THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION:
Region and Theory, Signifying Nothing?

Mark Wasserman
Rutgers University

AGRARIAN WARLORD: SATURNINO CEDILLO AND THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION IN SAN LUIS POTOSI. By DUDLEY ANKERSON. (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1985. Pp. 303. $32.00.)

MEMOIRS OF A MEXICAN POLITICIAN. By RODERIC A. CAMP. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988. Pp. 230. $22.50 cloth, $11.95 paper.)

SO FAR FROM HEAVEN: DAVID ALFARO SIQUIEROS'S "THE MARCH OF HUMANITY" AND MEXICAN REVOLUTIONARY POLITICS. By LEONARD FOLGARAIT. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Pp. 185. $34.50.)

REDISCOVERING THE PAST AT MEXICO'S PERIPHERY: ESSAYS ON THE HISTORY OF MODERN YUCATAN. By GILBERT M. JOSEPH. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1986. Pp. 208. $28.95.)

REVOLUTION FROM WITHOUT: YUCATAN, MEXICO, AND THE UNITED STATES, 1880–1924. By GILBERT M. JOSEPH. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1988. Pp. 391. $14.95 paper.)

THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION, VOLUME 1: PORFIRIANS, LIBERALS, AND PEASANTS. By ALAN KNIGHT. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Pp. 679. $49.50.)

THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION, VOLUME 2: COUNTER-REVOLUTION AND RECONSTRUCTION. By ALAN KNIGHT. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Pp. 620. $49.50.)

THE MYTH OF THE REVOLUTION: HERO CULTS AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE MEXICAN STATE, 1920–1940. By ILENE V. O'MALLEY. (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1986. Pp. 199. $29.95.)

FROM INSURRECTION TO REVOLUTION IN MEXICO: SOCIAL BASES OF AGRARIAN VIOLENCE, 1750–1940. By JOHN TUTINO. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987. Pp. 352. $42.50.)

BORDER FURY: A PICTURE POSTCARD RECORD OF MEXICO'S REVOLUTION AND U.S. WAR PREPAREDNESS, 1910–1917. By PAUL J. VANDERWOOD and FRANK N. SAMPONARO. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1988. Pp. 293. $27.50 cloth.)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Historical investigations of the Mexican Revolution have been the major focus of all study of twentieth-century Mexico. The question "Was the Revolution really a revolution?" has formed the core of these investigations since even before the last shots were fired. The Revolution has obsessed not only historians but political scientists, sociologists, novelists, and literary critics. The ten volumes under review here certainly prove the point.

Have scholars gone too far? In the quest for more detailed information about this region or that crucial event, have we lost sight of the forest for the trees? Moreover, have we asked the right questions? Are our methods, theories, or frameworks (if any) workable, plausible, or reasonable? In this essay, I will attempt to respond to these questions by using the books under review to illustrate my answers and speculations. Three critical issues will be considered: the appropriateness of focusing on the Revolution as a watershed, the efficacy of using theory in studying the Revolution, and the possibilities of exploring the "hearts and minds" of those who participated in the Mexican Revolution and its aftermath.

Paul Vanderwood maintains that the Revolution has become "an albatross around the necks of students of modern Mexican history," who have been "hypnotized by the official rhetoric of the . . . PRI."[1] The implication is that by focusing on the years 1910 to 1920, scholars have distorted history and created artificial periodization, thereby ignoring important aspects of society, politics, and economy in the rush to explain the Revolution.[2]

Periodization is, of course, one of the most difficult problems of historiography, even arguably one of the least productive. When to begin and end studies is always the subject of conjecture. Historians can dig up almost any excuse to examine a particular set of years.[3] For example, Dudley Ankerson begins *Agrarian Warlord,* his tale of Saturnino Cedillo, during the Porfiriato—a reasonable decision given the date of birth of the future boss of San Luis Potosí in 1890—and ends the account with Cedillo's death in 1938. Gilbert Joseph finds the roots of Yucatán's revolution in the Porfiriato, thus titling his book *Revolution from Without: Yucatán, Mexico, and the United States, 1880–1924.* But the Porfiriato began in 1877, and the closing year of Joseph's title derives from the end of Felipe Carrillo Puerto's rule in the peninsula. Alan Knight advertises no dates on the title page in *The Mexican Revolution,* but he too finds its origins in the dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz. Knight ends his study in 1917 with the murder of Venustiano Carranza. Thus all three books end with the murder of a central figure, but obviously none of these deaths ended the Revolution. John Tutino takes a broader view in *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750–1940.* He perceives the Revolution as part of a long historical process that began in the late colonial

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

period and ended only with the end of agrarian reform during the administration of Lázaro Cárdenas.

All four of these books agree that investigations of the Revolution cannot be initiated satisfactorily with the year 1910. Three of the four authors find the origins of the Revolution in the Porfiriato. From my own perspective, Tutino chooses the best dates for Mexico in general, although I consider 1854 (the beginning of the Liberal reform) to be a sensible compromise.[4]

Periodization depends on the researcher's goals. The historian sets out a historical problem—sometimes far too modest, at other times too broad. Ankerson tries to elucidate the evolution of revolutionary caudillismo and chooses the lifetime of Cedillo, a prime example of a caudillo. Joseph, grappling with a similar problem, explores the reigns of two other notable caudillos, Carrillo Puerto and Salvador Alvarado. Tutino is after bigger game and thus uses a longer time frame.

Historians know that nothing begins arbitrarily on a certain date (20 November 1910, in the case of the Mexican Revolution) because historical phenomena have origins that must be explained. But historians do not always do a good job of putting their chosen historical problem in context. The major problem, then, is context: how each subject connects to other aspects of society, economy, and politics. The dates the title proclaims are unimportant; what matters is context.

Ultimately, periodization is only a symbol. At the core of Vanderwood's taunt lies the question of whether or not there was a revolution. What he means to say is that the Revolution produced no appreciable change or, more to the point, did not cause any change that might not have occurred anyway without the upheaval. Thus, if the Revolution wrought no "revolutionary change," then it is not worth scholarly attention. This argument, however, is simply not convincing. Even if historians were to reject the notion that Mexico experienced a "real revolution," the very fact of a long civil war (or series of civil wars) between 1910 and 1920 would be sufficient reason for historians to investigate the causes, course, and aftermath. The Zapatista movement would have been worth studying, and John Womack's and Arturo Warman's elegant books worth reading, regardless of whether they were part of a larger phenomenon like the Revolution.[5]

The cynical view of the Revolution, known as revisionism, was once the dominant view but has suffered telling blows of late, ironically just when the contemporary Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI) has seemingly furnished its detractors with incontrovertible proof. Yet for Joseph, Ankerson, Leonard Folgarait, and Ilene O'Malley, revisionism still stands foursquare. In Yucatán Joseph finds a failed revolution, a movement too fragile to survive the murder of its leader, Carrillo Puerto. Ankerson too uncovers little benefit for the masses other than the lands

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cedillo obtained for his veteran troops and concludes that land reform was nothing more than the crassest of politics. For O'Malley the institutionalized Revolution's perversion of its heroes' myths is proof enough of its own corruption. Forgarait cites Siquieros's mural *The March of Humanity* as evidence of the Revolution's distortion of the Revolution. And novelist Rod Camp's Mexican politician is the phony revolution incarnate, one of the middle-class bloodsuckers who destroyed the social movement by turning it into an entrepreneurial opportunity.

In contrast, Tutino adopts the peasants' perspective and views the Revolution as having put an end to the causes of endemic rural unrest and thus constituting a partial victory. But it is Alan Knight's view of the Revolution as a genuinely popular social movement that wrought real change that carries the day in my opinion. His is not the optimistic vision of Frank Tannenbaum but one of caution and broad scope, a vision that has placed historical events in perspective. Knight deals ingeniously with the problems of periodization and revisionism: "Historians should not be looking for the single, knockout revolutionary punch, but for the accumulated blows which dispatch the old social order; they should evaluate their individual percussive effect, and their sequential relationship."[6] He looks to France's major historical dates—1789, 1830, 1848—as an appropriate parallel. This idea is complemented by Enrique Semo's characterization of Mexico's successive waves of bourgeois revolution in 1810, 1854, and 1910.[7]

Also pertinent here is the concept of "many Mexicos" and "many Revolutions." This perception is one of both geography and time. The differences between localities, regions, and states were broad and striking. Although Mexico in 1970 may have seemed like a more adept, successful Porfiriato, as Roger Hansen has argued, in the provinces, the Revolution had deeply affected society and politics.[8] Many revolutions took place, not only in Knight's sense of successive blows against the old order but also in the sense that revolution arrived at different times in different places.

One constant, crucial topic for regional historians, including those whose works are under review here, is the struggle for hegemony between the regions and the center. This struggle is perhaps the overriding political theme of the postindependence history of Mexico.[9] The interplay of regional oligarchy and the central government forms the backbone of Joseph's study of Yucatán. There, prerevolutionary elites led by Olegario Molina and his family held off Mexico City, but there also, both revolutionary caudillos lost bitter struggles against centralization. Ankerson's Cedillo met defeat at the hands of the centralizers as well. Knight argues brilliantly that the Revolution itself was fought over the issue of local and state autonomy. Successive leaders, particularly Francisco I. Madero, Victoriano Huerta, and Venustiano Carranza, were felled by the same inability to bring the various regions under control.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

One could also address the issue of focus by arguing that exploring the question of why human beings—peasants, middle classes, or elites—rebel is one of the most intriguing, if not the most important, of historical issues. In my opinion, the problem here is not focusing or overfocusing on this issue but how historians go about discovering the reasons for rebellion that raises hackles. This point is related to questions of theory and the "hearts and minds," which will be discussed shortly.

Knight, Tutino, and Joseph all employ theory superbly and not necessarily unobtrusively. For example, Knight does not think that grand theories of revolution are applicable to the Mexican case. Yet he warns that despite "the decreasing utility of general, socio-economic explanations," one must not lose sight of such explanations because smaller events are often manifestations of larger movements (Knight 1:303). Thus Knight discusses the most pertinent theories of peasant discontent rather thoroughly (1:150–70) and then goes on to construct at least two notable frameworks.[10] His notion of *serrano* rebellion, although debatable, is a provocative contribution (1:115–27). Another highly original contribution is Knight's idea of the "logic of the revolution," in which he maintains that ideology had less effect at any given time than specific local circumstances. In the latter case, Knight furnishes a highly flexible framework of human behavior while denying more rigidly structured theories.

Knight's "logic" is worth discussing as a useful starting place for understanding what some historians would like to label as "chaos" or attribute to inexplicable *mexicanidad:* "as the Revolution unfolded it evolved a logic of its own, which cannot be precisely related to the social origins or ideologies of participant groups." Mexicans had to react to quickly moving events and did so in "expedient fashion." The logic of the Revolution "implies no *a priori* pattern. . . . [I]t suggests, rather, a whole complex of crises, events, options, and opportunities which confronted participants and over which they felt themselves to have little control" (1:302).

From reading Knight and Tutino together with Friedrich Katz, one can construct what I consider a reasonable model, or profile, of a peasant rebel.[11] Knight writes that it was peasant "collective violence which underwrote the Revolution" (1:151). He views agrarian revolution as the product of the commercialization of agriculture and the centralization of political power. But Knight interprets cautiously, using the theories of Eric Wolf and others, and pays attention to nuances.[12]

Tutino seeks the answer to the question of why agrarian peoples rebel in the interplay of their material conditions, autonomy, security, and mobility. His formula posits that those agrarian peoples accustomed to dependence "become outraged and move toward insurrection" when they lose security as a result of the actions of powerful elites and this loss is not compensated by increased mobility. Autonomous agrarian peoples who lose their independence without compensatory security or mobility will

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

follow the same process. But neither dependence nor independence will produce revolution unless peasants perceive weakness in their oppressors. Mexican peasants were no fools, and they chose to rebel only with some reasoned calculation of success. Tutino maintains that they guessed wrong in following Father Hidalgo in 1810 but were correct a century later.[13] Gilbert Joseph argues in *Rediscovering the Past at Mexico's Periphery* that no peasant upheaval occurred in Yucatán precisely because its plantocracy was so strong. "Economically exploited, isolated, and without allies," the *campesinado* did not rebel (p. 83).

Although a broad consensus about peasants can be perceived among the authors under review here, it is not evident in their discussions of the importance of external factors to the Revolution. Joseph interprets the course of the Revolution in Yucatán as a product of the region's monocultural economy, which was dependent on the world market for henequen. Knight believes in the primacy of internal (endogenous) factors and denies the importance of economic factors for the Revolution. Here I think he is wrong, but he makes a cogent argument nonetheless.

It should also be said that theory is not everything. One can write, as many have, excellent history without a breath of theory or even include somewhat mixed-up theory lightly done. As Knight comments, "the historian is not obliged to subscribe to a general . . . theory. The historian should, of course, frame hypotheses and make them clear. . . . [U]ltimately it is fruitfulness—the payoff in terms of historical understanding—which counts" (1:84).

How do historians translate theories or frameworks into a research plan? The answer for Mexico lies in the regions. Vanderwood maintains that current Mexican historiography is "unimaginative and too often unconvincing. Fascinating methodological leads . . . have largely been ignored."[14] His particular bête noir is regional history. But in my opinion, regional history when used comparatively provides a way to employ theory, a proposition supported by four of the books under review here.

Historians must begin by defining regional history. Eric Van Young has chided me and others for our lack of specificity in defining the term *region*.[15] He is quite right. In the end, however, I am left with one flippant answer and one practical one. As Van Young has said in regard to the hacienda, "It turns out it is hard to describe, but you know it when you see it."[16] He has envisioned region as a "spatialization of an economic relationship."[17] This definition (or in fairness, beginning of a definition) has much merit, it seems to me, for studying colonial Latin America, where political boundaries were not important because they were too widely drawn. Localities—town or city hubs, surrounded by satellite suppliers—were the crucial entities. Since independence, and most especially for the purposes of studying the Revolution, region has meant the political unit defined by state governments.[18] The political entity of the state takes on

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

importance because it is on the level of the state against the national government that the major political conflicts in Mexico have been played out. Simultaneously, within each state, local elites battled for control of power at the state level. These intertwined struggles took place throughout the Porfiriato and the Revolution.[19] During the Revolution, the political entity, or region, was paramount.

Does regional history envision too many trees and not enough forests? Is it an acceptable, or even preferable, way to explore the history of Mexico? Alan Knight offers an example of regional history writ large. *The Mexican Revolution* is a history of all the regions, or rather a history of the Mexican Revolution, 1910 to 1917, from the perspective of the regions. As he states at the outset, "the real Mexico, and in particular the Mexico of the Revolution, was provincial Mexico" (1:1). For Knight and Tutino (and also Katz), comparing developments in the regions provide the basis for innovative overviews. Comparative history, then, is one key to context.

Comparisons are not easy, and they require historians to take risks. Not all historians are able or willing to take risks, nor are all the authors under review comfortable with such undertakings. For example, Ankerson at times presents Cedillo in isolation and makes only infrequent and terse comparisons with other contemporary state bosses, such as Adalberto Tejeda in Veracruz, Tomás Garrido Canabal in Tabasco, or Jesús Antonio Almeida in Chihuahua.[20] The sense of struggle between Cedillo (representing regional autonomy) and the central government would have come through far more clearly with more extensive use of comparisons.

Context has two other crucial ramifications for regional history. Regional studies must connect events at the state level to those at national and international levels as well. Joseph, while not always comparative in discussing contemporary state bosses, superbly delineates the interrelationships between external and internal political and economic factors. Yucatán, which was barely attached to Mexico politically or economically, was shaped by the world market for henequen. Consequently, world market forces in the form of the International Harvester Company and the U.S. government early took center stage and almost never exited. Yucatán cannot be understood without understanding the interplay of regional and national politics and regional and international markets. Ankerson, in contrast, rarely mentions economics, let alone the importance of the market for the products of San Luis Potosí, a major mining center.

Finally, historians must confront the issue of whether theory and methodology are really what they are after. Do theory and methodology collide with the desire to know what moves people to rebel? Getting inside the minds of people long dead is the most difficult endeavor for historians. And it is a particularly thorny problem for those who want to find out why people rebel. As Tutino observes: "We still know too little

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

about why and how the rural masses come to feel the outrage of injustice and begin to ponder taking the deadly risks of insurrection. It is ultimately impossible to know with any certainty the views and values of long-dead, often illiterate agrarian people. But we may approximate such an understanding by looking carefully at their complex and often varied ways of life" (23–24). Both Tutino and Knight "look carefully" at peasant life and conditions. The cases they build are circumstantial but persuasive nonetheless.

However successful these monographs might be at reconstructing the motivations of the revolutionaries, there are methods other than archival digging that can shed light on this problem. Authors Camp, Vanderwood and Samponaro, and O'Malley each try a different way.

Roderic Camp's detailed knowledge of Mexican political elites has been demonstrated in innumerable books and articles over the past decade and a half elucidating their backgrounds and career patterns. In his latest work, the fictionalized *Memoirs of a Mexican Politician,* Camp attempts to depict the hearts and souls of the "winners" of the Revolution. The protagonist of the book, Antonio Gutiérrez, "is a composite of politicians who grew up during the last decade of the Porfiriato, were educated during the second and third decade of this century, and dominated political life from 1940 to 1970" (p. ix). Camp has compiled true stories told to him by real politicians, ordered them chronologically, and placed them in historical context. The Revolution would have forged these men and their careers even if they had not fought in it. In Camp's words, it provided them with opportunities "to rebuild Mexico in their own image" (p. xii).

This composite "autobiography" is most successful in recounting the tale of "Tono" as he rises from poverty, works his way through school, confronts new ideas and people, and makes the connections that will ensure power and riches later on. Camp has captured an old man's ability to remember the distant past more engagingly than recent times. Camp is less successful in illuminating the path that Don Antonio took to power. It is apparently too much to ask that a Mexican politician reveal all, even in a work of fiction. But Camp has captured the mind, if not the heart, of the institutionalized revolution.

Examining popular culture is another method of exploring the hearts and minds of history. Some such expositions, like *Photographs from the Border* from the Aultman Collection, achieve brilliant illuminations of time and place.[21] Paul Vanderwood's and Frank Samponaro's *Border Fury* purports to dig up a "treasure trove for the social historian" among the picture postcards of the Revolution along the border. But the book provides only a short history of the postcard industry, a short biography of one Walter H. Horne (the reigning postcard empresario of the era), a brief history of the Revolution, and a short history of Pancho Villa's raid on

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Columbus, New Mexico. Vanderwood and Samponaro have produced an elegant accessory, but no hearts and minds.

So Far from Heaven provides the history and an explanation of David Alfaro Siquieros's mural-edifice, *The March of Humanity on Earth and toward the Cosmos.* Leonard Folgarait presents the mural as a metaphor for the course of the Revolution and its inherent contradictions. He interprets *The March of Humanity* as a construct of conflicting messages: "The political content . . . suggests that social and political problems will be solved, but in a very far future. It describes its contemporary present of the late 1960s, however, as untroubled and stable" (p. 3). Folgarait views the mural as a "desperate" attempt to legitimize the Revolution at a time when it was being revealed as a fraud. The mural tries to ease the crisis but instead "rubs salt on that wound." Art indeed reflected politics in this instance.

Ilene O'Malley is equally cynical about the uses of popular culture by the Mexican revolutionary regime. She maintains that the revolutionary party has fabricated and refabricated the myths of Francisco I. Madero, Emiliano Zapata, and Venustiano Carranza with great success in order to legitimize its government. The PRI has been less fortunate in attempting to mold the image of Pancho Villa. A critical aspect of the mythologizing process has been machismo. By emphasizing the machismo of the heroes, the official line has denigrated (especially in the case of Zapata) the deep-seated economic, political, and social grievances that these leaders represented. The four are depicted by official myth as precursors of the Revolution, clearly implying that the real revolution came later, brought by the Partido Revolucionario Mexicano, the Partido Revolucionario Nacional, and the PRI. The heroes have become empty figures, their historical roles perverted to suit the needs of the current regime.

The confluence of theory and "hearts and minds" in the discussion of why people rebel is, to say the least, not easy. As casual perusal of the severe critiques of revolutionary theory illustrates, the leap of faith from "social change to grievances, and from grievances to revolt or the conversion of vague and various discontents into drastic but deliberate political action" is not without pitfalls.[22]

The volumes under review are a true sampling of the state of the art of the study of the Mexican Revolution. As such, they are uneven. Knight's *The Mexican Revolution* is a masterful interpretation that examines the Revolution from the outside in. It rejects many of the tenets of revisionism, particularly reasserting the role of the popular classes (peasants and workers) in the upheaval. Joseph's *Revolution from Without,* while narrower in focus, illustrates the best of regional history with its sophisticated use of dependency theory and anthropology, careful delineation of the tensions between national and state regimes, and exposition of Yucatán's ties to the world economy.

Tutino wreaks a historiographical revolution of his own, linking

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the two great upheavals of Mexican history, the Hidalgo revolt and the Revolution of 1910. His theory of peasant revolution is original and provocative.

Ankerson's *Agrarian Warlord* represents a less ambitious approach to regional history with little use of theoretical frameworks and grudging discussion of factors outside his geographical area of focus. This study is solid and well-researched, nonetheless. Joseph's *Rediscovering the Past* is the culmination of a decade of intense study of Yucatán from the colonial era through the Revolution by a variety of scholars. It is unique in its interdisciplinary scope. Its only drawback is its lack of discussion of Yucatán's development in comparison with other regions, which parallels Ankerson's reluctance to venture outside the realm of his geographical focus.

Vanderwood and Samponaro's *Border Fury* unfortunately tends toward the superficial, delighting in good photographs or colorful anecdotes. Plots and conspiracies overshadow substantive historical issues, and one would be hard-pressed to find a theme. Both O'Malley's *The Myth of the Revolution* and Folgarait's *So Far from Heaven* oversimplify the course of the Revolution to prove their points. O'Malley particularly caricatures the Revolution to prove that its heroes have suffered the same fate. This model of the Revolution corrupted lacks nuance and is somewhat controverted by the other books discussed. The themes of these two studies are accurate, but they exhibit an unbending revisionist line.

In the opinion of this historian, at least, the historiography of the Mexican Revolution is in good hands with the regional historians. The outpouring of regional history has deepened and broadened our understanding of the Revolution and of Mexico. The important syntheses that have emerged since 1980—like those of Friedrich Katz, Alan Knight, and John Tutino—are based on work done in the provinces using a comparative perspective. Thus, regional history has not chained Mexican history but has instead set it free.[23]

NOTES

1. Paul J. Vanderwood, "Review of *Capitalists, Caciques, and Revolution: The Native Elite and Foreign Enterprise in Chihuahua, Mexico, 1854–1911* by Mark Wasserman," *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 88, no. 4 (Apr. 1985):434–35. Earlier Vanderwood asserted that the "the warp and woof of the historical cloth ripped apart in the Revolution of 1910." See Vanderwood, *Disorder and Progress: Bandits, Police, and Mexican Development* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1981), p. xii.
2. Richard Morse maintained much the same about periodization that focused on the Wars of Independence. His argument proved persuasive for a generation of historians, judging from the proliferation of recent studies of the late colonial and early independence eras. See "The Heritage of Latin America," in *The Founding of New Societies*, edited by Louis Hartz (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1964), 164–69.
3. Ramón Eduardo Ruiz, *The Great Rebellion: Mexico, 1905–1924* (New York: Norton,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

1980), delineates 1905 to 1924 as his period of study. He ends in 1924 because he thinks that "the rebel masters had consolidated their control" by that time (p. 5).

4. Two excellent studies that do not look backward, although they include introductory chapters, are: Romana Falcón, *Revolución y caciquismo: San Luis Potosí, 1910–1938* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1984); and Heather F. Salamini, *Agrarian Radicalism in Veracruz, 1920–1938* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971).
5. John Womack, Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1968); and Arturo Warman, *We Come to Object: The Peasants of Morelos and the National State* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980).
6. Alan Knight, "The Mexican Revolution: Bourgeois? Nationalist? Or Just a 'Great Rebellion'?," *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 4, no. 2 (1985):3.
7. Enrique Semo, *Historia mexicana: economía y luchas de clases* (Mexico City, 1978), p. 299, as cited by Knight in *Mexican Revolution.*
8. Roger D. Hansen, *The Politics of Mexican Development* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972).
9. A compelling case can be made for earlier origins for this struggle. See for example, Stuart Voss et al., *Notable Family Networks in Latin America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
10. Rather than enter the difficult debate involved in defining theory, I would propose that for my purposes, a theory provides a means for interpreting cross nationally, while a framework has a more specific use in assisting interpretation of a particular historical phenomenon in one country or region.
11. Friedrich Katz, *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 3–21.
12. Eric Wolf, *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).
13. The weakness of elites as prerequisite for revolution derives from Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
14. Vanderwood purports not to "insist that all regional historians must be engaged in social history." He goes on to say that regardless of the previous statement, it "is not expecting too much, to be informed, even inspired, by the best thought, methodology, writing and conceptualization of their profession." Vanderwood, "Building Blocks But Yet No Building: Regional History and the Mexican Revolution," *Mexican Studies/Estudios Mexicanos* (Summer 1987):422. He finds inspiration in the French mentalité school; all else is "tired and well-worn."
15. Eric Van Young, "Doing Regional History: Methodological and Theoretical Considerations." Paper presented to the Conference of Mexican and United States Historians, Oaxaca, Mexico, 23-26 Oct. 1985.
16. Eric Van Young, "Mexican Rural History since Chevalier: The Historiography of the Colonial Hacienda," *LARR* 18, no. 3 (1983):25. Van Young considers regional history "at once difficult and rewarding to produce" (p. 33). Van Young begins his paper entitled "Doing Regional History" with almost the same quote: "regions are like love—they are difficult to describe, but we know them when we see them."
17. Van Young, "Doing Regional History," 2.
18. There are exceptions to be sure. For examples, see William K. Meyers, "Interest Group Conflict and Revolutionary Politics: A Social History of La Comarca Lagunera, Mexico, 1888–1911," Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1979; and Frans J. Schryer, *The Rancheros of Pisaflores* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980). I categorize local history as another genre.
19. For the Porfiriato, see W. Stanley Langston, "Coahuila: Centralization against State Autonomy," in *Other Mexicos: Essays on Regional Mexican History, 1876–1911,* edited by Thomas Benjamin and William McNellie (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1984), 55–76; and all of the essays in *Caudillo and Peasant in the Mexican Revolution,* edited by David A. Brading (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980).
20. See Ernest Gruening, *Mexico and Its Heritage* (New York: Century, 1928), 391–493, which is not included in Ankersons's bibliography; see also two works he cites, Jean Meyer et al., *Historia de la Revolución Mexicana, período 1924–1928: estado y sociedad con Calles* (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1977); and Lorenzo Meyer, *Historia de la*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Revolución Mexicana, período 1928–1934: el conflicto social y los gobiernos del Maximato (Mexico City: Colegio de México, 1978).

21. Mary Sarber, *Photographs from the Border: The Otis A. Aultman Collection* (El Paso: El Paso Public Library, 1977).
22. Rod Aya, "Theories of Revolution Reconsidered: Contrasting Models of Collective Violence," *Theory and Society* 8 (1979):66.
23. Ruiz's *The Great Rebellion* was based on secondary sources written before the boom in regional history and suffers from not using this body of work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002387910002330X Published online by Cambridge University Press