

While this study focuses on an important development in postrevolutionary societies, it will not be the final word. It invites numerous questions concerning the interpretations involved in the explanation of the “rebirth” of inequality. One set of questions concerns the viability of the concepts themselves underlying the authors’ model in light of the Bolivian context. For instance, can and should culture and knowledge be conceptualized as “human capital” in a discussion of peasant society? To view peasant households as atomized entities that accumulate capital (physical or human) exclusive of others (as in the claim that an individual’s schooling “pays off”) is to discount the vital role of kinship in creating community by generating surplus itself through the obligations of reciprocity. That it can be so discounted is a dubious assumption for the Bolivian campesino. Furthermore, schooling (one yardstick of human capital in this model) has often acted as effectively as no education in limiting economic chances for the peasant.

A related set of questions involves the relationship of the universal and specific in the model. Certainly there is more to the complex reality that is Bolivia than this model suggests with its (excellent) summaries and its use of survey data. Such sayings as “*abuelo rico, nieto mendigo*,” commonly used to describe economic cycles of large landowners in pre-revolutionary Cochabamba, indicate greater complexity in the matter of capital accumulation than we are presented with here, for instance, in discussions of inherited privilege.

This book does not represent a significant contribution to Bolivian studies because the authors’ model leaves too much unsaid, intentionally or unintentionally. Its contribution lies rather in joining the efforts of others such as Charles Tilly to clarify our thinking on revolutionary processes.

Allegheny College

FRANK CAJKA

*Barros Arana’s Historia jeneral de Chile: Politics, History, and National Identity.* By GERTRUDE MATYOKA YEAGER. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1981. Illustration. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xiv, 187. Paper. \$12.00.

“Practitioners of history in Latin America characteristically used the past as a tool with which to address contemporary developments and justify political positions” (p. ix). Gertrude Yeager takes up this unelectrifying proposition and demonstrates its applicability to Diego Barros Arana, the great Chilean Whig, in 150 pages of relentless innocence. Did

not Herbert Butterfield point out some eighty years ago the tendency “in many historians . . . to emphasize certain principles of progress in the past and to produce a story which is the ratification if not the glorification of the present”? Did not Benedetto Croce observe that all (true) history is contemporary history? Did Barros Arana’s documentational overkill and footnote fetishism persuade anyone that he was somehow “objective”? Certainly not his fellow Chilean Francisco Encina, who some time ago dashed off a twenty-volume blast at his liberal predecessor’s assumptions. For that matter, does anyone today imagine that the arid monographs we write about other peoples’ history are free of imperialist (or antiimperialist) ethos? Yeager does not reflect very deeply on any of these questions. She is content to present a competent gloss of the sixteen-volume *Historia jeneral de Chile* (Santiago, 1884–1902) and a sketch of its author’s intellectual progress.

Barros Arana, like most of the great Latin American historians of the nineteenth century, was no mere academic scribbler. A journalist, rector of the Instituto Nacional and the University of Chile, and a diplomat, he was engaged in the public life of his country and twice paid the price with exile. Himself a descendant of the creole aristocracy, Barros Arana was inclined to identify the long-term development of that class with the progress of his country. This led to his broader, social interpretation of Chilean history rather than the more simplistic political formulae of his contemporaries, who saw independence from Spain as the division between darkness and light. By the late nineteenth century, Barros Arana was on the whole quite pleased with the progressive, triumphant liberalism around him, and his massive history is a detailed and accurate narrative of that progression with antecedent reaching into the Bourbon eighteenth century and even beyond to Pedro de Valdivia, the proper founder of the patria. Not for this “patrician-historian” as Yeager calls him, were the heroic struggles of the Araucanians or the plight of the peons of much interest: the entire prehistory of Chile is dismissed in three brief chapters of the first volume. Barros Arana liked the winners in history.

When Yeager strays from the trail of the *Historia jeneral*, which she follows in five of her ten chapters, she seems uncertain or uninformed of the terrain. The Jesuits were expelled in 1767, not in 1769 (p. 75); Diego Portales was shot in 1837, not 1836 (p. 132); Chilean estates were not “typically staffed by mestizo laborers who worked within a peonage system” (p. 75). And as much as we may admire Barros Arana, it seems an excessive claim for his precocity to argue that “he had values that were shaped through contact with Diego Portales” (p. xii) since the future historian was only seven when the Supreme Director was shot to death.

When she sticks to the main path, there is something of value in the book; and for anyone not wanting to read the full sixteen volumes, or for those who are unaware that ideas have a social context, Yeager's volume will serve as a useful introduction.

University of California, Davis

A. J. BAUER

*A Functional Past: The Uses of History in Nineteenth-Century Chile.* By ALLEN WOLL. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982. Notes. Charts. Bibliography. Index. Pp. 211. Cloth. \$25.00.

As historians, we rarely question the validity of our profession or contemplate its impact on society. Traditionally, history has signified academia, which, as we all know, is hardly the locus of power. In the newly emerging nineteenth-century Chilean nation, however, the study of history proved crucially important in shaping the country's attitudes toward itself and its future.

Allen Woll has carefully described the two schools of historical thought that developed in Chile: the first, led by Andrés Bello, argued that history should be a compilation of facts impartially presented in a narrative form. José Victorino Lastarria, while accepting the necessity of basing scholarship on research, granted more latitude than did Bello to historians, permitting them to use their writing for political ends. The differences between these two methodologies at times became acrimonious. Bello, who controlled the intellectual establishment, managed to isolate Lastarria. Slowly, however, young scholars began writing interpretive studies, and eventually the two schools merged into one, which emphasized using research but which also permitted historians to interpret their data for political or, in some cases, even personal ends.

Soon Liberals and Conservatives had their respective paladins: Lastarria, Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna, and Diego Barros Arana used their scholarship to prove the value of Liberalism and often to attack the abuses committed by the Montt administration; José Ignacio Eyzaguirre and José Hipólito Salas, on the other hand, searched through the past to demonstrate the majesty of the Roman Catholic Church in order to protect it from an increasingly aggressive secular state. Historians were also pressed into the service of the nation to advance Santiago's diplomatic claims, proving that Chile rightly owned Patagonia and the Atacama Desert. (Ironically, other historians repudiated this narrow view to urge that Chile adopt a more generous spirit and join the Americanist movement.) Historians also labored to alter the nature of Chile's educational system,