grounded their call for social and economic justice in the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, while Flores Magón’s PLM cited natural law and Karl Marx. Both blamed the disruption of social harmony on modern industrial capitalism (associated primarily with Anglo-Saxon civilization), which enslaved the worker, denigrated the Indian, and sacrificed the common good (however defined) to individual gain.

Not until his conclusion does Weiner make explicit his “central premise” and its origin. His insight that economy and culture are deeply interconnected was inspired by his identification of what he calls “a central irony in Adam Smith’s classic work A (sic) Wealth of Nations,” specifically Smith’s “separation of economics from politics, ethics and society.” Unfortunately Weiner’s reading of Smith is incorrect. Smith does not deny these connections, but affirms them (see Book 3:4). Weiner claims his work counters “recent trends in the literature . . . [that] ignore the cultural milieu in which the economy operated” (p. 4). Recent trends, however, are to treat economy with or even as culture. Weiner cites Stephen Haber’s work as evidence of the neglect of culture by economists, yet Haber wrote to criticize this cultural turn in Latin American economic history. These examples illustrate this reviewer’s problem with Weiner’s work overall. He promises to rectify the shortcomings of previous scholarship—to fill lacunae and gaping holes, explore the little explored, serve as a corrective, counter recent trends, and look over the overlooked. But the shortcomings he promises to correct are largely products of overstatement and misinterpretation, straw men in short. In the end, his tangled examination of “market discourse” shines little light upon race, nation, or market during the Porfiriato.

*Murray State University  
Murray, Kentucky*  

**William Schell**


This book offers a detailed reconstruction of the changes and continuities in penal debates, norms, and practices in Buenos Aires from late colonial times to the mid-nineteenth century. Barreneche’s main argument is that this “formative” period provided the foundation for the emergence of a “modern” penal system in Argentina. In line with a flow of recent studies about state formation in Spanish America, the author correctly points to the early post-independence period as a crucial era in the shaping of the structure, function, and nature of so-called “modern” state institutions—the judiciary, police, army, prisons, educational system, and so forth.

The emergence of a modern penal system in Argentina, the author contends, was strongly influenced by the dilemma faced by early independent jurists, magistrates, and policy makers: how to reconcile the tenets of liberalism and republicanism with the need to respond to day-to-day challenges stemming from inadequate legislation, economic shortages, political instability, and social cleavages. What Barreneche
found—and the book is at its best in describing this—is a complicated process of pragmatic adaptation of the written (usually imported) legal norms to the complex and changing realities on the ground. In doing so, however, policy makers and authorities introduced a degree of elasticity in the interpretation of the law that mounted to arbitrariness and that may be one of the most distinctive features of the Argentine penal system.

Chapter 1 outlines the book’s main arguments and locates them within recent historiographical developments in the study of law and justice in Latin America. Chapter 2 reviews the “legal architecture” of the colonial period, emphasizing the adaptation that peninsular norms suffered when transplanted to American soil. Of particular interest is the author’s attention to _bandos_, a series of norms enacted by local authorities in their attempt to improve mechanisms of social control. Chapter 3 looks in detail at the actual functioning of this system of criminal justice during the colonial period. The main contention here is that, despite occasional signs of impartiality (in the form of sanctions against guilty members of the “decent” groups or the acquittal of innocent plebeians), the evidence points to an overwhelmingly class-biased system of penal repression, which resulted (unlike the Mexican case studied by Michael Scardaville) in the lower classes’ profound distrust of the criminal justice system.

Chapters 4 and 5 survey the changes and continuities in penal doctrines and policies after 1810, when Buenos Aires jurists and policy makers engaged in numerous debates about the most efficient mechanisms of crime control and repression. Contradictions between the extant colonial legislation and the liberal principles that judges and attorneys allegedly professed, as well as the need to respond to pressing challenges emerging from political and social instability, resulted in a highly fragmented and heterogeneous body of norms, whose application reflected, in addition, great doses of arbitrariness. An important corollary was the weakening of the judiciary and the strengthening of the police in the implementation of state penal practices. As Barreneche suggests, “the [police] uniform and not the gown would become, metaphorically speaking, the visible symbol of the Buenos Aires republican justice for generations to come” (p. 109). Not surprisingly, the arbitrariness of this type of penal justice targeted mostly the subaltern groups, whose rights were not adequately protected by law or legal practice.

Chapter 6 reviews the formation of what the author calls a “republican penal discourse” in post-independence Buenos Aires, pointing again to the tension between a discourse (imported from Europe) of civil rights and rule of law, and the realities of lower-class criminality and social disorder. Finally, Chapter 7 offers both a summary of the book’s main findings and a brief account of post-1853 developments in penal practices in Argentina, emphasizing the author’s main argument about the continuities in the country’s approach to penal policies. He calls, among other things, for a “longue durée” approach to the analysis of penal policies, emphasizing the importance of paying attention to the weight of what he calls “institutional inertia.”
Barreneche’s book offers a solid reconstruction of the formation of the penal system in Argentina, one that nicely blends the virtues of institutional/legal history with the approaches and methods developed by political and (to a lesser degree) social historians. Scholars interested in the study of penal ideas, policies, and practices would benefit greatly from this compact, well-researched, and nicely written monograph.

University of Oregon  
Eugene, Oregon  

Carlos Aguirre


Cholera, like so many diseases, affects populations that are the most vulnerable. In order to understand why cholera killed over five hundred indigenous Warao in the Delta Amaruco of Venezuela during the summer of 1992, Charles Briggs and Clara Martini-Briggs have painstakingly collected narratives from the Warao, local physicians, public health officials, politicians and international epidemiologists from the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization. From a careful analysis of their narratives there emerges a picture of unequal relations based on race, class, gender and politics that have relegated the Warao to an inferior position, thus serving as a tragic example of what is increasingly happening to more and more people all over the world.

What makes this book exceedingly important is that the authors have been able to present a clear juxtaposition of different narratives. These stories give voice not only to those who became ill but also to the different people involved in treating them: those who collected epidemiological statistics, reported for the local and national press, performed political damage control, limited the migration of people from the Delta to local urban areas, and worked in public health, among others. This is perhaps the first time that so many voices have been heard. In turn, it has enabled the authors to show the polarization of viewpoints and the deeply engrained beliefs about why people get sick and how they should be treated. For the elites and other non-indigenous peoples of the Delta Amaruco, the Warao are viewed as unsanitary, unhealthy and uncivilized. Because of their cultural habits, which allegedly include eating raw crabs, the Warao are seen as being guilty of bringing the deadly disease on themselves and thus should bear the primary responsibility for their own high morbidity and mortality rates. Ill Warao were regarded as a threat and thus kept geographically isolated or quarantined to prevent the “civilized population” from getting infected. At the same time, *Vibrio cholerae* was regarded as an “invasion” into Venezuela that reached the Warao from other infected areas of South America and the rest of the world. The threat of infection led to rapid action by public health authorities, yet the very limited medical supplies rushed to the Delta were not made