

This lack of grounding in the detailed Mexican legislation leads to errors. For example, the title of *jueces de primera instancia* derived from their position in this statutory scheme, not because they handled preliminary investigations. *Bien preso* was not a judicial order that the defendant be shackled, but a probable cause determination needed to justify further incarceration. Most importantly, this legislation provides insight into the role of the prefects in the centralist period of Mexican legal history.

The prefects held general supervisory powers over the *jueces*, although they could not substitute their judgments for those of the judges. Mocho bases her study on the documentation kept by the local judges, and she does not discuss prefects' records. In California, hundreds of complaints about judges made their way to the prefects. New Mexican complaints could not only cast interesting light on the legal system, but also might reveal the ultimate outcome of so many of the homicide cases where the judicial paper trail ends before resolution.

Mocho mentions that the New Mexican legal system was based more on community values and traditions than on formal rules. True enough, but she leaves much of the evidence unanalyzed. For example, in the postinvestigation stage of prosecutions, the *plenario*, arguments focused on punishment, not on guilt or innocence. This Queen of Hearts approach to trial facilitated the reintegration of the defendant back into the community, especially in crimes less serious than murder. It also made it difficult to prosecute any but the most obvious crimes.

Mocho's evidence suggests great judicial inefficiency. Again unanalyzed, this evidence partly relates to the legal system's community basis. Under the 20 March 1837 law, the prefects nominated prospective judges for gubernatorial appointment. Judicial service became a mandatory, unpaid civic duty. If the local judges sometimes appeared hesitant or uncertain, this process of selection helps to explain that. Many lower-class defendants selected prominent men as their lay defense counsel. Although a man could refuse appointment as a *defensor*, social pressure urged acceptance. Lay judges, prosecutors, and defenders gave a very community-based, nontechnical cast to the legal system, but at the price of considerable inefficiency.

The research and analysis here is too shallow for this book to stand as a definitive study of the New Mexico criminal justice system, even as applied to homicide prosecutions. Mocho's contribution is to social history and not as an analysis of the legal system.

DAVID J. LANGUM, Samford University Cumberland School of Law

Ciudad de México: instituciones, actores sociales y conflicto político, 1744–1931.

Edited by CARLOS ILLADES and ARIEL RODRÍGUEZ. Colección Investigaciones. Zamora: El Colegio de Michoacán; Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 1996. Map. Tables. Figures. Notes, Bibliography. 343 pp. Paper.

In recent years Mexican scholars have been publishing sets of compiled essays on major themes in the history of their nation, and occasionally of Latin America, at a pace not

witnessed for some time. Some of these gather together important, already published pieces. Yet others are collections of solicited, original works. Still others assemble revised versions of conference papers. The set of essays brought together by Illades and Rodríguez belongs to the last category. The selections were originally delivered at a 1995 seminar at El Colegio de Michoacán that marked the completion of a three-year project by the authors—and others—on the subject of the evolution of institutions in Mexico City from 1857 to 1929. Several contributors pushed the beginning dates of their studies to the advent of independence—one as early as the late eighteenth century.

Because the contributors maintained a coordinated research emphasis over the term of the project, the individual selections share a unity of character and focus not commonly achieved in such collections. All are careful considerations of particular institutions and practices over a quite delimited period of time. The book is divided into three sections. The first considers the marginal, poor, and delinquent members of the capital. In it, Silvia Arrom looks at the Hospicio de Pobres; María Cristina Sacristán examines the state, the family, and the incapacitated in the Civil Code of 1870; and Pablo Piccato reports on the impact of the revolution on the city's penal system. The second part—on public institutions, the administration of political conflicts, and the production of urban space—comprises essays by Richard Warren on the municipal council and national politics in the early republic; José Antonio Serrano Ortega on the municipal council, the Tribunal of Vagabonds, and the *corvée* in the same period; María Dolores Morales on space, property, and the organs of power in the city in the nineteenth century; and Ariel Rodríguez Kury on the municipal council and revolutionary factions in 1914 and 1915. The third section treats the institutional alignment of social actors and consists of contributions by Sonia Pérez Toledo on artisans and the disappearance of guilds from 1780 to 1842; Carlos Illades on labor organizations in the nineteenth century; and John Lear on changes in labor organizations in the late Porfiriato and the revolution.

The contributions with perhaps the greatest scope and importance are Pablo Piccato on penitentiary reform during the revolution, María Dolores Morales on the expansion and reshaping of the city in the mid-nineteenth century (a continuation of her long-standing and highly successful research project on the ownership and use of buildings and space in the capital), and Sonia Pérez Toledo on artisans and guilds in the late colonial and early independence periods.

A surprisingly brief introduction by the two compilers mentions some approaches to the study of institutions. The volume assumes considerable knowledge of Mexican history during the period covered; the introduction does not provide a historical context. The collection has no conclusion, but does have a bibliography of the archival collections and secondary works cited by the contributors.

All of the essays make solid advances in urban institutional and social history in the national context by presenting substantial original scholarship rather than reexaminations of prior studies. One consequence of the freshness and carefully measured reach of these contributions is that established historians of Mexico City will find that their

views are not challenged nor, in most cases, even brought to bear. But no matter what their particular specializations, all urban historians of Latin America will likely find that this collection includes at least several essays of interest to them.

JOHN E. KICZA, Washington State University

Cultural Politics in Revolution: Teachers, Peasants, and Schools in Mexico, 1930–1940.

By MARY KAY VAUGHAN. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997. Maps. Tables. Notes. Bibliography. Index. xiii, 262 pp. Cloth, \$45.00. Paper, \$17.95.

Mary Kay Vaughan's most recent work joins a host of provocative reinterpretations of Mexico in the 1930s. Focusing on the "socialist" schools of the Cárdenas era, Vaughan provides a thorough and nuanced portrait of what happened when the "leviathan" state under the aegis of the Cardenista "juggernaut" ran up against rural Mexicans. In short, Vaughan finds that the postrevolutionary state and its cultural project did not emerge unscathed from their encounter with common Mexican people in the rural classroom. "The cultural revolution," she concludes, "lay not in the state's project but in the dialogue between state and society that took place around this project."

Vaughan organizes her analysis around a core of case studies—of a government institution (the Secretaría de Educación Pública) and its policymakers, of teachers, and of rural towns and their schools. After an introduction that explains the centrality of primary rural education to postrevolutionary cultural politics, she tackles the SEP and its putative agents, illuminating tensions between government officials in the cities and teachers in the countryside who were familiar with local conditions. Then Vaughan investigates the fate of Cardenista educational initiatives in two states: Puebla (with a chapter each on Tecamachalco and Zacapoaxtla) and Sonora (the Yaquis and immigrants to the Yaqui Valley each receive a chapter). For all six of the substantive chapters, Vaughan has thoroughly combed the relevant Mexico City, regional, and municipal archives, read local newspapers and the field notes of United States anthropologists, and talked with people who lived in the period and participated in its polemics. Her conclusion situates her findings in the context of the Gramscian notion of hegemony.

Although the book has the feel of a collection of essays, with each chapter taking up a different set of issues and able to stand on its own merits, several common themes emerge. One of Vaughan's most original and significant findings is an apparent paradox: schools both inculcated official values and at the same time provided communities with rhetorical tools to contest the very initiatives championed by the state. Postrevolutionary education—abetted by modes of informal education such as civic festivals—provided a language in which petitioners for government redress or favor could couch their complaints and demands. Why did the government provide this potentially subversive set of skills? The answer—implied by Vaughan—is that this *modus operandi* allowed the government to incorporate new constituencies *on its own terms*.

Vaughan's book provides detailed proof for what has been mostly suspected or sur-