

RECENT STUDIES IN NINETEENTH-  
AND EARLY-TWENTIETH-CENTURY  
REGIONAL MEXICAN HISTORY

*Alma M. García*  
*Santa Clara University*

*LIFE IN PROVINCIAL MEXICO: NATIONAL AND REGIONAL HISTORY SEEN FROM MASCOTA, JALISCO, 1867-1972.* By CARLOS B. GIL. (Los Angeles: UCLA Latin American Center Publications, 1983. Pp. 220. \$20.00.)

*CAPITALISTS, CACIQUES, AND REVOLUTION: THE NATIVE ELITE AND FOREIGN ENTERPRISE IN CHIHUAHUA, MEXICO, 1854-1911.* By MARK WASSERMAN. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984. Pp. 232. \$27.00.)

*HACIENDAS IN CENTRAL MEXICO FROM LATE COLONIAL TIMES TO THE REVOLUTION.* Edited by R. BUVE. (Amsterdam: Center for Latin American Research and Documentation, 1984. Pp. 305.)

*OTHER MEXICOS: ESSAYS ON REGIONAL MEXICAN HISTORY, 1876-1911.* Edited by THOMAS BENJAMIN and WILLIAM MCNELLIE. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984. Pp. 319. \$24.95 cloth, \$12.95 paper.)

When Lesley Byrd Simpson published his *Many Mexicos* in 1966, he helped set the stage for the development of a regional approach to Mexican history with his eloquent argument that there are "many Mexicos."<sup>1</sup> In 1970 Victor Alba restated Simpson's observation, "There is more than one Mexico. Its history can never be spoken of in the singular."<sup>2</sup> Soon after appeared Luis González's *San José de Gracia: Mexican Village in Transition*, a landmark in regional Mexican community studies.<sup>3</sup>

González states that his selection of San José de Gracia as an area of scholarly research was based not on the village's geographical, social, or political importance nor on San José's historical importance or uniqueness. He chose this Mexican village as his research site instead for its "typicalness," arguing that "in its typicalness lies its strength. The selected historical area is neither influential nor transcendent, but it is certainly typical. Everything it is and has been can also be said of many tiny, orphaned mestizo communities in the mountainous regions of Central Mexico."<sup>4</sup>

Ironically, González later concluded that “any village seems ordinary until it is examined closely and deliberately,” until the researcher “discovers that each village has its originality, its individuality, its peculiar mission and destiny, and . . . forgets what it has in common with other communities.”<sup>5</sup> González’s pioneer work marked the course for future regional studies of Mexican history. His monograph operates on two planes: a chronological narrative of village events and a perpendicular analysis of village structure, or “its socioeconomic, political, psychological and internal relationships.”<sup>6</sup> In combining both dimensions, González has painted a small corner on the mural of Mexican history.

González’s study sparked a revisionist trend in Mexican history in general and in studies of the Mexican Revolution in particular. The revisionist approach held that the study of Mexican history required analysis going beyond discussing national events and issues. The national emphasis was replaced by a focus on regional complexities, diversities, and conflicts. Regional and local studies were consequently viewed as windows into Mexican history. As Joseph Love pointed out, “The problems of regional conflict-relationships of domination and subordination, the competition for scarce resources, and the tension between national integration and regional separatism are of major importance in the history of Mexico. . . .”<sup>7</sup>

Specifically, regionalists have been critical of studies of the Revolution viewing it as a great national epic and focusing on a macro-level analysis of social, political, and economic institutions during the revolutionary period. Regionalists argue that this view has become a major limitation. According to Barry Carr, “if there is any phenomenon in Mexican history that demands close study at the regional and local level it must surely be the epic Revolution and its immediate aftermath.”<sup>8</sup> Gilbert Joseph states that Mexicanists have reached agreement on at least one point: “No longer can the Revolution be viewed as a monolithic event.”<sup>9</sup> Instead of viewing the Revolution as a single national unit, revisionists emphasize regional and local patterns of development.<sup>10</sup> Joseph calls for analysis of a “series of regional phenomena, some of which deserve perhaps to be called revolutions. Each was governed . . . by a discrete set of local, social, economic, political, geographical, and cultural factors.”<sup>11</sup>

In the past two decades, research on Third World countries has experienced similar revisionist trends. In the 1960s, the dominant theoretical paradigm—modernization theory—came under severe criticism.<sup>12</sup> Although scholars employing a dependency perspective disagree on various points, general agreement exists about the need to adopt a transnational analysis of the world capitalist economy. Empha-

sis has shifted from the development of individual nation-states to a world capitalist system with a core, periphery, and semiperiphery.<sup>13</sup>

A major criticism of scholarly work sympathetic to this theoretical approach has been its emphasis on the dependent relationship between peripheral and semiperipheral countries vis-à-vis the capitalist core. Although the dependency perspective undermined the modernization paradigm, it often lacked systematic analysis of the internal social and political relations existing within a given nation-state. The dynamics of capitalist development in the core were viewed as a critical explanatory variable for development, or rather, for underdevelopment in the periphery and semiperiphery. Critics argued that dependency analysis needed to examine the internal class and social-structural relations that may produce variations in the relations between the core and the periphery. Revisions of dependency theory have focused on regional variations within the capitalist world economy produced by internal class dynamics.<sup>14</sup>

The four volumes under review represent contributions to the revisionist literature on Mexican history dealing with the Porfiriato and the Revolution of 1910. They also provide primary research focusing on the complexities of internal social, political, and cultural variations within Mexico. These works therefore contribute to the revisionist literature on the dependency approach. A common thread in each volume reflects both Simpson's view of many Mexicos and González's emphasis on microhistory. Carlos Gil provides an in-depth regional analysis of the community of Mascota, Jalisco, between 1867 and 1972, in an approach patterned after González. Mark Wasserman does the same for the state of Chihuahua from 1854 to 1911 but goes beyond Gil's microlevel analysis in outlining the interdependency of Chihuahua with the national and international capitalist economic order. Raymond Buve's collection of essays traces regional variations in Mexican haciendas from the late colonial era to the Revolution. Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie's collection of essays on Mexican regional politics, economy, and society places these subjects within the larger framework of a capitalist world system.

Carlos Gil's *Life in Provincial Mexico: National and Regional History Seen from Mascota, Jalisco, 1867–1972* is divided into three parts. The first part focuses on the Porfiriato and the Revolution, the second part on the Cárdenas years, and the third part on the 1970s. Using archival material from the Mascotan community, Gil proposes to "facilitate a closeup view of the warp and weft of Mexican society . . . , to fashion a provincial perspective on national historical events" (p. 4).

Gil begins by analyzing landownership patterns, the social fabric, and statistical indicators of living conditions in Mascota. The Mas-

cotan pattern of small haciendas differed from landownership patterns in other regions. Gil provides snapshots of the Mascotan network of social relations as well as statistics on the community's pattern of life events—rates of birth, infant mortality, childhood diseases, epidemics, and fertility, as well as marriage patterns and family size.

Although such material microscopically describes daily life in Mascota, certain limitations are discernible in *Life in Provincial Mexico*. Gil cogently argues that Mascota's landownership patterns deviated from the large-sized haciendas characteristic of other Mexican regions and concludes that the changing landownership patterns contributed to the uniqueness of the community. But he does not provide sufficient analysis of either conclusion. He discusses no distinct regional features of Mascota or Jalisco that might explain divergent landownership patterns. The second chapter on provincial society relies heavily on distorting psychologisms. For example, Gil states that Mascotans "displayed the serene endurance of a simple existence" (p. 37). Later, he summarizes the life conditions of a hacienda worker as exploitative but adds that the worker "preserved heart and soul in a variety of ways" (p. 72).

Turning his attention to the effects of the Revolution on Mascota, Gil investigates events within Mascota during the Revolution, the experiences of other selected communities during this period, and the relationship between local and national events. Herein lies a major strength of this study because examining all three areas highlights regional variations evident in revolutionary struggles and their outcomes. The last two sections of *Life in Provincial Mexico* trace the development of Mascota from the Cárdenas administration through the 1970s. Gil's analysis emphasizes land reform policies—their implementation, limitations, and regional variations. The author clearly identifies the salient factors in Mascota that blocked land distribution, specifically, conflicts between peasants and *hacendados* as well as geographical isolation. Land reform came slowly, its impetus usually originating outside Mascota. Despite the distribution of land during the Cárdenas administration and increased numbers of landowning small farmers, Gil concludes by seriously questioning "the death of the hacienda in Mexico" (p. 167).

Wasserman's *Capitalists, Caciques, and Revolution: The Native Elite and Foreign Enterprise in Chihuahua, Mexico, 1854–1911* uses the regional history approach as a starting point but also analyzes dimensions of social change. In addition to presenting a microscopic view of Chihuahua, Wasserman places its regional development and overall social change within national and international contexts. Wasserman argues, as do other regionalists, that "the history of Mexico from independence (1821) to the Revolution (1910–1920) is the history of its regions and localities" (p. 34).

Wasserman first traces the origins, development, and consolida-

tion of political and economic power of Chihuahua's native elite, the Terrazas dynasty. In the second part, he analyzes the interrelationship between this entrepreneurial elite and foreign investors. The last section focuses on this relationship's effects on Chihuahua's non-elite sectors—the middle class, peasants, and workers. In this section, Wasserman discusses the origin of discontent among these non-elite groups and their consequent opposition to native and foreign elites. All three sections stress the relationship between Chihuahua's politics and economics in the state's regional, export-based economy.

One of Wasserman's major arguments in *Capitalists, Caciques, and Revolution* reinforces the importance of a regionalist perspective. A distinguishing factor in the regional variation in Chihuahua was the rise of the Terrazas family dynasty: "the history of Chihuahuan politics from 1854 to 1902 is a chronicle of the rise of Luis Terrazas. . . . No other cacique in prerevolutionary Mexico matched either the length of his career or the extent to which he controlled his domain" (p. 26). The history of Chihuahuan politics is consequently presented as a series of challenges to the power of the Terrazas dynasty, a process involving the co-optation or defeat of rivals challenging the political and economic power of this family.

Wasserman analyzes the successful tactics developed by Luis Terrazas and his family to gain and maintain dominance in Chihuahua as well as the ultimate consequences of their political and economic consolidation of power. Wasserman's thesis is that the Terrazas' success in creating an omnipotent power machine sowed the seeds of revolution in Chihuahua. The family "acted as a magnet for the discontent in Chihuahua society" (p. 42). Wasserman outlines the economic empire of the Terrazas within a framework of regional, national, and international challenges, emphasizing the position of Chihuahua and Mexico in a capitalist world economy. At the regional level, the Terrazas empire is discussed in terms of its economic consolidation. The family's investments in land, livestock, banking, commerce, transportation, and other interests provided the economic foundation of their political empire. At the national level, Wasserman examines the relationship between the Terrazas regional elite and the Díaz national elite. At the international level, Wasserman identifies the Terrazas as *compradores* for foreign investors, the means by which Chihuahua became particularly attractive to foreign investment. Wasserman's analysis effectively outlines a triple alliance among Chihuahua's native elite, the national Díaz regime, and foreign elites.<sup>15</sup>

Ironically, this triple alliance symbolized the power of the Terrazas dynasty and also signaled its demise. Chihuahua's economic growth and development proceeded at an accelerated pace as foreign infiltration created an export-based economy. Although this infiltration

safeguarded the political domination of the dynasty and the national Díaz regime, Wasserman argues that the relationship between foreign and native elites created a pattern of dependency. Chihuahua's export-based economy expanded within the world capitalist system yet was subject to the dislocations produced within that system. He elegantly employs a dependency approach in depicting Chihuahua's economic growth at both levels.

Wasserman's regional study addresses one of the major criticisms of dependency analysis in going beyond placing Chihuahua's economic order within an international context to analyze internal class conflicts produced by this dependent relationship. Thus the third part of the book examines the social upheavals culminating in the Revolution of 1910. In Chapters 6, 7, and 8, Wasserman explains the intense class conflicts in Chihuahua and attempts to provide a view of this society from the bottom up. This section is the weakest part of the book, however, because his analysis of the three major non-elite sectors fails to raise key questions concerning the origin, nature, and form of discontent among the middle class, peasants, and workers.

Wasserman concludes on a theoretical note, comparing Chihuahua with other regions of Mexico and pointing out that his case study supports major assumptions of the dependency perspective. The drain on the region by foreign investment, the destructive nature of the world capitalist economy, and internal class conflicts characterizing Chihuahuan society all strengthen this theoretical perspective. Wasserman nevertheless calls for additional studies that would include more systematic examinations of specific regional responses to the world capitalist economy.

The regionalist tradition is continued in Raymond Buve's *Haciendas in Central Mexico from Late Colonial Times to the Revolution*. The essays in this collection were presented at the CEDLA conference "The Hacienda in Mexican History" in Amsterdam in 1982. The first part consists of three essays focusing on the internal structure and dynamics of the hacienda as a micro-society. Lucas Ouweneel, J. Bazant, and Herbert Nickel present studies of haciendas in Tlaxcala (1765–1766), San Luis Potosí (1868–1904), and the Puebla-Tlaxcala region, respectively. Essays in the second part emphasize the relationship between the hacienda and the developing Mexican state. Juan Felipe Leal traces this relationship during the Porfiriato and the early years of the Revolution (1856–1914). Buve's contribution concentrates on the issues confronting the Tlaxcalan hacendados during the collapse of the Díaz regime (1910–1917). Ricardo Rendon Garcini's essay covers the same time period but focuses specifically on the hacendados' reaction to revolutionary upheaval (1910–1920).

Ouweneel, Bazant, and Nickel offer revisions to dependency

theory in that their studies clearly point to the regional variations within haciendas. Ouweneel's article directly addresses the limitation of dependency theory in overlooking such variations. As contributions to micro-level historical research, these essays are based largely on primary data sources gathered at the regional level, and each study poses research questions for future regional studies.

Ouweneel challenges the traditional monolithic view of Mexico's colonial haciendas by highlighting specific social and labor conditions as well as the technical agro-economic aspects of a Tlaxcalan hacienda. Using data from one of fourteen diaries taken from the Archivo General del Estado de Tlaxcala, the author sets out to "reconstruct a typical year on a hacienda" (p. 25). He provides a detailed overview of the hacienda's day-to-day activities, including a discussion of various working conditions that balances the sometimes overly technical economic analysis of the hacienda's agricultural production system.

Bazant's study of the Bocas hacienda complements Ouweneel's in analyzing the living conditions and problems facing different kinds of hacienda laborers as well as the strategies adopted by hacendados to maintain control of their "micro-society." Like Ouweneel, Bazant establishes a relationship between labor conditions, wage differentials, and the crises affecting the haciendas' agricultural production. While Bazant and Ouweneel implicitly challenge the monolithic view of Mexico's haciendas, Nickel explicitly questions major assumptions about particular conditions on haciendas during the Porfiriato. He contends that empirical data point to regional variations on the haciendas. His study disputes the generalizations that the conditions of hacienda workers deteriorated during the Porfiriato, stressing instead the need to reassess the assumption that hacienda workers experienced increased food prices, decreased real wages, and an exploitative relation with the "tiendas de raya." Nickel agrees with Ouweneel and Bazant that hacienda workers experienced divergent living and working conditions.

The articles by Leal, Buve, and Garcini employ a different level of analysis in focusing on the relationship between the hacienda and the developing Mexican state. Leal studies the effects of the Díaz modernization program on the haciendas. He argues that although Díaz and the Científicos developed a program for modernizing Porfirian Mexico, its effect on Mexican haciendas produced regional differences when various hacienda structures and labor conditions yielded different outcomes. The rise of a commercialized export-oriented agriculture was closely linked to the transformation of hacienda workers into wage earners. The task for future research is to document the regional differences.

Buve extends his analysis to the period between 1910 and 1918 in an attempt to identify major variables that can explain variations in

hacienda-state relations. His case study of Tlaxcala reveals three major variables that together shaped this relationship. He begins by discussing the nature of power held by regional elites, then identifies the local agrarian structure (specifically, the degree of incorporation into a world market), and ends by citing the dynamics of the agrarian social structure. Certain agrarian conditions are viewed as increasing the likelihood of agrarian unrest and therefore challenging the hacendados and the national government. Buve's concluding section outlines a causal link between freeholding peasant villages and agrarian revolts in Tlaxcala. This essay provides a theoretical framework for further studies aimed at exploring the variations in relations between haciendas and the national government.

Garcini's essay adds a variable to those discussed by Buve. His work presents a "typical" hacendado's perspective on the revolutionary upheaval, based on the writings of one hacendado. Garcini captures the generalized fears of this group during the period between 1910 and 1920: hacendados feared Madero's "crazy socialists" (p. 276), peasant demands, and social, political, and economic instability. While lacking the analytical precision of Buve's study, Garcini's essay provides a new dimension that can be incorporated into Buve's scheme.

As a whole, *Haciendas in Central Mexico* contributes significantly to Mexican regional history, especially to Tlaxcalan microhistory. The authors also offer comparisons with other regions of Mexico, although the comparative attempts are constrained by the central focus of the anthology.

Benjamin and McNellie's *Other Mexicos: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876–1911* avoids this shortcoming in being thematically organized into three major sections on regional politics, the rural economy, and regional society. Each section includes works that selectively highlight regional diversities as well as similarities. This collection contains outstanding scholarship on the Porfiriato from a regionalist perspective, and its essays systematically place Mexican regional developments within the world economy.

Essays by Wasserman, William Stanley Langston, and David LaFrance trace the intricate balance of alliances, co-optation, coercion, and accommodation characterizing the relationship between the Díaz regime and the states of Chihuahua, Coahuila, and Puebla. The Díaz political machine developed an overall economic modernization plan that was translated into policies in each region. All three authors identify the role of international factors in shaping these configurations within each state.

Regional politics during the Porfiriato created a rich mosaic. Wasserman's study of Chihuahua's Terrazas family empire focuses on its political and economic base. Developments in Coahuila discussed by



Langston contrast sharply with those found in Chihuahua. The Pax Porfiriana was characterized by an authoritarian regime that at times relied on intrastate conflicts to consolidate its power, as in Coahuila, where Díaz pitted elites against one another in the gubernatorial elections. Díaz's strategy of divide and conquer allowed him to maintain control of Coahuila. Langston argues that this policy proved effective in the short run but fatal in the long run.

LaFrance provides a similar critique of the Díaz regime. While the strength of the Díaz regime lay in its concentration of power, its ultimate destruction was brought about by this monopoly—that is to say, the Díaz regime could not accommodate the forces it had unleashed. LaFrance's study of Puebla illustrates the "pan o palo" strategy employed by the Díaz political machine that led to its political disintegration. Puebla represented a more strategic region than Coahuila. Situated between the capital and Veracruz, Puebla's agricultural and industrial importance caused Díaz to establish a more intense and repressive network of social control. Thus the regional political differences were largely produced by Puebla's relations with the center. Díaz's control of the Pueblan political sphere resulted in a greater political vacuum in the state once the Díaz government collapsed.

In the same way that political developments with the Díaz regime reveal regional patterns, the economic development policies adopted by the center led to regional diversities. The second part of *Other Mexicos* outlines two divergent patterns, the development of an export-based plantation economy and the rise of a small class of commercial farmers (*rancheros*).

Daniela Spenser argues that the development of dependent capitalism in Porfirian Mexico was linked to a network of regional economic specialization and differentiation. Her study of the coffee plantation system in Soconusco, Chiapas, between 1890 and 1910 illustrates the "interconnective nature of regional, national, and international export-led economic growth in Mexico" (p. 127). She outlines the actions taken by the Díaz regime to meet regional labor shortages and demonstrates how these policies facilitated the entry of German coffee entrepreneurs into Chiapas, thus placing it in a dependent position within a world capitalist economy.

While the economic growth of Chiapas resulted largely from external international factors, economic development within northern Hidalgo came from internal impulses. Frans Schryer challenges the view of Porfirian Mexico as a polarized society of large hacendados and masses of peasants. His study traces the origin of a small group of *rancheros* owning medium-sized estates. This group usually employed day laborers as well as renting out land to sharecroppers. As Schryer points out, these *rancheros* initially supported Díaz and thus helped

him to consolidate state power but later opposed him. A further irony can be found in the land reform policies of the Díaz regime. These policies contributed to the rise of the *ranchero* class, which maintained itself by means of a subsistence-oriented agricultural system that soon changed under the impact of national and international factors. The development of a commercial agricultural system based on wage labor sparked internal differentiation within the *ranchero* class, often producing internal rivalries. Schryer concludes that while the Porfiriato created the *ranchero* class, the regime ultimately set in motion opposing forces that would overthrow this group. The essays by Schryer and Spenser cogently illustrate the impact of Díaz's economic policies within a regional context.

The final section of *Other Mexicos* examines the class conflicts that developed within Porfirian society as well as the patterns of opposition and resistance developing in various sectors. The essay by Evelyn Hu-DeHart analyzes the impact of Díaz's development policies on Yaqui Indians and Chinese immigrants in Sonora. The policies adopted by Díaz in both cases underline the tensions evident between center and periphery. Díaz's policy of systematically deporting the Yaquis to Yucatán as laborers and his support for increased Chinese immigration created growing opposition among regional Sonoran elites. These elites disliked the Yaqui deportations because they were experiencing labor shortages of their own. In addition, the rise of a petite bourgeoisie of Chinese immigrants challenged the Sonoran commercial and business sectors.

Allen Wells studies the effects of Díaz's economic policies on non-elite groups in Yucatán. The state's henequen economy was tied to a monocrop economic order dependent on the world market and was based on a coercive labor system of debt peonage. This system was maintained by strong repressive controls that produced sporadic, but intense, episodes of violence, which in turn increased repressive measures. Because of the nature of Yucatán's labor system and the effective measures employed by the state, patterns of resistance failed to intensify. Wells argues forcefully that peasant unity and resistance were thus preempted, thereby exempting Yucatán from the intense revolutionary struggles that occurred in other regions of Mexico.

This pattern contrasted sharply with the major agrarian unrest manifested in La Comarca Lagunera in North Central Mexico, as outlined in William Meyer's article. The link between Díaz's modernization policies and agrarian unrest has been firmly established. Díaz set out to attract foreign capital to the region, and his successful policies led to the development of an export-based cotton industry in this region. The industry established itself by seizing peasant land and creating a landless agricultural work force. These land conflicts, plus susceptibility to

fluctuations in the world economy, created a situation ripe for revolt. Unlike the situation in Yucatán, successful political mobilization efforts among the region's workers increased the probability for revolt.

All the works reviewed here continue the tradition established by Luis González. At different levels and with varying degrees of success, they provide windows into the microsocieties that make up the "many Mexicos." Wasserman's *Capitalists, Caciques, and Revolution* and the anthology edited by Benjamin and McNellie undertake a larger task in fitting their regional studies of Mexico into a larger international theoretical framework. Although more research is needed like that undertaken by Gil and Buve to further document regional patterns within Mexico, future studies will be strengthened by placing regional developments within national and international contexts.

## NOTES

1. Lesley Byrd Simpson, *Many Mexicos* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), 10.
2. Victor Alba, *The Mexicans: The Making of a Nation* (New York: Pegasus, 1970), 8.
3. Luis González, *San José de Gracia: Mexican Village in Transition*, translated by John Upton (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972). It was originally published under the title *Pueblo in vilo: microhistoria de San José de Gracia* (Mexico City: Colegio de Mexico, 1972).
4. *Ibid.*, p. xvi.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*, p. xxiv.
7. Joseph L. Love, "An Approach to Regionalism," in *New Approaches to Latin American History*, edited by Richard Graham and Peter H. Smith (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974), 137.
8. Barry Carr, "Recent Regional Studies of the Mexican Revolution," *LARR* 15, no. 1 (1980):3.
9. Gilbert M. Joseph, *Revolution from Without: Yucatán, Mexico, and the United States, 1880–1924* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), xi.
10. See these regional studies: Hector Aguilar Camín, "The Relevant Tradition: Sonoran Leaders in the Revolution," in *Caudillo and Peasant in the Mexican Revolution*, edited by David A. Brading (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 92–123; Dudley Ankersen, "Saturnino Cedillo: A Traditional Caudillo in San Luis Potosí, 1890–1938," in *Caudillo and Peasant*, 140–68; Raymond Buve, "State Governors and Peasant Mobilization in Tlaxcala," in *Caudillo and Peasant*, 224–44; Friedrich Katz, "Pancho Villa, Peasant Movements, and Agrarian Reform in Northern Mexico," in *Caudillo and Peasant*, 59–75; Raymond Buve, "Peasant Movements, Caudillos, and Land Reform during the Revolution (1910–1917) in Tlaxcala, Mexico," *Boletín de Estudios Latinoamericanos y del Caribe* 18 (June 1975):112–52; and Paul Friedrich, *Agrarian Revolt in a Mexican Village* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970).
11. Joseph, *Revolution from Without*, xi–xii.
12. For a critical review of the modernization approach, see J. Samuel Valenzuela and Arturo Valenzuela, "Modernization and Dependency: Alternative Perspective in the Study of Latin American Underdevelopment," *Comparative Politics* (July 1978):535–57. For other critiques, see: André Gunder Frank, "Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology," *Catalyst* 2 (Summer 1966):20–73; Joseph R. Gusfield, "Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change," *American Journal of Sociology* 72 (Jan. 1967):351–62; Reinhard Bendix, "Tradi-

- tion and Modernity Reconsidered," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (June 1967):292–346; Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15 (Mar. 1973):199–266; and Alejandro Portes, "Modernity and Development: A Critique," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 8 (Spring 1973):88–112.
13. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974), 7.
  14. For discussions of such revisionist literature, see Robert Brenner, "Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe," *Past and Present* 70 (Feb. 1976):30–75; and Theda Skocpol, "Wallerstein's World Capitalist System: A Theoretical and Historical Critique," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (Mar. 1977):1075–90.
  15. A similar analysis using Brazil as a case study can be found in Peter Evans, *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1979).