practices, however, led to the erosion of long-term church influence.

Sullivan-González convincingly refutes the idea that churchmen, with a few notable exceptions, supported the initial Carrera revolt or took up arms on its behalf. In the wake of the Carrera revolt (1838–1839), creole clerics of the capital (namely Juan José de Aycinena, the former marqués de Aycinena), once they overcame their fears of a caste war, devised the notion of a covenant between God and Guatemala, marking Guatemalans as a chosen people. The author's skillful deconstruction of Aycinena's rhetoric would benefit from additional historical context. His role as spokesman for the creole elite as well as the institutional church needs to be considered. A more sustained comparison of Guatemala's church question with Mexico's or that of other parts of Latin America, and consideration of the views of important conservatives like Lucas Alamán, would seem to be as apt as erudite references to South Africa and New England.

Although Sullivan-González recognizes the difficulties of linking elite discourse with popular beliefs and actions, he adroitly explores numerous fascinating episodes in Guatemalan social history, seeking to divine the meaning of cemetery revolts, the murders of priests, popular responses to epidemics, and the appearance of Sun Gods in the western highlands. Most outbursts, it seems, reflected a tenacious resistance to assaults on *costumbre*, traditional practices.

The connection between such phenomena and the formation of a nation is not always clear. Nevertheless, the author asserts that in the rebellious ladino east, popular religiosity and a partially revitalized church establishment, undergirded by the notion of a divine covenant, formed and eventually consolidated a Guatemalan nation, able to defend itself against "foreign" attacks from El Salvador and Honduras. With somewhat greater dexterity, he argues that in the predominantly indigenous western highlands, Mayan communities grateful for newfound political and religious autonomy were bound to the Guatemalan "nation" via an almost mystical connection to Carrera, a process that Sullivan-González defines as protonationalism. The link between nation and protonations was provided by Carrera.

Yet, this particular national vision, and the multi-class and multi-ethnic alliance that sustained it, collapsed rather quickly after Carrera's death in 1865, raising doubts about its sustainability or long-term significance. The author attributes the success of J. R. Barrios in 1871 primarily to his Remington rifles, ignoring the demands of coffee and the emerging coffee elite. He speculates that Barrios was killed in El Salvador in 1885 by angry Guatemalan easterners, by implication as punishment for destroying the earlier national vision. He does not deal at all with the subsequent Liberal era (1871–1944), jumping instead to the 1990s by way of an epilogue entitled, "What Changed?" A sense of continuity is thus difficult to discern. Although some readers may be reluctant to accept all aspects of Sullivan-González's vigorous argument, he has made an important contribution nevertheless, adding new layers of meaning to Guatemala's nineteenth-century history.

Richmond F. Brown
University of South Alabama

Jeffrey L. Gould. *To Die in This Way: Nicaraguan Indians and the Myth of Mestizaje, 1880–1965*. (Latin America Otherwise: Languages, Empires, Nations.) Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. 1998. Pp. xiv, 305. Cloth $54.95, paper $18.95.

Shortly before his party's electoral defeat in Nicaragua in 1990, Sandinista leader José González told Jeffrey L. Gould, referring to his home region of Matagalpa, that "there are no 'real Indians' [here] and so their demands aren't valid" (p. 274). Decades earlier, in the 1950s, an editorial in the *Revista Conservadora del Pensamiento Centroamericano* declared: "The Nicaraguan people, formed during colonial times, [are] a product of mestizaje. In reality, there is no other Central American country where this process has been realized to the same degree. Practically speaking, the Indian element has ceased to exist" (p. 167). Ideologues and fora of both the left and the right, Gould makes it clear, subscribed to this ethnic construction of Nicaragua from the late nineteenth century on, thus making "the indigenous people of central and western Nicaragua largely invisible to intellectuals, politicians, and most city folk throughout the twentieth century" (p. 3). It is this mythologizing of Nicaragua as a homogeneous mestizo society, "Nicaragua mestiza" as he terms it, that Gould explores and explodes in this provocative and absorbing book.

Gould lays out his case, cumulatively and convincingly, by a creative mix of archival foraging, ethnographic fieldwork, oral history, regional analysis, and judicious recourse to the now formidable theoretical literature on ethnicity, identity, and nationalism. He takes it all in his stride, punctuating his narrative here and there with an easy use of first person singular for the most part mercifully free of self-reflexive angst and postmodern hand-wringing. Chapter one examines "diverse forms of indigenous resistance" (p. 38), including armed insurrection, by which native peoples in Matagalpa and Jinotega in north-central Nicaragua responded to a "frontal assault on their land and labor resources" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (p. 19). In chapter two, Gould shifts the scene of Indian-state collision south and east to Boaco and Camoapa before moving west, in chapter three, to Sutiaba, "where the annexation of the indigenous municipality to Léon accelerated the process of communal land privatization and dealt a serious blow to the cohesiveness of the community" (p. 19). Chapter four concentrates on the discourse of mestizaje between 1920 and 1940, with Gould pointing out that even Augusto César Sandino bought into the myth. He attributes to Sandino such assimilationist sentiments

as "[we must] do whatever [is] necessary to civilize these Indians, who are the marrow of our race" and "[we must] make true men out of them" (p. 159). Sandino's "Indo Hispanism" is perhaps best captured by the statement: "I used to look with resentment on the colonizing work of Spain, but today I have profound admiration for it . . . Spain gave us its language, its civilization, and its blood. We consider ourselves to be the Spanish Indians of America" (p. 134).

The theme of native resistance to state intrusion is developed further in chapters five and six, primarily by charting episode after episode of confrontation in the 1930s and 1940s. Here Gould focuses on "the growing gulf between the national discourse of ethnic homogeneity and grassroots ethnic conflict and repression" (p. 20), even after the government of Nicaragua endorsed the Pátzcuaro Convention of December 19, 1941, and established (as did other Latin American countries) an Instituto Indigenista Nacional. "The signing of the treaty," Gould informs us, "had far more to do with Somoza's strategic alliance with the United States than with any particular program in favor of the country's Indians" (p. 192). Chapter seven deals with the 1950s and 1960s and is an attempt "to reconstruct the role of collective memory in the peasant movements" (p. 20). Gould offers some trenchant remarks about "the Central American Left's failure to resolve the dilemmas of Liberalism and in particular its tragic inability to come to terms with ethnic identities" (p. 264). His comment that "revolutionary nationalism" contains "its own forms of erasure and amnesia" (p. 16) is one that certainly applies beyond Nicaragua's borders to other parts of the much-troubled isthmus.

Numbers, of course, do not allow us humanize the story very well, but they do afford us some idea of the scale of "erasure and amnesia" Gould refers to. He draws on the work of Linda Newson (*Indian Survival in Colonial Nicaragua* [1987]), who calculates that an Indian population of 825,000 at contact had been reduced to some 85,000 by the late eighteenth century, at which time "Indians represented between 50 and 78 percent of the population" (p. 16). Nicaraguan historian Germán Romero Vargas reckons that Indians constituted less than fifty percent of the population during the early nineteenth century (*Las Estructuras sociales de Nicaragua en el siglo XVIII* [1988]). A census dating to the year 1846 furnished E. G. Squier with an Indian population of 80,000, or thirty-two percent of the Nicaraguan total (*Nicaragua: Its People, Scenery, Monuments and the Proposed Interoceanic Canal* [1852]). The French geographer Pablo Levy estimated the native population at fifty-five percent in 1870 (*Notas geográficas y económicas sobre la Republica de Nicaragua* [1873]). Gould suggests that, in 1900, Indians made up some forty percent of Nicaragua's population.

It is at this juncture that mestizaje myth making gears up a notch, for the national census of 1920 recorded an Indian population of under four percent, a drop from thirty to forty percent in 1906. Indians, racialized as *cobrizos* (copper-colored) in the language of the census, were not even recorded in eleven institutionally recognized Indian communities. Between 1877 and 1923, these communities resisted eight attempts on the part of the government to abolish them. Gould comes up with an estimate of the Indian population in 1920 "at between 90,000 and 125,000, or between 15 and 20 percent of Nicaragua's population" (p. 18), significantly more than officially recognized. By 1950, however, the state's attack on "the institutions that defined indigenous ethnicity" had achieved its ends, after which time "it took but a short leap of faith to declare the Indians dead upon arrival of the twentieth century" (p. 49).

Regarding debates about how to theorize Indian identity, Gould's evidence lends itself to a constructionist as opposed to an essentialist interpretation, which means that he depicts ethnicity "as a social construct with no reference to any primordial essence" (p. 69). Consciousness of being Indian is therefore "not a given transmitted from the distant past but rather a constructed identity mediated by contact with nation-states and with other ethnic groups" (p. 14). An emphasis on cultural survival gives way to thinking in terms of cultural transformation.

Gould's portrayal of the "imagined community" of Nicaragua reveals "the myth of mestizaje" to be a fundamental element of nation building. It thus complements the work of Dario Euraque on Honduras (*Estado, poder, nacionalidad y raza en la historia de Honduras* [1996]) and Erik Ching and Virginia Tilley on El Salvador ("Indians, the Military, and the Rebellion of 1932 in El Salvador," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 30 [1998]: 121–156) and invites comparison with the way in which Costa Rica, to employ the categories of Carolyn Hall, has been conjured as a "White Euro-American" society as opposed to the "Mestizo-American" one it really is (*Costa Rica: A Geographical Interpretation in Historical Perspective* [1985]).

Gould is to be congratulated on a fine piece of research that not only adds to our understanding of Central American history but also forces us to rethink it. Although this book will be read principally by Latin Americanists, scholars of other parts of the world with interests in ethnic identity and the rise of nation-states will find much to engage them.

W. George Lovell
Queen's University,
Kingston, Ontario
[All reviewers of books by Indiana University faculty are selected with the advice of the Board of Editors.]

Samuel Amaral. *The Rise of Capitalism on the Pampas: The Estancias of Buenos Aires, 1785–1870.* (Cambridge Latin American Studies, number 83.) New York: Cambridge University Press. 1998. Pp. xviii, 359. $59.95.