

useful and interesting research notes, a comprehensive bibliography, and a well-prepared index.

Florida Atlantic University

CHARLES J. KOLINSKI

Ideología y acción de San Martín. By A. J. PÉREZ AMUCHÁSTEGUI. Buenos Aires, 1966. Editorial Universitaria de Buenos Aires. Libros del Tiempo Nuevo. Notes. Bibliography. Pp. 109. Paper.

The author's introduction states that the aim of this brief volume is not to offer another "biography" of San Martín, but rather to demonstrate the "unitary coherence" of the Liberator's "plan of action." Even so, anyone wishing a summary account of San Martín's political and military career may derive some benefit from the present work. Those already familiar with the main lines of that career will be more interested in the interpretation.

Pérez Amuchástegui's central theme is the deep commitment of San Martín to the twin goals of Spanish American independence and unity. He attributes the origin of this commitment—at least in large part—to the influence of Miranda's revolutionary cabal. He then traces San Martín's striving to make those goals a reality, devoting almost as much space to the years following his final departure from Peru as to the ascendant phase of his career. By organizing the work in this fashion, the author seeks to emphasize both San Martín's continuing devotion to the cause of independence and unity and the genuine importance of his services to it. These he rendered even while living ostensibly in retirement in Europe, through personal contact with American and European revolutionaries, statesmen, and opinion-makers. Moreover, the author sees not only a perfect consistency and continuity of purpose in San Martín but an unshakable unity of objectives between San Martín and Bolívar. In the latter connection, Pérez Amuchástegui repeats his earlier conviction that the Guayaquil interview produced no really fundamental disagreement between the two leaders, and that San Martín's subsequent withdrawal from Peru was due in final analysis not to Bolívar's uncontrollable ambition but to developments within Peru itself.

Because of San Martín's penchant for lodges and his generally secretive nature, perhaps some of the author's statements should be couched in less positive terms; nor is it easy to accept the profound importance of San Martín's services as informal American agent in Europe, when British policy alone was sufficient protection against the Holy Alliance. There are a few other minor points with which

one could find fault. But this is not a pretentious volume, and essentially it does what it sets out to do.

University of Florida

DAVID BUSHNELL

NATIONAL PERIOD

The Dynamic of Mexican Nationalism. By FREDERICK C. TURNER. Chapel Hill, 1968. University of North Carolina Press. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xii, 350. \$8.50.

For years after World War II scholars wrote about "nationalism" as if it solved problems, intellectual and political. By now its theory and practice have themselves become problems. Here a political scientist examines those problems in the case of Mexico. His thesis is that Mexican nationalism is a distinctive product of xenophobia, "a common race, a common language," egalitarian social changes (especially during the Revolution), improved communications, and literary and artistic boosting. Though the idea is not novel, the depth and extension of the argument are.

The approach goes against a historian's grain. In the first place he may doubt that "loyalty to the national community . . . has been one of the most influential forces shaping Mexico's society, economy, and political system." Was not much of the shaping the other way around? Or at least was there not a dialectical relation between feelings and the facts of power? A historian likes to know how and why the loyalty grew. He thinks of time as a condition of growth, not as its cause. Here, however, he learns mostly what a political scientist likes to know—what the constituent elements of national loyalty are, and how they function as factors to shift "parameters."

A historian of Mexico also learns to his embarrassment that the scholarship in his field has misled this intelligent outsider more often than it has set him right. In dismay he sees Turner convey the impressions, debatable at the very least, that "nationalism is most conspicuous by its absence in nineteenth-century Mexico," that the Revolution was a radical break from the past, that Indians were prominent in the Revolution, that after the Revolution the Mexican people were somehow all of one mind, and that since 1917 progress has been steady and uniform in the country. These hoary though dubious generalizations reappear not because the author has ignored the historiography of Mexico, but because he has swallowed it and suffered