

familia chiapaneca have remained cohesive, adaptive, and cooptive enough to survive the Reforma, interventions from the national capital, the Mexican Revolution, unionism and the campaigns of socialist and communist organizers, land invasions, and poorly coordinated protests and revolts from below.

A political history, the book stresses the activities and origins of the long line of modernizing governors, most of them large landowners or satraps of the national presidents, running from Emilio Rabasa in the 1890s to the present. Most of these leaders have emphasized transportation and communications, and have favored the commercial agriculture of the Central Valley and Soconusco. Legislation to improve the grim lot of the highland Indians and lowland laborers and renters has been minimal, bogged down in corruption, or compromised by the labor and land needs of local landowners. Peonage and land tenure inequities which caused protest and campaigns for reform in the 1890s remain today. In many ways Chiapas is still at the end of its Porfiriato.

Now, Benjamin suggests, this *ancien régime* is approaching a final crisis. Indigenous peoples are creating their own organizations, the demographic explosion increases land hunger and poverty, violence has become endemic (Chiapas is now the second most violent state in Mexico, after Veracruz), and murderous repression continues. The outlook for the masses remains poor, the author believes, as long as the national state remains cohesive and monopolizes legitimate force. While short on social and anthropological analysis, this political history is a thorough, cohesive and compelling account of a dreadful and brutal history.

University of Florida

MURDO J. MACLEOD

Industry and Underdevelopment: The Industrialization of Mexico, 1890–1940. By STEPHEN H. HABER. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989. Maps. Tables. Graph. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xv, 237. Cloth.

Where historians of Mexican industrialization have usually worked from aggregate national statistics, Haber, in this succinct study, has researched specific industries and companies. He concludes that the Porfiriato saw the decisive initiation of industrialization; that foreign entrepreneurs made a major contribution; that they laid down an industrial base greater than the level of demand warranted, hence profits were low; and that they resorted to monopolistic practices and tariff protection, beginning a tradition of state dependency. Neither the armed revolution of 1910 nor the “preferred” revolution of the 1940s greatly altered this ingrained pattern. Since the argument parallels David Walker’s analysis of the nineteenth century, we seem to have an industrialization process which is remarkably and atavistically constant. Most of the argument, based on company reports and the financial press, is convincing; the style is not elegant, but it is admirably clear.

Haber hazards international comparisons, although he prefers sharp contrasts with the United States, rather than more subtle and relevant comparisons with other newly industrializing countries. Three points seem debatable. Haber asserts the prevalence and significance of foreign entrepreneurs, offering individual examples but no quantified headcount; and a corroborating footnote cites Brading's Bourbon immigrants, which constitutes an analogy rather than a proof (p. 80). Immigrants may have been important, but many (like the Limantours, Braniffs, and the "New Group" of the 1940s) rapidly assimilated: was this foreign infusion distinctively Mexican, indicative of a peculiar pattern? Second, Haber is aware of—and ingeniously compensates for—the limitations of his sources (especially company reports); but, in view of the close, familial, and corrupt mores which governed Mexican entrepreneurial behaviour, stock prices are surely less than transparent indices of company performance. Finally, there is a certain circularity in the argument about postrevolutionary industrialization. Haber's statistics show depressed investment in the 1920s and higher investment in the '30s. Inferring moods from figures, he argues that entrepreneurs lacked confidence under the Sonoran regime, but reacquired it under Cárdenas, since (a bold and original statement) "Mexican manufacturers did not perceive the reformist government of Cárdenas as particularly inimical to their interests" (p. 188). However, it may be that factors other than confidence explain 1930s growth, and that some are to be found not in industry, but in the shake-up of the postrevolutionary agrarian economy. These issues deserve further debate. Haber is to be applauded for raising them and effectively resolving others. Historians of Mexico and of industrialization will read his book with great interest and profit.

University of Texas, Austin

ALAN KNIGHT

Revolutionary Mexico: The Coming and Process of the Mexican Revolution. By JOHN MASON HART. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987. Map. Photographs. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xi, 478. Cloth. \$35.00.

John Hart is a resourceful, ingenious researcher and a fearless analyst. Who would have thought one could learn so much about the Mexican Revolution rummaging through the archives of the Texas rich and the United States-Mexican Claims Commission?

Hart has made some illuminating discoveries. A network of Texas capitalists, including Charles Stillman, Richard King, and Mifflin Kenedy, with strong connections to New York banks, financed and armed Porfirio Díaz's rebellion in 1876. Also part of the south Texas group with large holdings in Mexico was the family of Colonel Edward M. House, President Woodrow Wilson's confidant. The Mexican railroad consolidation that took place between 1902 and 1908 was an effort by the Díaz government to reduce the economic influence of the "Big Four" railroad