

4-1-1969

Perspectives on Mexican Revolutionary Historiography

Michael C. Meyer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Meyer, Michael C.. "Perspectives on Mexican Revolutionary Historiography." *New Mexico Historical Review* 44, 2 (). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol44/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in New Mexico Historical Review by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact amywinter@unm.edu, lsloane@salud.unm.edu, sarahrk@unm.edu.

PERSPECTIVES ON MEXICAN
REVOLUTIONARY HISTORIOGRAPHY

MICHAEL C. MEYER

IT IS INDEED ironic that Mexico, a country with an historical tradition dating from the moment of the initial European contact and a tradition nurtured through and enriched by four and a half centuries of concerted scholarship, dedication, and considerable talent, should not yet have come to grips with its own historiographical reality. Mexico has not produced historiographical studies at all comparable to those of Guillermo Feliú Cruz in Chile,¹ Rómulo D. Carbia in Argentina,² José Manuel Pérez Cabrera in Cuba,³ or José Honório Rodrigues in Brazil.⁴ Mexican efforts in this field have been sparse and the large majority of those works purporting to be historiographical in essence constitute little more than annotated bibliographies of an extended nature on the one hand, or philosophies of history on the other. Those studies which properly can be considered historiographical are all limited by scope of coverage, structural framework, and intent of author.⁵ Most often they treat the scholarly output of a single individual and fail even to place him within the intellectual currents of his own day.⁶

Serious historiographical scholarship requires the perspective of years—years of archival research, relentless reading and contemplation, a firm grasp of the methodological considerations with which historians are forced to wrestle, and certainly the faculty, more acquired than innate, for honest and perceptive criticism. Mexico has produced historians with all of these talents but unfortunately they have not directed themselves to the historiographical task. Almost by default then, it falls to that interested legion without all of the requisites to mold its own perspective and hopefully by doing

so to elicit some retort—be it even enlightened indignation—from those who have abdicated responsibility. Nowhere in the four hundred fifty years since the arrival of the Spaniards is the need more graphic than in the period of the Mexican Revolution.

During the past fifty years, within the general field of Mexican history, an inordinate proportion of the historical writing has centered on the Revolution. For some, even after years of study and research, the Mexican Revolution continues to hold a certain charisma—a unique flavor which helps carry one through the drudgery that archival research can sometimes be. Certainly Pancho Villa, Pascual Orozco, and Emiliano Zapata must rank high on anyone's list of most unforgettable characters. To the more pragmatic, the Revolution was, after all, the first serious social upheaval in twentieth century Latin American history, and one of the great social revolutions in world history. The *Decena Trágica*, as it turned out, were also *Ten Days that Shook the World*. But what of the historiographical results of this protracted interest in a dynamic and significant historical subject? Unfortunately, until the last fifteen or twenty years, the overwhelming majority of Mexicanists, both in the United States and in Mexico, have not given the subject the type of attention which it merits.

In purely quantitative terms, the historical literature produced during the first three decades of the Revolution is rich. To state it another way, it is almost frightening in terms of sheer bulk. The problem is that by necessity one must wade through the voluminous secondary literature and begin the almost endless job of sifting. In the last analysis, however, it is the quality rather than the quantity that is of primary concern. As one begins to examine the nature of the literature produced during the first thirty or thirty-five years of the Revolution, it quickly becomes obvious that most of it simply is not well grounded in historical fact. An alarming percentage was distorted by blatant partisanship. Most of the practitioners were amateurs, even dilettantes, not professionals.

The positivist tradition which permeated historical scholarship during the *porfiriato* was discredited along with the social philosophy embodied in Mexican *cientificismo*. But unfortunately as the

positivists retired from the field no serious group rose up to take their place. Anti-positivism in itself, even with its vigorous attacks on materialist explanations, was insufficient to rally any school of historical thought. While the negative label could bind a group together in terms of what it was against, it offered nothing with respect to what it was for. The Mexican philosopher was quickly able to accept or reject something new—the pragmatism and subsequently the Christian dualism of Antonio Caso. The artist could embrace or reject the new *indigenista* muralist movement. But the historian had only something old to discard. Grasping for straws he finally opted for the very antithesis of any system of rational thought—exaggerated *personalismo*—that type of blind commitment not to ideology, not to program, but simply to the image which the individual caudillo is able to project. The various *ismos* continue even today to be very important to that generation of Mexicans who lived through and participated in the early Revolution. The historical literature produced by that generation is strongly colored by Villismo, or Zapatismo, or Carrancismo, or Obregonismo.

Something else of substantive import occurred during the period 1910 to 1940 or 1945. As the 1910 uprising gradually began to mushroom into a social upheaval, and as it began to yield its first positive fruit, the Revolution—this rather nebulous phenomenon—began to be viewed as the very essence of the Mexican state. Nationalism and *mexicanidad* became inexorably intertwined with the revolutionary ideal. To be Mexican, in the full meaning of the word, was tantamount to being a revolutionary. As a logical corollary, a counter-revolutionary, or someone judged to be a counter-revolutionary, was not viewed simply as a political opponent but rather as something less than a true Mexican.

History became one of the many vehicles for the apotheosis of the Revolution. It was conceived as a pragmatic device for keeping the Revolution alive and exalting its successes. Biographers of those men who had in some way opposed the quickly accepted apostles of the Revolution invariably made use of shamelessly long lists of pejoratives to depict their various apostates. The heroes, on

the other hand, had to be defended, their indiscretions notwithstanding. Historical narratives artfully concealed documentation or testimony which seemed to refute favorite hypotheses and preconceived prejudices. Time-honored methods of authentication either were overlooked or purposely ignored. The crimes of the Revolution were dismissed or excused on grounds of political necessity while those of the opposition were painted as barbarities of the worst kind.

Must one then concede a vast totalitarian conspiracy undermining the girders of historical scholarship? Formal censorship was not a significant factor. The Mexican Revolutionary historian, when confronted with a seemingly irreconcilable dichotomy, decided that he would rather be loved than candid. Once accepting that the Revolution embodied all virtue it was necessary to deprecate the enemies of the movement in the most scathing terms. The bulk of the historical literature was designed simply to serve the interests of the movement rather than those of historical scholarship itself. The result of this very pervasive frame of reference was finally the development of a school—a pro-revolutionary school.

The *personalista* tradition and the pro-revolutionary predilection were not at all incompatible. To the contrary they complemented one another perfectly. The pro-revolutionary umbrella, as the official party itself, was made large enough to shelter some differences. Some historians such as Rafael F. Muñoz,⁷ Elías L. Torres,⁸ and Ramón Puente⁹ became adherents of Pancho Villa; others such as Gildardo Magaña,¹⁰ and Baltasar Dromundo,¹¹ of Emiliano Zapata. Some opted for a Carrancista interpretation—Francisco Urquiza,¹² Félix Palavicini,¹³ and Alfonso Taracena¹⁴—while still others preferred an Obregonista interpretation—Miguel Alessio Robles¹⁵ and Juan de Dios Bojórquez.¹⁶ The differences, although real, were severely circumscribed by a fundamental commitment to the Revolution. The practitioners merely differed on which of the protagonists most closely approximated the ultimate ideal—revolutionary orthodoxy.

It would be foolhardy indeed to expect that the Mexican historian of the period 1910 to 1945 could have divorced himself en-

tirely from the partiality wrought by his social and political environment. Even granting that historians are likely to reflect the prejudices of their age, one cannot help but be outraged by the extent to which subjectivism pervaded the historical output.

But one should stop short of protesting too much lest he imply that all of the literature produced during the first three and a half decades of the Revolution is of no value. This is far from the case. Critically used, even the most questionable works of the early revolutionary period often provide guides to the chronology of events and at times are valuable for their insights into motivation, historical settings, and personal responses to historical stimuli. The diaries and memoirs, for example those of Manuel Calero,¹⁷ Toribio Esquivel Obregón,¹⁸ José Fernández Rojas,¹⁹ Alvaro Obregón,²⁰ Ramón Prida,²¹ Francisco Vásquez Gómez,²² Querido Moheno,²³ and Alberto Pani,²⁴ are extremely important; but these are less history than part of the raw material from which history is made.

At the same time there are exceptions even to the general tenor of scholarship. Serious scholarly contributions were made in this period by Roberto Ramos²⁵ in the field of bibliography, by Ricardo García Granados²⁶ in the field of political history, and by Manuel González Ramírez²⁷ in the field of diplomatic history. United States efforts in this period are best represented, but not characteristically represented, by the works of Frank Tannenbaum²⁸ and Eyler Simpson.²⁹ There are other exceptions, but the point to be borne in mind is that they are exceptions. One simply cannot take too much pride in the bulk of the historical literature produced between 1910 and 1940 or 1945.

Beginning in the post World War II period certain basic changes began to take place in Mexican revolutionary scholarship, both in Mexico and the United States, as previously accepted methods and unquestioned assumptions were subjected to rigorous analysis for the first time. Within Mexico one of the first major break-throughs occurred in 1940 with the foundation of El Colegio de México, which at that time was under the presidency of Alfonso Reyes. Five years later the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México established its Instituto de Historia, and these two in-

stitutions contributed immensely to the professionalization of historians interested in the Revolutionary period.

Also in the 1940's, new historical organizations roughly analogous to the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians came into existence.³⁰ The most important of these, but by no means the only one, was the Junta de Investigaciones Históricas. By the 1950's several important new journals with a definite professional orientation and sufficient financial backing to maintain uninterrupted publication had been founded.³¹ Two of the best are creatures of El Colegio de México: *Historia Mexicana*, which devotes a substantial percentage of its pages in each issue to the revolutionary period, and *Foro Internacional* which focuses on diplomatic history and international relations.

The Mexican government has played an important role in raising professional standards, for it has provided funds to pull together and purchase major documentary collections and make them available to investigators. In the past ten years at least three major revolutionary collections have been acquired: The Espinosa de los Monteros Archive, which focuses on the Reyista movement, is now housed in the historical annex to Chapultepec Castle; the Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público acquired the 66,000-item Archivo Madero, and the National University managed to purchase the Zapata papers.

The results of the professionalization in the post-war period have not yet all come in and there are those in Mexico who fail to acknowledge that the changes which have occurred are changes for the better. Old-line revolutionaries such as Alfonso Taracena, for example, have flailed out at the work being done at El Colegio de México. Pulling out his Yankee-phobic crutch, Taracena insists that the best interests of Clio cannot be served by any institution which deigns to accept financial assistance from the Rockefeller Foundation.³² In spite of invectives such as this, some of the post-war production is encouraging.

In general, evaluations of the Revolution have become more guarded. Studies have begun to depart from the over-simplified pro-revolutionary patterns and have begun to show the shortcom-

ings as well as the successes of the movement. They reflect a new consciousness which is not totally permeated by the type of Mexican nationalism which prostituted so much of the earlier work. More specifically they reflect a new consciousness which is not overpowered by the concept of the Revolution.³³

In the field of biography Mexicanists for the first time began to take an active interest in the methodological considerations prerequisite to serious scholarship: the proper relationship of the individual to the historical process; personal leadership vs. environmental considerations; and the nature of the decision-making process within a revolutionary setting. The emergent works demonstrated clearly that the paladins of the first twenty years of the conflict fell conspicuously short of perfect and the heretics were not always malicious and depraved.

The 1950's were the important years of transition. As an example one can point to three biographies of Francisco I. Madero—two written in the United States by Stanley R. Ross³⁴ and Charles C. Cumberland,³⁵ and one written in Mexico by José C. Valadés.³⁶ Unlike the hundreds of books, pamphlets and articles which had been written about Madero previously, all three of these studies were based upon serious archival research. While none of the three departed drastically from the pro-revolutionary frame of reference, it is accurate to label them sympathetic biographies, certainly not eulogistic or panegyric. Because of the nature of the research and the development of the argumentation, the burden of proof rests heavily with any who would dissent from the conclusions presented.

Another important trend initiated in the 1950's was the beginning of the inter-disciplinary approach. Many Mexican historians began to recognize the desirability, indeed the necessity of enlarging their own frame of reference in order to incorporate the findings, and, when applicable, even the methodology of sister disciplines in the humanities and the social or behavioral sciences. In colonial Mexican history the ethno-historian really came into his own as a part of this trend. The inter-disciplinary approach is best represented in studies of the revolutionary period by the efforts of

Howard F. Cline,³⁷ Frank Brandenburg,³⁸ and most recently by James Wilkie.³⁹ Mexicanists have not yet reached the extreme of Eric Erikson or Bullitt and Freud but there is some modest experimentation with psychoanalysis and history.

Within Mexico the new professionally oriented school is engaging in some very meaningful work. First of all the roots of the Revolution—namely the Díaz period—are being examined with a degree of maturity and sophistication completely unparalleled in the past. The result is a detailed, multi-volume cooperative work on the Porfiriato edited by Daniel Cosío Villegas.⁴⁰ These volumes must constitute the starting point for anyone contemplating research on the Díaz era. Exhaustive bibliographical work is also currently being produced, especially by a group of Mexican and United States scholars at El Colegio. Three bibliographical volumes have appeared thus far on books and pamphlets devoted to the Revolution,⁴¹ two on periodical literature,⁴² one on the holdings of the Archivo de Relaciones Exteriores de México,⁴³ and one is being prepared currently on the holdings of the Archivo Histórico de la Defensa Nacional.⁴⁴

One of the most heartening trends in the last two decades is the cultivation of regional histories. Because the fight against the exaggerated centralism of the Porfirist state ushered in a period of extreme regionalism and sectionalism, the Revolution, to be fathomed, must be viewed against a background of disparate regional interests, pursuing different ends and utilizing different means. State histories and studies of state and regional leaders are still in their infancy. Hopefully those works which have appeared mark only the beginning.⁴⁵ The regional histories are complemented nicely by a growing emphasis on revolutionary institutions and by topical studies moving across the revolutionary period. Thus the mining industry, the revolutionary army, the social security system, and the role of organized labor have been researched with considerable care.⁴⁶

Finally, in the last five or six years, new documentary publications are rapidly becoming available. The most notable group engaged in this field, but by no means the only one, is the Comisión

de Investigaciones Históricas de la Revolución Mexicana which was founded by Isidro Fabela and directed by him until his death several years ago. The Comisión has already published thirteen volumes of documents on the early revolutionary period (four on the Carranza era, five on the Madero period, one on the Flores Magón brothers, one on other precursors, and two on the Pershing punitive expedition) and is projecting a total of twenty-three. When completed, this project might well be the most important of its kind ever produced in Mexico.⁴⁷

Just as it was necessary to qualify the interpretations of the first thirty-five years of the Revolution by indicating that some work of lasting value was produced, the same must be done with the post-war period. Professionalization has not yet penetrated very deep. The amount of work coming off the presses is still tremendous and library shelves continue to be filled with works of very poor quality. The major difference, however, is that the percentage of serious work has increased markedly in the past twenty years.

The changes in the historical literature are but one segment of a very profound mutation in Mexico's entire scholarly, literary, and artistic output. Modern Mexican art, for example, has closed the door on the great muralist movement of a generation ago. The Mexican literary community has turned its back on the novel of the Revolution. Musical productions are departing drastically from the stereotype Ballet Folklórico. The Ballet Folklórico today is primarily for foreign consumption, for Expo 67, Hemisfair 68, or the cultural Olympics, not for the Mexicans.

All of these changes in Mexico's scholarly, literary, and artistic endeavors have at least one important ingredient in common. They indicate a demise of traditional Mexican revolutionary nationalism in the search for the more universal. Perhaps the most important lesson to be gleaned from the new approach is that Mexico obviously has begun to mature. It has begun to outgrow what Samuel Ramos referred to as the national inferiority complex. Mexico is beginning to show that it can continue to progress without using the Revolution as a crutch for every step.

In short, the historians have made the beginning of a contribu-

tion. They have come a long way in the past twenty years, but plenty of work remains to be done. My plea is not for a return to the positivist tradition. In retrospect it is obvious that complete scientific detachment and restraint from value judgment proved as illusory for the *científicos* as for anyone else. I don't even ask for a commitment on the complex issue of interpretive or narrative emphasis. I only implore the Mexican revolutionary historian, either north or south of the dividing line, to at least begin his endeavors by taking full advantage of the abundant and available archival material and allow the narratives or judgments to flow honestly from there.

NOTES

1. *Historiografía colonial de Chile* (Santiago: Fondo Histórico y Bibliográfico José Toribio Medina, 1958); *Medina y la historiografía americana: Un ensayo sobre la aplicación del método* (Santiago: Imprenta Universitaria, 1933); *Las Obras de Vicuña Mackenna* (Santiago: Prensas de la Universidad de Chile, 1932); *Barros Arana, historiador* (2 vols., Santiago: Ediciones de las Anales de la Universidad de Chile, 1958).

2. *Historia crítica de la historiografía argentina desde sus orígenes en el Siglo XVI* (Buenos Aires: Imprenta López, 1940); *Historia de la historiografía argentina* (La Plata: Universidad Nacional, La Plata, 1925).

3. *Fundamentos de una historia de la historiografía cubana* (Havana: Academia de la Historia de Cuba, 1959); *Historiografía de Cuba* (Mexico: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1962).

4. *História e historiadores do Brasil* (Sao Paulo: Fulgor, 1965); *Historiografía del Brasil* (2 vols., Mexico: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1957-1963); *Vida e história* (Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1966); *Historiografía e bibliografía do domínio holandes no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro: Departamento de Imprensa Nacional, 1949).

5. Among the better of these are Daniel Cosío Villegas, *Nueva historiografía política del México moderno* (Mexico: Editorial del Colegio Nacional, 1965); Robert A. Potash, "The Historiography of Mexico Since

1921," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. 40 (1960), pp. 383-424; Stanley R. Ross, "Aportación norteamericana a la historiografía de la Revolución Mexicana," *Historia Mexicana*, vol. 10 (1960), pp. 282-308; Roberto Esquenazi-Mayo, "Historiografía de la guerra entre México y los EE. UU.," *Duquesne Hispanic Review*, vol. 2 (1962), pp. 34-77; Paul V. Murray, "La historiografía mexicana sobre la guerra de 1847," *Revista de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 21 (1948), pp. 173-89; M. S. Al'perovich, "Istoriia Otnoshenii Mezhdu Meksikoi i SSha v Poslevoennoi Meksikanskoi Istoriografii," *Voprosy Istorii*, vol. 3 (1958), pp. 171-83; and J. Gregory Oswald, "La Revolución Mexicana en la historiografía soviética," *Historia Mexicana*, vol. 10 (1960), pp. 340-57. On the other hand Mexican historiography is rich in bibliographical works and other types of guides and aids to historical study. For a comprehensive listing of these works see David F. Trask, Michael C. Meyer and Roger R. Trask, *A Bibliography of United States-Latin American Relations Since 1810: A Selected List of Eleven Thousand Published References* (Lincoln, Neb., 1968), pp. 30-34, 49-50.

6. A recent listing of Mexican historiographical studies cites eighteen works published between 1964 and 1966. All eighteen are devoted to study of a single scholar or a single work. See *Bibliografía histórica mexicana* (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 1967), vol. 1, pp. 28-30.

7. *Vamos con Pancho Villa* (Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, S.A., 1935).

8. *20 vibrantes episodios de la vida de Villa* (Mexico: Editorial Sayrolles, S.A., 1934).

9. *Villa en pie* (Mexico: Editorial México Nuevo, 1937).

10. *Emiliano Zapata y el agrarismo en México* (3 vols., Mexico: Edición de la Secretaría de Prensa y Propaganda del Partido Nacional Revolucionario, 1934-1936).

11. *Emiliano Zapata* (Mexico: Imprenta Mundial, 1934).

12. *Carranza: El hombre, el político, el caudillo, el patriota* (Pachuca: Talleres Linotip. del Gobierno, 1935); *Don Venustiano Carranza* (Mexico: Editorial Cultura, 1939).

13. *Historia de la Constitución de 1917* (2 vols., Mexico: 1938); *El primer jefe* (Mexico: Imprenta "La Helvetia," 1916).

14. *En el vértigo de la Revolución Mexicana* (Mexico: Editorial Bolívar, 1930).

15. *Obregón como militar* (Mexico: Editorial Cultura, 1935).

16. *Obregón: Apuntes biográficos* (Mexico: Editorial Patria Nueva, 1929); *Alvaro Obregón: Síntesis de su vida* (Mexico: Talleres Tip. de "El Nacional," 1931).

17. *Un decenio de política mexicana* (New York: Middleditch Co., 1920).

18. *Democracia y personalismo: Relatos y comentarios sobre la política actual* (Mexico: Imprenta de A. Carranza e Hijos, 1911).
19. *De Porfirio Díaz a Victoriano Huerta, 1910-1913* (Guadalajara: Tip. de la Escuela de Artes y Oficios del Estado, 1913).
20. *Ocho mil kilómetros en campaña* (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1960).
21. *De la dictadura a la anarquía* (El Paso, Texas: Imp. de "El Paso del Norte," 1914).
22. *Memorias políticas (1909-1913)* (Mexico: Imprenta Mundial, 1933).
23. *Mi actuación política después de la Decena Trágica* (Mexico: Ediciones Botas, 1939).
24. *Mi contribución al nuevo régimen, 1910-1933* (Mexico: Editorial Cultura, 1936).
25. *Bibliografía de la Revolución Mexicana* (3 vols., Mexico: Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1959-1960).
26. *Por qué y cómo cayó Porfirio Díaz* (Mexico: Andrés Botas e Hijos, Sucr., 1928); *Historia de México desde la restauración de la república en 1867 hasta la caída de Porfirio Díaz* (Mexico: Andrés Botas e Hijos, Sucr., 1928).
27. *Los llamados Tratados de Bucareli: México y los Estados Unidos en las Convenciones Internacionales de 1923* (Mexico: Editorial Fábula, 1939); *El Petróleo mexicano: La expropiación petrolera ante el derecho internacional* (Mexico: Editorial América, 1941).
28. *The Mexican Agrarian Revolution* (Washington, 1929); *Peace by Revolution* (New York, 1933).
29. *The Ejido: Mexico's Way Out* (Chapel Hill, 1937).
30. Historical associations, such as the Mexican Academy of History and the National Academy of History and Geography, had functioned previously in Mexico but these organizations attracted primarily professional colonialists or well-meaning amateurs interested in the national period. Their importance to the subject at hand was therefore negligible. See Potash, "The Historiography of Mexico," pp. 393-94.
31. The earlier journals, such as the *Revista mexicana de estudios históricos*, the *Boletín* of the Archivo General de la Nación, and the *Anales del Museo Nacional de Arqueología, Historia, y Etnografía*, were devoted almost entirely to the pre-colonial and colonial periods.
32. Alfonso Taracena, *La Labor Social* (Saltillo, 1958?), p. 73.
33. At least one substantial work frankly antagonistic to the Revolution was produced in the 1950's. See Jorge Vera Estañol, *La Revolución Mexicana: Orígenes y resultados* (Mexico: Editorial Porrúa, S.A., 1957).

34. *Francisco I. Madero: Apostle of Mexican Democracy* (New York, 1955). A Spanish edition of this work appeared four years after the English edition. See *Francisco I. Madero: Apóstol de la democracia mexicana* (Mexico: Biografías Gandesa, 1959).
35. *Mexican Revolution: Genesis Under Madero* (Austin, 1952).
36. *Imaginación y realidad de Francisco I. Madero*, 2 vols. (Mexico: Antigua Librería Robredo, 1960).
37. *Mexico: Revolution to Evolution, 1940-1960* (New York, 1963).
38. *The Making of Modern Mexico* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964).
39. *The Mexican Revolution: Federal Expenditure and Social Change Since 1910* (Berkeley, 1967).
40. *Historia moderna de México*, 8 vols. (Mexico: Editorial Hermes, 1955-1965).
41. Luis González, ed., *Fuentes de la historia contemporánea de México*, 3 vols. (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 1961-1962).
42. Stanley Ross, ed., *Fuentes de la historia contemporánea de México: Periódicos y Revistas*, 2 vols. (Mexico: El Colegio de México, 1965-1966).
43. Berta Ulloa, *La Revolución Mexicana a través del Archivo de la Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores* (Mexico: Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, 1963).
44. For the early development of this project and an analysis of the goals see Stanley Ross, "Bibliography of Sources for Contemporary Mexican History," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, vol. 39 (1959), pp. 234-38.
45. Among those recent works with a state or regional focus are Michael C. Meyer, *Mexican Rebel: Pascual Orozco and the Mexican Revolution, 1910-1915* (Lincoln, Neb., 1967); John Womack, Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (New York, 1969); Lowell L. Blaisdell, *The Desert Revolution: Baja California, 1911* (Madison, Wis., 1962); Francisco R. Almada, *La Revolución en el estado de Chihuahua*, 2 vols. (Mexico: Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1964-1965); Claudio Dabdoub, *Historia del Valle del Yaqui* (Mexico: Librería Manuel Porrúa, S.A., 1964); Jesús Romero Flores, *Historia de la Revolución en Michoacán* (Mexico: Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1964); and José G. Zuno, *Historia de la Revolución en el estado de Jalisco* (Mexico: Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1964); Everado Gámiz Olivas, *La Revolución en el estado de Durango* (Mexico: Biblioteca del Instituto Nacional de Estudios Históricos de la Revolución Mexicana, 1963).
46. Marvin D. Bernstein, *The Mexican Mining Industry, 1890-1950*:

A Study of the Interaction of Politics, Economics and Technology (Albany, N.Y., 1964); Edwin Lieuwen, *Mexican Militarism: The Political Rise and Fall of the Mexican Army* (Albuquerque, 1968); Lucila Leal de Araujo, *Aspectos Económicos del Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social* (Mexico: Cuadernos Americanos, 1966); Luis Araiza, *Historia del movimiento obrero mexicano*, 4 vols. (Mexico: Talleres de la Editorial Cuauhtemoc, 1964-1965); Joe C. Ashby, *Organized Labor and the Mexican Revolution under Lázaro Cárdenas* (Chapel Hill, 1967).

47. Isidro Fabela, ed., *Documentos históricos de la Revolución Mexicana*, 13 vols. (Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica and Editorial Jus, 1960-1968). The only comparable undertaking in modern Mexican history has been the publication of the Díaz papers. Alberto María Carreño, ed., *Archivo del General Porfirio Díaz*, 30 vols. (Mexico: Editorial "Elede" S.A., 1947-1960). The published Díaz archive is not nearly as impressive as the total number of volumes might seem to indicate. No discernible system of selecting important documents was used, and as a result hundreds and hundreds of documents of only marginal interest are included.