

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Carpenter, Victoria ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3880-6555> (2018) Introduction. In: The Tlatelolco Massacre, Mexico 1968, and the emotional triangle of anger, grief and shame : discourse of truth (s). Cardiff, University of Wales Press

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/3052/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<https://www.uwp.co.uk/book/the-tlatelolco-massacre-mexico-1968-and-the-emotional-triangle-of-anger-grief-and-shame-ebook-epub/>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk

Chapter 1

Introduction:

'2 October' Is Not Forgotten

It was a Monday like any other Monday. I was in my office, getting ready to teach an Advanced Spanish class to my final-year students. The topic was 'Absent Texts and Political Turmoil' and the case study was a massacre of a student demonstration in Mexico City, known as the Tlatelolco massacre, on 2 October 1968. Having gathered excerpts from Elena Poniatowska's *La noche de Tlatelolco*, poems by Rosario Castellanos, Isabel Fraire and Jaime Sabines about the horror of the massacre and the apathy afterwards, and a couple of newspaper articles with statements from the government officials blaming the students and their parents for what had happened, I was putting together a presentation to start the lesson. A photograph of a student held down by smiling soldiers; a layout of the Plaza of the Three Cultures; a pile of shoes left behind by the demonstrators running for their lives – all the necessary attributes to describe a nightmarish evening in a quiet residential neighbourhood. To round the presentation off, I searched for a high-resolution image of the monument erected in the plaza by the families of the victims of the massacre on 2 October 1993, twenty-five years after that night.

The image stood out against the dark blue background of the PowerPoint slide. At the bottom of the monument, lines from Rosario Castellanos's poem 'Memorial de Tlatelolco' reminded the audience that the newspapers and the government tried to erase the event from the collective memory, denying it had ever happened and going about their business as usual the next day. There were names chiselled out in granite. Men and women, young and old, listed in no particular order. I wrote the names down and, as any meticulous researcher would

do when there is a bit of free time available, plotted a graph of ages and noted the gender balance. And I counted the names – there were twenty. I tried to remember where I saw the figure of twenty before. Not in a book; not in a journal article; not in an eyewitness account released outside the state-controlled press and publishing circuit. It was in a newspaper, splashed across the front page: ‘Veinte muertos, 75 heridos y 400 presos’ (‘Twenty Dead, Seventy-Five Wounded and 400 Arrested’).¹ The paper was *Excelsior*, Mexico City’s largest daily newspaper; the date on the front page – 3 October 1968. Staring at the image on the screen, I read Rosario Castellanos’s familiar line at the bottom of the monument: ‘los periódicos / dieron como noticia principal / el estado de tiempo’ (‘the newspapers / featured the weather report’).² The two pieces of information jarred – the number of victims was the one reported by the newspapers (at least, one of them), which were supposed to ignore what had happened. The monument – a text from the public discourse – displayed the information it should have rejected as inaccurate or an outright lie. It looked like there was no black-and-white division in the way the story of the massacre was told. Both sides talked about it; at least one side used the other’s information. Who told the right story? Was there one? This was when the idea for this book emerged.

The aim of the book is not to question whether the Tlatelolco massacre happened – it did; or whether the Mexican government was responsible for it – it was. What happened in the Plaza of the Three Cultures in the Tlatelolco district of Mexico City on 2 October 1968 was a violent unprovoked attack on a peaceful demonstration – and this study is not denying or downplaying this well-established fact. Nor is this study trying to whitewash the reputation of those responsible for the massacre. It does, however, carry out a comparative analysis of the way the massacre was presented, analysed and reacted to in the two apparently opposing discourses: the state (represented by the statements of the government officials, presidential

addresses and the press coverage, which has for many years been considered the product of ‘la prensa vendida’ (‘sold out press’),³ and the public (represented by the texts written outside the government and media rhetoric). There is an agreement among critics and academics that the public discourse opposes the state discourse, but, as we shall see, in some cases the texts from the public discourse follow ‘the party line’ and endorse the views expressed originally by the government figures. There are also instances when the two discourses deliver the same facts but use different language to do so.

Harris notes that neither discourse is internally consistent or coherent; instead of a homogenous state or public discourse, there are multiple discourses attributed to various groups on both sides.⁴ While I agree with Harris’s affirmation regarding the fragmentation of both state and public discourses, there are common characteristics uniting these fragments into definable, albeit disjointed, entities of the Tlatelolco state discourse and the Tlatelolco public discourse. Furthermore, intrinsic fragmentation of the two discourses does not prevent them from creating similar narratives, as we shall see in the main body of the study. We will use the similarities within and between the discourses to identify a knowledge archive of the images and facts that is then propagated by the texts presenting analyses and emotional reactions to the massacre. Emotional charge in these texts may be either an inherent part of the narrative (for example, a testimonial of a survivor) or a political rhetoric trying to evoke emotions. This presents a certain methodological challenge when addressing the sincerity of these emotions. However, the authors’ intentions and attitudes will not form part of the analysis, since the study is focused upon the text itself, rather than its originator. In short, we focus on the representation of the massacre in texts, rather than the analysis of individual authors’ participation in the events.

This book does not aim to answer the questions ‘what happened in Tlatelolco’ or ‘who is responsible’ – there are enough studies trying to do so.⁵ Nor will it take up the Herculean task of examining all texts written about 2 October 1968 in Mexico and beyond from 1968 to the present day. It will focus on the texts produced by the state and public discourse in Mexico immediately after the massacre and up to the end of Luis Echeverría’s presidency. The choice of the cut-off date is self-explanatory: Echeverría’s role in the massacre, although denied by the Mexican state, is well known.⁶ He was Interior Secretary during Gustavo Díaz Ordaz’s presidency and then took the presidential office in 1970, so it would be fitting to include the texts spanning his time in office from 1968 till 1976. And by keeping the geographical spread to Mexico, the study will remain focused on its aim: to examine the way the Tlatelolco massacre was portrayed in the contemporary state and public discourses in order to determine whether the purpose of the texts produced by them is to ‘tell the truth’ or to achieve some other goal, which may have little to do with an accurate representation of the events of 2 October 1968. I propose to explore in more detail the relationship between affect and the collective memory to determine how the massacre is presented immediately after it happened and what of that representation remains (and in what form) as more narratives emerge.

To begin, we shall review the events between July and October 1968 to understand the context of the massacre. Then, we shall consider the nature of the Mexican state discourse, especially the part of it which is distributed to the general public. Finally, we shall present a short overview of the public discourse texts analysed in this study, summarising the plots where necessary and reviewing the body of critiques for the main contributions.

Summer of 1968: The Standoff

In the summer of 1968, as Mexico was getting ready for the XIX Olympic Games, the stage was set for a major display of the revolutionary values put to practice in the country born of violence and political and social turmoil. The Partido Revolucionario Institucional, or PRI (Revolutionary Institutional Party) and the country's president Gustavo Díaz Ordaz (representing the PRI, as eight presidents had done in succession between 1929 and 1964) were working on the image of Mexico as a shining example of what can be achieved by making the revolutionary ideals a reality. 'Everything Is Possible in Peace' was penned as the slogan for the upcoming Olympic Games; the new Olympic Stadium, built near the main campus of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM, National Autonomous University of Mexico) in the Ciudad Universitaria (University District) in the capital, was a masterpiece of modern architecture and art. Mexico was ready to receive well deserved accolades from the visitors from around the globe. But all was not well in this haven of democracy.

A number of strikes and protests by university students and academics, teachers, doctors and railroad workers tested the government's resolve to protect the appearance of Mexico as the country where freedom rules. The PRI was fighting a losing battle trying to remain in power and in charge, as it had been seeing itself since it became the country's ruling party in 1929 as the National Revolutionary Party. The strikers' attempts of opening a dialogue with the government failed repeatedly and on 23 July 1968, the campus of Vocational School No. 5 was occupied by the *granaderos* (riot police). A rather questionable reason given for the attack was a supposed altercation between two gangs taking place on the school grounds; the police and *granaderos* were sent in to disperse the troublemakers. Three days later, the Instituto Politécnico Nacional (IPN, National Polytechnic Institute) and the

Federación Nacional de Estudiantes de Tecnología (FNET, National Federation of Engineering Students) held a protest march; there was another demonstration in the city to commemorate the fifteenth anniversary of Fidel Castro's forces' attack on the Moncada barracks. Both demonstrations were dispersed by the *granaderos* because the government saw these gatherings as a security threat – not because of the danger they posed to the general public, but because they threatened to tarnish the gleaming image of the country ready for the Olympic glory.

As weeks went by, the tension between the students and the government grew, with the latter using more and more force to keep the students from organising further demonstrations and marches.⁷ By August, it became clear to many involved in the movement that a more organised approach would work better and the Consejo Nacional de Huelga, or CNH (National Strike Council) was put together. There was no single leader to follow; the Council consisted of around forty students from different universities and preparatory schools. Among these were Raúl Álvarez Garín, Sócrates Campos Lemus, Luis González de Alba, Gilberto Guevara Niebla, Marcelino Perelló and other names we shall see repeatedly in the course of this study. The Council's main goals were to substantiate the movement with a series of political demands and to lead the movement in a coherent, cohesive way, with representatives in universities and schools across the country.⁸ The Council was first brought together in a meeting between the Coalición de Padres de Familia (Coalition of Parents), representing the families of the students involved in (and sympathetic to) the movement and the Coalición de Profesores de Enseñanza Media y Superior (Association of University and College Teachers), in a meeting on 1 August. If it worked well, the Council had an excellent opportunity to present a cogent well-organised opposition to the government's attempts to discredit the student movement and dismiss it as random skirmishes between local gangs.

The nature and membership of the Coalition of Parents are rarely discussed; in the novel *Regina*, its origins are briefly narrated: in late July 1968, at a meeting with the parents of students who had been taking part in the demonstrations, Félix Hernández Gamundi called for collaboration between parents and students and Román Herrero responded with a proposal ‘que de inmediato fue aceptada – de que se integrase una “Coalición de padres de familia”, la cual debía coordinar las actividades de todos los padres que en apoyo de sus hijos se solidarizasen con el Movimiento’ (‘that it should be accepted immediately, so that a “Coalition of Parents’ should be formed to coordinate the actions of all the parents showing solidarity with the movement in support of their children’).⁹ In most studies, the coalition’s leading role in the demonstration on 27 August 1968 is noted but not examined in detail.¹⁰ It appears that all the mentions of the coalition’s role in the demonstration are based on the following sentence from Monsiváis’s essay: ‘A lo largo de la ruta, del Museo de Antropología al Zócalo, encabezada por la Coalición de Padres de Familia y Maestros, los contingentes han extremado su afán competitivo’ (‘All the way from the Museum of Anthropology to the Zócalo, led by the Coalition of Parents and Teachers, the groups have stepped up their competitive effort’). Soon, however, the parents left the coalition (and later took a rather avid pro-government stance), while the academics set up the Coalición de Maestros (Coalition of Further and Higher Education Teachers).¹¹

On 4 August 1968, the CNH sent its demands to the government:

1. Libertad a los presos políticos;
2. Destitución de los generales Luis Cueto Ramírez y Raúl Mendiola, así como también del teniente coronel Armando Frías;

3. Extinción del Cuerpo de Granaderos ...;
4. Derogación del artículo 145 y 145 bis del Código Penal Federal (delito de Disolución Social) ...;
5. Indemnización de las familias de los muertos y a los heridos ... desde el viernes 26 de julio en adelante;
6. Deslindamiento de responsabilidades de los ‘actos de represión y vandalismo’ por parte de las autoridades a través de la policía, granaderos y Ejército.

- (1. Free political prisoners;
2. Remove Generals Luis Cueto Ramírez and Raúl Mendiola and Lieutenant Colonel Armando Frías from their positions of power;
3. Disband the *Granadero* Corps ...;
4. Repeal Articles 145 and 145bis (the law of sedition) of the Federal Penal Code ...;
5. Compensate the families of those killed or wounded ... from 26 July to the present day;
6. Identify those responsible for the ‘acts of repression and vandalism’ among the authorities represented by the police, *granaderos* and the army.¹²

It was hoped that the president would respond to these demands in the spirit in which they were meant – by opening up an equitable and respectful dialogue between the government and the opposition. But the students’ aspirations were not to come to fruition. Instead of sitting down with Gustavo Díaz Ordaz and his government for a productive discussion, the students continued to be met with the *granadero* troops as these went on dispersing demonstrations and arresting the protesters. By the time the president was due to deliver his fourth presidential address on 1 September 1968, further strikes and demonstrations forced

him to make a token gesture and offer to start talking to the students. But the conditions of this dialogue were to be dictated by the PRI, not by the CNH.¹³ One cannot help but feel that the government was not taking the CNH or the movement seriously, seeing it as no more than children following bad examples. On the other hand, neither the railroad workers, the medical personnel of the capital's hospitals, nor the university academics involved in the movement could be dismissed as badly behaved youngsters. Equally, they could not be swept under the carpet as individual troublemakers; yet the government was not going to change its position and admit that a number of those held in prison were indeed political prisoners (a member of the railroad workers' union Demetrio Vallejo, for one).¹⁴ The government's rigid unwillingness to reconsider its position led to a complete impasse by the time Díaz Ordaz delivered his address.

The address was focused on the preparations for the Olympic Games, with some time dedicated to the 'recent conflicts' in the capital. Describing the student movement as 'el ansia de imitación' ('a desire to copy'),¹⁵ it no doubt referred to the events in Paris, Prague and the United States over the summer of 1968. The demonstrations and protests in the capital were presented as attacks on the country's stability and a threat to the upcoming Olympic Games. A notion of an external conspiracy was floated in no uncertain terms: 'en los recientes disturbios intervinieron manos no estudiantiles' ('non-student hands contributed to recent disturbances').¹⁶ So it is hardly surprising that in conclusion the president assured the government that the army would be called upon 'para la seguridad interior y la defensa exterior de la Federación' ('for the internal security and external defence of the Federation').¹⁷ Was he promising a massacre or banking on the students backing down after this thinly veiled threat?

Two weeks later, on 13 September, a silent demonstration was held in the Zócalo as a response to the president unwillingness to talk on equal terms. During the demonstration, 600,000 people marched in silence down Paseo de La Reforma to the Zócalo to show that there was only one way to talk – in a dialogue, not by kowtowing to the authority of the ‘adult’ government.¹⁸ Five days later, the army troops invaded the UNAM campus.¹⁹ The blatant disregard for the principle of the university autonomy and the use of excessive force against the students and academics was met with fury and indignation by the university staff, students’ parents, intellectuals and other sectors (especially those involved in the strikes). On 23 September, the rector of the UNAM, Javier Barros Sierra turned in his resignation in protest, indicating that he was being held personally responsible for the conflict between the students and the government.²⁰ From now on, the standoff became more pronounced: neither side was prepared to yield, but the government had the army on its side and continued to use it almost daily whenever an opportunity to show superior force arose. However, the student movement went on to present a powerful opposition, central to the political change, even if the change took many years to come about.²¹ The composition of the movement was mostly middle class, which is an important consideration, not the least because the Mexican middle class was the main beneficiary of the country’s economic progress and the social sector responsible for ‘interpreting reality’.²² By this token, the way the middle class perceived the political situation in the country would then be adopted by the lower classes (not unlike the ‘foquismo’ principle).²³ A tentative union – but a union all the same – of the students and railroad workers attests to this, however much effort was put into discrediting and diminishing it by the state discourse and the PRI supporters, who presented it as sporadic violence against the government forces by hoodlums.²⁴ The railroad union members joined the students in several demonstrations; they also sent their representatives to the Plaza of the Three Cultures on 2 October 1968.

By the end of September 1968, the attacks on university campuses were becoming more violent: during an attack on the Casco Santo Tomás campus of the IPN, 15 students were killed and 40 wounded.²⁵ The campuses in the Zacatenco district of the capital were the last to be occupied by the army. The use of bazookas and high-power weapons was no longer the front-page news and the students retaliating by throwing Molotov cocktails and stones or setting fire to buses and cars offered the government enough of an excuse to deploy artillery against civilians. It would seem that the government would stop at nothing to show that it was right in its policy, even if it meant killing its own citizens in the process.

On 2 October, ten days before the opening ceremony of the XIX Olympic Games, as representatives from around the world were arriving in Mexico City, the CNH organised one more large demonstration. It was supposed to start in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas (Plaza of the Three Cultures) in the middle-class residential district of Tlatelolco in the north of the city, and proceed to Casco Santo Tomás. The demonstration was no secret; in fact, it was being prepared meticulously to attract as many people as possible so that the need for an open dialogue with the government could be conveyed to larger segments of the population. The middle-class area was selected for the purpose of getting the local population interested in the movement's goals. The invitations were sent to the students and teachers in schools and universities across the city; the trade union representatives were invited; the speakers from the CNH members were carefully selected and the leaflets with the Council's statements were printed to be distributed at the demonstration. The key demand the CNH was making is to free all political prisoners, even though the government insisted that there were none (later, this view was amended to there being prisoners held for inciting unrest in the country but they were definitely not called 'political prisoners'). The speakers were going to talk about

the current political situation in the country (Florencio López Osuna), the importance of international solidarity (José González Sierra), tasks assigned to different brigades in the movement (David Vega) and preparations for a hunger strike (Eduardo Valle Espinoza). The speeches were to be delivered from a balcony on the third floor of the Chihuahua building. The CNH members were to gather and stay there during the demonstration. After deciding on the speakers, location and topics, the organisers agreed not to proceed to Casco Santo Tomás because of the very real danger of a major altercation with the army.²⁶ In short, the organisers were trying to ensure that the demonstration went on as planned and nobody got hurt. Unfortunately, the government had other plans.

* * *

Is it possible to put together a full and coherent picture of what happened in the Plaza of the Three Cultures on the evening of 2 October 1968? Probably not. Nor, as I will argue, is it necessary. So, what does the Tlatelolco discourse do? Is it the matter of the state and public discourses being at loggerheads in their respective claims to accuracy and ‘truth’? Or is it something else, led not by the search for truth, but by the need for emotional reconciliation?

Tlatelolco State Discourse: General Observations

The state discourse texts analysed in our study include articles from Mexico City’s *diarios*, or daily newspapers (with particular focus on *Excélsior* as the one with the largest circulation) published between 3 and 12 October 1968. The dates chosen fall between the first coverage of the Tlatelolco massacre and the start of the XIX Olympic Games. We will also include the

fifth presidential address delivered by Gustavo Díaz Ordaz on 1 September 1969, since it spoke about the massacre and its consequences, albeit in a rather roundabout way.

The press's role in the construction of the state discourse's narratives of the massacre is often reduced to the attempts to either downplay the massacre or lay blame on anyone but those responsible. Since in Mexico the state has the monopoly on paper imports, it would be easy to conclude that whatever was printed for large circulation would have to be approved by the government, so it would be difficult for a *diario* to remain fully objective and independent. The sheer number of daily newspapers weakens their focus because 'no todos cuentan con las instalaciones, el equipo humano y el capital que requiere un diario moderno' ('not all have access to the facilities, manpower and capital that a modern daily paper needs'),²⁷ the absence of reliable financial support is often a threat to the newspaper's independence. The other, greater threat is 'el poder incontrastable del gobierno' ('the government's overwhelming power'),²⁸ especially when it comes to the monopoly on paper import and distribution.²⁹ There appears to be only one option open to the few independent publications: 'dar con la proporción justa de elogios y censuras para mantener su independencia y, al mismo tiempo, evitar ser objeto de una presión o una represalia que pudiera resultar fatal' ('present praise and criticism in equal measure to maintain its independence while avoiding becoming an object of pressure or retaliation that might be fatal').³⁰ The discord between the state discourse, as presented in periodicals, and the readers' expectations means that the readers have come to take the opposite of what the newspapers say as the truth.³¹

The capital's daily newspaper with the largest circulation is *Excélsior*, founded in 1918 by Rafael Alduncin. From August 1968, its general editor Julio Scherer García worked

hard to uphold the highest standard of journalism while trying to toe the party line. He saw journalism as ‘a problem of balance and counterbalance, ... an acrobatic art with networks of protection’.³² Smaller periodicals included *El Universal*, *La Prensa*, *Ovaciones*, *Novedades*, *¡Siempre!*, a rather left-wing magazine *¿Por Qué?* and others. Some of these were openly pro-government, happy to reiterate the state rhetoric, especially when it came to the coverage of the student movement; others held a more neutral perspective or leaned (in the case of *¿Por Qué?*, significantly so) towards the opposition. But generally speaking, the Mexican press in the late 1960s was caught between a rock and a hard place, having to extoll the country’s progress and report on the instances of obvious disregard for civil liberties at the same time.³³

On 11 July 1968, the representatives of the Club de Periodistas de México (Mexican Press Club, established in 1952) were received by the president, who reminded them that ‘el arma fundamental del periodista es la verdad’ (‘the journalist’s key weapon is the truth’)³⁴ and that upholding the truth was as important to the journalist as enforcing the law is to the government. The president also stated that the two sides needed to function in parallel and in the atmosphere of mutual support; considering the way some newspapers reported on the clashes between the students and the capital’s police and, later, the army, the atmosphere of mutual support connoted the newspapers acting as the spokespeople of the government. This would, of course, go against the press’s dual role of information dissemination and ‘reconstrucción espiritual’ (‘spiritual reconstruction’), expressed in the need to ‘entrar serena y noblemente el debate de todas las opiniones; ... despojarse de todos los prejuicios y prescindir de todas las pasiones’ (‘enter calmly and with dignity into the debate of all opinions, ... free itself from all prejudice and reject all passions’).³⁵ In other words, the press had to remain objective and neutral in all circumstances. Was this the case in the press

coverage of the massacre? According to Juan Miguel De Mora, the newspaper coverage was supposed to be reassuring the public that nothing major had happened and nobody was to be singled out as the one responsible for it: ‘Versiones oficiales. Versiones tranquilizadoras. Versiones modestas. El triunfo de la modestia’ (‘Official versions. Calming versions. Modest versions. A triumph of modesty’).³⁶ So, it would appear that objectivity and neutrality have been sacrificed to keep the country from exploding into a civil war with the whole world watching. It would then be up to the public discourse to step up to the plate and deliver factually accurate narratives about the massacre without sparing the public’s feelings in face of painful, uncomfortable truth.

Tlatelolco Public Discourse: General Observations

The public discourse texts span a longer period: from the poems by José Carlos Becerra and José Emilio Pacheco (published at the end of October 1968) to the works released by the end of 1976, as Luis Echeverría’s time in office drew to a close. These will be presented in chronological order. To give the reader a clearer understanding of these texts, we will include brief plot summaries of the lesser-known works and overviews of their critiques where available.

Once the works of fiction and poetry telling the story of the massacre began to appear, a hard-hitting ‘literatura de Tlatelolco’ (Tlatelolco literature) surfaced. Although the movement was relatively small because, as Leal argues, most writers ‘are committed to the writing of purely literary compositions’ and the massacre did not affect the writers beyond Mexico City,³⁷ it delivered a powerful message of disillusionment with the empty rhetoric of national glory and revolutionary ideals. But its more pressing aim was to tell the truth about

the massacre because the official channels would not do so,³⁸ identify those responsible for it, and keep the memory of Tlatelolco alive.³⁹ The latter is often achieved by the publications on the anniversaries of the massacre; the works published in 1973 (five years after the massacre) will be included in our study. The Tlatelolco literature includes poetry and prose (mainly novels; some short stories were also published).

The Tlatelolco poetry corpus can be divided into two groups: the account poems delivering a story of the massacre, and the aftermath poems analysing what happened and constructing an emotional response to the massacre.⁴⁰ It is therefore hardly surprising that emotions dominate the poetic narratives of the massacre, with a strong sense of a standoff best reflected in the juxtaposition of ‘us’ and ‘them’.⁴¹ The first poems about the massacre were José Emilio Pacheco’s ‘Lectura de los “Cantares mexicanos”’ (‘Reading the “Mexican Songs”’) ⁴² and José Carlos Becerra’s ‘El espejo de piedra’ (‘The Stone Mirror’), ⁴³ published on 30 October in *La cultura en México*; a week later, Juan Bañuelos’s poem ‘No consta en actas’ (‘Not in the Records’) appeared in the same supplement. Between 1969 and 1976, the main corpus of the Tlatelolco poetry emerged, with contributions from Jesús Arellano (‘Mordaza’ (‘Jaw’), 1970), Jaime Labastida (‘El caos o restos, temblores, iras’ (‘The Chaos or Remains, Tremors, Fury’), 1970), Rosario Castellanos⁴⁴ (whose poem ‘Memorial de Tlatelolco’ (‘Memorandum on Tlatelolco’) was written in 1971 for Elena Poniatowska’s work *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Massacre in Mexico)), Óscar Oliva (‘Concentración de la cólera’ (‘Concentration of Rage’), 1972), Jaime Sabines (‘Tlatelolco 68’, 1972), Gabriel Zaid⁴⁵ (‘Lectura de Shakespeare’ (‘Reading Shakespeare’), 1968; ‘No hay que perder la paz’ (‘Peace Cannot Be Lost’), 1971) and many others.

However, the Tlatelolco literature was not the only public response to the massacre. A significant number of essays, academic analyses and testimonial writings⁴⁶ contributed to the corpus of the public discourse texts. These texts did not always present a perspective different from that of the government, but they will be considered outside the state discourse corpus because they were not produced by the government officials or by the press.

The first essay on the massacre is Ramón Ramírez's *El movimiento estudiantil de México: Julio/diciembre de 1968* (Student Movement in Mexico: July/December 1968), published in February 1969. Released so quickly after the massacre, it admits that it cannot predict what the long-term outcome would be: 'Al término de la redacción de este trabajo, primeros días del mes de febrero de 1969, es difícil prever la suerte del movimiento estudiantil' ('At the time when this work has been finished, in the first days of February of 1969, it is hard to predict the fate of the student movement'),⁴⁷ but the movement will have left an indelible mark on the country's history. Raúl Jardón calls Ramírez's work 'la más importante ... obra que sigue siendo la más amplia compilación documental y la cronología más completa sobre el movimiento' ('the most important ... work that continues to be the fullest collection of documents and the most complete chronology of the movement'),⁴⁸ and recognises that because of its nature and the time it was published, there are mistakes and omissions and, more importantly, it did not explore 'la visión interna de los hechos desde el seno del Consejo Nacional de Huelga y los Comités de Lucha' ('the insider's perspective on the events, gleaned from within the National Strike Council and the Fight Committees').⁴⁹

Edmundo Jardón Arzate's essay, *De la Ciudadela a Tlatelolco (México: el islote intocado)* (From the Ciudadela to Tlatelolco (Mexico: An Untouched Island)), published in May 1969,⁵⁰ is similar to Ramírez's work in that it seeks to understand not only why the

student movement arose but also why it was so violently terminated. The essay starts with historical contextualisations of Mexican society and the role of universities, and traces how the lack of growth and development in the educational sector contributed to the discontent in the universities.⁵¹

The accounts of the massacre written by eyewitnesses or participants of the demonstration also begin to appear in 1969. One of the first books to be published was the infamous anonymous *¡El Móndrigo!* (Lily-livered Scum) which aimed to uncover a conspiracy in the CNH to open fire at the demonstration in Tlatelolco, thus provoking the army to respond. Apparently, this was supposed to help start a revolution, at the end of which the CNH would take over the country. Needless to say, this hastily put together opus can hardly be trusted to tell an accurate story of the student movement. We shall spend a bit more time on it because it is almost always left out of the analyses of the Tlatelolco narratives, either because of its blatant propaganda content or because of its lack of literary finesse – or both.

The authorship of the text is unclear. Who was El Móndrigo, if there ever was one? If he was killed on the day his body would have been collected by an ambulance and transported to one of the hospitals. According to the publisher's preface, he was not disfigured by the wounds, so he would have been wounded below the neckline; by his own admission later in the book, he went to the university, so he would be in his late teens or early twenties. In the preface, it is also stated that he was buried as an unidentified victim. But if he was wounded on the third floor of the Chihuahua building, where it all began and where there were plenty of government agents, it is unlikely that his body would have been left behind since this would have been one of the first areas to be swept by the police and the army. It is

also unlikely that a member of the CNH would not have been identified by the agents or other CNH members.

The contradictions continue, ranging from who was the author to the suggestion that Sócrates Campos Lemus was the lead figure of the movement and a CIA agent. This work is not about the massacre itself but about what happened before and how the massacre was organised. It seems to agree with the notion of ‘columnas de seguridad’ (‘security brigades’) representing the hardliners of the student movement, which was propagated by the state discourse. The introduction from the supposed publisher refers to ‘el combate en la Plaza de las Tres Culturas’ (‘the battle in the Plaza of the Three Cultures’),⁵² indicating that there was indeed a major altercation in the plaza. The statement ‘los ambulantes casi habían acabado de levantar muertos y heridos’ (‘the paramedics had just finished collecting dead and wounded’)⁵³ suggests that there were quite a few casualties, and surely more than the supposedly ever decreasing numbers later mentioned by Juan Miguel De Mora.⁵⁴ A reference to ‘reales y supuestos francotiradores’ (‘actual and alleged snipers’)⁵⁵ confirms that there were snipers involved in the gunfight. If some were ‘alleged snipers’, then either those people claimed to be snipers or the police wrongly took them for snipers – the latter explanation is more plausible, since many were arrested and later released without charge.⁵⁶

El Mándrigo also states that he takes it upon himself to write ‘un relato cronológico’ (‘a chronological story’) of the movement and he will continue to do so ‘hasta su culminación triunfal’ (‘till its triumphant completion’). Although there will be gaps because some facts may escape his mind and therefore be unverifiable later, or because ‘no todo amerita líneas’ (‘not everything is worth writing down’). Yet, nothing of relevance ‘que marque jalones, or errores que pongan en peligro [el destino del movimiento estudiantil]’ (‘that would leave

marks, or the errors that would endanger [the fate of the student movement]’⁵⁷ will be left out. This is a very bizarre statement to make – it is as if El Mándrigo was preparing the readers for the inconsistencies that they will encounter if they compare this narrative with other versions of the events (presumably, either from the state or the public discourse). The language of the book is equally inconsistent, as the ‘author’ seems to forget who he is supposed to be. He uses slang and high academic style on the same page (for example, ‘metió su cuchara en el debate’ (‘stuck his nose in the discussion’)⁵⁸ and ‘exigió detalles del trato con la CIA’ (‘demand the details of the agreement with the CIA’)),⁵⁹ further complicating the issue of the authorship – is the text written by a student or a government official?

Following *¡El Mándrigo!* and offering a different view of the student movement, a number of publications by eyewitnesses contributed their versions of the answer to the question ‘what happened on 2 October?’ Among these, the best known (and probably the most contentious, as far as its fidelity to the original testimonials goes) is Elena Poniatowska’s *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Massacre in Mexico), first published in February 1971. However, the first full-length authored eyewitness account was Gilberto Balam’s *Tlatelolco: reflexiones de un testigo* (Tlatelolco: Reflections of a Witness, February 1969). Most of this work is devoted to the author’s story of coming to Mexico City to start a course at a preparatory school and becoming involved in the movement. Only five pages are devoted to the massacre;⁶⁰ the rest of the essay is about the student movement and the clashes between the students and the state; there is also an attempt at analysing the reasons for the conflict between the government and the students.

Roberto Blanco Moheno’s essay *Tlatelolco: Historia de una infamia* (Tlatelolco: History of an Infamy, May 1969) does not present an account of what happened on 2

October. Instead, it makes inferences about the reasons for the massacre, quotes from often unidentified sources to explain why the students (more precisely, the members of the CNH) were the ones solely responsible for the attack, and performs a series of rather overly passionate character assassinations on all the members of the CNH, José Revueltas, Eli de Gortari and other key figures of the student movement. Finally, there is a reflection on the events between July and October 1968, which assumes that the reader will know exactly what the text is implying: for example, the presence of foreign journalists in the plaza is attributed to the movement's attempt to further discredit Mexico, with the help of the CIA, the Soviet Union, the Cuban communists and other foreign political bogeymen.

A collection of essays by Jorge Carrión, Daniel Cazés, Sol Arguedas and Fernando Carmona appeared in January 1970. Aptly titled *Tres culturas en agonía* (Three Cultures in Agony), it offers a rather emotionally charged analysis of the events preceding and following the massacre. Only one chapter presents a detailed account of the events of 2 October: Fernando Carmona's essay 'Genealogía y actualidad de la represión' ('Genealogy and Reality of Repression'),⁶¹ which was the first attempt to put together a coherent picture of what happened in Tlatelolco. Carmona admits from the onset that there are many accounts, some of which contradict others; and the only source of information is the press coverage and statements from eyewitnesses. He describes the problem thus: 'lo que ocurrió en Tlatelolco es tan confuso y contradictorio en tantos aspectos, que no será fácil que se llegue a reconstruir los hechos en todos sus detalles' ('what happened in Tlatelolco is so confusing and contradictory in so many ways, that it won't be easy to reconstruct all that happened in every detail').⁶² However, there is still enough information to answer the questions he posits: who opened fire and on whose orders; what information was this decision based on; what other steps could have been taken and why the officials decided to use force; what happened

exactly; how many were killed and how many wounded; of these, how many students; and finally – and very importantly – what role different factions played in ‘un movimiento tan heterogéneo como el estudiantil’ (‘a movement as varied as the student movement’).⁶³

Octavio Paz’s actions after the massacre have been noted by many intellectuals, including José Emilio Pacheco, Carlos Monsiváis, José Revueltas, Vicente Rojo, Elena Poniatowska and others, and followed by several writers (Juan Bañuelos, Gabriel Zaid, Jaime Reyes and others). As he announced his resignation from the post of Mexico’s cultural attaché to India, Octavio Paz summed up the massacre succinctly and bitterly in his letter to the Secretary of External Relations Antonio Carrillo Flores on 4 October 1968:

Las fuerzas armadas dispararon contra una multitud compuesta en su mayoría por estudiantes. El resultado: más de 25 muertos, centenares de heridos y un millar de personas en la cárcel. No describiré a Ud. mi estado de ánimo. Me imagino que es el de la mayoría de los mexicanos: tristeza y cólera.

(The armed forces fired on a crowd consisting mostly of students. The result: more than twenty-five dead, hundreds wounded and over a thousand in prison. I won’t describe my state of mind to you. I think that most Mexicans feel the same way: sad and furious.)⁶⁴

Paz’s resignation was presented as enforced by the government to save face,⁶⁵ especially after Paz’s letter to the Olympic Committee, in which he condemned the army’s violence against unarmed civilians during a peaceful demonstration.⁶⁶ But the fact that Paz refused to continue

to represent the corrupt government was noted and lauded by many.⁶⁷ First, instead of writing a poem for the Opening Ceremony of the Olympic Games, Paz wrote a short poem ‘Intermitencias del oeste III’ (‘Interferences from the West III’), condemning the massacre. The poem was included in the collection *Ladera Este* (East Slope, May 1969). Then in 1970, while in a self-imposed exile, Paz re-wrote his famous *El laberinto de la soledad* (The Labyrinth of Solitude), adding new sections to analyse and reflect upon the massacre and historical roots of the violence that coloured 2 October. The essay ‘Posdata’ (‘Postscript’, 1970) was added to *El laberinto* to continue the exploration of the Mexican national identity.

The essay which delivers the most emotionally powerful narrative of the massacre as a reflection of Mexico’s violent past is Carlos Monsiváis’s essay ‘Y era nuestra herencia una red de agujeros, 2 octubre / 2 noviembre 1968: “Día de muertos”’ (‘And Countless Wormholes Were Our Heritage, 2 October / 2 November 1968: “Day of the Dead”’),⁶⁸ originally published in December 1970. The second and third sections of the essay are about the Tlatelolco massacre; the first tells of a religious pilgrimage on the Day of the Dead and the Mexicans’ attitude towards death. A symbolic link between the two is painfully clichéd; although we would not expect this from Monsiváis’s usually subtle narrative, the historical link between the massacre, La Noche Triste⁶⁹ and human sacrifice is seen as a powerful means of preserving the event in the collective memory.⁷⁰

The collection of essays *Los procesos de México 68: Tiempo de hablar* (The Trials of Mexico 68: Time to Speak) by two members of the CNH (Eduardo Valle Espinoza and Raúl Álvarez Garín) and José Revueltas (all imprisoned in Lecumberri between November 1968 and January 1969) was published in November 1970. The introduction, written by all three contributors, talks about the ‘violencia inolvidable’ (‘unforgettable violence’),⁷¹ and how it

came to be. The government presented it as a reaction to a conspiracy followed by insurgency,⁷² so that the violent retaliation would be expected and accepted by the populace as the only way to deal with this obviously dangerous situation. The three chapters that follow offer three similar views of the reasons for the massacre, some eyewitness accounts, and a lengthy analysis of the PRI's multiple failings (presented by Revueltas).

The first novel in the Tlatelolco literature corpus, Rafael Solana's *Juegos de invierno* (Winter Games, 1970), was supposed to be filling the knowledge gap in both discourses: while the government's version of the narrative would be telling about why the massacre had to happen to stop anti-government movements, the public discourse would deliver an equally unconvincing story because neither side would be prepared to be objective.⁷³ Speaking about Revueltas, Avilés Fabila and Mendoza (whose books came out a year after Solana's novel), the novel's narrator states that none of their writings would be telling an objective story of the massacre: 'Pepe Revueltas, imagínate nada más lo que diría ... René Avilés Fabila está picado de la misma araña; también él haría canto lírico ... tal vez la China Mendoza' ('Pepe Revueltas, you can just imagine what he would say ... René Avilés Fabila has got the same bee in his bonnet; he would also produce something lyrical ... possibly the Chinese Mendoza').⁷⁴ So it would be assumed that Solana's novel would be the one rising to the challenge. But does it? Without telling the story, it asks many questions about the reasons for the massacre, who was responsible and who benefited from it. Like *¡El Mándrigo!* and *Tlatelolco: historia de una infamia*, it places the blame squarely on the university academics, who apparently wanted to rule the country. Among those blamed for inciting the students to violence are Carlos Madrazo and Humberto Romero, who had already been accused by Campos Lemus of funding the hardliners of the student movement.⁷⁵ It is surprising that the novel claiming not to follow in the footsteps of the state or the public discourse does not go

beyond reiterating the information previously revealed in the national newspapers by a member of the CNH. The critics of Solana's novel note the absence of hard facts in the narrative of the massacre; instead, the novel relies on hearsay, conjectures and speculations.⁷⁶

In February 1971, Elena Poniatowska's collage *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Massacre in Mexico, 1971) was published. This is arguably the most analysed contribution to the Tlatelolco public discourse,⁷⁷ so rather than summarising the work and covering the whole corpus of its critiques, we shall consider the aspects of the work that have found their way into other texts and into the public discourse in general. *La noche de Tlatelolco* combines eyewitness accounts, newspaper coverage and other texts (such as excerpts from poems) in an attempt to depict the massacre 'like it was', using accounts on both sides (but, of course, giving preference to the non-government sources). However, it ends up not telling the story. Instead, it creates a complex affective atmosphere in which the narrative of the event is constructed out of several themes defined by the quotations from the students, bystanders, officials, newspaper reporters and others: the start of the massacre; bodies, wounds and blood; arrests and beatings; immediate reactions to the massacre; and the aftermath.

In the preface to the 2 October section, Poniatowska affirms that there is a single shared accurate representation of how it all started ('todos los testimonios coinciden' ('all accounts say the same thing')),⁷⁸ but not what happened after that or how the massacre ended. The notion of a single knowledge pack emerges, even though, as Poniatowska is quoted saying, there was no official account of the massacre published prior to her work: 'I took my interview to *Novedades*, but they turned it down because there were orders not to publish a single word about the incident.'⁷⁹ How does this align with the coverage in *Excelsior*, *La Prensa*, *¡Siempre!* and other newspapers? What about all the other essays and poems that did

talk about the massacre in no uncertain terms? Poniatowska herself used many of these sources in her work. She may be referring to a more emotional, eyewitness-centred publication aimed at a wider readership, which no essay had achieved, although I would argue that the newspaper coverage coming from the journalists in the plaza incited sufficient emotional response from its readers.

La noche is designed to rouse a unified emotional reaction: the government is evil, the students are good and the massacre is a crime against humanity in every way. So the quotations selected are chosen to build up the affective atmosphere to a crescendo of the massacre and then lead into a more analytical area, where the readers are given a chance to choose the side to support. However, the choice is already made for them by the preceding narrative: when told that the students wanted to steal the Olympics' limelight,⁸⁰ the reader is already conditioned to sneer at this interpretation because s/he knows the 'truth'. And the 'truth' is at the core of the event narrative: the vulnerable are being attacked because the attackers are themselves vulnerable in their attempt to preserve the appearance that is rotten to the core.

The book is a collection of styles: some are accounts, retold experiences; some are analyses; some are disjointed calls from the people in the plaza (unless these were taped and transcribed word for word, they appear to be contrived for an emotional effect). This stylistic collage creates an affective immediacy, metaphorically immersing the readers into the panic and pain of the moment, so that they forget that three years have passed since that night, and feel that what they are reading unfolds as it is being read. The same purpose is served by the intertextuality of *La noche*, with excerpts from poems and newspapers presented alongside

statements from the eyewitnesses.⁸¹ Roberto Blanco Moheno uses this technique to a certain extent in *Tlatelolco: Historia de una infamia*, but he does this less aggressively: he takes on the role of the narrator and the emotional charge of his narrative is in his simultaneous analysis and affect built into the form of the delivery, especially when he ‘screams’ at the reader in block capitals in Chapter Three, ‘El corrido’ (‘The *corrido* song’). In *La noche de Tlatelolco*, the poignancy is in the description of the massacre; the analysis is deliberately left out, with the exception of the opening pages of the Tlatelolco section where the author steps in with a brief – and supposedly objective – analysis and then leaves to give the eyewitnesses a chance to tell it ‘like it was’. But the author remains in the text as the editor, deciding whose quotations to use and how.⁸² As a result of editing the eyewitness statements, there are some factual inaccuracies in the work. For example, several quotations were misattributed to different members of the CNH.⁸³ A request to send civil ambulances with their sirens on was wrongly ascribed to a reporter, whereas it was made by the head of the Dirección Federal de Seguridad (Federal Security Directorate) speaking on the phone in the Chihuahua building.⁸⁴ Some quotations were heavily edited to deliver a more emotional message: the ones by Margarita Nolasco and her friend might have been either re-written to resemble a story or edited to make them more effective in inciting the readers’ emotional response.

Other, less well-known public discourse texts appeared in 1971 alongside *La noche de Tlatelolco* and were inevitably eclipsed by it. Edmundo Domínguez Aragonés, who took part in the demonstration on 2 October, published his contribution to the Tlatelolco literature, the novel *Argón 18 inicia* (Argon 18 Is Activated) in April 1971. Dedicated to María Luisa Mendoza, this novel has a brief but powerful description of the massacre, although the rest of the novel is about two sets of relationships: one of Libraris, Milagros and Pepe Nava, and the other of Aristeo López and his family. The events of the summer and autumn of 1968 are a

backdrop to the psychological entanglement between the two groups of protagonists.⁸⁵ In June 1971, María Luisa Mendoza's novel *Con Él, conmigo, con nosotros tres* (With Him, with Me, with Us Three) came out (having been copyrighted in March that year). Mendoza's novel (dedicated to Edmundo Domínguez Aragonés) was influenced by her own experience on 2 October as well as by the newspaper coverage: the two are linked in Mendoza's daily column in *El Día* 'La O por lo redondo' ('O All Around'), which voiced both concern for the prisoners and victims, and fear of retributions.⁸⁶ The novel tells the story of a family whose history spans almost 100 years from the 1870s to 1968. Its last surviving member, Delifina, is dying after witnessing many lines of her family disintegrate and succumb to the violence in which the country has been steeped for years.⁸⁷ The Tlatelolco massacre is an integral part of Delfina's life, but it is one of many similar events, some affecting the whole of Mexico, others destroying just her family.

Carlos Fuentes's essay *Tiempo mexicano* (Mexican Time) came out in November 1971. This work combines Octavio Paz's historical perspective on Tlatelolco⁸⁸ with the affective fury of the first accounts of the massacre. The essay's complex tone – from sombre to anguished – is inspired not only by the macabre subject, but also by the weight of previous similar (not to say, habitual) violence experienced by the nation.⁸⁹

Salvador Hernández's essay *El PRI y el movimiento estudiantil de 1968* (The PRI and the Student Movement), released in August 1971, presents an account of the massacre, calling it 'la Masacre de Tlatelolco' ('the Tlatelolco Massacre').⁹⁰ This is the first time that no metaphor is used to describe what happened. The three-paragraph summary of 'la Masacre de Tlatelolco' is largely unemotional, although the phrases 'sin ninguna advertencia o

provocación de desorden civil' ('without any warning and without being provoked by civil unrest')⁹¹ and 'asesinando e hiriendo' ('killing and wounding')⁹² evoke anger at the government's unlawful actions against its own citizens. These phrases are constructed using the language of the state discourse – these paragraphs read as if they had been copied from a police report or the front pages of *Excélsior*.

Luis González de Alba's autobiographical work *Los días y los años* (Days and Years, August 1971) does not tell the story of the massacre in a linear fashion. Instead, it presents a combination of the narrative of the author's two years in the Lecumberri prison, memories of the CNH's activities before the massacre (González de Alba was its member), and eyewitnesses' testimonies of what happened in the plaza on 2 October. González de Alba's own memories are included, although he was not in the plaza. Along with other members of the CNH, he was on the third floor of the Chihuahua building where he was arrested by the Olympia Battalion agents shortly after the gunfight began. This work is seen as a documentary account of the massacre and its aftermath;⁹³ its literary merit is often overlooked in favour of its testimonial value.

René Avilés Fabila's novel *El gran solitario de palacio* (Great Loner of the Palace) was published in September 1971. Like his earlier novel, *Los juegos* (Games, 1967),⁹⁴ *El gran solitario* was received with cautious optimism as it revealed the author's caustic sense of humour that later marked all of his work. *El gran solitario de palacio* is a combination of political satire, *testimonio*, love story and social commentary, although it does not come across as disjointed as this description may suggest. The novel consists of a brief introduction written as a mock interview 'Borrador de un reportaje' ('A Draft of a Report'); a word of warning, so to say – 'Adverencia' ('Warning'); two chapters: 'Introducción, la quema de

vanidades o el medio ambiente' ('Introduction, Burning of Vanity Items or Environment') and 'Los sucesos' ('Events'), an interview with Dr H. Henrick by Jaime Villaseñor from the *Sol Caliente* newspaper ('Anexo único o varios años después del movimiento estudiantil', ('The Only Appendix, or Several Years after the Student Movement')) and a one-sentence epilogue. The first chapter describes an unnamed Latin American country (Mexico, by all accounts), ruled by El Caudillo, an apparently immortal representative of PRT (Partido de la Revolución Triunfante – Revolutionary Triumphant Party, a tongue-in-cheek wordplay on the name of the PRI), who comes back every six years as a new President – a Mexican Dr Who. The second chapter is a collection of scenes from the Tlatelolco massacre and its aftermath: a demonstration gathers in the plaza; police and *granaderos* open fire; many are killed; many are imprisoned; some are later executed, while others are released.

The novel was published in the same year as Poniatowska's *La noche* and, as a result, was among those overshadowed by the latter. This may explain the paucity of critiques. The few that did appear agree that the novel is a piece of political satire aimed to expose Mexico's corrupt government and apathetic public; there is also a consensus that the novel uses irony for this purpose.⁹⁵ Unlike other Tlatelolco texts, *El gran solitario* pokes fun at the government – everyone else treats it seriously, with the possible exception of Gabriel Said's poem 'Todo es posible en paz' ('Everything is possible in peace'). The novel uses irony as 'the rhetoric of approval and disapproval'⁹⁶ to show that the government is inept, ignorant and generally crippled by its own corruption; and the public and the government play the same game of pretence. Surprisingly, the novel does not portray students as saintly heroes or martyrs, the way many other Tlatelolco texts do. Here, students are scared, hurt, crying, betraying their friends to save their own lives. We cannot really talk about this novel presenting facts about the massacre, since there is a half-hearted attempt at making the

country not appear to be Mexico – the plaza is called ‘La Plaza de la Cultura’ (‘the Plaza of Culture’), the Olympic Games are ‘la Semana Deportiva’ (‘the Sports Week’), and the Caudillo President is unidentifiable. However, those who know what happened would identify all the necessary components of the story of the massacre.

Rosalio Wences Reza’s essay *El movimiento estudiantil y los problemas nacionales* (Student Movement and National Problems, December 1971) is a sociological study with quantitative elements focused primarily on the 10 June 1971 Corpus Christi massacre. However, there are many parallels drawn between this massacre and ‘1968’ (mainly 26 July and 2 October, although the first date is mentioned once in Appendix 2 and the second is referred to but not discussed in detail), as the trend of violence is traced from 1968 to 1971. The introduction (written by the Editorial Nuestro Tiempo) creates the ‘we/they’ juxtaposition from the onset: ‘Quienes rechazamos la tesis policiaca de que la protesta estudiantil es una conjura internacional ... pensamos que el movimiento estudiantil es un hecho social y político real, importante’ (‘Those of us who reject the political statement that the student protest is an international conspiracy ... believe that the student movement is a real, important social and political phenomenon’),⁹⁷ thus showing that the international conspiracy theory should be dismissed as ignorant, at best. The academic tone of the book is noted as potentially off-putting to those who ‘han vivido la lucha estudiantil desde dentro’ (‘have lived the student fight from within’),⁹⁸ although it is also said to be beneficially objective. The book will not ‘relatar hechos concretos bien conocidos’ (‘relate well-known specific events’)⁹⁹ – and this once again suggests that everybody knows what happened.¹⁰⁰

There was less published about the massacre in 1972, either from the state or from the public discourse. It could be due to the change of the government, although Luis Echeverría’s

presidency was in its third year by then; it could be because the information has been retold enough times to be ingrained in the collective memory and little needed to be added. It is also possible that the Corpus Christi massacre of 10 June 1971 overtook Tlatelolco in the public mind; but considering that there was very little written on the former, it is more likely that the enormity of Tlatelolco overshadowed a similar, but smaller, event. The largest contribution was in poetry, with several collections released in 1972: *Poesía no eres tú* (Poetry Is Not You) by Rosario Castellanos, *Libro de la dicha negra* (Bad Luck Book) by Orlando Guillén, *Estado de sitio* (State of Emergency) by Óscar Oliva, *Noticias contradictorias* (Contradictory News) by Juan José Oliver, *Arde como fiera* (Burns Like Hell) by Livio Ramírez and *Multiempo* (Bad Weather) by Jaime Sabines.

The most notable publication of 1972 was the second edition of Luis Spota's controversial novel *La Plaza* (The Plaza; first edition January 1971; second edition February 1972). The novel's first-person narrative is delivered by an engineer who calls himself Domingo (Sunday). He is a widower and his only daughter Mina was killed in the plaza. Domingo is the leader of the Days of the Week, a group of people whose family members were killed in the plaza or in prison following the demonstration. He and his companions, each named after a day of the week, set out to kidnap an unnamed government official (presumably Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, Mexico's president at the time of the massacre), who is assumed to have been responsible for the Tlatelolco massacre. Now retired, the official is kidnapped while out for a drive. He is brought to Domingo's house, where he is kept locked up in a dark room while Domingo makes him listen to homemade collages re-telling the story of the student movement from 26 July 1968 (the San Ildefonso incident) to 2 October 1968. Finally, the group confronts the hostage. After a heated interrogation, the group decides on the hostage's fate: some are for a quick trial and execution, while others are prepared to let

him go free. The hostage attempts to reason with them and explain his actions; although some members appear to be inclined to let him go, Jueves (Thursday, who lost his brother in the massacre) grabs Domingo's hand with a gun in it and shoots the hostage. Domingo then leaves the body in the middle of the Plaza of the Three Cultures and promises that there will be more bodies to come.

La Plaza is seen by many critics as a pale replica of Poniatowska's *La noche*, from which Spota quotes extensively and openly in his work. As a result, Spota was made to withdraw the first edition of the novel (appearing briefly in 1971), and remove all quotations used in *La noche*. He kept some of the quotations by asking permission to do so directly from the eyewitnesses quoted in *La noche*. Some agreed and others did not; in the introduction to the second edition, Spota thanks those who did and derides the rest.¹⁰¹ Following this incident, Spota lost his place in the pantheon of the Mexican literary figures, being seen as an avid spokesman for the corrupt government. Spota's novel was not well received by readers and critics alike: some complained of overtly voyeuristic (not to say pornographic) scenes, while others bemoaned Spota's apparent attempt at whitewashing the PRI's rather stained reputation by placing the blame for the Tlatelolco massacre on the students and particularly the organisers of the ill-fated demonstration.¹⁰² As a result, it remains in the shadows of its more reader-friendly contemporaries, with few analyses venturing beyond agreeing that the novel is openly pro-government, diverting the reader's attention from those responsible for the massacre and invoking pity for the hostage, who should instead be condemned.¹⁰³ Luis Leal's perspective on Spota's novel is less vitriolic,¹⁰⁴ highlighting the testimonials in the novel giving 'depth to the novel by interpolating, in the form of interior monologues, the events of Tlatelolco and the consequences'.¹⁰⁵ Rather than 'stealing' from other texts, as Spota was accused of doing by Poniatowska, Martré and others, the novel creates a

polyphony of voices to address ‘such a monumental subject [that] could not be written by one person alone’.¹⁰⁶ The novel does not try to whitewash those responsible for the massacre or to justify what happened on 2 October by making the reader commiserate with Díaz Ordaz’s ordeal. It keeps the massacre from disappearing from the collective memory,¹⁰⁷ stressing the horror of 2 October – something that frequently escapes the critics’ attention in the analyses of *La Plaza*.¹⁰⁸

In 1973, five years after the massacre, more texts appeared to commemorate the anniversary of Tlatelolco. Gerardo de la Torre’s short story collection *El vengador* (Avenger, 1973) engaged with the topic of the massacre but failed to deliver an account of the events, opting instead for a more analytical approach. One exception from the collection is the story “‘Únete pueblo agachón”” (‘Wimps of the World Unite’),¹⁰⁹ which tells the story of the railroad workers’ contribution to the student movement. A bitter account of corruption, mistrust and disorientation is delivered by several members of a strike council, whose purpose was to support the CNH. The remaining pieces tell about students’ disillusionment with politics, sexual exploits and other ways of pursuing the meaning of life.¹¹⁰

Juan Miguel De Mora’s novel *Tlatelolco 1968: Por fin toda la verdad* (Tlatelolco 1968: Finally the Whole Truth, 1973) draws parallels between the Tlatelolco massacre and the Corpus Christi massacre on 10 June 1971 in an emotionally disturbing narrative. While claiming to tell the whole truth about Tlatelolco, it seldom refers to any objective documentary evidence, citing instead articles and headlines from national newspapers, translated excerpts from foreign newspapers, eyewitness accounts and poetry about the massacre. The introduction states that the main means of telling ‘toda la verdad’ (‘the whole truth’) is fiction, yet little is done to justify this choice. In the introduction, De Mora is

insistent upon the text being nothing but the truth, stating that the foundation of his work is ‘verdades que no se habían publicado’ (‘the truths that have not been published’).¹¹¹ The problem with this statement is that it cannot be verified because the reader would not have access to something that has not been published. For that matter, how did De Mora come across these ‘truths’? There appears to be an answer to this question at the end of the second paragraph of the introduction – ‘todo lo demás, por horrible e increíble que pueda parecer, es la verdad, recogida de testigos’ (‘the rest, horrible and unbelievable as it may seem, is the truth, collected from witnesses’).¹¹² Although it would appear that De Mora had interviewed the eyewitnesses and the transcripts of these interviews remain unseen by the public, the quotations he uses were previously published by Poniatowska, Carrión, Ortiz and others, with Poniatowska’s work being the originating point for most. One wonders why the volume did not go down the documentary route (there were enough eyewitness accounts available by 1973 to support this approach), or create a testimonial account if the eyewitness statements were deemed insufficient. Instead, the volume is largely comprised of highly emotional, often painfully graphic fictional depiction of the fate of several students in the ill-famed plaza, interspersed with quotations from poems, newspapers and eyewitness statements.

It is surprising that in Sócrates Campos Lemus’s novel *El otoño de la Revolución: Octubre* (Autumn of the Revolution: October; released in January 1974), there is no attempt made at telling the story of the massacre, considering that its author was a member of the CNH, who was present at the demonstration, addressing the crowd from the third floor of the Chihuahua building. In the novel, the protagonist Octubre regains consciousness in the plaza after presumably collapsing during the demonstration¹¹³ and cannot remember what happened. As he walks in a daze across the plaza, he sees sheer carnage around him.¹¹⁴ The enormity of what happened is evident in these lines and even though there is no indication of

who opened fire, who was in the plaza, or why the gunfight started, the aftermath is chilling. The structure of the novel mirrors that of Gonzáles de Alba's *Los días y los años*: Campos Lemus's ruminations about being in prison are interspersed with the memories of the summer of 1968, protests and preparations for the demonstration in the Plaza of the Three Cultures.

1976 saw the publication of Renata Sevilla's *Tlatelolco ocho años después: Trascendencia política de un sangriento suceso* (Tlatelolco Eight Years Later: Political Consequences of a Bloody Event), a collection of interviews with several well-known members of the student movement: José Revueltas, Heberto Castillo, Carlos Sevilla, Gilberto Guevara Niebla, Raúl Álvarez Garín and Luis González de Alba. 30,000 copies were printed in the first instance – this is by far the largest print run of a single edition of any book in the Tlatelolco corpus. The title assumes, as do many other texts, that the reader will know immediately – almost instinctively – which ‘event’ the book is about. And the ‘event’ is ‘bloody’, so there is no doubt as to what it is. In the preface, Sevilla talks about the two dominant views of the Tlatelolco massacre: ‘Algunos afirman que todos los sacrificios fueron una lamentable pérdida que a nada condujo ... Otros, sin embargo, ven resultados positivos y trascendentes. El curso de los eventos parece dar la razón a estos últimos.’ (‘Some say that all the sacrifices were a sad loss that led nowhere ... Others, however, see positive results of great consequence. The course of the events seems to support the latter’).¹¹⁵ The nature of the first group is explained in detail, since the public is expected not to know or share this view; the second one is brief – there is little need to explain what the readers should or do feel.

Through the course of this study, we will consider a range of texts – from Blanco Moheno's block-capital rants and Paz's soliloquy, to Domínguez Aragonés' politico-erotic musings and the factual inaccuracies of *El Móndrigo*, among many others, – to see that the

Tlatelolco discourses are not simple oppositional groupings, but a complex and often uncomfortable unity (in the sense of being brought together, willingly or not) of affective and cognitive perspectives.

¹ All translations, unless indicated otherwise, are mine – VC.

² Rosario Castellanos, ‘Memorandum on Tlatelolco’, in Maureen Ahern (ed.), *A Rosario Castellanos Reader: An Anthology of Her Poetry, Short Fiction, Essays, and Drama* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1988), pp. 98–9.

³ This wordplay juxtaposes the advertisement of newspapers for sale and the corrupt nature of the Mexican press, controlled by and supporting the ruling party.

⁴ C. Harris, ‘Luis González de Alba’s *Los días y los años* (1971) and Elena Poniatowska’s *La noche de Tlatelolco* (1971): Foundational Representations of Mexico ‘68’, in Keith Brewster (ed.), *Reflections on Mexico ‘68* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 107–27. See also César Gilabert, *El hábito de la utopía: análisis del imaginario sociopolítico en el movimiento estudiantil de México, 1968* (Mexico City: Miguel Angel Porrúa, 1993).

⁵ Samuel Steinberg, *Photopoetics at Tlatelolco: Afterimages of Mexico* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2016); Jaime Pensado, *Rebel Mexico: Student Unrest and Authoritarian Political Culture during the Long Sixties* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013); Claire Brewster, *Responding to Crisis in Contemporary Mexico: The Political Writing of Paz, Fuentes, Monsiváis and Poniatowska* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2005); Elaine Carey, *Plaza of Sacrifices: Gender, Power, and Terror in 1968 Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005), to name but a few.

⁶ Sergio Aguayo Quezada, *1968. Los archivos de la violencia* (Mexico City: Grijalbo/Reforma, 1998), p. 201.

⁷ Michael Meyer, William Sherman and Susan Deeds, *The Course of Mexican History*, 8th edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 583–8; Eric Zolov, *Refried Elvis: The Rise of the Mexican Counterculture* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1999), pp. 119–31; Raúl Álvarez Garín, *La estela de Tlatelolco* (Mexico City: Grijalbo, 1998), pp. 34–7.

⁸ See, for example, P. Fournier and J. Martínez Herrera, ‘“Mexico 1968”: Among Olympic Fanfares, Government Repression and Genocide’, in Pedro Funari, Andrés Zarankin and Melisa Salerno (eds.), *Memories of Darkness: Archeology of Repression and Resistance in Latin America* (New York: Springer, 2009), pp. 145–74: pp. 149–51.

⁹ Antonio Velasco Piña, *Regina* (Mexico City: Jus, 1987), p. 344.

¹⁰ See, for example, C. Monsiváis, ‘“¡Somos borregos! ¡Nos llevan! ¡Bee! Bee!”: Un relato de ingratitudes y su consecuencia pictórica’ (no date), <http://www.mty.itesm.mx/dhcs/deptos/ri/ri-802/lecturas/nvas.lecs/1968-monsi/mc0290.htm> (accessed 7 June 2017); G. Olivier, S. Tamayo and M. Voegtli, ‘Movilización y desmovilización en los movimientos sociales. La protesta estudiantil del 68 ante la doble cara de la represión’ (2010), <https://sergiotamayo.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/movilizacion3b3n-y-desmovilizacion3b3n-en-los-movimientos-sociales.pdf> (accessed 9 June 2017); and A. Rodríguez, ‘Hibridez discursiva y tratamiento político en Palinuro en la escalera de Fernando del Paso’ (2008), in Antoine Rodríguez and Ignacio Sosa (eds.), *México/Francia 1968: Representaciones e interpretaciones*, ‘Ateliers’: Cahiers de la Maison de la Recherche, Université Charles de Gaulle Lille 3, 39, http://cecille.recherche.univ-lille3.fr/IMG/doc/Hibridez_discursiva_sexo_y_politica_en_Palinuro_en_la_escalera.doc (accessed 23 June 2017).

¹¹ Daniel Cazés, *Crónica 1968* (Mexico City: Plaza y Valdés, 1993), pp. 91–9.

¹² Cited in Ramón Ramírez, *El movimiento estudiantil de México, julio-diciembre de 1968*, vol. 2 (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 1969), pp. 27–77 (there are multiple versions of the original statement), Álvarez Garín, *La estela*, p. 52, and many others.

¹³ Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, *Informes presidenciales: Gustavo Díaz Ordaz* (Mexico City: Dirección de Servicios de Investigación y Análisis, 2006), p. 257.

¹⁴ See Pensado, *Rebel Mexico*, pp. 137–43.

¹⁵ Díaz Ordaz, *Informes presidenciales*, p. 255.

¹⁶ Díaz Ordaz, *Informes presidenciales*, p. 260.

¹⁷ Díaz Ordaz, *Informes presidenciales*, p. 264.

¹⁸ Gareth Williams, *The Mexican Exception: Sovereignty, Police, and Democracy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 117–20; George Szanto, *Inside the Statues of Saints: Mexican Writers on Culture and Corruption, Politics and Daily Life* (Montreal: Véhicule, 1996), p. 20.

¹⁹ Ryan Long, *Fictions of Totality: The Mexican Novel, 1968, and the National-popular State* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2008), p. 128; Álvarez Garín, *La estela*, pp. 73–5.

²⁰ George Philip, *The Presidency in Mexican Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1992), p. 56.

²¹ Gerardo Estrada, *1968, Estado y Universidad: Orígenes de la transición política en México* (Mexico City: Plaza Janés, 2004), p. 234.

²² S. Loaeza, ‘México, 1968: Los orígenes de la transición’, in Ilán Semo (ed.), *La transición interrumpida: México 1968–1988* (Mexico City: Departamento de Historia, Universidad Iberoamericana, 1993), pp. 15–47: pp. 19–20.

²³ Ernesto Guevara, *Obras completas* (Buenos Aires: Andrómeda, 2002), pp. 363–8. See also Guillermo Lora, *Revolución y foquismo: balance de la discusión sobre la desviación ‘guerrillera’* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones ryr, 2011), pp. 30–2; D. Rubio Giesecke, ‘Las

guerrillas peruanas de 1965: entre los movimientos campesinos y la teoría foquista’,

Histórica, 32/2 (2008), pp. 121–66; Jorge Castañeda, *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), pp. 73–7.

²⁴ Pensado, *Rebel Mexico*, pp. 206–9; Aguayo Quezada, *1968*, pp. 111–20.

²⁵ Álvarez Garín, *La estela*, p. 79.

²⁶ I. Carrillo Prieto, ‘Hechos ocurridos el 2 de octubre de 1968 en la Plaza de las Tres Culturas en Nonoalco, Tlatelolco’, in Salvador Martínez della Rocca (ed.), *Voces y ecos del 68* (Mexico City: Gobierno del Distrito Federal, 2009), pp. 117–39: p. 121; Álvarez Garín, *La estela*, p. 85.

²⁷ Daniel Cosío Villegas, *El sistema político mexicano: las posibilidades de cambio* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1972), p. 55.

²⁸ Cosío Villegas, *El sistema político*, p. 55.

²⁹ This is also noted by Evelyn Stevens, *Protest and Response in Mexico* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1974), p. 44; and Consuelo Medal, *El periodista como orientador social* (Mexico City, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1965), pp. 96–7. Also see C. Brewster, ‘The Student Movement of 1968 and the Mexican Press: The Cases of Excelsior and Siempre!’, *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 21/2 (2002), 171–90; Guillermo Enríquez Simóni, *La libertad de prensa en México: una mentira rosa* (México City: B. Costa-Amic, Editor, 1967), pp. 75–83 and 111–21; and Rafael Carrasco Puente, *La prensa en México* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1962).

³⁰ Cosío Villegas, *El sistema político*, p. 56.

³¹ Cosío Villegas, *El sistema político*, p. 56.

³² Quoted in M. Werbowski, ‘Rise and Fall of a Great Mexican Newspaper: A chronicle of the mythical daily, “El Excelsior”’ (15 February 2007), OMNI,

http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?menu=c10400&no=345560&rel_no=1 (accessed 14 July 2017).

³³ Stevens, *Protest and Response*, p. 32.

³⁴ Moisés Ochoa Campos, *Reseña histórica del periodismo mexicano* (Mexico City: Editorial Porrúa, 1968), p. 145.

³⁵ Ochoa Campos, *Reseña histórica*, p. 143.

³⁶ Juan Miguel De Mora, *Tlatelolco 1968: por fin toda la verdad* (Tlatelolco 1968: Finally the Whole Truth) (Mexico City: Editores Asociados, 1973), pp. 133–4.

³⁷ L. Leal, 'Tlatelolco, Tlatelolco', in Ilan Stavans (ed.), *A Luis Leal Reader* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007), pp. 335–48: p. 347.

³⁸ I. Fenoglio-Limón, 'Reading Mexico 1968: Literature, Memory and Politics', in Ingo Cornils and Sarah Waters (eds.), *Memories of 1968: International Perspectives* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), pp. 299–319: pp. 306–8; F. Merrell, 'Uncommonplace Happenings: Post-Tlatelolco Mexican Narrative', *Latin American Research Review*, 23/3 (1988), 180–7.

D. Young, 'Mexican Literary Reactions to Tlatelolco 1968', *Latin American Research Review* (Pittsburgh, PA), 20/2 (1985), 71–85: p. 82

³⁹ A. Toledo, 'El invierno de nuestras desdichas (Apuntes sobre el movimiento estudiantil de 1968 en la novela mexicana)', *La Palabra y el Hombre*, 108 (1998), 133–43; R. Medina, 'Ayer es nunca jamás: Continuidad y ruptura en la narrativa mexicana del '68', *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, 21 (1995), 207–18: pp. 209–10; J. Ibarguengoitia, 'La literatura Tlatelolco', *Libro Abierto* (November 1971), pp. 38–40; Young, 'Reactions to Tlatelolco', p. 79; Leal, 'Tlatelolco'.

⁴⁰ See V. Carpenter, 'The Echo of Tlatelolco in Contemporary Mexican Protest Poetry' *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 24/4 (2005), 496–512, for an in-depth analysis of both types, and V. Carpenter, "'You Want the Truth? You Can't Handle the Truth": Poetic

Representations of the 1968 Tlatelolco Massacre’, *Journal of Latin American Research*, 21/1 (2015), 35–49, for a relationship between factual accuracy and emotional charge of the Tlatelolco poetry.

⁴¹ Ignacio Ruiz-Pérez, *Lecturas y diversiones: La poesía crítica de Eduardo Lizalde, Gabriel Zaid, José Carlos Becerra y José Emilio Pacheco* (Xalapa: Universidad Veracruzana, 2008); Carpenter, ‘Echo of Tlatelolco’, p. 511; see also Marco Antonio Campos and Alejandro Toledo, *Poemas y narraciones sobre el movimiento estudiantil de 1968* (Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Coordinación de Humanidades, Dirección General de Publicaciones, 1996), pp. 19–22.

⁴² Analyses of Pacheco’s poem (in most cases, only its second version published in 1969) focus on the relationship between the past and the present, and the cyclical nature of history. See J. Aguilera, ‘José Emilio Pacheco: Las sutiles huellas de la inconformidad’, in Edith Negrín and Álvaro Ruiz Abreu (eds.), *Pasión por la palabra: homenaje a José Emilio Pacheco* (Mexico City: UNAM, UAM, 2013), pp. 207–20; Carmen Dolores Carrillo Juárez, *El mar de la noche: Intertextualidad y apropiación en la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco* (Mexico City: Universidad del Claustro de Sor Juana, 2009); R. Dorra, ‘Pacheco se pregunta cómo pasa el tiempo’, in Pol Popovic Karic and Fidel Chávez Pérez (eds.), *José Emilio Pacheco: Perspectivas críticas* (Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno, 2006), pp. 53–70; V. Campos, ‘Toward a New History: Twentieth-Century Debates in Mexico on Narrating the National Past’, in Santiago Juan-Navarro and Theodore Robert Young (eds.), *A Twice-Told Tale: Reinventing the Encounter in Iberian / Iberian American Literature and Film* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 2001), pp. 47–64; R. Friis, ‘The Postmodern Twists of José Emilio Pacheco’s *No me preguntes cómo pasa el tiempo*’, *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos*, 34/1, (2000) 27–46; M. Díaz, ‘“El remoto pasado y el concreto presente de México” en la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco’, *Lucero: A Journal of Iberian and Latin American Studies*, 8

(1997), 76–82; M. L. Fischer, ‘Presencia del texto colonial en la poesía de Antonio Cisneros y José Emilio Pacheco’, *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica*, 32 (1990), 127–37; Luis Antonio De Villena, *José Emilio Pacheco* (Madrid: Ediciones Júcar, 1986); and L. Soto-Duggan, ‘Realidad de papel: Máscaras y voces en la poesía de José Emilio Pacheco’, *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica*, 18 (1983–84), 245–54.

⁴³ See Ruiz-Pérez, *Lecturas y diversiones*, pp. 55 and 59–60.

⁴⁴ See L. Melgar, ‘Rosario Castellanos, crítica de la violencia. Una aproximación’, *Destiempos*, 4 (2009), 395–412.

⁴⁵ See Ruiz-Pérez, *Lecturas y diversiones*, pp. 60 and 66.

⁴⁶ See, for example, D. W. Foster, ‘Latin American Documentary Narrative’, *PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 99/1 (1984), 41–55.

⁴⁷ Ramírez, *El movimiento estudiantil*, vol. 1, p. 141.

⁴⁸ Raúl Jardón, *1968: el fuego de la esperanza* (Mexico City: Siglo XXI, 1998), p. 12.

⁴⁹ Jardón, *El fuego*, p. 12.

⁵⁰ This essay was incorrectly attributed to Roberto Blanco Moheno, the author of *Tlatelolco: Historia de una infamia*. See Gonzalo Martré, *El movimiento popular estudiantil de 1968 en la novela mexicana* (Mexico City: UNAM, 1986), p. 22.

⁵¹ See ‘Prueba de fuego: La opinión pública disidente’ (‘Acid Test: Dissident Public Opinion’), *Excélsior*, 4 October 1968, pp. 6 and 10A.

⁵² Anonymous, *¡El Móndrigo!* (Mexico City: Editorial Alba Roja, 1968), p. 5.

⁵³ *El Móndrigo*, p. 5.

⁵⁴ De Mora, *Tlatelolco 1968*, pp. 133–4.

⁵⁵ *El Móndrigo*, p. 5.

⁵⁶ See, for example, ‘400 de los 1,650 capturados el miércoles, quedaron en libertad’ (‘400 of the 1,650 Captured on Wednesday, Are Released’), *Excélsior*, 5 October 1968, pp. 1A and 15A.

⁵⁷ *El Móndrigo*, p. 9.

⁵⁸ *El Móndrigo*, p. 98.

⁵⁹ *El Móndrigo*, p. 99.

⁶⁰ Gilberto Balam, *Tlatelolco: reflexiones de un testigo* (Mexico City: Talleres Lenasa, 1969), pp. 96–101.

⁶¹ Jorge Carrión, Daniel Cazés, Sol Arguedas and Fernando Carmona, *Tres culturas en agonía* (Mexico City: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1970), pp. 170–246.

⁶² Carrión et al., *Tres culturas en agonía*, p. 213.

⁶³ Carrión et al., *Tres culturas en agonía*, p. 213.

⁶⁴ Cited in Gilberto Sheridan, ‘Octavio Paz: cartas tlatelolcas’ (2011), *El minutarario*, <http://www.letraslibres.com/blogs/el-minutarario/octavio-paz-cartas-tlatelolcas> (accessed 16 April 2017).

⁶⁵ Juan Federico Arriola, *La filosofía política en el pensamiento de Octavio Paz* (Mexico City: UNAM, 2008), p. 84.

⁶⁶ Elena Poniatowska, *Octavio Paz: Las palabras del árbol* (Mexico City: Plaza Janés, 1998), p. 126.

⁶⁷ See, for example, S. Loaeza, ‘Octavio Paz en el debate de la democratización mexicana’, in Anthony Stanton (ed.), *Octavio Paz: Entre poética y política* (Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 2009), pp. 155–97: p. 161; R. Pozas Horcasitas, ‘La libertad en el ensayo político’, in Enrico Mario Santí (ed.), *Luz espejeante: Octavio Paz ante la crítica* (Mexico City: Biblioteca Era, 2009), pp. 606–24: p. 615; Gilberto Sheridan, *Poeta con paisaje: ensayos sobre la vida de Octavio Paz* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2004); and D. Sorensen,

‘Tlatelolco 1968: Paz and Poniatowska on Law and Violence’, *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos*, 18/2 (2002), 297–321.

⁶⁸ Carlos Monsiváis, *Días de guardar* (Days to Remember) (Mexico City: Biblioteca Era, 2008): pp. 295–305.

⁶⁹ La Noche Triste (The Sad Night) was the night of 30 June 1520, when Hernán Cortés’s troops were driven out of the Aztec capital Tenochtitlán.

⁷⁰ For further analysis of Monsiváis’s essays as unofficial historical records see L. Egan, ‘Carlos Monsiváis, in Collective and Personal Memory’, *Mexican Studies*, 27/1 (2011), 225–32; C. Wolfenzon, ‘El 68 mexicano y el eterno retorno en Monsiváis y Poniatowska’, *Torre: Revista de la Universidad de Puerto Rico*, 12 (2007), 105–28; Jezreel Salazar, *La ciudad como texto: la crónica urbana de Carlos Monsiváis* (Monterrey: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, 2006), pp. 43–8, 57–62; I. Zavala, ‘Días de guardar: Reformulación y representación del espacio público’, *Revista de Literatura Mexicana Contemporánea*, 11 (2005), 97–106; and Linda Egan, *Carlos Monsiváis: Culture and Chronicle in Contemporary Mexico* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 2001), pp. 148–51 (focusing on ‘Y era nuestra herencia una red de agujeros’).

⁷¹ Eduardo Valle, Raúl Álvarez Garín and José Revueltas, *Los procesos de México 68: tiempo de hablar* (Mexico City: Editorial Estudiantes, 1970), p. 5.

⁷² Valle et al., *Los procesos*, p. 6.

⁷³ Rafael Solana, *Juegos de invierno* (Mexico City: Ediciones Oasis, 1970), cited in R. Cartas, ‘Los juegos de invierno de Rafael Solana’ (2015), <http://ricardocartas.com/2015/11/los-juegos-de-invierno-de-rafael-solana> (accessed 5 January 2017).

⁷⁴ Cited in Cartas, ‘Los juegos’.

⁷⁵ ‘Revelaciones sobre el movimiento’ (‘Revelations about the Movement’), *Excélsior*, 6 October 1968, pp. 1A, 15A and 16A.

⁷⁶ Martré, *El movimiento popular*, p. 71; Toledo, ‘El invierno’, pp. 136–8; Cartas, ‘Los juegos’.

⁷⁷ Although the critiques of *La noche de Tlatelolco* are too numerous to list here, the following represent the principal themes of analyses: the relationship between the narrator and the editor (Jorgensen 1991); the testimonial nature of the work (T. Karam Cárdenas, ‘Acercamiento semiótico al estudio de la crónica testimonial en la obra de Elena Poniatowska’, *Especulo: Revista de Estudios Literarios*, 33 (July–Oct 2006), <https://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/especulo/numero33/eleponia.html> (accessed 14 July 2017); J. Gelpí, ‘Testimonio periodístico y cultura urbana en *La noche de Tlatelolco* de Elena Poniatowska’, *Celehis: Revista del Centro de Letras Hispanoamericanas*, 9 (2000), 285–308); and the relationship between the testimonial and fictional narrative (Y. Unnold, ‘El testimonio y *La Noche de Tlatelolco*’, *Revista de Literatura Mexicana Contemporánea*, 6 (2000), 26–31; Harris, ‘Foundational Representations’; S. Poot Herrera, ‘Las crónicas de Elena Poniatowska’, *Colmena*, 11 (1996), 17–22; A. M. Amar Sánchez, ‘Las voces de los otros: El género de no-ficción en Elena Poniatowska’, *Filología*, 25/1–2 (1990), 161–74; and B. Jorgensen, ‘La intertextualidad en *La noche de Tlatelolco* de Elena Poniatowska’, *Hispanic Journal*, 10/2 (1989), 81–93). See also Nora Erro-Peralta and Magdalena Maiz-Peña (eds.), *La palabra contra el silencio: Elena Poniatowska ante la crítica* (Mexico City: Biblioteca Era, 2013); and A. R. Reckley Vallejos, ‘La colectividad: Molina, Poniatowska y Puga’, *Revista de Literatura Mexicana Contemporánea*, 2/6 (1997), 51–4.

⁷⁸ Elena Poniatowska, *La noche de Tlatelolco* (Mexico City: Ediciones Era, 2008), p. 167.

⁷⁹ Michael Schluesser, *Elena Poniatowska: An Intimate Biography* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2007), p. 160.

⁸⁰ Poniatowska, *La noche*, pp. 259–60.

⁸¹ See Gelpí, ‘Testimonio periodístico’; Amar Sánchez, ‘Las voces de otros’; and Jorgensen, ‘La intertextualidad’, among others, for more detailed reading of the multiplicity of voices in Poniatowska’s work.

⁸² See B. Jorgensen, ‘Framing Questions: The Role of the Editor in Elena Poniatowska’s *La noche de Tlatelolco*’, *Latin American Perspectives*, 18 (1991), 80–90.

⁸³ L. González de Alba, ‘Para limpiar la memoria’ (October 1997), *Nexos*, 238, <http://temibleDaniIlga.blogspot.co.uk/2008/09/nexos238199710.html> (accessed 4 March 2017).

⁸⁴ ‘Edificio Chihuahua, 18:00 horas’, *Excélsior*, 3 October 1968, p. 4A.

⁸⁵ Martré, *El movimiento popular*, pp. 87–92.

⁸⁶ Jorge Volpi, *La imaginación y el poder: Una historia intelectual de 1968* (Mexico City: Biblioteca Era, 2006), p. 337.

⁸⁷ Long, *Fictions of Totality*, pp. 81–115.

⁸⁸ See M. S. Stabb, ‘The New Essay of Mexico: Text and Context’, *Hispania*, 70/1 (1987), 47–61: p. 53.

⁸⁹ See Stabb, ‘The New Essay’, p. 51. Also see R. A. Marrero-Fente, “‘La Iliada descalza’: La teoría épica transatlántica de Carlos Fuentes’, *Literatura Mexicana*, 56 (2006), 189–205; and L. Villar, ‘Retórica y revolución en *Tiempo mexicano*’, *Selecta*, 5 (1984), 122–8.

⁹⁰ Salvador Hernández, *El PRI y el movimiento estudiantil de 1968* (Mexico City: Ediciones ‘El Caballito’, 1971), p. 13.

⁹¹ Hernández, *El PRI*, p. 13.

⁹² Hernández, *El PRI*, p. 13.

⁹³ Harris, ‘Foundational Representations’; R. Long, ‘Lecumberri, Fact, and Fiction: The Prison Writings of Álvaro Mutis and Luis González de Alba’, *Revista de Estudios Hispánicos*

40/2 (2006), 361–77; and R. Medina, ‘Ayer es nunca jamás: Continuidad y ruptura en la narrativa mexicana del ‘68’, *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, 21 (1995), 207–18: p. 213.

⁹⁴ René Avilés Fabila, *Los juegos* (Mexico City, 1967).

⁹⁵ P. Cabrera López, ‘El imaginario del 68 mexicano en la narrativa literaria: debate figurativo y político’, *Revista de Literatura, História e Memória*, 7 (2011), 213–36: pp. 222–3; S. Ugalde, ‘El gran solitario de palacio y la modalidad de la ironía’, *Inti: Revista de literatura hispánica*, 1/12 (1980), <http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/inti/vol1/iss12/4> (accessed 18 February 2017); and H. Musacchio, ‘Entre la novela y el testimonio’ (1973), *Revista de la Universidad de México*, 5, http://www.revistadelauniversidad.unam.mx/ojs_rum/index.php/rum/article/view/9816/1105 (accessed 3 May 2017).

⁹⁶ Linda Hutcheon, *Irony’s Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 46.

⁹⁷ Rosalío Wences Reza, *El movimiento estudiantil y los problemas nacionales* (Mexico City: Editorial Nuestro Tiempo, 1971), p. 7.

⁹⁸ Wences Reza, *El movimiento estudiantil*, p. 8.

⁹⁹ Wences Reza, *El movimiento estudiantil*, p. 7.

¹⁰⁰ See Balam, *Tlatelolco*, p. 99, for one.

¹⁰¹ Luis Spota, *La Plaza* (Mexico City: Joaquín Mortiz, 1972), p. 9.

¹⁰² J. Pouwels, ‘Political Bias in Readings of Two Tlatelolco Novels: Elena Poniatowska’s *La noche de Tlatelolco* and an Unwelcome Sequel, Luis Spota’s *La plaza*’, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 77/1 (2000), 279–90; see also I. Trejo Fuentes, ‘Los muchos Méxicos de Luis Spota’, *Revista de la Universidad de México*, 78 (2010),

http://www.revistadelauniversidad.unam.mx/ojs_rum/index.php/rum/issue/view/65 (accessed 18 February 2017).

¹⁰³ Martré, *El movimiento popular*, p. 39.

¹⁰⁴ Leal, 'Tlatelolco', p. 346.

¹⁰⁵ Leal, 'Tlatelolco', p. 346.

¹⁰⁶ Leal, 'Tlatelolco', p. 346.

¹⁰⁷ Leal, 'Tlatelolco', p. 346; also John Brushwood, *México en su novela: una nación en busca de su identidad* (Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1973), p. 95.

¹⁰⁸ For similar views of Spota's work, see Evodio Escalante, *La intervención literaria: Crítica sobre Rulfo, Fuentes, Cuesta, Chumacero, Spota, González Rojo* (Mexico City: Alebrije, Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa, 1988), p. 62; Brushwood, *México en su novela*, p. 54, cited in Escalante, *La intervención literaria*, pp. 66–7; and Edmundo Domínguez Aragonés, *Tres extraordinarios: Luis Spota, Alejandro Jodorowsky, Emilio 'Indio' Fernández* (Mexico City: Juan Pablos, 1980), pp. 25–7.

¹⁰⁹ Gerardo de la Torre, *El vengador* (Mexico City: Joaquín Mortiz, 1973), pp. 90–116.

¹¹⁰ Later, in Martín del Campo's novel *Las rojas son las carreteras* (The Streets Run Red, 1976), this disillusionment leads to tragic deaths of four students. One can draw parallels with the Tlatelolco massacre, which is mentioned briefly at the start of the novel. Although Martré considers this novel 'fundamental en la saga de 68' ('fundamental in the saga of 68, Martré, *El movimiento popular*, p. 76), it is difficult to glean any information about the events of 2 October from the text, unless the reader is looking to support the view that the reason the movement failed is because students were more concerned with sex, drugs, and rock-n-roll than politics.

¹¹¹ De Mora, *Tlatelolco 1968*, p. 5.

¹¹² De Mora, *Tlatelolco 1968*, p. 5.

¹¹³ Sócrates A. Campos Lemus, *El otoño de la Revolución: Octubre* (Mexico City: B. Costa-Amic Editor, 1974), p. 55.

¹¹⁴ Campos Lemus, *El otoño de la Revolución*, p. 56.

¹¹⁵ Renata Sevilla, *Tlatelolco ocho años después: Trascendencia política de un sangriento suceso* (Mexico City: Editorial Posada, 1976), p. 7.