

of their efforts and decided to collaborate. Mexico was deep in crisis at the time, and the country's future was in doubt. *A la sombra de la Revolución Mexicana*, the basis of this translation, sought to explicate the historical roots of the dilemmas confronting the de la Madrid administration.

The text focuses on both the Mexican Revolution and the political and economic trajectory of postrevolutionary regimes. The prevailing economic models are analyzed and their political result is explored. A satisfying balance—a sense of searching, with hindsight, for explanations—is achieved. Treatment of the Mexican Revolution is quite detailed (pp. 1–70), since the authors intended to measure subsequent regimes in terms of expectations or demands emerging from that era. Political actors and localities that were often excluded from previous general histories are included here, to the satisfaction of Mexican specialists but perhaps to the dismay of our undergraduates, who, having no previous experience of this complex panoply of small towns and minor participants, may find the text overloaded. The real complexity of the Revolution and subsequent developments is illustrated by considering the many parties and factions that emerged.

The organization and political roles of both labor and campesinos are fully explored, as are the major opposition candidates and their constituencies in key elections. The authors' admiration for the trajectory of the Cárdenas administration is evident, but they treat subsequent governments with empathy, clarifying the difficulties faced and the rationale for policy choice. The 1940–1968 era is treated as the “Mexican miracle,” while 1968–1984 is seen as its demise, or the “Mexican transition,” signaling the country's painful departure from the social pact resulting from the Mexican Revolution. The authors' explanation of the ensuing crisis is poignant. No projection of solutions is attempted. Statistics are utilized to good effect, especially in demonstrating Mexico's plight under the López Portillo and de la Madrid terms.

The selected bibliography serves to reveal the books that have influenced Mexico's historians of the contemporary era. There is rarely an error in the English text (although Jesús Guajardo murdered Zapata, not Carranza [p. 79]). The translator is so well attuned to U.S. speech that, like many of our students since the late 1960s, he utilizes “as” when “like” is called for.

HAROLD DANA SIMS, University of Pittsburgh

Exits from the Labyrinth: Culture and Ideology in the Mexican National Space. By CLAUDIO LOMNITZ-ADLER. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993. Maps. Figures. Notes. Bibliography. Index. x, 386 pp. Cloth. \$45.00.

The discipline of anthropology has never been particularly sensitive to spatial scale and variation. Traditional perspectives on nationalism, ethnicity, and culture have been generated largely from observations of artificially bounded communities and interviews with selected informants. As a consequence, groups sharing

social (cultural) mores frequently were assumed to be isomorphic with politically bounded nations or populations. More contemporary approaches have ignored space entirely, focusing instead on the production and conceptual logic of cultural meanings and sets of symbols. Conversely, systematic analyses of regions and macroregions have been rare, and generally have concentrated rather narrowly on economic behavior. Not surprisingly, then, at a time when anthropology might be centrally positioned for on-the-ground, diachronic questions concerning heterogeneous boundaries, complex scales, and degrees of integration, much of the current debate concerning nationalism and ethnicity has been removed to the realms of literary essayists and policy planners.

In *Exits from the Labyrinth*, Claudio Lomnitz-Adler proposes a methodology for the analysis of culture in internally differentiated regional spaces. The empirical focus is “Mexican national culture,” a topic that, the author convincingly illustrates, has been but need not be outside social scientific approaches. More specifically, Lomnitz-Adler simultaneously mediates between a spatially broad, systemic view and a more detailed, actor-centered perspective to compare two historically diverse Mexican regions, Morelos and the Huasteca Potosina. The economy, scale, and internal administrative organization of these regions are shown to be variable, and at the national level they are seen as articulated in diverse ways with the central government in Mexico City. These differences, particularly in the mechanisms through which power and wealth have been accrued, are then juxtaposed with the distinct traditional views of the Huasteca as a ranching periphery and Morelos as a breeding ground for the notion of the “exemplary peasant.” Nevertheless, the economies of both regions are shown to be heterogeneous and temporally shifted from the stereotyped perceptions. Through this comparative analysis, as well as contrasts drawn with more literary depictions of Mexican national culture, the author endeavors to systematize and retain the latter concept while broadening it to accommodate marked spatial variation.

This ambitious volume, which tries to broach the theoretical lacunae between culture and space, convincingly demonstrates why scale and variability should receive more systematic attention in conceptions of mores, nationalism, and ideology. At the same time, the volume might well serve to revive a broadened school of regional analysis that no longer neglects learned traditions and their relationship to economic behavior. Yet paradoxically, the author’s own comparative analyses of Morelos and the Huasteca would be strengthened if the rich life histories and broad historical narratives presented were more thoroughly grounded by the kinds of regional-scale observations of settlement patterns, marketing, transport, and political boundaries found in the work of Carol Smith and G. William Skinner. Nevertheless, this thoughtful work should be read widely both for what it achieves and, more important, for the discussions and intellectual debates it should engender.

GARY M. FEINMAN, University of Wisconsin, Madison