

his discussion of African “nations” helping or hurting resistance in the period of slavery, and by the two articles devoted to Afro-Brazilian religions—none of the writers engages African studies seriously. Thus although Jocélio Teles dos Santos and Véronique Boyer-Araujo both discuss the role of Caboclo, a divinity of apparently native American origin, in the Yoruba-based religion of Candomblé, they do not examine the dynamic of Yoruba religion as it is being discussed in recent work by David Laitan, Karen Barber, J. D. Y. Peel, or Andrew Apter.

Having noted this weakness, however, it must be said that the work published in this issue is of very high caliber. It is well researched, focused on the leading-edge thought (and produced by the leading-edge scholars) in modern Brazilian studies. Reis’s lead-off piece on slave resistance focuses on the role of African nationalities as both a divisive element and a unifying thread in the struggle against slavery and domination. It is followed by two pairs of articles, one pair devoted to the role of race and class in modern Brazil, the other to Caboclo and Candomblé.

Antonio Sergio Alfredo Guimarães examines Brazil’s movement since the 1950s from a status society based on color to a class society resulting from industrialization, and finds that color is less important than it once was. While not directly contesting Guimarães, Michel Agier explores the rise of *négritude* in Brazilian life and the reorganization of status, class, and color in a society still defined largely by racism.

In the articles devoted to Caboclo, Teles dos Santos notes that this figure has been integrated into the Candomblé symbol system in consonance with the Yoruba gods. Boyer-Araujo, on the other hand, sees Caboclo as a voice for the poor and dispossessed in the larger Candomblé system. Like the essays on race and class, the pairing of these articles is based not on diametrically opposed positions but on subtle differences in emphasis.

All the contributions here will be a worthwhile addition to Brazilian studies, though not yet the contribution that one might hope an Africanist journal could make. But these articles mark the commencement of what may be a deeper and more lasting collaboration of Africanists and students of African American culture. One hopes they will stimulate more contributions in the future.

JOHN THORNTON, Millersville University

*Tradición y modernidad en los Andes.* Compiled by HENRIQUE URBANO. Cuzco: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos Bartolomé de Las Casas, 1992. Map. Tables. Notes. Bibliography. 338 pp. Paper.

This anthology contains 17 chapters by 19 authors, who discuss modernity and tradition in the Peruvian, Ecuadoran, and Bolivian societies from an interdisciplinary perspective. The bulk of the material deals with Peru. Except for the introduction by Henrique Urbano and the conclusion by José Ignacio López Soria, the chap-

ters are highly empirical. Their central theme is how the Andean cultures and institutions adapted and adopted symbols, illusions, and strategies from the Western world. An intertwining relationship developed; the road to “progress” was not straight.

Charles Walker considers a hypercritical evaluation of indigenismo to be the most important intellectual task ahead. Juan Estenssoro notes that the defeat of Túpac Amaru ended white tolerance for indigenous cultural manifestations; after that, the local elites attempted to modernize themselves by rejecting Indian concepts, while the “popular culture” continued to receive indigenous ingredients. Zoila Mendoza confirms the vitality of Indian traditions in plebeian dances. Cecilia Méndez reminds readers that even Bolívar’s utopia was a liberal dream that did not include Indians. Rossana Barragán maintains that the Cholos of La Paz have their own culture, and rejects the notion that they are mere imitators of whites. Cecilia Seligmann asserts that in the Andes not only interethnic but also intergenerational conflicts exist; such dissension adds fire to the country’s social crises and further debilitates the state. López Soria concludes, in a debating tone, that the project of modernization has been exhausted and that these nations are entering a postmodern period. Whether or not the former is true is a matter of ideological preference; but the postmodern condition is an anarchic conglomeration without limits.

Urbano attempts to analyze the Andean tradition in the context of Western philosophy. For him the ideas of Jürgen Habermas are the key to understanding Andean modernization. Urbano feels that to attribute the merits of Western rationality to Andean thought is absurd. The great Andean tragedy, he feels, is that the incipient capitalism of the nineteenth century produced only a small mental revolution. He criticizes Mariátegui and his followers for their inability to think about the present and future without myths. The late historian Alberto Flores Galindo is portrayed as confused, while other Peruvian intellectuals receive even harsher words. Urbano laments that nobody can say “what it is” in Peru; that the Andean mental universe continues to be plagued by magic and dogma. To solve the problem, Urbano feels, it is important to clean the pseudointellectual pigsty (*chiquero*) with detergent. In reality, however, his long introduction to this book does not do justice to the other contributions. Not only is it arrogant and redundant, but it pretends to analyze the Andean societies in the strict framework of theories created thousands of miles away. Despite the great merits of the Frankfurt School, the Andes must be examined on their own terms.

HERNÁN HORNA, Uppsala University