

Anne Rubenstein
History Department
Faculty of Arts
York University
Toronto, Ontario
Canada

This paper is a work in progress.
Please do not cite or quote it without
written permission from the author.

The body politic at the movies: spectacular behavior in urban Mexico, 1920-1940

All over the world, sometime around the beginning of the twentieth century, city-dwellers began to experience daily life and their own bodies differently, and they named this difference Amodernity.@ People at the time, and historians since then, have ascribed this disjunction between past and present to wars C the First World War, the Russian and Mexican Revolutions C to technological change, to economic transformation, to migration and urbanization processes, and to progress or decadence. But above all, those who experienced the onset of modernity and those who struggled to describe and explain it have pointed at new ways of reproducing sound and image as both exemplifying and explaining how modern life came to be modern: photography, cheap printing, radio and cinema remade ordinary people in body and mind.

This paper explores what it was like to go to the movies in Mexico City in the years following the Mexican Revolution, as a way to begin describing how and explaining why *chilangos* embodied and enacted new identities in this era. We might assume that audiences were disembodied, that what mattered about moviegoers was the relationship between their imaginations and what they saw on the screen in front of them. But in fact I hope to demonstrate

here that going to the movies was an intensely physical experience: it produced new sensations and it suggested new forms of movement and behavior. And sometimes, what Mexicans saw on the screen was the least important part of the experience.

City of spectres

Moviegoers faced physical and moral dangers when they stepped into a cinema in the 1920s and 1930s. The moral danger of movie-going grew from the physical connection between movie houses and *carpa* (vaudeville, or music hall) theater. *Carpa* theaters were distinctly male spaces, rowdy and unrespectable; since they were the first venues to show movies, the same sense of moral risk hovered around movie-going at first as it did around attending *carpa* performances. But the novelty of moviegoing – the way that movie houses were a new kind of social space – also raised moral doubts. (In 1938, the first year in which the census gathered national statistics, it counted only 472 cinemas in all Mexico.¹) As late as 1934, long after cinemas detached themselves completely from theaters, there was still some question as to who should join a movie audience and how they should behave, so that at least one movie house offered separate shows for "gentlemen" and "ladies".² Movie theater operators seem to have tried segregating the audience by gender, at least occasionally, since they first went into business in Mexico City, or perhaps the audience segregated itself along gender lines: a 1918 photograph of the audience filling every seat in the Salon Rojo (then Mexico's premiere movie house) shows only women and girls in the first five rows of seats and only three men and one boy in the entire

theater.³ Similarly, differential ticket prices kept richer and poorer patrons apart, even when they attended the same cinemas. Although the Mexico City government regulated ticket prices at all movie theaters after 1919, it placed a ceiling on prices but not a floor underneath them; this allowed tickets to get much cheaper as patrons climbed higher up in the balconies.

Audiences also divided themselves between different locations and times to see movies. Mexico City movie theaters formed chains in the 1920s, with each chain showing (for the most part) movies made by a single production company, usually a Hollywood company. Throughout the 1920-1940 period, first-run movies would appear at fancier, newer, larger or more centrally located theaters within the chain, with movies cycling on to lesser venues after a week, and then to third-run theaters a week later. Very few films were popular enough to remain in a first-run theater more than a week. Different movie theaters and different times drew different audiences, some more responsive to the artistry of cinema than others. For instance, critic and intellectual Jaime Torres Bodet, who reviewed movies for the weekly Revista de Revistas in the 1920s, described one actress as having been “the idol of the public who attended the Salon Rojo on Saturday afternoons for the premieres of Paramount movies” – implying a mostly female audience who demanded high production values (especially, as we will see, good costumes) and a sentimental story enacted “naturalistically,” as the review put it.⁴

Even though movies were first shown in Mexico City in [1898?] and had become, by 1920, an extremely popular form of entertainment, an atmosphere of doubt and disapproval shadowed people=s experience of movie theaters in the 1920-1940 period. The center of this

cloud may have been the cinemas' start as lowbrow carpa theaters, but other factors added to it. Increasingly through this era, movie-goers knew that the people who made movies behaved in questionable ways: rising literacy and the attendant growth of the magazine business in post-Revolutionary Mexico meant that, by the end of this period, news-stands on every corner of Mexico City carried fan magazines which detailed the scandalous doings of local and Hollywood stars. And even if moviegoers avoided such periodicals, other print media helped emphasize the moral dangers moviegoing could pose. Beginning in 1938 the archdiocese of Mexico City, for example, distributed a weekly leaflet that carefully listed all the sins displayed in every movie on Mexican screens, recognizing that its parishioners could not be prevented from movie-going but hoping to steer them away from truly "impure" material.⁵ (It often criticized locally made romances and comedies, but endorsed the wholesome animated fare provided by Walt Disney.)

The state of cinema technology made movie-houses physically dangerous places too, especially in the 1920s. Often, movie theaters were created by renovating theaters built for live performances. But showing movies required electric wiring while theatrical performance could get along with gas lights, and while gas was in itself hazardous, retrofitted wiring combined with leftover gas fittings C sometimes still in use for house lighting C made fire even more likely. In the 1920s, too, films were printed onto flammable celluloid, which only required a spark to burn explosively. (And no law prevented smoking inside cinemas, or even inside the projection booths and storage areas where films were kept.) Theaters were sometimes very crowded, and since movies had to be projected in complete darkness, theater operators disliked lighting aisles or exits, so in an emergency it was not always possible to leave quickly. Such conditions led to a

notorious movie-theater fire in a working-class neighborhood of the port of Veracruz in the summer of 1924. El Teatro Esclava had been packed with spectators for an afternoon showing of *La ciudad de los espectros* when a cigarette butt dropped near the projector ignited the fire that killed thirty people including some children and injured seventy more.⁶ Considering the circumstances it is surprising that such horrors were not more common.

Besides the risk of fire, moviegoers subjected themselves to other hazards, and frequent visits by municipal inspectors and the constant presence of a policeman in every theater ensured that everyone remained aware of the risks that they ran. (The state emphasized its presence even further by placing an inspector from the municipal tax collection office in the box office of every movie theater.)⁷ Between July and December of 1922, for example, inspectors working for the government of Mexico City saw cinemas without lights, cinemas with broken seats, cinemas with unwashed floors, cinemas with unpainted walls and cinemas with leaky roofs; they recorded bathrooms that were filthy, out of order, lacked running water, or simply did not exist; they took note of floors, walls, and balconies on the verge of collapse; they reported faulty wiring, poor ventilation, missing fire extinguishers and inadequate fire escapes; and they remarked on the sale of tickets beyond the number of available seats, leading to crowded conditions and sometimes fights.⁸

Movie houses could be violent places, and this danger, too, had its roots in the conditions of cinema. Besides overcrowding and discomfort, other, more subtle problems led to public outcry. Silent films were fragile and expensive as well as flammable. Thus, in the 1920s, a single

copy of a movie might be shown at several theaters in the same day, as cinema operators would send runners between the movie houses with each reel, a system which resulted in long delays and left the movies scratched, broken, and hard to watch. One inspector complained that when films wore out or were in poor repair, the first damage was always to the inter-titles, A which at times cannot even be read ... [the movies] are unintelligible and irritating to whoever has the bad luck to be present@ in the movie theater.⁹ In 1923 Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, then chief of the Mexico City cinema inspectors, wrote a memo about this practice:

The Cine Mina has been fined for having begun a show half an hour late. This Department must once again insist that the same picture must not be shown at more than four movie theaters at the same time, considering that the number of theaters in which they are shown creates delays which do harm to these businesses and to the public.¹⁰

He meant that delays, discomfort and poor viewing conditions could produce Annoisy public protest@ (as another inspector described it) which included overturning chairs, throwing food at the screen, and fist fights.¹¹ Such incidents were fairly common C the municipal inspector=s reports for 1917-1925 mention perhaps one a week, though most seem to have involved such mild behavior as whistling rudely at the screen C and though they were sparked by uncomfortable or aggravating conditions in the cinemas, they also belonged to a longer tradition of rowdiness among male theater patrons in Mexico City.

Theaters of masculinity

Years of incidents such as those described above made cinemas a logical site for rebellious assertions of masculine power through the 1920-1940 period and afterwards. One of ethnographer Oscar Lewis's informants vividly recalled occasions in the early 1940s when a local gang, "the terror of the neighborhood" visited the local cinema, where "they sat up on the balcony and smoked marijuana ... and if the movie were a daring one, you could hear them saying dirty things." Movie houses were a space where sexual mores might be transgressed. Movie houses were one of the rare locations in Mexico City where young couples could find privacy. Oscar Lewis cited the recollection of one of the "Sanchez" family (from about 1941, when "Manuel" was thirteen years old): "I took her to the movies where we could kiss and embrace."¹² This would not have surprised cinema inspectors some two decades earlier, whose insisted on good lighting not only to reduce the risk of catastrophe in case of fire but also as a gesture toward good manners and correct behavior, ruling that Adim illumination must be there even during the showing of the movies, so that the various rooms of the movie house will not be completely in darkness, thereby avoiding the immoralities that could occur in a similar place which lacked light completely.¹³

People who entered movie houses, then, placed themselves at physical, moral, and even political risk. One odd incident illustrates this nicely. On a Saturday night in February, 1934, three teenage boys -- highschool classmates -- went to see an American movie. The three boys sat politely through the first reel of "Tres Pequeños Vagabundos," a melodrama originally titled

"Wild Boys of the Road," at the elegant Cine Montecarlo in central Mexico City. But during intermission, while the reels were being changed, they elbowed aside the ushers and ran to the front of the crowded movie house. There they began making speeches, shouting their opposition to a government proposal to institute sex education in the public schools. The boys were, as they later explained, particularly concerned with protecting the honor of their female classmates by shielding them from seeing pictures or hearing explanations of reproduction. At first, the other movie-goers believed them to be making some sort of advertisement for upcoming movies, as the ushers often did during intermissions, and so the boys were ignored. Gradually -- at least if the right-wing newspaper which recorded this event is to be believed -- the spectators realized what was going on, and began applauding enthusiastically. The account continues, "it is not known who informed the police, but suddenly they arrived and obliged the orators to leave their improvised podium."¹⁴ A few days later, the boys were fined and sentenced to a brief jail sentence. They took advantage of the occasion to go on a hunger strike, during which they held a press conference to announce their exact political position and call for other students to join them in resisting the government's nefarious attempts to explain the mysteries of reproduction to Mexican girls.¹⁵ After a few days of this, they were released from jail and quickly dropped from the public eye. Elsewhere, I have used this story to illustrate political tensions in 1930s Mexico City between an expanding state and, in Alan Knight's term, a Arecalcitrant@ citizenry.¹⁶ Here, though, I repeat the story because it marks the extreme end of a spectrum of comprehensible, if not entirely respectable, male behavior at the movies.

Young men in more ordinary circumstances still took movie theaters as a venue to protect female virtue and defend family honor. Chava Flores made a point of this in his memoir of his boyhood in Mexico City during the 1920s. The chapter in which he describes going to the movies begins with an exchange between Chava, his brother Enrique (nicknamed Quico), and his father:

Papa asked us ... You=re going to the movies? Who with?

C By ourselves. Mama will let us, won=t you, Mom?

Mama assented, but Papa reproached us: C And your mother and your sister? Why not bring them?

... But I quickly recovered, and replied: C Because we can=t. We=re going to the *gayola* [top balcony? literally, cage] and Mama and Trini [his sister] can=t go there.

C Then take them to the main floor, my father said, as if it were the simplest thing in the world.

But for a family of four to sit in the *luneta* section cost ten times the price for two boys to sit in the *gayola*. The boy=s father solved the problem by lending them a peso, saying that they could repay him Awhen you are big, when you have jobs.@¹⁷ In other words, preparing to go on a family trip to the movies was also preparation for adult male responsibilities. On the way to the movie theater, with Chava=s father off at his job, the young boy=s half-joking efforts at manly

behavior continued:

We went out happily and all wanted to take my mother's arm ... When we arrived at the cinema, I felt my responsibilities. For those moments I was the head of the family and I went to buy the tickets ... My mother looked at me seriously and later I saw her laugh, commenting to my sister C A clown!@ The ticket window was a little high but my nose already could reach the counter.

C Four orchestra seats, please, I told the ticket seller, proudly handing him one of my two pesos.

I took the tickets and I ran to show them to my mother. Trini and Enrique wanted me to give them theirs, but my mother opposed this, adding to my importance.

C Let him, let him carry them, you'll lose them.

Trini wanted to buy pepitas, but Quico wisely responded ... C First let Mom pick whatever she wants, then we'll see what's left over for us.¹⁸

Chava Flores vividly remembered this scene nearly fifty years later though he recalled almost nothing of the movie he saw once his family finally sat down in those expensive seats. For him, in other words, the lasting excitement of an afternoon at the movies came from the chance to enact -- to embody -- a responsible adult man. And he writes that when he finally did grow old enough to Aearn my first pesos,@ he spent some of his first paycheck taking his mother, brother and sister to that same movie theater, celebrating his arrival at adult responsibility in the precise

place where he had so memorably played at maturity.¹⁹

The importance of being Pola Negri

Movie theaters, then, offered a stage on which young men could enact a range of masculine behaviors and identities. Yet they were not exclusively male spaces. As we have seen, some male performances – like that of Chava Flores – required female actors too. And sometimes women went to the movies without men. Ethnographer Margaret Park Redfield found that respectable married women in Tepoztlán did not like joining local cinema audiences; her fieldnotes contain an interview with an informant named Antonia, who told her that “ my daughter-in-law and I take the baby and went [sic] out to the movies one night as my son said we should go. But we were uncomfortable, two women alone with all those men.”²⁰ But even this small town, some women – including Antonia’s husband’s girlfriend! – liked accompanying men to the movies, and in Mexico City some respectable women visited movie houses frequently in the company of female relatives or friends. The family of Gloria Schoemann Vargas was, perhaps, a bit extreme in their passion for movie-going in Mexico City in the 1920s:

Well, my grandmother was a fanatic about the movies, she went every day, and usually twice a day, she would leave one cinema at seven-thirty and go on to another. All my life movies have enchanted me too, but my sister would go to sleep in the movie theater so as not to be bothered with the movie. The worst punishment that I could have in those days

for whatever little thing I did was if they punished me by not letting me go to the movies that day, which I felt in my soul.²¹

Schoemann Vargas and her family were unusually dedicated to cinema – the little girl who loved movies would grow up to become a very successful film editor – but their presence as women unescorted by men in the Mexico City movie houses of the day was not unusual at all.

Young women used cinemas as backdrops to play out a new feminine identity. The contents of the movies that they saw (especially silent film made in Europe and the United States) and the dangerous pleasures of the movie-going experience provided young Mexico City women with a new model of the feminine self; some of them made these new ways of acting and appearing part of their own self-presentations. But unlike young Mexico City men, women during the 1920-1940 period did not find much support at movie theaters for a variety of embodied identities. For them, going to the movies meant affiliating themselves with a single vision of femininity: the modern girl, also known as the flapper, the *chica moderna*, and the *pelona*.

The locations, architecture, interior design, and even the names of Mexico City movie houses reminded their customers that these were spaces caught between old and new, disreputable and respectable. The names of the biggest, fanciest cinemas in Mexico City in the 1920-1940 period had an exotic ring -- Salon Rojo, Cine Palacio, Cine Venecia, Cine Parisiana, Cine Rialto, Cine Odeon, Cine Montecarlo -- suggesting that to go to the movies was to participate in an old-world, aristocratic art form. But these theaters had for the most part

inherited their names, and often their buildings too, from older theaters; and many were located on or near Calle San Juan de Letrán, which had long been a not terribly reputable or safe district for both highbrow performances and *carpa*. These buildings usually looked Porfirian, too: they were large structures heavily ornamented with carved stone and cast iron.

But cinema owners had to remodel or reconstruct their buildings after 1926 to accommodate the new sound technology. By 1930 entrepreneurs all over Mexico, and especially in the capital, were constructing movie theaters which had no physical connection to the world of opera, and even less to *carpa*. To enter these grand new cinemas was to enter an interior as modern as a factory's or a train station's.²² With their stream-lined decor replete with mirrors, neon, and chrome, their enormous blank surfaces of walls, floors and ceilings, their sweeping staircases and grand atriums, their well-lit powder rooms, the new cinemas underlined their differences from older styles of theaters: they offered light, space, and a new kind of showcase for their patrons' entrances and exits. Such art deco monuments to the dream of technological progress became common enough that two Mexico City architects specialized in designing them, sometimes simply remodeling older movie houses in the modernist style.²³ In Mexico City, some of these new theaters still had exotic or historical names, like the Cine Olimpia and the Palacio Chino; but others from that era, like the Cine Alameda, were given names with a nationalist ring to them, and still others, like the Cine Metropolitano and the Cine Moderno, pinned their commercial appeal to the allure of the novel and urbane.

The modernity and exoticism of the film-viewing experience were reinforced by what audiences encountered on the screens. Particularly in the years of transition between cinema

technologies, the movies playing in Mexico City had been made somewhere else. (Sound was first synchronized to film in the United States in 1926, but 1933 was "the first year with a significant number of sound films" made by Mexicans.²⁴) Silent film, unlike the talkies, could be a little ambiguous about its national origins through the expedient of changing the inter-titles and the accompanying music. The haste in which new silent movies were made and distributed also helped blur differences between locally produced and foreign film. For instance, bad translations of foreign films' "captions," as a newspaper columnist complained, could barely be distinguished from the "bad language" of locally made silent movies – all of them "having generally been written in some kind of abominable Kickapoo dialect."²⁵ A third factor contributing to the confusion between foreign and local film in 1920s Mexico City was the rise of the movie magazine: *Cinelandia*, the first and for many years the most popular fan magazine sold in Mexico, was in fact edited and printed in New York. And a fourth cause for confusion between local and international production of silent film was that moviemakers within the United States sometimes employed actors recognizable from the Mexico City stage or newspaper gossip pages; even such notorious figures as the photographer Tina Modotti and the artist Nahui Olin had brief Hollywood careers. Movies with sound, however, had a much more definite location within a national or international culture. Thanks to subtitling, Mexico City audiences still could hear voices speaking languages other than Spanish and foreign music on the soundtracks. Meanwhile, the advent of sound made Hollywood film-makers much more reluctant to hire Mexican actors whose English might be limited or accented.

Movies made abroad were thought to be especially appealing to modern young women as

they provided international models for liberated behavior – beginning with liberation from restrictive clothing and piles of heavy, long hair. Reviewers assumed that Mexican “*señoritas* would go to the cinema to witness the defense of or the attack on this new mode of feminine hairdo,” the bob.²⁶ Similarly, when Mexico City periodicals in the 1920s printed reviews of movies made in Italy, Germany, France, England and the United States, they frequently described the leading actress -- Pola Negri, Theda Bara, Constance Talmadge, Clara Bow or Laura La Plante -- as a flapper; and reviewers seemed to believe that flappers were what female audiences demanded to see.²⁷ The association between new female fashions and the movies owed something to the new architectural style of movie theaters at the end of the 1920s, too, whose ladies’ rooms, grand staircases, wide atriums and open balconies gave women wonderful spaces in which to pose themselves fashionably, surrounded by luxuries – especially the luxury of space – they were unlikely to find in other aspects of their lives in the booming city. But even in rural Morelos, where Margaret Park Redfield spoke with “Antonia,” movie houses could be venues for displaying up-to-the-minute fashion (and associated loose morals); “Antonia” complained to Redfield that “my *marido* is going out with another woman. He says there is nothing wrong about it but he takes her ... to the movies and he comes home and brags to me about her fine clothes.”²⁸ And this association between fashionable women’s attire and movie-going lasted well beyond the 1920-1940 era. Juan Orol, who scripted, directed, produced and acted in a long series of lowbudget gangster movies and thrillers in the 1940s, told an interviewer that the feminine audience in Mexico City in those days was different than in other parts of

Mexico: A Those who we might describe as *high life* (he used the English phrase)

go to the movies to criticize them, they don't go just to watch a picture, the women go to see style, they go for the styles and if there are styles that they can use to make dresses for themselves, then they say that the film is very good; if there are no stylish clothes, if they can't borrow anything from the movie, they say that they don't like the movie and it isn't any good.²⁹

To be a *pelona*, though, involved more than fashionable clothing and short hair. Women who adopted the *pelona* style in the 1920s were aligning themselves with an international style and sensibility, which included athleticism and a reshaped ideal for the female body, which they knew about – at least in the early years of this style – from imported movies and magazines. So *pelona* style connected its wearers with transnational urbanity and modernity. But it also (and increasingly through the years) allied young Mexico City women with the projects of the post-Revolutionary state – especially those projects involving sports, social reform, and education. This web of connections was knotted up around movies, movie-going, and state involvement in cinema.

The forms that state involvement in the movie business took changed during this period. Daily municipal inspection of Mexico City movie theaters ended in 1928 [?]. The powerful new Ministry of Public Education briefly sponsored outdoor showings of educational films in the mid-1920s and then took up producing movies of its own, which included announcements about health, current events, and government services which played in movie theaters, as well as short

films intended for use in schools.³⁰ Formal and informal film censorship was the topic of gossip and speculation as well as occasional newspaper reports. And the government moved from taxing movie production and movie theaters heavily, in the early 1920s, to supporting local movie production as a patriotic gesture – the cultural equivalent of import-substitution industrialization in the Lázaro Cárdenas years. But throughout the 1920-1940 period audience members who were paying attention would have seen many signs of government involvement at the movies.

Like education, religion, and sports, movie-going in this era grew increasingly and obviously political. The politics of film-making and movie-going in Mexico City between 1920 and 1940 were gendered: for women, even more than men, attending the movies could not be an entirely simple pleasure. They might go simply “*para divertirse*,” but they still had to decide to go, who to go with, which theater to go to, where in the theater to sit, what to wear, and how to behave. They had to choose between movies made in Mexico and those from other countries. They had to argue – if not in out loud, at least in their minds – with the neighborhood gossips who might criticize them for going to the movies. Mexico City movie-goers of both sexes could be understood to be embodying new and old forms of gender and national identities. For women, such embodiment was more openly, plainly political.

Endnotes

¹. "Espectaculos publicos," Anuario estadístico de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos 1942 (Mexico: Secretaria de Economía, 1948), p. 422.

². Advertisements for El Cine Alarcon in Excelsior, Jan. 1 - June 30, 1934.

³ Photo (from the fototeca of INAH) reprinted in Francisco H. Alfaro and Alejandro Ochoa, eds., La República de los cines (Mexico City: Editorial Clío, 1998), p. 17.

⁴ . Celuloide [J. Torres Bodet], "La cinta de plata," Revista de Revistas 18 October 1925, cited in Felipe Garrido, ed., Luz y Sombra: Los inicios del cine en la prensa de la ciudad de México (Mexico: Consejo nacional para la cultura y las artes, 1997).

⁵. The very name of this periodical, Apreciaciones, signals the Church's acknowledgement of Mexicans' determination to watch movies.

⁶. AMas de 30 niños muertos y como 70 heridos en Veracruz,@ El Universal 24 July 1924, secc. 1, p. 1.

⁷. The records of the Oficina de Diversiones Públicos show that these safety inspectors did make very regular visits, often more than once every day, which was possible as each inspector was charged with visiting two, three, or at most four theaters, always in the same neighborhood. But inspectors frequently cited the theaters for the absence of either the police or the tax inspectors, occasionally both. See Vols. 812, 813, 853 and 854, Diversiones Públicos, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, Archivo Histórico del Distrito Federal.

⁸. See Expediente 240, 242, 245, 290, 293, 294, 335 and 346, Vol. 812, Diversiones Públicos, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, Archivo Histórico del Distrito Federal.

⁹ Hipólito Amor to the chief inspector, 16 June 1922, Expediente 250, Vol. 812, Diversiones Públicos, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, Archivo Histórico del Distrito Federal.

¹⁰. Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, Informe #1152, 30 April 1923. Expediente 363, Vol. 854, Diversiones Públicos, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, Archivo Histórico del Distrito Federal.

¹¹ Hipólito Amor to the chief inspector, 17 June 1922, Expediente

230, Vol. 812, Diversiones Pùblicos, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, Archivo Històrico del Distrito Federal.

¹². Oscar Lewis, The Children of Sanchez (New York: Vintage, 1963), pp. 31, 147. The continued use of downtown Mexico City cinemas as spots for illicit sexual behavior can be seen in Luis Zapata's novel of teenage street life in the 1970s, El Vampiro de la Colonia Roma (Mexico: Grijalbo, 1979).

¹³. Hipólito Amor to the chief inspector, 12 June 1922, Expediente 250, Vol. 812, Diversiones Pùblicos, Gobierno del Distrito Federal, Archivo Històrico del Distrito Federal.

¹⁴. Nuevo Regimen 17, Feb. 19, 1934, p. 1.

¹⁵. Nuevo Regimen 19, February 23, 1934, p. 1.

¹⁶. See my article ARaised Voices at the Cine Montecarlo, @ Journal of Family History [date, pp. ...]

¹⁷. Chava Flores (Salvador Flores Riera), Relatos de mi Barrio (Mexico City: Editores Asociados, 1972) p. 101.

¹⁸. Flores, p. 103.

¹⁹. Flores, p. 106.

²⁰ "Antonia," n.d. (1933?) p. 22. Folder 3, Box 48, Redfield Papers, Special Collections, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago.

²¹ Gloria Schoemann Vargas interviewed by Maria Alba Pastor, 16 August 1975. PHO/2/32, p. 3, Archivo de la palabra, proyecto de cine mexicano, PHO, INAH.

²². A few downtown movie houses built in the late 1930s survive in Mexico City today, including El Metropolitan and El Palacio Chino; though they do not look the same as they did, remnants of their past decor can still be glimpsed.

²³. Francisco H. Alfaro and Alejandro Ochoa, eds., La República de los cines (Mexico City: Editorial Clío, 1998), pp. 56-61.

²⁴. Alexandra Pineda and Paulo Antonio Paranagua, "Mexico and its Cinema," in P. A. Paranagua, ed., Mexican Cinema (British Film Institute, 1995), p. 29.

²⁵. Carlos González Peña, "La inspección de los cines," El Universal 7 February 1917, cited in Felipe Garrido, ed., Luz y Sombra: Los inicios del cine en la prensa de la ciudad de México (Mexico: Consejo nacional para la cultura y las artes, 1997)pp. 254-255.

²⁶. Celuloide [Jaime Torres Bodet], review of *Pelona* in Revista de Revista 29 November 1925, cited in Garrido, Luz y Sombra, p. 451.

²⁷. See the reviews reprinted in Felipe Garrido, ed., Luz y Sombra: Los inicios del cine en la prensa de la ciudad de México (Mexico: Consejo nacional para la cultura y las artes, 1997) pp. 402-404, 410-412, 415, 418-420, 456.

²⁸ "Antonia," n.d. (1933?) p. 21. Folder 3, Box 48, Redfield Papers, Special Collections, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago.

²⁹. Juan Orol interviewed by Eugenia Meyer, 2 July 1975. PHO/2/30, pp. 25-26, Archivo de la palabra, proyecto de cine mexicano, PHO, INAH.

³⁰ See SEP fototeca ...