

de la región. Una nación que se revela más abarcativa, más ampliada, no así más democrática ni más plural. Quien impusiera ‘sus’ significados de la nación se haría de un plus de legitimidad política de la mayor importancia. Por eso consideramos fundacional la discusión intelectual sobre la nación en la década de 1920, en la que esos significados se tramitan prioritariamente en el campo cultural e ideológico y, recién hacia finales de la misma, se objetivan políticamente.” Bien lejos de toda forma de historicismo, ¿es que acaso se puede retacear la persuasividad de ese “espejo” para entender varios de los procesos históricos que se sucedieron con posterioridad? ¿Es que acaso esas y otras proposiciones del libro no pueden interpelar genuinamente trayectorias y comportamientos contemporáneos que se despliegan hoy mismo en nuestro continente?

Gerardo Caetano

Universidad de la República, Uruguay

ALAN KNIGHT and WIL PANSTERS (eds.): *Caciquismo in Twentieth Century Mexico*. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, 2005.

Caciquismo in Twentieth Century Mexico gives the reader much to consider. With the goal of updating David Brading’s edited volume, *Caudillo and Peasant in the Mexican Revolution* (1980), it sweeps through the century in multidisciplinary fashion, describing ejidal caciques, urban caciques, labor caciques, national caciques, Cristero caciques, institutionalized caciques, university caciques, and gatekeeper caciques. As is inevitable in a collective work, some authors address central issues more squarely than others and not all agree, but Knight’s excellent introduction and Pansters’s meticulous conclusion do a good job of drawing things together.

Brading’s book concentrated on the period from 1910 to 1940. It also focused on caudillos, while the present volume uses caciques as its organizing concept. The reason for that, Knight indicates, has to do with definitions of the two terms. Eschewing the position that a caudillo is merely a cacique writ large—operating on the state or national, as opposed to local, level—Knight cogently asserts that a caudillo is a warlord, while a cacique is a political boss or broker who functions during periods of relative peace. Both use violence, but the caudillo is the product of more violent times. Since 1940, then, caudillismo has not been viable in Mexico, leaving caciques the obvious focus for a book that wants to chart clientelism up to the present.

The volume is divided into three parts: the first covering the period of revolutionary fighting and its aftermath; the second focusing on the middle of the century; and the third concerned with contemporary events. Part one consists

of Jennie Purnell's chapter on Che Gómez in Juchitán, Oaxaca; Christopher Boyer's piece on the caciques of Naranja, Michoacán; Matthew Butler's treatment of Cristero caciques in Coalcomán, Michoacán; and Keith Brewster's study of Gabriel Barrios in the Sierra Norte de Puebla. In this section, an important concern is the distinction often made between "traditional" and "modern" caudillos or caciques—the former rural, local, and informal, the latter perhaps more impersonal and more fully integrated into the state. Purnell's clear analysis of Gómez is the only one in this volume that treats the era of revolutionary fighting, in which traditional forms supposedly dominated, but she argues that Gómez did not reject the state, as a traditional cacique might, but rather sought to appropriate the state's local manifestations. Brewster's nuanced chapter contends that Barrios's focus on building infrastructure demonstrated the modern inclinations of an otherwise apparently traditional cacique.

The middle section consists of Marco Antonio Calderón's chapter on the lasting role of Lázaro Cárdenas in the sierra P'urhépecha of Michoacán; works on Chiapas by Stephen Lewis and Jan Rus; and María Theresa Fernández Aceves's essay on the union leader Guadalupe Martínez in Guadalajara. Calderón's somewhat unfocused chapter traces the changes Cardenismo brought to indigenous communities in Michoacán, where his presidency was a watershed between traditional and modern practices of caciquismo. Lewis comes down at a similar place on this issue using slightly different terms. He finds caudillismo stamped out by 1940, but caciques flourishing thereafter in highlands Chiapas. In one of the volume's more interesting chapters, Rus demonstrates how the expulsion of Protestants from Chamula villages between 1965 and 1977 had its roots in conflicts between caciques and dissidents over political and economic issues, conflicts that only gradually gained a religious dimension. Fernández Aceves is the only author in this volume to note that a woman might function as a cacique.

The final section contains Salvador Maldonado Aranda's look at union caciques in greater Mexico City; Rogelio Hernández Rodríguez's chapter on Carlos Hank González; José Eduardo Zárate Hernández on caciquismo's persistence during Mexico's recent democratic opening; Pansters on a neoliberal university cacique; and Pieter de Vries on the performance of caciquismo. Hernández Rodríguez offers something of an apology for Hank González, one of Mexico's most notorious leaders in recent decades, concluding that Hank lacked the "direct and personal power" (270) required of a cacique. Arguing that the decline of the PRI has not ended caciquismo, Zárate Hernández finds that it has instead provided new options for local caciques, who play one party against another. Pansters agrees about the persistence of caciquismo, maintaining that during the 1990s José Doger Corte became a cacique as rector of a Puebla university. Finally, de

Vries suggests that the performance of caciques, as they seek to convince that they can navigate the bureaucracy and access resources, merits attention.

This book does not resolve such issues as whether a line can be drawn between traditional and modern caciques, or whether modernity undermines caciquismo. One obstacle to such resolution has to do with the failure to keep the distinction between caudillo and cacique clear. Several authors, for instance, are at pains to demonstrate that the intrusion of the state does not end caciquismo, though Knight's definition suggests that it is precisely the presence of state institutions that *makes* caciques, as opposed to caudillos. The definitional fluidity continues up to the point, especially in the work of Zárate Hernández and Pansters, that the reader might wonder if the authors are not stretching caciquismo beyond all recognition. Zárate is perhaps too idealistic about democracy when he condemns local operators who take advantage of the recent democratic opening to play one party off another as caciques. True, these people are mediators, a key element of the definition of cacique, but is that not true of all politicians in their representational capacities? Zárate's data might in fact be taken to prove the proposition he seeks to refute: that multiparty competition puts caciquismo in peril.

One might also complain of awkward, unclear, and opaque language in some chapters. One reason for that is that many authors (Maldonado Aranda, Pansters, de Vries, and others) introduce and theorize at great length before offering details to support their claims. The result is more argument by assertion, and somewhat less building of carefully crafted arguments, than might be ideal. Such complaints aside, though, this is a rich and challenging look at caciquismo from numerous perspectives, required reading for anyone who seeks to understand the phenomenon.

Samuel Brunk

University of Texas, El Paso

RAYMOND B. CRAIB: *Cartographic Mexico: A History of State Fixations and Fugitive Landscapes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.

Conceptions of "geography" have changed significantly in past years, especially in our usual comprehension of the relationship between the science of mapping and maps, spatial reality itself, and the significance of geography in human relations. In her essay "Places and Their Pasts," Doreen Massey asserts that "places...are always constructed out of articulations of social relations (trading connections, the unequal links of colonialism, thoughts of home) which are not only internal to that locale but which link them to elsewhere. Their 'local uniqueness' is always already a product of wider contacts..." This secular asser-