

The Fracturing of Indigenous Imagery and Allegory within Mexico and the Nation

Erika Michelle Ramírez

Mexican national cinema is characterized and recognized through films created during a time period known as the Golden Age. The Golden Age, acknowledged as the years during and immediately after World War II, gained its peak between 1939 and 1952. It is during this era that Mexican cinema gained and developed its highest production and creative rate. This included a star system that many recognized film directors were able to work with and create internationally recognized films. The establishment of the Golden Age's popular star system as well as creative outlook on Mexico's history and development can largely be attributed to what would become the foundations of popular Mexican images. These would help shape and form what became known as the Mexican nation in an attempt to build a cohesive entity within the arraying populations for the still developing nation of Mexico. Through the development of Mexican cinema the idea of *mexicanidad* came to consist of one of the many ideas that would lead Mexican identity formation in a modern Mexico. Many past authors have attempted to define *mexicanidad* thus creating several different observations of the Mexican populace. Octavio Paz, who is well known for his discourse on Mexican identity discusses in *Labyrinth of Solitude* that the Mexican identity, based on Mexico's turbulent history, can be defined as a "a search for our own selves, which have been deformed or disguised by alien institutions, and for a form that will express them" (Paz 166). Under this interpretation of *mexicanidad*, Mexico can be regarded as a mirror of its colonizers where, the idea of a purely unique Mexico would have to unite two different Mexicos, pre-colonial, and post-colonial. Charles Ramírez Berg explains, "According to Paz,

Mexican history is one extended identity crisis, 'the history of a man seeking his parentage, his origins.' The nation's inability to synthesize its Old World and New World roots and arrive at a consensual definition of *mexicanidad* accounts, in Paz's view, for the confused and disoriented Mexican character and colors every aspect of Mexican Life" (Ramírez Berg). Though it is difficult to pin point an exact idea of what *mexicanidad* entails, it is possible to understand what may constitute the basic formation of this idea. Mexicanidad is an attempt to define what the Mexican nation is; it is predominantly patriarchal, gender based, and has been largely reliant on visual representations to establish what Mexico should, at least, physically look like. *Mexicanidad* also formed and developed different archetypes and allegories of Mexican identities within film which were assigned to various Mexican populations. These representations become problematic when looking at *mexicanidad* through a psychological lens; the question of what *mexicanidad* is a representation of and for complicates the means of identity formation for many marginalized communities, specifically the modern day indigenous populations.

Many of the visual representations that have come out of the Golden Age are identified as the indigenous peasant, 'la Malinche' who is contrasted with the 'virgin of Guadalupe', as well as the female 'spitfire'; these and the development of genres such as the ranchera, urban comedies and musical comedies were funded and produced by various organizations working with the Mexican state. Organizations such as the Banco Cinematográfico, which was established on April 14, 1942, and CLASA studios (Cinematográfico Latino Americana, SA), would collaborate with private interest groups through incentives that would contribute to and help finance the production and

distribution of Mexican national films, specifically during the Gold Age. Through this collaboration the Mexican state began to take a greater interest in the cinema as a different aesthetic form that could promote its national values. With this motivation the state would come to subsidize the new CLASA studios, which were inaugurated in 1935, and equip them with the most up to date equipment further facilitating the production of new cinematic productions. It is also known that the U.S. film industry had much to do with the development of this height in Mexican Cinema, "Under the direction of Nelson Rockefeller, the U.S. Office of the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs (OCIAA) offered the Mexican industry technical, financial and material assistance" (Noble 15). Though private and public state sectors collaborated in developing a more solid cinema that is representative of a Mexican nation, it becomes apparent that state involvement from both Mexico and the U.S. has been necessary for a Mexican film industry to exist. This development of Mexican representations through its cinema has allowed Mexican identities to develop alongside the creation of the various archetypal representations that have become classics of Mexican cinema. Influenced by Hollywood productions, U.S. support, as well as state involvement, many films of the Golden Age would begin to establish what are now known as classic filmic depictions of Mexico's indigenous populations. These indigenous representations become problematic and complex in their attempt to define indigenous identity and its place within Mexican history. These filmic visuals further developed certain existing allegories of indigenous communities that conflict with the modern day indigenous communities and continue to propagate how the Mexican government chose to produce these as the nation's historical identity. Within this essay I plan to discuss how indigenous communities were represented through

Golden Age cinema and how they became problematic within the allegorical ideas that entail *mexicanidad*. I also plan to develop how new indigenous film and media attempt to address the problems associated with those ideas by creating a new type of representation while in the process of fracturing the archetypal and allegorical indigenous image.

The influence of indigenous imagery is evident throughout Mexico's artistic history. Murals such as those painted by artists José Clemente Orozco, Diego Rivera, and David Alfaró Siqueiros, became prominent images that would help construct Mexico's past and then present, history visually. These images were largely influenced by the Revolution's main participants which were "Indians [that] accounted for nearly half of Mexico's population around the turn of the century" (Ramírez Berg 140). During film's rise in Mexico, many filmmakers would come to portray similar images that were painted throughout Mexico during the muralist movement. Many of these images portrayed were the revolution's Adelitas, peasant soldiers, Catrinas, portrayals of human relationships with the land all became nationalistic images. Through the murals the Mexican Indian became largely honored icon but throughout film the indigenous peoples that made up a large part of muralist history would be represented as minor characters. At the same time these minor roles would become the absent role that the indigenous would become placed in by simply being regarded as a mere part of Mexico's past history. Ramírez Berg explains, "Revered in history, Indians are neglected in fact, relegated to the fringes of Mexican life. The same is true in the movies where, in the main, *los indios* are Mexican cinema's structured absence. When Indians do appear, they are usually stereotypical minor characters- rural simpletons who provide comic relief or servants who cook, clean, and open doors for the lighter-skinned protagonists" (138). However, there are also films

that hold the indigenous population as the main protagonists. Films such as the quintessential *María Candelaria* (1944), would be revered for its portrayals of the indigenous, though the outcomes in many of these films are often bleak with "the encounter between Indian and non-Indian result[ing] in death, customarily of the Indian, who was often a woman" (Ramírez Berg 138). Many of the films that hold Indians as minor and main characters would continue to be influential in the formation of indigenous identity for years to come. The influence of these images in films made during the Golden Age assisted in the creation of indigenous archetypes and allegories, which would become a part of what the state would revere as *mexicanidad*. With the help of government funding and national schools, Mexican filmmakers created a cinema that reflects the indigenous "Mexican" culture as its state had wished to create. Within these there also existed representations that at one point, in the beginnings of Mexican industrial cinema, attempted to truly create and represent the Mexican people in their mixed backgrounds.

There are certain films such as Eisenstein's *¡Que Viva Mexico!* (1932) that attempt at creating a vision of the native and indigenous roots that exist within Mexico in a sort of glorified form from an outsider's perspective. Though his film was never completed in its entirety, it is noticeable how this film becomes one of the first attempts to establish a view and an understanding for the indigenous peoples of Mexico and their way of life through an outsider's view. This attempt at understanding indigenous peoples started the development of the idea of indigenismo. Indigenismo is an attempt to promote a dominant social and political role for the indigenous populations of various countries where they constitute a sizable majority of the population. The idea of indigenismo is not

always clear on whom, whether indigenous peoples or others, are promoting their role in society, and therefore develops various meanings for different peoples, its most unifying factor is its effort towards increased recognition and involvement of indigenous populations into larger society. The idea of indigenismo became very popular soon after the revolution during the 1920s and 30s in the beginning processes of development of the nation. Eisenstein became influential in relation to this indigenous ideology and presence in films, but there were other Mexican artists that carried these ideas such as Diego Rivera and David Alfaro Siqueiros within their murals of the early 1930s. These ideas and expressions of creating “a revolutionary Mexican art” to form “mexicanidad grounded in the ideology of indigenismo” (Hershfield, Maciel 86) became problematic as they reinforced the stereotypical representations of racial and ethnic divisions that became prevalent in Mexican society with the establishment of the caste system by the Spanish conquistadors in the fifteenth century. Indians in these murals that came to be known as 'national art' were often portrayed as simpleminded and directionless people who needed to be taught revolutionary and social consciousness by the educated mestizo upper class created by colonialism and mestizaje. This was carried on into representations following the revolution, which continued to divide the indigenous people from main society. By viewing the indigenous through a lens of simple glorification, through folklore in Indian crafts, and pre-Colombian art, many fail to recognize the indigenous as present communities and continue to imagine a “folk-indigenous” identity.

Films such as *María Candelaria* present the indigenous population of Mexico through an established star system within the state subsidized CLASA studios. *María Candelaria* was cast with star system actors Dolores del Río, Pedro Armendáriz,

Margarita Cortés, and Miguel Inclán. Many of these actors play indigenous parts, Dolores del Río plays María Candelaria, Pedro Armendáriz plays her promised love as Lorenzo Rafael, Margarita Cortés plays María's rival who is jealous of her relationship with Lorenzo, and Miguel Inclán plays the villainous Don Damián who is in charge of overlooking the indigenous trades. These actors, who not only belong to a different class level of the populations they depict, also fail to physically depict and represent the indigenous population. The two main characters who are of direct indigenous descent as we see through the customs and traditions made from the Indian doctor, to the landscape that part of the indigenous culture, are especially important to the underlying representation of the indigenous class; Dolores del Río and Pedro Armendáriz are taking on these roles depicting a population that is not given the opportunity to represent itself. These actors, who would go on to star in several other Golden Age films, were far from a truly indigenous background, both having spent extensive time in the United States returned to Mexico for different reasons and would become popularly known for the roles played in *Maria Candelaria*. The characters portrayed by these actors would come to embody what had previously only been seen in glorifying murals, and would help create the film aesthetics of Mexican indigenismo. Directed by Emilio Fernández, *Maria Candelaria* would also use landscapes to enhance indigenous people by placing the Indian in what is considered a natural and untainted Mexico. Landscapes were very prominent in creating a national representation for the Mexican audience; *Maria Candelaria* took place and was shot in Xochimilco, which showed Mexico, as it once was before Mexico City became more developed and expansive. Using Xochimilco as part of the landscape within this film was a key element to the development of indigenismo in

film as it is an ancient part of the Aztec Empire where it was used and developed as series of 'floating gardens'. These historic and nationally known floating gardens would create the landscape that indigenous groups are traditionally associated with. There are several overwhelming sky and landscape shots that also position the viewer within these natural landscapes, allowing them to reminisce about a past Mexico. The placement of the indigenous within these natural landscapes is one of the ways that the film manages to create its first indigenous archetype, as an outsider of the city. There are many scenes where Maria herself is an outcast within her own community, but overall they are all outside of the city, only going to the city to sell their goods. The characters portrayed also develop different archetypes and allegories of Mexican representation. Dolores del Río's character comes to represent an allegorical figure of the virgin, "an Indian woman so pure, so good that she combines the virginal characteristics of both a virgin and the Virgin" (Ramírez Berg 58). The 'virgin' in Mexican indigenous views, cannot be simply overlooked as just a virgin; the Indian virgin is culturally tied with the Virgin of Guadalupe, the Mexican nation's patron saint. The Virgin of Guadalupe is known as the Indian Virgin, who represents the foundation of the Mexican identity and is regarded as the "mother" of all Mexican peoples, indigenous and mestizo. This is clearly shown during the scenes where María runs into the church angry at the Virgin; her image is juxtaposed with the Holy Virgin and the Indian virgin as she cries out against the injustices made upon her by her own people. Through these images Maria Candelaria becomes the allegorical archetype that is the pure state of the indigenous that is synonymous with the Virgin of Guadalupe, the face of Mexico. Maria's tragic ending results in a bleak outlook for the indigenous population, she is essentially sacrificed in



order for her town to unite and move forward without the "shame" she had brought upon them. This sacrifice of an indigenous past reflected the position that Mexico's audiences had toward their own indigenous peoples. The indigenous were regarded solely as a past that needed to be sacrificed in order for Mexico's mestizo nation to move forward. These representations become problematic for the existing Indigenous Mexican populations whose identities have been created to fit only within a specific time frame of Mexican history.

Mexico began to physically establish the identities and images given through these allegories as well as indigenous archetypes, but most importantly these films developed the imagined identities and communities that the Mexican nation longed to develop for a cohesive unified nation based on an indigenous past, and modernized international future. *María Candelaria* premiered in 1944 at the Cine Palacio where it had a run of four weeks (Noble 194) and went on to win three different awards, two at The Cannes Film Festival in 1946 and one in the Locarno International Film Festival in 1947. *María Candelaria* came to represent Mexico on an international level and further solidified Mexican identity through later films that would be shown abroad. Through these films, the idea of indigenismo came to be recognized as an aspect of Mexican identity and culture, which was now viewed in a different medium apart from the popular images of the Mexican Muralist movement. It became an attempt to create an imagined past that Mexico as a nation longed to recover as part of its identity, but in very real social conditions these 'past' groups tend to always be neglected. Hershfield describes this attempt as "The call for unity under the banner of a common Indian heritage was thus no more than the promotion of an imagined alliance among diverse ethnic, religious,

cultural and regional groups" (89). Within many discourses *María Candelaria* is critiqued as neglecting any substantial criticism of the societal forces that act as an agency towards the indigenous populations depicted within the film. These films would often fail to discuss the reality that these people are Mexico's most oppressed and exploited group, mistreated on the basis of their race and their class, all while neglecting the reasons behind these inequities. Sources of isolation, poverty, neglected laws, the unfair redistribution of land, and the reasons why indigenous groups refuse to fully assimilate to mestizo culture are themes that are not touched upon by these popular films. With this said, *María Candelaria* only creates a representation of the indigenous within a mainstream cinema, while disregarding the diverse indigenous populations, their plight and offers only inauspicious solutions to their social afflictions.

In terms of economic and social class, the Indian has always been placed last, without being given the option to become educated or be a stable player in their role of a present day Mexico. During the Golden Age, president Lázaro Cárdenas del Río (1934-1940) declared that the "indigenous problem is not to maintain the Indian as an Indian nor of 'Indianizing' Mexico, but it lies in how to 'Mexicanize' the Indian [while] respecting his blood" (Ramírez Berg 141). In this attempt Cárdenas would go on to establish the Department of Indian Affairs in 1936 in the hopes of directing a national Indian program, but would fail to establish a clear and direct idea of how to 'Mexicanize' the Indian populations while respecting their diverse cultures. In 1948 with the creation of the National Indian Institute (INI), founder Alfonso Caso sought to involve Indian populations in the Mexican economy while recognizing the Indian plight. Unfortunately this also did not fully help to involve the Indian population and by mid-century "Mexico's

attitude toward the Indian, though benevolent, still had not changed significantly from the days of the Conquest. The state had not yet found a workable way to incorporate the Indian and, some would argue, was uncertain whether it really wanted to" (Ramírez Berg141). These attempts to incorporate the Indigenous within the overall encompassing Mexican nation are clearly displayed within the film *Río Escondido* (1947). Rosaura Salazar, played by Maria Félix, is a teacher who attempts to educate Indians outside of the city as a way of incorporating them into the Mexican identity that she is a part of, as a mestiza within the larger centralized city. The film's narrative consists of Rosaura, through the actions of the government, attempting to incorporate the uneducated and impoverished indigenous families into a modern Mexico by giving them a place in Mexican history through the history of the Mexican revolution. This advancement into modern Mexican society is constantly in conflict as the exploitative *cacique* of the town works against Rosaura's plans. In the end she must fight to stay and continue her position as educator as well as representative of the Mexican State. Throughout the film there are many allegorical uses of landscapes, where Rosaura is placed along a backdrop of a never ending desert, pointing out the harsh environment that Indians of the Northern Mexico live in. The natural landscapes become a part of the people that Rosaura must educate; it represents them as a unit within the film as an outside part of the populous city that Rosaura came from. The landscape is contrasted with the large state buildings that Rosaura is placed next to in the beginning of the film while she is in Mexico City, where the audience is narrated the gleaming history that all mestizos and Indians took a role in building the nation. There are also instances throughout the film where Rosaura directly addresses the children she teaches being able to become a part of the Indians who have

helped build the Mexican nation, mentioning leaders such as Benito Juarez as she stands next to his image in the school house. The film attempts in so many ways to address the Indians as a part of society while at the same time placing them outside of society as mentioned with the use of landscapes and Rosaura's attempts at educating them. The film places the Indians within the already established social context of poverty, while living in rural areas, without the education and history of the place they live in as the state has governed it. This establishes the Indian in a position of assimilation into the overarching Mexican nation, where the Indian can only be placed in the past within the context of the revolution if they do not assimilate into the modern dominant culture.

Visual forms of the indigenous have become so glorified that they have developed the quality of a myth. Allegorical representations such as the simple, uneducated rural Indian, the Virginal Indian as compared to the Virgen de Guadalupe, Mexico's patron saint, as well the Indian's direct relation to the land, has the Indian placed within a limited amount of roles in Mexico's national representation. These allegories representing the indigenous communities only subjugated more of them into the lower levels of a racial and class hierarchy that developed out of colonization. Through this glorification, Mexican society has reduced the national psyche to look onto the indigenous as a past and has thus marginalized them into becoming a separate society; separate to the modernization and the global Mexico that it has attempted to present in films after the Golden Age. This marginalization has led people to look upon the indigenous as a social problem. Since these "problems" are frequently analyzed in the current context of globalization, it is important to digress and determine how this social problem came to be. Ramírez Berg explains that the indigenous populations "constitute a sizable

population in a nation where mestizos are the vast majority, creoles a small minority. But though numerically inferior, white creoles are the nation's phenotypical ideal. This ideal was institutionalized by a colonial caste system that placed the European at the pinnacle and the Indian at the bottom" (Ramírez Berg 76). This has heavily divided the Mexican population in the majority's search to become the great mestizo nation with their future headed towards a Eurocentric ideal. As mentioned earlier, Mexico had attempted to create various specific decrees to help "Mexicanize" the Indian, but has not been able to resolve problems within these communities and their direct involvement in state policies. The Indian has been left out of this future and the nation has neglected to fully represent them in politics, economics, and regular state accordance of rights. In relation to visual representation, the conflict still lies in that the indigenous have not been able to participate in their own representations in popular Mexican film from the past and have only recently gradually been able to conduct and lead their own representations in media other than film.

Over the past thirty years indigenous communities have begun to make a new appearance into the social sphere of the Mexican nation, not as a past but rather as a very active present. During the late 1960s Mexico began to face violent social, political and economic turmoil. Specifically the year 1968 became a prominent year throughout the world, but for Mexico, this was an extremely important year in establishing itself within a largely global context. This was the year that Mexico would finally show the world it had arrived as an industrialized, modern nation ready to participate in the world of global politics. The Olympic Games were to be held in Mexico, the first Latin American country the Olympic Games have ever been held in, and Mexico was in the spotlight around the

world. Students, workers, professors all began to demand a change in the politics that had governed the state since the revolution. The Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) had been under heavy criticism by the Mexican people who felt the political and economic structures were no longer working for their needs. It was during this period that the Mexican nation as it had been established began to unravel before international eyes. Artists, intellectuals, academics began to discuss the need for a new nation, a new representation of their Mexico. Though these were some of the first people to academically or artistically write and portray a desire for a new identity, it was the indigenous groups who found this moment to be pivotal to their construction of their identity. As the Mexican identity began to be criticized and analyzed, indigenous communities began to create their imprint in what would become their new representations.

During this era the use of audiovisual documentation became prominent in the new film schools that were coming up such as the CUEC (Centro Universitario de Estudios Cinematograficos) as well as other state funded institutions. Filmmakers began to take an interest in realism or documentary filmmaking in several countries around Latin America. These interests are directly tied to the Latin American cinematic movement led by key figures Fernando Solanas and Octavio Getino who describe past cinema as a "surplus value" cinema, examining how these past films are no more than consumer goods made for aesthetic and entertainment value. Instead they sought to create a cinema that would address "the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of the Third World and of their equivalents inside the imperialist countries [that] constitutes today the axis of world revolution" further mentioning that, "Third Cinema is, in our opinion, the

cinema that recognizes in that struggle the most gigantic cultural, scientific, and artistic manifestation of our time, the great possibility of constructing a liberated personality with each people as the starting point-in a word, the decolonization of culture" (Solanas Getino 59). Third Cinema became a reality which worked against the normalized structures of representation within the star system and aesthetics of Hollywood and art cinemas. Third cinema was a precursor to that which will become known as a fourth cinema, as well as indigenous cinema, where pro-indigenous and indigenous filmmakers alike attempt to separate the past artistic and film indigenous representations from the new indigenous representations that are being made. It is difficult to really begin to define what exactly indigenous cinema is, since for the most part, this cinema is made for a specific audience and many times it does not even begin to fit the standards of what is canonically cinema in regards to visual aesthetics. Even the idea of visual aesthetics becomes problematic as documentary aesthetics become appropriated by film circles and become integrated as an artistic quality. Solanas and Getino address this issue by stating how revolutionary political film must separate itself from artistic values in order to be regarded as something more than aesthetic pleasure. Though it is a matter of discussion whether aestheticism will or should truly be abandoned or sacrificed in the service of militancy as well as independence for these groups, much of the media created is mostly out of necessity and not for an appropriation of aesthetic styles. Regardless, indigenous media is in a constant state of change and development as well as quite limited during our present times.

Much of the indigenous media that has been coming out of Mexico is created by independent film and media groups that at times work with state funding to create

programs to teach and develop a direct relationship with people from various indigenous groups in order to can create their own media. Some of these collectives include the Chiapas Media Project/Promedios de Comunicación Comunitaria, or the Ojo de Agua Comunicación Indígena, each located in Chiapas, and Oaxaca, Mexico, respectively. Ojo de Agua is a part of the Instituto Nacional Indigenista which was designed by the Mexican state to “connect indigenous organizations with video technologies and the skills to use them” (Smith 113). Indigenous video takes on a new ideology very different from past media, “indigenous video entails a [commitment] to permitting local actors to control the ways in which their cultural knowledge is conveyed to viewers...[which] desires to initiate and sustain respectful and reciprocal relationships with the indigenous peoples, places, and practices” (Smith 114). Indigenous media attempts to produce indigeneity as a part of their identity, but work against creating a stereotype for their identities. In regards to creating this new form of representation, indigeneity becomes inclusive for the people of the communities that become part of the process of creating this media. Therefore it becomes very site specific and the media can become exclusive to outsiders, in the form that the social depictions are uniquely that of the community represented, but it is inclusive in the form that an outsider is able to visually see a window into these communities that have been marginalized for decades.

It is important to differentiate between the varieties of indigenous media that has surfaced during the last decade of the twentieth century. Indigenous media has its differing factors, specifically that of pro-indigenous media made by mostly outsiders with the means of making this media, and specifically indigenous media made directly by indigenous groups as well as the direct participation of indigenous peoples within these



from production, to the narrative agency that follows through these films and videos. Many films have been created by these collectives, each about different events or actions that occur within the community. The films often create a collective discussion of the ideas that are constructing the acts and events within the indigenous communities. They document and reflect what their struggles are and how they go about organizing to create various changes within the communities such as documenting the takeover of a television station in order to voice the people's own direct representations for a wide reaching broadcast. This is seen within the film *Un Poquito de Tanta Verdad* (2004) by Corrugated Films. Other films such as *Granito de Arena* (2005), also by Corrugated films, look into social problems that exist in large communities, such as lack of educational funds to teach in Oaxaca. The film follows the teachers union as they fight for a better system for themselves and their students. These films have come out of the most traditional realist depiction of documentary in film. They manage to create realist depictions of communities that are marginalized and at times part of the indigenous communities within the same context. Essentially many of these films attempt to recognize the government's shortcomings that have not allowed the economic and social developments these communities need in order to strive culturally and socially. Furthermore the peoples of these communities are taking part in the development of these films and media presentations not as filmmakers or actors, but as people representing their families and communities. Other movements have been documented differently in forms of guerrilla movements, calling directly for a revolutionary change in an overall society.

On January 1st 1994, the North American Fair Trade Agreement went into effect;

along with this the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) went public in direct response to NAFTA and Mexican global politics that were further affecting the indigenous populations. This event was recorded and has been a part of many films and media created by groups affiliated with the EZLN as well as groups that are dedicated to the rural working class who may or may not consider themselves indigenous. Subcomandante Marcos, the most identified person behind the movement has written public messages for an international audience and especially the Mexican audience calling for a revolution of the nation, “We are inheritors of the true builders of our nation. We are millions, the dispossessed who call upon our brothers and sisters to join this struggle as the only path, so that we will not die of hunger due to the insatiable ambition of a seventy year dictatorship led by a clique of traitors who represent the most conservative and sellout groups. They are the same ones that opposed Hidalgo, and Morelos, the same ones that betrayed Vicente Guerrero, the same ones that sold half our country to the foreign invader, the same ones that imported a European prince to rule our country, the same ones that formed the 'scientific' Porfirista dictatorship, the same ones that opposed the Petroleum Expropriation, the same ones that massacred railroad workers in 1958 and the students in 1968, the same ones that today take everything from us, absolutely everything” (Marcos 2). This statement is a window into the resentment that has existed within this community as well as many others that have also lost respect and trust for the established state. *Caracoles: Paths of New Resistance* (2003) was created as documentation of these events and as propaganda for the Other Campaign which calls for a new government that addresses the rights of the indigenous populations within Mexico.

Although many of these films attempt at depicting the realities of whichever

group they represent, there continues to be a constant complexity of viewpoints within indigenous groups, where many times there results a variety of opinions that are towards one goal are not representative of all peoples involved. There is a collective aspect within the making of these films as well as the narrative within them that at does not directly become the representation one indigenous group, but rather can be appropriated to become a representation of various groups. Many times these films accidentally encompass various other indigenous groups that do not exactly establish themselves as a part of these representations. This is complexity of narratives becomes especially hard to distinguish as there is a limited availability of this media, it is often hard to differentiate from that various groups that do exist with Mexico that do not consider themselves a part of some of the more revolutionary groups taking a larger role in indigenous representation.

Taking into account that these are a limited amount of media projects, films and film collectives they nevertheless have come to encompass indigenous media or pro-indigenous media, as it is currently known. They are attempts in creating a new indigenous identity through the construction and development of these communities and their involvement in portraying the complexities behind their representations and are directly involved in the process of representation for their own use. Whether it is for social change, for their own communities, or as guerrilla propaganda, this media has become influential in the process of creating a new imagined nation across various communities that may not know each other, but manage to have a common ideology due to their marginalized status or their social goals in representation. Indigenous media has begun to rupture what was established and accepted as indigenous representation within

national identity in Mexico. The people of these groups no longer accept the iconic folk representations of the larger indigenous images and their will to recreate and establish a new identity with a national identity is crucial to their representation. The nation becomes fractured and through indigenous representation there emerges a new cultural identity. Though much of the indigenous communities and the Mexican state continuously attempt to recuperate a past indigenous ancestry, they have come to represent an allegorical past. This allegory must be broken in order to create some progress towards an inclusive and understanding development of indigeneity and the new indigenous identity for the communities who also consider themselves Mexican.

## Works Cited

- Benedict, Anderson. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London; New York: Verso, 2006.
- Brígido-Corachan, Anna. "An Interview with Juan Jose García, President of Ojo de Agua Comunicación". American Anthropologist- Volume 106, No.2, June 2004, pp. 368- 373.
- Cusi Worthman, Erica. "Between the State and Indigenous Autonomy: Unpacking Video Indigena in Mexico". American Anthropologist- Volume 106, No.2, June 2004, pp. 363- 368.
- Guibernau, Montserrat and Rex, John. The Ethnicity Reader: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Migration. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- Hershfield, Joanne and Maciel, David R. Mexico's Cinema: A Century of Film and Filmmakers. Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, c1999.
- Himpele, Jeff. "Gaining Ground: Indigenous Video in Bolivia, Mexico, and Beyond". American Anthropologist- Volume 106, No.2, June 2004, pp. 353- 363.
- Martin, Michael T. New Latin American Cinema Volume Two. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997.
- Noble, Andrea. Mexican National Cinema. London; New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Paz, Octavio. Labyrinth of Solitude, the other Mexico and other essays. New York, NY: Grove Press, 1961.
- Pick, Zuzana M. The New Latin American Cinema: A Continental Project. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1993.

Ramírez-Berg, Charles. Cinema of Solitude: A Critical Study of Mexican Film.

1967-1983. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.

Sanjines, Jorge. "Language and Popular Culture". Reviewing Histories: Selections from

New Latin American Cinema. Ed. Coco Fusco. Buffalo, N.Y.: Hallwalls

Contemporary Arts Center, 1987.

Schiwy, Freya. Ennis, Michael. "Special Dossier: Knowledges and the Known: Andean

Perspectives on Capitalism and Epistemology": Introduction Nepantla: Views

from South - Volume 3, Issue 1, 2002, pp. 1-14.

Smith, Laurel C. "Mobilizing Indigenous Video: the Mexican Case". Journal of Latin

American Geography - Volume 5, Number 1, 2006, pp. 113-128.

Solanas, Fernando and Octavio Getino. "Towards a Third Cinema". Reviewing Histories:

Selections from New Latin American Cinema. Ed. Coco Fusco. Buffalo, N.Y.:

Hallwalls Contemporary Arts Center, 1987.

Subcomandante Marcos. Our Word Is Our Weapon: Selected Writings. ; edited by Juana

Ponce de León; foreword by José Saramago; afterword by Ana Carrigan; timeline

by Tom Hansen and EnLace Civil. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2001.

### Filmography

Caracoles: Paths of New Resistance. Dir. Chiapas Media Project. 2003. Chiapas Media

Project.

El Violin. Dir. Francisco Vargas. Perfs. 2005.

Granito de Arena. Dir. Corrugated Films. 2005.

Maria Candelaria. Dir. Emilio Fernandez. Perfs. Dolores del Rio, 1944. Videocassette

1997.

Que Viva Mexico!. Dir. Sergei Eisenstein. Perfs. 1979.

Un Poquito De Tanta Verdad. Dir. Corrugated Films. 2004.