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Emilio Fernández was one of the great directors from the so-called golden age of Mexican cinema. He was nicknamed “El Indio” because his mother was Kickapoo. Identifying himself with indigenous Mexicans, he felt himself an outcast. While his movies were closely linked to the official nationalist project, they also expressed his own obsessions, which did not always coincide with state ideology. His stereotypical images of Mexico and all things Mexican—images in which women and indigenous peoples are fundamental—were viewed around the world.

Although Fernández filmed all forty-one of his motion pictures between 1941 and 1978, his ideals regarding many themes, such as indigenismo, derive from the 1920s and 1930s. During the 1940s, he established a prototype repeated with slight variations and expressed through the themes of his movies, his theories, and his artistic expression. His films do not express a homogenous block of ideas but rather a field of force among ideas, motion pictures, and social practices. His stories outwardly display the ideology of post-revolutionary government, but in their mimesis and diegetic incongruities, filmic “lapsus” (as Marc Ferro would say) seep through that reveal shades of meaning within his thought—contradictions, ambiguities, incoherencies.
One central cultural theme in Mexico during the 1940s dealt with nation-building and the search for Mexican identity, which official policies attempted to sustain through indigenous culture despite common practices of contempt and racism toward living Indians. Emilio Fernández clearly promoted opinions coinciding with post-revolutionary nationalist projects, such as the exaltation of patriotism, agrarianism, secular positions regarding religion, indigenismo, and the need for education. He conveyed them through love stories and displayed them adorned with panoramic beauty and pre-Hispanic and colonial works of art. He preferred to set his stories in rural environments. Yet, despite his role as an agent of official ideology, one would be mistaken to consider his filmic stories as univocal; on the contrary, he often criticized existing injustices, albeit in an oblique fashion.

Fernández had his own filmic style, fed by classic Hollywood cinema, especially that of John Ford, and also by the Russian Sergei M. Eisenstein, from whom he discovered "the struggle and freedom through social justice." El Indio attempted to build a nationalist project through film, and his works join those of other greats in what is known as the Mexican School of Cinema. Despite their peculiarities, his films form part of Mexican institutional cinema.

According to Fernández, indigenous people form the most delicate, pure, and beautiful part of society. Through his images, he transported the indigenous from the periphery toward the center and endowed them with a symbolic prominence. María Candelaria (1943) received at the 1946 Cannes Film Festival an award that, at the time, was commemorative rather than competitive. From that point on, his films gained appreciation in the Old World and his characters took on iconic dimensions, bathed in their own light. Considered paradigms of quality and beauty, his films were exported around the world. His stereotypical indigenous people became a widely accepted cultural symbol that seemed to reference the "true and authentic Mexico," which coincided with the interest in primitivism in vogue among Europeans who admired the innocence and ferocity of peoples marginalized by civilization.

Fernández's gaze toward Indians combined interestingly with his perception of women. Although the director boasted of his machismo, one look at the titles of his movies demonstrates women's centrality to them as well as to his construction of the nation, where women have a significant role as Mexico's emblem and sustenance. "Women are the soul of a people, the inspiration, everything, no?"
In the 1940s, Fernández dominated the theme. In his movies, it was not always clear who were Indians and who were peasants, probably due to the influence of Cardenismo (1934–40), a populist movement in which the concept of “Indian” became for a short time synonymous with exploitation rather than ethnicity. However, in some films Fernández does provide an explicit indication of culture, highlighting forms of dress, mentality, customs, and even language, with the indigenous appearing as “the other” of the established order. The movies in which his protagonists were clearly Indian were María Candelaria (known in the United States as Portrait of María), La perla (1945), Maclovia (1948), and Paloma Herida (1962). In others, the indigenous presence consists of extras, as in Río Escondido (1948), or else their characters are not explicitly Indian but rather poor mestizos or assimilated Indians, as in Pueblerina (1948).

Emilio Fernández emphatically declared his appreciation of the indigenous world, turning his gaze toward it in order to elevate it: he made it beautiful, possessing a certain honor, dogged by suffering that absolved it of any evil: “I want to dramatize their lives through my work by touching and raising the awareness of the wretched governments that marginalize our true race [la verdadera raza nuestra], . . . It is our race and they are the victims.”

His model of indigenismo is suggested in María Candelaria. An initial scene shows the continuity between pre-Hispanic culture and living Indians, with Fernández repeating the technique Eisenstein used in the rushes for ¡Qué Viva México! (1930–32), in which pre-Colombian sculptures alternate with living, dispassionate faces, revealing the similarities...
between their physical characteristics and suggesting the preeminence of the past in the present, the force of an “eternal” culture. The influence of Robert Flaherty and his ethnographic cinema is also clear, as is that of F. W. Murnau in *Taboo* (1930), with regard to the protagonists’ association with the “noble savage” persecuted by Westerners.

In Fernández’s construction of the indigenous, not only do story and plotline count but cinematic language does as well. For example, the solemnity and rigidity of the faces are reflected in the movements of the camera itself, which are very slow or even fixed: in *La perla* only the wind moving the clothes of Indians as they watch the sea reveal that this is cinema and not a projection of still photography. The figures are more like sculptures than human beings and convey a permanence beyond social change. The soundtrack also influences the stereotype. Indians often appear in silence, attentive to natural sounds. Speech is not their strength: their characters’ lines are always sparing and enigmatic.

Moreover, Fernández’s depiction of the masses insists on a rigid concept of the indigenous, since crowds are presented as a block, as part of a collective devoid of individuality, moving atavistically without any opinions of their own, like a machine. This is evident in the groups carrying torches that advance menacingly in *María Candelaria* or *Maclovia*. In *Río Escondido* the priest has the bells rung for the Indians to line up and receive their vaccinations; the villagers are surprised by their docility and liken them to sheep. A great many of Fernández’s stories narrate the conflicts of heroes who attempt to live their own lives amid this homogeneous and overwhelming group that is the collective.

Although Fernández emulates Eisenstein in the use of natural actors, he positions them always in the background, leaving the leading roles to famous celebrities and stars. Secondary actors conform the masses, while audiences identify with the heroes, whose faces they recognize. The scholar Aurelio de los Reyes finds that indigenista nationalism blends with cosmopolitan nationalism, which in turn is based on glamorization.

Fernández stereotypes his Indians, transforming them into an ideal, a symbol of purity and dignity despite their defeat. They are all equal and form part of nature, of that landscape of impassioned beauty known as Mexico. The cultural differences of indigenous groups are homogenized by an undifferentiated use of scenery, costumes, music, and rites to narrate the films. It seems that being photogenic is more important than ethnographic precision. Fernández plays close attention to customs: one sees dances, pilgrimages, the blessing of animals on Corpus Christi day in *María Candelaria* and on the Day of the Dead in Pátzcuaro in *Maclovia*. Although this is folklore for tourists, it does provide an account of the protagonists’ rituals and devotions. One sees the respect paid by Lorenzo Rafael (the leading man in *María Candelaria*) in honoring the rites of a healing woman, but one also sees him pray in front of the church.

A hallmark of his plots is a tension between tradition and modernity that goes beyond the theme commonplace in contemporary cinema. Fernández refers to two conceptions of a nation not yet integrated and in perpetual conflict. In one conception is an essential, eternal, centripetal Mexico that communicates only through symbols and symptoms, a Mexico of cyclic time and inescapable destiny, of natural disposition: the indigenous Mexico. Above this conception, without penetrating, modifying, or suppressing it, is modern Mexico, made up of individuals who make their own history and face social and political conflicts. Civilization attempts to impose itself over elemental Mexico, and the two worlds interact, blend, and repel each other. Dominating and resisting, they work together and then grow apart. Their heroes are trapped within this struggle. Fernández explicitly endorses the official discourse of indigenismo and attempts to modify the order of things, but among the lines and images he equates the indigenous with nature and the Western with culture.

His films were successful in European festivals, but their acceptance among the national cultural elite was problematic. Before *María Candelaria* received any awards, painter Diego Rivera ranted, “This conceited guy . . . may be a success beyond our borders, where our reality is unknown [but] the film is rubbish, a terrible attack against the reality of our Indians.” Emilio Azcárraga, boss of movie exhibition circuits, also felt the film was pessimistic and would be unsuccessful. Only after it received an award at Cannes did it come to be considered a national treasure. Thus, the foreign gaze assigned a value to the film and transformed it into a banner of the nation.

**Women and Indians: The Necessary Other**

Since the late nineteenth century, women’s social participation had increased; however, the standard of conduct for women remained conservative. Women’s conditioning was strict: they represented the nation. Mexican women had to be docile, pretty, chaste, and hardworking in order to act as an emblem of the fatherland, a notion that held firm throughout the twentieth century. Woman, as a dark continent (as Freud put it), had to forgo her own projects in order to symbolically fulfill her function of alterity. The representation of women in established Mexican cinema expressed this cliché. Women were the other for men: the feminine was
constructed in opposition to the masculine and formed an abstract entity. "Woman," an entity that suppressed the social characteristics of actual women and likened them to a biological species. Yet, for the purpose of narrating cinematic stories, this "Essential and Eternal Woman" was disassociated through a series of stereotypes, with the figures of Eve or Mary being the most evident.24

El Indio takes his own stand in this regard, albeit supported by the binary system guiding Western mentality: the values and characteristics assigned to men and women are exclusive and specific, and the masculine hierarchy is superior. Women are associated with nature, while men represent a culture with the ability to go out and hunt. Although common to Western thinking, the concept of nature in Fernández is overwhelming and rooted in mythical thinking. His couples represent the original dyad, the original complementarity that human beings tirelessly seek, and his tragedies narrate his protagonists’ successive failures to achieve this completion. His images stereotypically express a series of fundamental archetypes, such as those that place nature in opposition to culture.25

The coincidence between feminine and indigenous figures is noteworthy, as the latter also fulfills the function of the other. In the mid-twentieth century difference meant otherness. Throughout Mexican history, women and Indians were the most closely watched and judged social groups, and on the grounds of their difference, whether biological or cultural, their conduct was structured and supervised.

The stereotype of the Indian describes him as a submissive, timid, weak, subordinated being who is tied to the earth and to nature, with an atavistic and irrational mentality due to his intellectual weakness and his identification with nature. The same attributes are ascribed to women because of their reproductive function: they embody the other, opposite manly reason and activity. Indigenous women thus appear as doubly oppressed figures; in fact, they present an ideal metaphor for both the feminine and the indigenous conditions. In Fernández’s cinema they are both.

In an attempt to characterize the psychology of Mexicans based on their history, Santiago Ramírez, points out that since the years of the conquest “women have been devalued to the extent they are gradually identified with the indigenous. Men have been overvalued to the extent that they are identified with the conqueror, dominant and prevailing.”26 He goes on to say that masculine-feminine parity associated with the active-passive principle acquires “significant and dramatic aspects.”27 Ramírez concludes that, for the Mexican, “the indigenous and the feminine have been converted into an unconscious equation.”28 Such seems clear to a director who constructs women, “making them feminine, demanding from them morality, a vibe, a certain pride, and naturally a certain dignity, right? But I want to have them always as faithful dogs, obedient to man and man ready to die in defense and honor of his woman . . . and [for] the construction of a family.”29 For Emilio Fernández, women are nature, not only nourishing but also the realm of fate and destiny, a ferocious, overwhelming, and devouring nature that absorbs human beings. Men, on the other hand, are culture: it is therefore ideal that men order and command, while women follow and obey.30

The indigenous woman is perhaps the best-known feminine figure in Fernández’s cinema, with María Candelaria (Dolores del Río) as the paradigm. Fernández considers indigenous women to be the most virtuous, because they assume their role in nature more naturally. In his films they distinguish themselves by preserving tradition, the home, and ties to the land as well as by their instinctive character and their abnegation in the face of suffering.

Despite Fernández’s explicit discourse of indigenismo, he likens the feminine to the indigenous while the masculine is associated with the mestizo or the criollo. Indigenous men are very handsome and dignified but incapable of fulfilling their prescribed function of naming, acting on, and imposing themselves on nature. Indian women are doubly women, while Indian men are feminized. This, according to Emilio Fernández, who prides himself on his machismo, positions Indians on an inferior level and apparently contradicts his own most forceful assertions.

In Paloma Herida, Danilo Zeta (Emilio Fernández) arrives in a Guatemalan village to exploit the Indians and corrupt their customs one by one, killing all those who oppose him and raping the women. The film is a critique of false progress, to such a degree that in a cabaret called La dolce vitta, the Indians learn to dance the twist. In one important sequence Zeta announces his new order to the invaded town: during a slow, lengthy scene, the image of a row of indigenous men’s naked legs and huaraches-shod feet alternates with the image of the pants-sheathed legs of the row of women facing them. The shot opens up to reveal the Indians with woolen wraps and headaddresses and the prostitutes, mestizas, chewing gum and watching indifferently as the mestizo master shouts out orders, brandishing his pistol and promising them to the Indians in exchange for the latter’s docility. The crux of the image is Danilo Zeta, in the center of the frame, imposing order that, while unjust and brutal, is order nonetheless. The Indians are dressed in a type of skirt, the so-called enredo, and the women wear trousers: they are the agents of a false progress that breaks the natural order of the sexes, an original Eden in harmony with nature where
all was fun and games. The Indians will not be able to transcend their submission: they are shown drunk, fighting among themselves, and beating their wives, who abandon them. The protagonist, Paloma (Patricia Conde), will be the one who, in her character as nature, kills the villain.

Just as women bring life, they also bring death. Paloma appears in a beach town one day, quiet and sad, dressed in white with a black shawl, determined to kill her rapist. She is in jail and refuses to speak: the muteness of the indigenous woman is absolute, and she tells her story—that is, the plot of the film—only when they threaten to take away her son. She kills Zeta, but the evil had already been done: the muteness in which she prides herself can only exist once “progress” has suppressed her true voice, leaving none in its place. The indigenous is defeated, leaving the women voiceless and the men feminized. Paradise has been shattered.

The Films

María Candelaria exemplifies Fernández’s indigenista theme. The script was written on thirteen napkins by the director himself as a birthday present to Dolores del Río, who played the protagonist, and was inspired by the plot of Janitzio, in which del Río starred in 1934. (Janitzio was also the basis for Maclovia.) Janitzio narrates the ill-fated love of a couple driven from Eden because of the imbroglios caused by a white man, with whom Eréndira, the female lead, has sexual relations in order to save her betrothed from prison. She is considered a traitor to her culture and her people, and her punishment is to be stoned to death. Joanne Hershfield argues that through the indigenista theme Janitzio reasserts the Malinche myth. This theme was also critical for Emilio Fernández: tragic love would become his recurring plotline.

In the initial scripts for María Candelaria, the film is called Xochimilco and tells a much simpler story than the final version. The protagonist, María del Refugio, is loved and appreciated in her town, but her betrothed has a jealous temperament and rejects outsiders. The theme tells of the difficulties of integration and the tension between two Mexicans. The definitive script incorporated the element of the town’s hatred for the newly baptized character of María Candelaria, moderating the boy’s jealous temperament and dramatizing the situation of the protagonist, her marginalization and weakness, making her kindness more noteworthy and her sacrifice more absurd.

María Candelaria establishes itself from the outset as a banner for nationality. Its publicity declared, “Impregnated with the utmost femininity, profoundly racial in character and most distinctive to us, this
María Candelaria symbolizes exclusion: she is cast out even by those who are already marginalized par excellence: Mexican Indians. She exclaims, “How nice it would be to be able to live in peace with the townspeople, treating us like brothers and sisters and not like dangerous animals!” It is significant that she has been stigmatized by the sexual practices of her mother, a characteristic intrinsically associated with the female gender. The scriptwriter Mauricio Magdaleno protested because, he said, prostitution did not exist among the Indians. But the film matters as a metaphor. María Candelaria is doubly marginalized: as an Indian but also as a woman and as a sexed being, which is made evident in the painting.

Fernández’s indigenous women are continually sexually besieged by mestizo villains, but they avoid mixing with them. They act in a manner contrary to that of the director’s own mother, who left her ethnic group in order to marry his mestizo father. Indigenous women preserve culture and defend the land, but they also resolutely suffer an inexorable destiny. Their men can never defend them: the masculine role remains undermined.

María Candelaria is stoned to death by her own people. What indigenismo is invoked when racial purity is deposited in the naïve goodness of a woman and associated with atavism and submission? What indigenismo, when the rest of her group proudly displays its intransigence and barbarity? One herein observes a lapsus of El Indio: the indigenous is associated with a ferocious, indomitable nature that neither the sermons of the priest nor the proximity of the modern Mexico bordering Xochimilco can calm. The film distinguishes between “the indigenous,” the collective represented by natural actors native to Xochimilco, and the natural aristocracy of his protagonist, “with the beauty of ancient princesses.” In effect, Dolores del Río does not look anything like the extras. The explicit discourse of the film insists on the Indians’ goodness and authenticity, but the star is dressed by Armando Valdés Peza, one of the most famous haute couture fashion designers, following the norm already established in La noche de los mayas (Urueta, 1939), in which huipiles, or traditional dresses, were narrowed at the waist to flatter the actresses’ figures. Emilio Fernández recalls that he told the star she was representing a little Indian woman and not Cleopatra, but even so the glamour of the stars, the formalism of their style, and the idealization of the Indians goes against the kind of cinema that he wanted to make. The old concept creeps onto the screen, contrasting the living Indian, devalued and sublimated by history, from the exalted ones “with the beauty of ancient princesses.” María Candelaria is a turncoat from the past.

María Candelaria reveals the scarce resources with which Indians endure their lives. She is assisted only by her beauty, which wins her the painter’s admiration, and her resignation, which seduces the priest. Lorenzo Rafael can count on the support of his community, but nothing more: his room to maneuver runs out in other spaces. Emilio García Riera has pointed out the force of criollo or mestizo characters who can put a name to the couple’s disgrace and still help them, although once indigeneous barbarity has been unleashed, they are impotent: the priest symbolizes the church; the doctor, science; the painter, art. The relationship is always unequal: they address the Indians with the informal “you” and receive submission in return.

María Candelaria shows certain features of indigenous culture, such as the attachment to the land, that are biological in nature. When the young man considers emigrating, his fiancée dissuades him: “And our chinampas? And our flowers? We were both born here, and we have always lived here. This is our land: look how black and soft it is [she takes it in her hands]. How could you want us to leave? . . . They don’t want us, but with outsiders it’s even worse.” The man looks at her, serious, and the scene unfolds in silence, with no background music: immobility is best, and the woman is its spokesperson. Moreover, the land has use value rather than exchange value, and the film never questions the property rights of the protagonist to her hut or the plot of land where she gathers flowers. When Don Damión wants to ruin her, he sends someone to kill her piglet, which symbolizes, more than anything else, an investment in her future and recognizes the importance assigned among the indigenous to animals.

At two points in the film, Náhuatl is spoken: first, when María Candelaria pursues Lupe, her rival in love, who by throwing a stone has broken her image of the Virgin of Guadalupe; she comes to blows with Lupe, throwing her into the water, and the woman threatens in her native language. Náhuatl is also spoken when Lorenzo Rafael leaves the market, in order to avoid the painter who has noted his girlfriend’s beauty. Both moments are not only action-packed but also angry. They are images contrary to María Candelaria’s reaction when she talks back to the Virgin in a rage: “And you! Why won’t you listen to me? You are too hard on us.” The priest makes her repent her outburst and ask the image for forgiveness: docility speaks in Spanish.

One of the films derived from María Candelaria is Maclouvia, which repeats many of its patterns: love between Maclovia (María Félix) and José María (Pedro Armendáriz), made difficult by society—as represented by the girl’s father, Macario (Miguel Inclán), by harassment from the white man as a romantic rival, and by mestizos as authority figures, in this case the teacher and professional military officer who defend the Indians. In
Maclovia, an old mestizo soldier prevents the lynchings and helps the couple escape, in a clear concession to Hollywood happy endings. However, indigenous isolation has in Maclovia the necessary setting of an island. The teacher tells the officer, "No native ever leaves the island. For them, it would be worse than death. Here they are born, here they live, here they die." Thus, the denouement of the couple fleeing augurs a new cycle of suffering for the protagonists, placing in doubt the ending's happiness.

Just as in María Candelaria, feminine beauty is an ambiguous value: it opens doors in life, but it also leads to problems. Thus, Maclovia chides God for not having made her more ugly. María Felix performs her beauty before humility: her figure is inappropriate, her gestures are not docile or tender, characteristics of Indian women according to Fernández. She cannot escape from the stereotype of the strong, tough woman who made her famous, and perhaps that is also why El Indio saves her from being stoned to death.

In La perla, Quino (Pedro Armendáriz) and Juana (María Elena Marqués) are a happily married couple, and she is the prototype of the docile wife. One scene defines her character neatly: she waits outside the cantina, curled up on the ground with her baby wrapped in a shawl, waiting for Quino to finish getting drunk so she can take him home. She watches him furtively in order to protect him.

Once the fisherman finds an enormous pearl in the sea and begins to envision a promising future, he starts laughing uncontrollably, with the arrogance and demeanor of someone who dares to challenge fate: he is filmed from underneath standing in the boat beside Juana. His laughter mixes with stentorian music while she cries: she fears that the balance of her life will be ruptured. Where he glimpses freedom and education for their son, progress and happiness, she suspects death and solitude. Ambition is alien to the indigenous man’s desires, and Quino’s breaks with the order of things. Although Juana never offers any arguments, her instinctive reaction turns out to be well founded: she is closer to nature, and the plot will go on to describe Quino’s failure. Emilio Fernández does not allow his indigenous people either to assimilate to national culture or to find happiness in their own world, and his other films tell of the pain felt by those who set forth in search of other ways of life. In the final scene of La perla, the couple throw the great pearl back into the sea. With it go hope, education, well-being, and happiness.

The feminine essence and that of the indigenous is natural, not cultural or social. Nature is formless, ambiguous, chaotic, and should be molded in males by different means: tenderness, violence, authoritarian orders, love, just to name a few. However, indigenous men are not successful in shaping the world: they lack resources and the words. In the beginning, nature was dominant, but culture prevailed and, with it came the destruction of the aboriginal world.

By Way of Conclusion

In Fernández’s films can be discerned long standing elements that were constructed with the retrograde mentality of the times but expressed in the novel language of cinema for the benefit of mass audiences in the modern Mexico of the twentieth century.

On an explicit level, the indigenous characters of Emilio Fernández embody perfection: they are the most beautiful and purest racial group, the most delicate culture. However, through lapsus one observes that they are scenic beings, inscribed into nature, and that any change they attempt is impossible. They cannot modify the life that fortune has given them; they appear to resist progress, contradicting the purpose of a cinema that struggles against social injustice. Fernández constructs a stereotype that shows that the dignity, mystery, and stoicism of Indians cloak their inertia, submission, and ignorance. According to Ayala Blanco, "Fernández’s indigenous may very well be docile lambs ripe for slaughter by Evil-worshiping whites."39 In Fernández’s films women are identified with Indians. All women are subjugated, thus indigenous women become a double metaphor for otherness and the quintessence of femininity.

But something disturbing remains: despite his failure, the Indian supports the nation, and he resists in the same way that the feminine, identified with nature, overpowers and dominates. Through El Indio’s cinema, the nation acquires a gendered character: essential Mexico is indigenous, ergo it is feminine and faces the tension implied by a modernity represented through criollos and mestizos—a struggle that expresses the one that exists between nature and culture. Although in all his films the Indians are defeated and the women vanquished, the feminine principle, the indigenous principle, dominates and conquers, albeit solely in order to preserve injustice and inertia.
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