Klaus Kannapin o el más reciente de Max Paul Friedman. De haber consultado esas investigaciones, Cedillo habría advertido que sus descubrimientos, de por sí meritorios, se integran en un horizonte de alcance continental y mundial. Pero también habría podido contrapuntar las informaciones generadas por el espionaje alemán con las que encontró en los archivos norteamericanos. Una parte de estos descubrimientos confirman hipótesis ya transitadas por distintos historiadores, mientras que otra parte, y esto es lo verdaderamente trascendente, amplían informaciones que merecerían una crítica acuciosa, atenta a reconstruir una historia que merece ser contada.

Pablo Yankelevich 

Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia


This ambitious book began at a seminar in Mexico City in 1999 and culminated at a public conference in Washington, D.C., in 2000. Its eleven essays address the following question: if both the 1810 Independence wars and the 1910 Revolution had been preceded by periods of state-led reform, economic growth, and increasing disparities between rich and poor, could the strange parallelism that has marked modern Mexican history be repeated yet again in 2010? As the editors suggest in the introduction, at the heart of this question lies the relationship between community politics and nation-state formation and transformation.

There are key differences in how the authors treat this question. Francois-Xavier Guerra’s essay, the only one to remain unrevised because of his unfortunate passing in 2002, advances an argument familiar to those who know his work: the attempt to make two incompatible kinds of sovereignty, that of the nation and that of the pueblos, compatible with each other was at the center of 19th-century conflict, not only in Mexico, but throughout Hispanic America. What he calls the “precocious adoption” (p. 134) of political modernity caused deep problems between states and communities, because pueblos were not ready to let go of tradition. Eric Van Young makes an analogous argument about the differences between the views held by villagers and by elites at a broader societal level, suggesting that ideas of crisis in the late 18th century were filtered through a localized world view. At the same time, by rejecting the notion that villagers were apolitical, he refuses the binary between corporate deference and modern politics.
The essays by Antonio Annino and Leticia Reina are at the other end of the spectrum in their exploration of the same theme. Annino explores two forms of liberalism that he sees coming out of the 1812 Spanish Constitution: one individualist and private property oriented; the other emphasizing community and citizenship through the autonomous ayuntamientos. The ayuntamientos or pueblos, Annino argues, were repositories of “natural” sovereignty, while the holder of abstract sovereignty, the king or other form of central authority, was a constructed or constituted form. “The duality between ‘natural’ and ‘constituted’,” he writes, “explains why the implementation of a new plan always required a new congress or a new constitution” (p. 74).

Reina argues that struggles against the centralization of power have been a constant in Mexican politics since pre-colonial times, and using elections to legitimize, delegitimize, or renew authorities in indigenous communities has been deeply embedded in local political cultures. Low electoral participation accompanies times of continuity, she writes, while participation is high and politically contested in times of crisis or abuse. She suggests that high electoral participation tended to defuse discontent, since both in 1810 and 1910, areas where such participation occurred were less likely to take part in the insurgencies.

While John Tutino recognizes that political leadership and vision are essential to the success of rural movements, he emphasizes the material basis of rebellion. He calls this base “ecological autonomy,” and anchors the concept in viable peasant household economies with patriarchal organizations of labor power. For peasant communities to participate in rural insurgencies, Tutino argues, they must have their autonomy threatened but not extinguished. He defines the Mexican Revolution of 1910 as a struggle by communities to reconstitute their ecological autonomies and the patriarchies they sustained, and goes even further to suggest that an analysis of ecological autonomy could help explain the relationship between modern revolutions more generally and their peasant bases. Tutino’s essay is the only one in the collection to look at communal politics through a materialist lens, and he concludes that the excessive focus on politics and culture by recent postmodern analyses has tended to overlook the dimensions his analysis uncovers.

The importance of a focus on communal society, both economic and political, is especially clear when we read the essays about recent politics by Lorenzo Meyer and Enrique Semo. Meyer posits a contradiction between economic liberalization and political authoritarianism that does not compute if Mexican history is examined from the pueblos. And Semo’s essay, while providing an especially stimulating history of the participation of the Mexican left in elections and the tensions between the electoral left and the EZLN, would have benefited from a deeper consideration of local politics and civil society.
At the same time, the potential for a certain economic determinism in Tutoño’s argument is also clear when we read the essays by Guillermo de la Peña and Elisa Servín, both of whom examine, from very different perspectives, the increasing and mutually constitutive tension between the PRI-dominated state and civil society after the mid-1970s. De la Peña puts the EZLN in historical context by examining the emergence of rural and urban popular organizations, while Servín demonstrates how the 1977 electoral reform law opened the door to what she calls “municipal insurgencies,” or the use of local elections for the purpose of popular mobilization.

This stimulating collection has two limitations. Not all essays, for example, address the main themes as laid out in the introduction and explored here. The chapters by Friedrich Katz and Alan Knight are not a good conceptual fit, and thus cannot be included in a short review. More important, the fact that the essays were mainly written at the time of the first PANista transition (2000-2002), and only lightly revised thereafter, gives some of them a dated flavor. Though efforts at revision did occur, and Servín in particular tempers her optimism after the alarm bells of discontent sounded in 2006, the chapters treating contemporary politics have not worn as well. Still, the breadth and ambition of this collection should stimulate scholarly conversations for years to come.

Florencia E. Mallon

University of Wisconsin, Madison


El águila del escudo patrio y la Virgen de Guadalupe son dos de los símbolos más representativos del nacionalismo mexicano. Ambos remiten a una identidad, a un mismo tiempo secular y religiosa, que comparten los actores sociales que convivieron en el espacio del México posrevolucionario: el Estado, la élite (empresarios, miembros de la clase política e intelectual) y los sectores populares (trabajadores campesinos e indios). Con este título, el esfuerzo colectivo que encabezan Mary Kay Vaughn y Stephen Lewis indaga en torno a las expresiones en que se materializó la revolución cultural del México de la primera mitad del siglo XX. Este volumen sostiene la hipótesis de que la verdadera revolución cultural no está marcada por el diálogo entre el Estado y la sociedad, sino por la respuesta creativa de la sociedad al proyecto hegemónico del discurso de la “Revolución”. El acierto de esta compilación de ensayos es que los mismos se enfocan con cuidado en la resistencia de la población a las iniciativas del Es-