an exceptionally high percentage of the state’s revolutionary leadership emerged from the ranks of the *hacendado* community or from the class of prosperous capitalist farmers and ranchers that occupied such an important place in northern society.

The growth of the anti-Díaz opposition in Chihuahua is the central focus of Mark Wasserman’s study. In Chihuahua, as elsewhere in Mexico, the closed political system of the porfiriato began to alienate ever larger sections of the community. Virtually every major social group was affected by the growing economic and social inequalities and crises generated by the Porfirian policies—not only workers and peasants but small farmers, merchants, middle-sector intellectuals, and even leading members of the *hacendado* community. The owners of agricultural and industrial wealth were particularly affected by the increased susceptibility of the local economy to abrupt changes in the international economy. The northern Mexican states were especially sensitive to changes across the Río Grande. The serious downturn in the economy of the southwestern United States between 1907 and 1909 halted the flow of capital vital to the mining sector in the Mexican border states and severely depressed commercial activity in the region. Almost as serious a threat to the stability of the Porfirian edifice was the simultaneous repatriation of large numbers of Mexican workers as employment opportunities in mining and agriculture were collapsing in the American Southwest. Several of the uprisings organized by the PLM within Chihuahua appear to have drawn on this newly created pool of unemployed for recruits.

All groups seem to have been affected by the monopolistic control exercised over political office and the bureaucracy by small *camarillas* of political favorites. But the group that resented the monopolization of office most deeply was the growing middle sector, which discovered to

its cost that “the career open to talents” was not among the many slogans espoused by the Diaz machine. By 1910 the largest of the northern states, Chihuahua, had become a virtual fief of the Terrazas-Creel families. The monopoly they enjoyed over state political offices, the legislature, and the judiciary had its counterpart at the local level in the political bossism of the *jefes políticos*. Resentment at the arbitrary nature of local authorities was strongest in the western section of the state, the mountainous Guerrero District, an area populated by semiagricultural laborers and small landowners or *rancheros* who “highly valued their independence.”<sup>26</sup> It has been suggested recently that peripheral and *serrano* zones of this kind elsewhere in Mexico may have generated similar patterns of resistance to central government encroachment on traditional autonomies.<sup>27</sup>

The *maderista* promise of “free elections and no boss rule” transformed western Chihuahua into an important focus of revolutionary activity in 1910–11. The leaders of the rebellion in the District of Guerrero and in other areas were generally drawn, as Wasserman and Katz have shown, not from the ranks of the peasantry or day-laborers but from the rural elite and merchant class. The substantial increase in the number and prosperity of these two groups during the Porfirian *frenesi del desarrollo* is amply demonstrated in Wasserman’s use of census data and state *Anuarios*. The increasingly burdensome and arbitrary level of taxation levied by the Terrazas-Creel clan completed the alienation from the regime of substantial numbers of bourgeois merchants and artisans.

Of all the regional caudillos thrown up by the Mexican Revolution after 1917, it was Felipe Carrillo Puerto who caught the attention of the outside world most strongly.<sup>28</sup> His activities, more than those of any other figure, served to identify the Mexican revolutionary movement as socialist to the contemporary European and Latin American left. Gilbert Joseph’s research addresses itself both to the particularities of Yucatán’s overall revolutionary experience and to the issue of the state’s relationship to cacical authority in the peninsula. The concern with the key theme of caciquismo reflects a growing historical interest in the more informal mechanisms of authority and control that frequently operate in the shadow of formal institutions. In the case of Yucatán these formal institutions were exemplified by the network of socialist and resistance leagues established by Carrillo Puerto. The evidence marshalled in Joseph’s paper demonstrates effectively how the precocious development of an apparently sophisticated system of social and political mobilization in Yucatán during the early 1920s draws the observer’s eyes away from the less visible but more traditional structures of authority on which Carrillo Puerto drew in the construction of his “socialist” system.

In many areas of Mexico, the Revolution destroyed traditional methods of social control only to a limited degree. The old networks of control were often simply appropriated by the "new men" who emerged during the course of political struggle in the years following the overthrow of Díaz. To understand Carrillo Puerto as a leader, we need not invoke conventional psychologisms such as charismatic authority. Rather, his regime's strength resulted from the presence of a highly negotiable resource base, henequen, and on his skill in utilizing an existing network of local power-holders. Interestingly, Francisco Paoli and Enrique Montalvo, in an important recent work, have reached very different conclusions.<sup>29</sup> For them the activities of the Partido Socialista del Sureste constituted the emergence of a truly popular (as opposed to populist) system that might have served as the basis for the emergence of socialist relations of production in Yucatán. While the macro-sociological approach of Paoli and Montalvo's work draws attention to important theoretical issues relating to the limits of populism in Latin America, it appears somehow to have passed over those detailed layers of traditional experience that only painstaking historical analysis seems able to reveal.

To contemporaries as well as to many present-day observers, the system erected by Carrillo Puerto impressed by its apparent ability to reach out and touch every feature of Yucatecan economic, social, and political life. It had all the appearances of a truly parallel society sanctioned by the existence of a unique network of identification—symbols, uniform, language, and iconography. Yet it is the extreme fragility of this parallel system of social and political organization that emerges most clearly from Joseph's account. The splendid edifice created by Carrillo Puerto was obviously imposed from above and involved only a small degree of authentic mobilization of the rural masses. The hollowness of the Liga system explains the relative ease with which Carrillo Puerto was eliminated in 1923. Other "mass" organizations created during the 1920s, like the nationally articulated CROM and PNA, shared similar weaknesses.

The regional studies of Wasserman and Joseph are part of a relatively new phenomenon to which both Mexican and non-Mexican historians are making contributions. To a very real extent, the revival of regional and local history is linked to Mexican intellectuals' struggle to reformulate the history of their twentieth-century Revolution and to provide a coherent basis for action to democratize the country's sclerotic institutions. The act of rediscovering the past has meant not only alterations in the physical boundaries of historical space but also a growing radicalization of historical scholarship and in particular the refreshing recovery of a nondogmatic Marxism.



All of this should not suggest that the recent upsurge of interest in regional history is without its problems. The ability of regional and local analysis to provide global and multilayered accounts of the experiences of a particular area is clear enough. Yet, in spite of the growing influence of Marxist theory, there have been relatively few regional studies that have paid special attention to the economic level of human activity.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, while most people have a clear enough common-sense understanding of where the boundaries of their region lie, most regional studies have tended to neglect the issue of how one defines a region (by ecological, political, economic, or linguistic considerations?) and the question of whether any region, however small, can really be considered to be a homogeneous entity.<sup>31</sup>

In many areas of the world the revival of local history has been linked to the democratization of research and to the involvement in historical investigation of ordinary working men and women. This is hardly surprising when we consider that the theme of so many regional and local studies has been the struggle by "the people" to defend the vitality and integrity of their traditions from attacks by overmighty officials, landowners, and industrialists. As yet, regional and local history in Mexico is still the preserve of the "professional" scholar. Hopefully, the current struggles of sections of the working class, peasantry, and urban bourgeoisie in Mexico will make such studies a project in which the creativity and experiences of all sectors of society can be employed.

Finally, we must not let the excitement of "doing" regional history make us fail to see the forest for the trees. The number of regional studies already published or underway is staggering.<sup>32</sup> The discovery of the regional variety of modern Mexico's historical evolution should not be used to deny the validity of formulations about Mexico's development couched in global or even supra-national terms. The move away from the nation-state as the sole unit of analysis should encourage historians to pool their knowledge of interdependent regions to produce synoptic histories on a large scale. Why should we not, for example, look forward to a "Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean in the Age of Obregón"?<sup>33</sup> Above all else, what is needed most urgently now is a brave new synthesis of the history of the Revolution integrating both regional and national-level research within the overall perspective of the global expansion of capitalism.

## NOTES

1. We still lack, however, adequate biographies of a host of revolutionary figures including Obregón, Calles, de la Huerta, Carranza, Alvarado, Amaro, Morones, and many others.

2. Jean Meyer, *La Révolution Mexicaine* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1973).
3. Friedrich Katz, "Agrarian Changes in Northern Mexico in the Period of Villista Rule, 1913–1915," in James Wilkie, Michael Meyer, and Edna Monzón de Wilkie, eds., *Contemporary Mexico: Papers of the IV International Congress of Mexican History* (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center, 1976); Raymond Th. J. Buve, "Peasant Movements, Caudillos and Landreform [sic] during the Revolution (1910–1917)," *Boletín de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 18 (1975).
4. Jean Meyer, *La Cristiada* (México: Siglo XXI, 1973–74), 3 vols.
5. The classic study of Morelos by John Womack has been followed by a number of important recent works that deal with post-zapatista developments in the state. See Arturo Warman, *Y venimos a contradecir: los campesinos de Morelos y el Estado Nacional* (México: Ediciones de la Casa Chata, 1976); Laura Helguera R., Sinécio López M., and Ramón Ramírez M., *Los campesinos de la Tierra de Zapata, 1: Adaptación, cambio y rebelión* (México: CIS-INAH, 1974); Jorge Alonso, Alfonso Corcuera Gaza, and Roberto Melville, *Los campesinos de la Tierra de Zapata, 2: Subsistencia y explotación* (México: CIS-INAH, 1974).
6. The states of Sonora and Sinaloa constitute one of the key "leading edges" of development in Mexico. For one of the few studies of the agricultural development of this area that pays due attention to historical analysis, see Cynthia Hewitt de Alcántara, *La modernización de la agricultura en México, 1940–1970* (México: Siglo XXI, 1978).
7. For some Oaxacan examples see Ronald Waterbury, "Non-Revolutionary Peasants: Oaxaca Compared to Morelos in the Mexican Revolution," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 17:4 (1975) and Michael Kearney, *The Winds of Ixtepeji: World View and Society in a Zapotec Town* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972).
8. This emerges very clearly from the work of Héctor Aguilar Camín. See, for example, his article "Antes del reino. Plutarco Elías Calles y Adolfo de la Huerta: un ensayo de gobierno, 1915–1920," *Trimestre Político* 1:4 (1976). See also "Los jefes sonorenses en la Revolución Mexicana: tradiciones disponibles," in David A. Brading and Jean Meyer, eds., *Peasant and Caudillo in Modern Mexico* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming). On "governorships" in general see William H. Beezley, "Research Possibilities in the Mexican Revolution: The Governorships," *The Americas* 29:3 (Jan. 1973):308–13 and the same author's "Governor Carranza and the Revolution in Coahuila," *The Americas* 33:1 (July 1976):50–61.
9. The papers presented at the Jalapa meeting have been published. See *Memoria del Primer Coloquio Regional de Historia Obrera* (México: CEHSMO, 1977). An increasing number of Mexican university theses on labor questions incorporate primary sources. The state of Veracruz, not unsurprisingly, has produced a number of excellent recent dissertations. See especially, Bernardo García Díaz, "Un pueblo fabril del porfiriato: Santa Rosa, Veracruz" (Tesis de Maestría, Centro de Estudios Históricos de la Universidad Veracruzana, 1977). Although falling outside the revolutionary period proper, Rodney Anderson's work on the *orizabeño* and *poblano* working class is obligatory reading for those interested in the experience of these areas during the post-revolutionary era. Rodney Anderson, *Outcasts in Their Own Land: Mexican Industrial Workers, 1906–1911* (DeKalb: University of Northern Illinois Press, 1976).
10. Luis González y González, *Invitación a la microhistoria* (México: SepSetentas, 1973).
11. This is particularly true of a number of state histories including the important studies of Antonio Rivera and Francisco R. Almada. Antonio Rivera, *La Revolución en Sonora* (México: Imprenta Arana, 1969); Francisco Almada, *Historia de la Revolución en el Estado de Chihuahua* (México: Talleres Gráficos de la Nación, 1964).
12. For an excellent recent critique of a number of community studies, see William B. Taylor, "Revolution and Tradition in Rural Mexico," *Peasant Studies* 5:4 (1976).
13. Gerrit Huizer, *The Revolutionary Potential of Peasants* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1972), pp. 21–63.
14. Paul Friedrich, *Agrarian Revolt in a Mexican Village* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1970).

15. Barbara L. Margolies, *Princes of the Earth: Subcultural Diversity in a Mexican Municipality* (Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, 1975), p. 158.
16. Héctor Aguilar Camín, *La frontera nómada: Sonora y la Revolución Mexicana* (México: Siglo XXI, 1977); Heather Fowler Salamini, "Adalberto Tejeda and the Veracruz Peasant Movement," in Wilkie, Meyer, and Monzón de Wilkie, eds., *Contemporary Mexico*, and the same author's *Agrarian Radicalism in Veracruz, 1920–1938* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977).
17. See, for example, the last four issues of the *Boletín*, especially Sergio Ortega Noriega, "Archivos históricos regionales y locales—un proyecto de catálogo," tercera serie, tomo 1, no. 2 (jul.–sept. 1977) and Luis López Rivas, "Archivo General del Estado de Yucatán," tomo 1, no. 3 (oct.–dic. 1977). Among the twentieth-century topics covered by the new style *Boletín*, most space has been given to the Mexican working class. A whole issue (tomo 1, no. 5) has been devoted to a detailed breakdown of worker organizations in Mexico by state and region, accompanied by excellent maps.
18. David C. Bailey and William H. Beezley, *A Guide to the Historical Sources in Saltillo, Coahuila* (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975); David G. LaFrance, Fred Lobdell, and Maurice Leslie Sabbah, "Fuentes históricas para el estudio de Puebla en el siglo XX," *Historia Mexicana* 27:2 (oct.–dic. 1977):260–72. Among the many recent reports on archives that have appeared recently in *The Americas*, one might cite Cynthia Radding de Murrieta, "Archival Research in Sonora, Mexico," 22:4 (Apr. 1976) and E. Bruce White, "Archives of the Western Federation of Miners and International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelting Workers and the Latin American Historian" 32:2 (Oct. 1975):292–95.
19. Richard Greenleaf and Michael C. Meyer, eds., *Guide to Research in Mexican History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1976).
20. *Controversia*, published in Guadalajara; the Orizaba-based *Anuario: Centro de Estudios Históricos, Universidad Veracruzana*; Yucatán: *Historia y Economía. Revista de Análisis Socioeconómico Regional*; and *Anuario de la Escuela De Historia, Universidad Michoacana*. The Secretaría de Educación Pública during the Echeverría sexenio published a number of regional studies of interest to the historian of the Mexican Revolution. They include: Edith Boorstein Couturier, *La Hacienda de Hueyapán, 1550–1936* (México: SepSetentas, 1976); Alan M. Kirshner, *Tomás Garrido Canabal y el movimiento de las camisas rojas* (México: SepSetentas, 1976); Octavio García Mundo, *El movimiento inquilinario de Veracruz, 1922* (México: SepSetentas, 1976).
21. See the various *cuadernos de trabajo* published by the Programa de Historia Oral of INAH, especially *Estudio* 1 (1974), 7 (1975), and 8 (1975).
22. David Bailey, "Revisionism and the Present Historiography of the Mexican Revolution," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 58:1 (Feb. 1978): 62–79.
23. Alan Knight, "Peasant and Caudillo in Revolutionary Mexico, 1910–1917," in D. A. Brading and Jean Meyer, eds., *Peasant and Caudillo in Modern Mexico* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).
24. Stuart Voss, "Towns and Enterprises in Sonora and Sinaloa, 1876–1910" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1971); Evelyn Hu-Dehart, "Development and Rural Rebellion: Pacification of the Yaquis in the Late Porfiriato," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 54:1 (1974); Michael C. Meyer, *Mexican Rebel: Pascual Orozco and the Mexican Revolution, 1910–1915* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1976); William H. Beezley, *Insurgent Governor: Abraham González and the Mexican Revolution in Chihuahua* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973).
25. Friedrich Katz, "Peasants and the Mexican Revolution of 1910," in Joseph Spielburg and Scott Whiteford, eds., *Forging Nations: A Comparative View of Rural Ferment and Revolt* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1976), p. 67.
26. Northwestern Chihuahua is currently the focus of a research project coordinated by the Centro de Estudios Superiores del INAH (CIS-INAH). Richard Estrada is studying the *villista* movement in the area and Horacio Espinosa the development of the *escobarista* rebellion. See *Noticias del CIS-INAH*, 1, no. 5 (sep.–oct. 1978).

27. Knight, "Peasant and Caudillo."
28. Recent published materials on Carrillo Puerto include transcripts of interviews with his relatives recorded by members of CEHSMO. See *Historia Obrera* 2:5 (1975):15–16.
29. Francisco Paoli and Enrique Montalvo, *El socialismo olvidado de Yucatán* (México: Siglo XXI, 1977).
30. For a stimulating critique of economic analyses of the Mexican Revolution, see John Womack, Jr., "La economía en la Revolución (1910–1920): historiografía y análisis," *Nexos* 1:11 (nov. 1978):3–8.
31. On this and other questions relating to regional history, see Lydia Espinoza, "Historia regional: el rincón de la fatalidad," *Nexos* 1:7 (julio 1978):21. The magazine *Nexos*, edited by Enrique Florescano and Héctor Aguilar Camín, should be obligatory reading for anyone who wishes to follow current developments in Mexican historical scholarship.
32. Some of the best interdisciplinary research on regional aspects of Mexican history is taking place under the umbrella of the Centro de Estudios Superiores del INAH. CIS-INAH's regular news bulletin, *Noticias del CIS-INAH*, provides a summary of work in progress with comment on methodological issues arising from research.
33. Cuba was, after all, the stepping-off point for the million Spaniards who "whitened" the Caribbean in the twenty years before the sugar crash of 1921, and Veracruz was a major point of entry to some of these Spaniards as well as to Cubans and other nationals, many of whom played an important role in the development of Mexico's agrarian and labor movements. North American, Spanish, and Portuguese sailors and oil workers influenced developments in the Tampico petroleum zone and two men who had worked for many years in the Tampa tobacco industry occupy an important place in the early history of the Mexican Communist party. Yucatán has always looked outwards towards the Gulf and the Atlantic since the nineteenth century and its economic and political links with Cuba have been especially strong since before the time of the Caste War. Last, but not least, wave after wave of revolutionary exiles and conspirators settled on the U.S.-Mexican border, in the American Southwest as well as in New Orleans and Havana. The rather cheeky title for this project emerged from a recent conversation between the author and John Womack, Jr.