ars interested in public concepts of honor and in Mexico's twentieth-century transformation would benefit from a serious look at this work, for it lays bare the supreme importance of the oft-hidden rules of the Mexican public sphere. As Piccato explains, capitalism's increasing importance to the viability of Mexico's governments (beginning with Díaz) made the honor of a nation very important. Honor went from a romantic concept to a very modern capitalist good. Likewise, duels, once essential to repairing honor, were replaced by the more modern and soon to be increasingly common repression of journalists.

JAMES A. GARZA
University of Nebraska, Lincoln


Colin Palmer's book on Cheddi Jagan is the latest addition to the many studies that seek to elucidate the role of colonialism and the Cold War in frustrating the democratic aspirations of the Guyanese people. Preceding this remarkable, well-written, and skillfully organized work are other capable contributions from scholars like Raymond Thomas Smith, Leo A. Despres, Stephen Rabe, Maurice St. Pierre, and Cheddi Jagan himself. So what new insights on Jagan or Guyana can Palmer deliver in this, the most recent of his works on Caribbean political leaders?

For this book, Palmer utilized extensive and copious documentary research from among some of the richest of colonial and U.S. archives. His main thesis seems to be that Guyana's past and current dilemmas, such as delayed independence, ethnic divisiveness, and recurrent political violence, derive from the weaknesses and failures of the Guyanese political leadership in general, and that of Jagan and his People's Progressive Party (PPP) in particular. Palmer characterizes the so-called weaknesses of Jagan and the PPP in terms of their supposed "naivety" or "irresponsibility" in clinging to a self-defeating communist or Marxist dogma within British and American spheres of influence and control. Yet, the British knew that the realization of Soviet or Cuban communism in Guyana was highly improbable, and that Jagan's policies were basically nationalist and pragmatic.

Jagan was castigated for his role in initiating and fomenting racial politics and violence. Historical evidence, however, shows that the racial and ethnic divisions that followed the party split in 1955, and ignited political violence between 1962 and 1964, were mainly instigated by British and American governments in order to prevent the supposedly communist Jagan from obtaining political power. Jagan's national political opponents, Forbes Burnham and Peter D'Aguilar, were more directly culpable in this racial and political conspiracy, given their collusion with colonial and American authorities. Admittedly, Jagan eventually resorted to the political expediency of ethnic mobilization, which has characterized the entire Guyana political landscape since the early 1960s.

Palmer displays obvious sympathy for Jagan's struggle against British and American Machiavellianism. Yet he tends to downplay Jagan's leadership and ability to navigate a process so overwhelmingly stacked against him. This dismissal of Jagan's strengths no doubt saves Palmer's main thesis, which emphasizes leadership weaknesses in Guyana's nationalist movements at the time. Similarly, no effort is made to counter the unsubstantiated and seemingly racist insistence of the colonial and American officials that the only real intelligent and capable leadership in the PPP was provided by the white, U.S.-born Mrs. Jagan, despite much historical evidence to the contrary.

Historically, Jagan's leadership capabilities are shown by his resilience against foreign and domestic forces and his eventual triumph in regaining the presidency and international respectability in 1992. Also, Palmer's main conclusions—that the 1954 Robertson Commission inspired and instigated the 1955 PPP split, that the Colonial Office exaggerated the communist bogey to deny independence for Guyana under Jagan, and that Jagan and the PPP, between 1953 and 1964, were merely in office but not in real power—have been identified and exposed by Jagan since the 1950s. Jagan was also a visionary as the earliest and most consistent advocate of coalition politics embracing Guyana's Africans and East Indians as a necessary means towards political stability and development in the country.

Palmer's historiography is conventional and relies heavily on Colonial Office and U.S. State Department documents. He paid little attention to Jagan's many writings and speeches, as well as other domestic sources, including the PPP's periodicals. This more grounded approach is necessary to counterbalance the biased assessments of British colonial and U.S. officials and pro-British newspapers in Guyana, which the author tends to privilege. Nevertheless, aside from these omissions, Palmer's book makes interesting reading and is particularly valuable for advancing, so far, the clearest and most persuasive statements about the critical connections between foreign conspiracies and interventions and Guyana's traumatic struggles toward democracy and political independence.

PERRY MARS
Wayne State University


There are books that come along only rarely and that stand out for condensing in their pages the concerns of
a generation. They become lightning rods for debate and classics because of their style of exposition, set of propositions, and originality. This is one such book, and we are fortunate that it has now, at last, come out in English. It offers a deep meditation on memory, myth, and history in the Peruvian Andes and brilliantly probes the long tradition of Andean utopianism, specifically the aspiration for a return of the Inca. Based on its critical engagement with the problems of poverty, exclusion, and violence in the past and present, it argues for a reconstituted utopia to transform Peru along more egalitarian lines in the future.

Alberto Flores Galindo was an outstanding representative of the Latin American historiography of the 1970s and 1980s. This book won Cuba’s Casa de las Américas prize in 1986 and the Clarence Haring prize for best book in Latin American history, awarded by the American Historical Association, in 1991. He left his mark not only with one great book but with a number of works, each of which reoriented Andean historical studies. These include his approach to the long-term regional economic history of Arequipa and the southern Andes, his edited volume on the uprising of Túpac Amaru II, his splendid treatment of the heterodox Marxist José Carlos Mariátegui (1894–1930), and his portrait of urban social hierarchy in late colonial Lima. But Flores Galindo was also a journalist and public intellectual, and this book reaches beyond strict academism to engage a broad audience on eminently accessible terms. His style here is essayistic, concise and clear, showing scrupulous treatment of historical evidence without disguising his moral and political judgments. In his approach to the past, Flores Galindo consistently joined an Annalist’s sensitivity to mentalités (his own doctoral work was conducted in France) with a Marxist’s concern for political economic trends and structures.

In Flores Galindo’s account, the Inca Empire was transformed from an oppressive regime into an idealized symbol of sovereignty, just governance, and social harmony in the painful aftermath of the Spanish conquest. This reinvention of the Inca in the subsequent course of colonial history had no parallel in Mexico, and the Aztecs never acquired a comparable standing as a symbolic alternative to colonial injustice and misrule. In the sixteenth century, the idea of the return of the Inca stemmed from ongoing Inca military resistance and new nativist religious impulses, as well as the Andean uptake of Joachimite millenarianism. In the seventeenth century, Flores Galindo sees the full-fledged public emergence of the utopian myth of the Inca, not only in the celebrated Royal Commentaries written by Garcilaso de la Vega (1539–1616), himself a mestizo of partial Inca ancestry, but in urban processions by the indigenous nobility of Inca descent and in theatrical representations of the clash between Atahualpa and Pizarro. Flores Galindo also reveals the emergence of the Inca imaginary in clandestine religious practices targeted for extirpation by the Catholic Church.

The neo-Inca cultural renaissance that grew up in the eighteenth century found powerful political expression in the anticolonial insurgencies of two leaders who claimed legitimate status as Inca royalty. Flores Galindo examines Juan Santos Atahualpa’s campaigns in the 1740s and 1750s and offers an important interpretation of the insurgency led by Túpac Amaru II in 1780–1781. After the suppression of these movements, the Inca was evoked rhetorically for a time in the 1810s and 1820s by creole independence leaders who sought to claim the glorious mantle of the “sons of the sun.” Yet for the most part, argues Flores Galindo, the utopian dimension dissipated, as racist discrimination toward Indians became embedded in the structures of everyday life and in elite scientific discourse.

In the twentieth century, the utopian aspiration underwent a resurgence as cycles of indigenous and peasant political mobilization sparked the conscience of leading intellectual and political figures in both socialist and indigenista movements. Flores Galindo’s treatment of Mariátegui in the 1910s and 1920s and of novelist and anthropologist José María Arguedas (1911–1969) in the mid-twentieth century are models of historical insight. He shows how the struggles of their personal lives and intellectual production illuminate broader contradictions between capitalist development and Andean tradition. A final chapter takes up the brutal war between the Shining Path guerrilla movement and the Peruvian state, which had still not come to an end by Flores Galindo’s untimely death in 1990.

There is a subtle tension in Flores Galindo’s own treatment of Andean utopia. The historical chapters are written with an exemplary seriousness about and empathy for historical actors, even if they were marginal figures or losers in their historical contests. Like Mariátegui, who advocated Marxism as a modern myth, Flores Galindo believed in the need for a utopian perspective to empower popular and socialist struggles in the present. Like Arguedas, who drew upon ancient Andean mythology as a key for rethinking the collision between Andean culture and capitalist modernity, Flores Galindo believed it essential to build a new political project for Peru out of preexisting historical material. Yet he displayed certain defensiveness in the face of criticism from the Right and the Left. In the second and third editions of his book, he insisted that his own vision was not backward looking or irrational. And in distancing himself from messianic millenarianism and the expectation of a “return of the Inca,” he implied that earlier projects were prone toward fanaticism, authoritarianism, or becoming trapped in the past, a conclusion somewhat at odds with the substance of his historical analysis.

Editors Carlos Aguirre and Charles F. Walker provide a splendid introductory essay about “Tito” Flores Galindo, Peru’s intellectual and political milieu in the post-1968 period, and the reception of this book. Explanatory notes throughout the text make the volume highly accessible to non-specialists. The one disappointment for this reader is the elimination, presumably due to its length, of the chapter on the quixotic
creole Gabriel Aguilar who headed an anticolonial conspiracy in Cuzco in 1805. Flores Galindo’s original chapter, which explores Aguilar’s dreamlife and unconscious yearnings, is a tour de force and was important to the author’s overall project.

The appearance of this volume in English is to be celebrated. Readers will draw from it inspiration for thinking about utopianism and the historical imagination. They will find in it an elegant and passionate presentation of the long, fraught history of Peru. And they will encounter not only a brilliant interpreter of Mariátegui and Arguedas, but the intellectual successor to Peru’s two great twentieth-century intellectuals.

Sinclair Thomson
New York University


Richard Graham has made an impressive contribution to the social history of Salvador, Brazil in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The former capital of Portuguese America, a key port in transatlantic commerce, and Brazil’s second most populous city for much of the period in question, Salvador was also a city of tremendous sociocultural variety and dynamism.

The city’s dynamism, variety, and importance are all highlighted in this book, which, as its title suggests, examines Salvador’s provisioning over some eighty years. It is a subject Graham came to fortuitously, through the chance intersection of a pedagogic interest in food-related issues and the availability of some remarkable documentation at two of Salvador’s archives. This existing interest and archival good fortune were the bases on which years of research, analysis, and writing could construct the “business and busy-ness of the food trade [that] lay at the heart of city life” (p. 210), bringing together women and men, slave and free, African, European, and Brazilian.

The book is divided into two parts. Part one is composed of six chapters detailing the worlds and work of street vendors, storekeepers, boat captains, sailors, stevedores, porters, grain merchants, cattle dealers, drovers, slaughtermen, and butchers. In a different historian’s hands, the result might have been a table-laden exercise in cliometrics, but Graham’s narrative skill and affection for his subjects led him in a different direction, in which the humanity of such historical figures as slaves hired out as sellers of foodstuffs is emphasized in well-wrought portraits.

Part two connects the social worlds of the city’s food trade to the grand political and ideological developments of the first half of the nineteenth century, in which Brazil gained its independence, Salvador was the site of significant social unrest, and liberalism made its first sallies against older conceptions of the ordering of state, market, and society. In chapter eight, Graham provides a terrific capsule history of the independence struggle in Bahia, including a convincing case that the insurgents’ ability to cut off the supply of food to Salvador, particularly by obtaining the cooperation of most of the “people of the sea” who controlled the waterborne supply of manioc flour to the city in normal times, ultimately “assured Brazilian independence” (p. 155). Chapters ten and eleven examine attempts by traders and government officials, driven by avarice and the ideas of Adam Smith, to eliminate price controls and other colonial-era restrictions on commerce. Although the law of the land favored these would-be liberalizers, their successes were fleeting. For most city residents and many city councilors, Salvador’s provisioning was too important to be left to merchant self-interest and Scottish social theory. Instead, when shortages and rising prices resulted in popular outrage, and outrage threatened rebellion, city officials imposed restrictions aimed at defending the common good and assuring the deference of the many to the few. These paternalistic restrictions may have flown in the face of national legislation and international vogue, but economic liberalism had proven an impossible fit for a society as unequal as Salvador’s.

In both halves of the book, Graham shows a keen eye for the intricacies of the food trade and the dauntingly complex hierarchy of a society in which an African-born street vendor could out-earn Portuguese shopkeepers and an enslaved ship captain in the coastwise manioc trade would command crews that included free white sailors. While Graham credits his findings in Salvador’s municipal and state archives with allowing him to bring out this wealth of social detail (p. xiii), further research in additional documentary collections in Salvador, Rio de Janeiro, and Lisbon obviously paid off in this regard as well. Graham’s command of printed sources is equally impressive, with material from travelers’ accounts deployed to particularly good effect.

This book has a few flaws. Graham’s apparently unselfconscious use of the term “middle class” will drive historians of middle-classness to distraction. More seriously, the term “proto-abolitionist” seems conceptually fuzzy and an odd fit with at least one of the situations in which it is applied (p. 101). The characterization of Salvador’s society as “premodern” (p. 69) will ring falsely to modern ears.

But these are small quibbles. This book is a labor of love that ought to receive a wide readership among historians of Brazil, as well as historians of Spanish America and of early modern cities elsewhere in the world. Should it fail to reach a ready audience among the latter two groups, the blame will lie with scholarly and un-scholarly chauvinisms, not this very fine book.

James P. Woodard
Montclair State University

James N. Green. We Cannot Remain Silent: Opposition to the Brazilian Military Dictatorship in the United States.