

of the first importance. *Santander* is at times the work of an advocate, but at all junctures it sets out the cases against him with fair completeness and paints his private life warts and all. The narrative conveys well the stresses and dangers of the era—the Sardá conspiracy of 1833 is particularly well handled—and it can be read with advantage by historians who think such an approach outmoded by more structural concerns, such as the origins of the local sense of nationality or the fiscal and logistical aspects of the wars of independence. The author is excellent on Santander's properly military career and the miniature but murderous campaigns in which he fought before the victory of Boyacá turned him into a *general de bufete*. These affairs are not tidied up and glorified, as has so often been the case, with unlikely maps of strategic troop movements but described in all the petty chaos of improvisation, desertion, and cruelty.

Though he was born in Cúcuta, by customary definition outside the *Reino*, Santander was the first republican who discerned clearly how New Granada could be governed. One criticism that can be made of this biography is that it does not address fully Santander's political methods. Mention is made of his indefatigable scribbling—it was said that Bolívar had an incontinent tongue, and Santander an incontinent pen—his vast correspondence, his occasionally *populachero* ability to get on well with all classes. His electoral victories are reported, and there is naturally much insistence on his legal ability, but there is no extended treatment of how all was combined into a system. It was not a hermetic one: Santander failed to command the election of his successor as president of New Granada and spent his last years in opposition. Nevertheless it is possible to discern in his methods the pattern of government that has prevailed for so much of the subsequent century and a half.

New or old historians who come to this book will find it rigorously documented, presenting Santander's frequently powerful arguments with telling quotation and clear resumé, and beneath and beyond the occasional *Hombre de las Leyes* they will also find it worldly and down-to-earth. Like most of his contemporaries, Santander was not averse to self-praise and was much given to the pursuit of personal glory, and it is still easy for a writer today to succumb to the spirit of that age. This author does not. She succeeds in giving us a picture of a real man facing real problems, with many of which the "new history" is not sufficiently familiar. Pilar Moreno's *Santander* should be in any collection on Colombian history.

MALCOLM DEAS, St. Antony's College, Oxford

*Poderes y regiones: Problemas en la constitución de la nación colombiana, 1810–1850.* By MARÍA TERESA URIBE DE HINCAPIÉ and JESÚS MARÍA ÁLVAREZ. Medellín: Universidad de Antioquia, 1987. Bibliography. 300 pp. Paper.

This book offers a new meditation on the early years of Colombian republican history in four long essays—obstacles to the formation of the nation, the state's in-

capacity to formulate a national economic policy, the process of land appropriation, and labor control. The authors' expertise lies in Antioqueño sources, and there is valuable material here derived from their previous work, and a welcome use of a particularly rich press. It is a pity that there is not more of this and somewhat less of Gramsci, Poulantzas, and the early writings of Karl Marx. These glosses do not disguise quite a heavy reliance for the main features of the period on old and familiar works, such as those of Luis Eduardo Nieto Arteta and Luis Ospina Vásquez. Still, those two are always worth rereading.

*Poderes y regiones* offers the reader an excellent reconstruction of the commercial ties that bound and did not bind the New Granada that emerged into independent life in 1830. It offers too a stimulating survey of the varied social structures of the new republic, especially of Antioquia and Cauca. There are some telling quotations from Agustín Codazzi and Carlos Segismundo de Greiff on the particular commercial advantages of the Antioqueños, their control of gold, and their early vinculation with Jamaica.

This work, however, is not always convincing. Defining what a nation is as well as what the relations of regions and nations are poses problems that admit of no simple answer. Certainly, nationality does not bear any clear relation to the rise of a capitalist national economy, itself not so easy to define. The assertion of the authors that more intense contact with the world economy "accentuated the economic heterogeneity and political fragmentation that was already present in the colony" (p. 99) seems debatable, just as the account (summed up on pp. 68–69) of what New Granada lacked to be a proper nation seems arbitrary.

Some of the authors' schema seem too neat, such as the supposed rivalry between gold-exporting Antioqueños and tobacco-exporting easterners. Some of their views are prejudiced: contracts with foreigners were far from being generally "juicy and leonine" for the foreigner (p. 264), and it is not obvious that Manuel Murillo Toro was being "lucid" in 1852 when he stated that nobody should own more land than he could cultivate for subsistence (p. 277). The authors make some errors of fact: José Hilario López did not fight in the "Guerra de los Supremos," nor can the overthrow of José María Melo in 1854 be accounted a defeat for "los militares de la Independencia."

The book nonetheless makes a valuable contribution in its surveys of some major themes. It is particularly useful, apart from the subjects already mentioned, on small property and the emancipation of the slaves.

MALCOLM DEAS, St. Antony's College, Oxford

*La tierra de Manuel Lozada*. Edited by JEAN MEYER. Mexico City: Centro de Estudios Mexicanos y Centroamericanos, 1989. Maps. Tables. Bibliography. 402 pp. Paper.

Manuel Lozada, often called the "Tigre de Alica" (a traditional name referring to his native Nayarit in western Mexico), is sometimes compared to Emiliano