

Apocalypticism was not a powerful concept among Mesoamericans until Western missionaries came to scare the bejeezus out of them with end-of-the-world sermons and art. The authors are also challenged to explain passages from the Maya Books of Chilam Balam that appear to foretell world endings in native, not just European, terms. But they marshal evidence to suggest that such seemingly authentic Maya passages are directly channeled from medieval European thought regarding the end of the world.

Some of the ground covered in this book was also discussed in Maya epigrapher David Stuart's new book, *The Order of Days: The Maya World and the Truth about 2012* (2011). Stuart covers the ancient Maya evidence at greater length and arrives at the same conclusion, that little there supports a Maya interest in their equivalent of 2012. But Stuart succumbs to a common prejudice afflicting archaeologists and epigraphers: the notion that if it ain't written in stone, it ain't Maya. Restall and Solari as historians and anthropologists cultivate in this work a broader perspective on what Maya culture is, even after Mayas became subject to Spanish rule. And as historians they are interested in the history of 2012-ism. The notion that the ancient Maya calendar pointed to an end of the world to occur in 2012 is not just a lie or an idiot's dream. It's an idea that has a history, a belief among some that has causes or motivations that astute historians can reveal, as do the authors of this book.

The authors offer four conclusions in this work concerning 2012. They say the Mayas didn't predict the end of the world. They say that millenarian ideas came only from the West. For these two they offer good evidence, which some might yet debate. They say that the West was far more apocalyptic than the ancient New World, and that seems pretty solid. Concerning their final conclusion—that the world will not end on December 21, 2012—unless the authors are gods themselves, this surely they cannot know.

This is an excellently written, well-argued presentation that many should read—while there is still time.

PAUL SULLIVAN, Fitchburg, Massachusetts

DOI 10.1215/00182168-1545719

Historia económica general de México: De la colonia a nuestros días. Edited by SANDRA KUNTZ FICKER. Mexico City: Secretaría de Economía / El Colegio de México, 2010. Maps. Tables. Notes. Glossary. Bibliography. 834 pp. Cloth, \$39.00.

This massive tome is a monument to our current understanding of the history of the Mexican economy. Published to commemorate the bicentenary of Mexican independence and the centennial of the revolution, it contains 19 chapters surveying many aspects of Mexican economic performance, plus an introductory essay for each of the four eras and an introduction and conclusion by editor Sandra Kuntz Ficker. Each contribution contains a bibliography, and there is also a useful glossary of economic terms. Unlike some academic anthologies whose content seems to be determined by the idio-

syncratic interests of the contributors, this volume reflects planning and organization to provide comprehensive coverage.

Had this volume appeared 30 years ago, it would have had much more to say about Marxist modes of production and dependency theory. These are now largely missing from the stage, where new concerns predominate, such as the new institutional economics, which holds that institutions shape an economy. Thus, the hacienda, forced labor, and the pueblo molded the Mexican economy up to the revolution.

Part 1, the colonial period to 1760, begins with Bernd Hausberger's overview. He rejects Ruggiero Romano's view that colonial Mexico's landholding, labor, and agriculture resembled ancien régime Europe. Hausberger prefers Carlos Sempat Assadourian's interpretation emphasizing the impact of colonial mining on the export sector and domestic economic structures. In other chapters, Felipe Castro Gutiérrez writes about the regional diversity of indigenous economy and the great demographic collapse. Brígida von Mentz analyzes the mining economy; and Manuel Miño Grijalva surveys the crafts, commerce, and other components of the service sector. These chapters reflect the scarcity of hard data on much of the economy aside from mining and import/export commerce. The section lacks a separate chapter on royal taxation and finances.

Covering 1760–1850, part 2 benefits from the better series of data generated by Bourbon colonialism but must then confront the murkier decades of independence and early nationhood. Carlos Marichal's survey depicts the opulent great silver boom, which hid agrarian crises, wage stagnation, and scarcity of monetary stocks to carry on domestic trade. Independence brought few changes, except that taxation declined and capital investment was disrupted. Silver mining stimulated economic growth in the late colonial period, but social inequality, the crown's drainage of specie out of Mexico, and poor distribution of profits impeded development (writes Antonio Ibarra). Bourbon fiscal policies left Mexico short of capital, drained the monetary system, and failed to promote technological and institutional infrastructure; when independence came, the fiscal system collapsed, making it impossible for the government to promote economic development (Luis Jáuregui). Ernest Sánchez Santiró offers the revisionist conclusion that following the independence crisis the Mexican economy recovered between 1835 and 1855 before stagnating once again.

In part 3, Kuntz Ficker's overview of 1856–1929 depicts a poorly integrated economy where liberal reforms encouraged entrepreneurship and protected private property. Growth begun during the Porfiriato did not end with the revolution but with the depression of the 1930s. Marcello Carmagnani traces the recovery of public finances and credit. Mexico benefited from foreign trade and investment and was harmed when those sectors were interrupted by the revolution (Paolo Riguzzi). General economic growth and protectionist policies led to some industrialization, but the small size of the domestic market limited the potential for domestic manufacturing (Stephen Haber). The agrarian sector continued to dominate the economy until the mid-twentieth century, although regional diversity and political radicalization of credit prevented its moderniza-

tion (Daniela Marino and María Cecilia Zuleta). The revolution had a severe but brief economic impact. Its most long-lasting result was sociopolitical change that brought real benefits to workers. By 1927, however, the economy had stagnated (Alan Knight).

During the fourth period, 1929–2009, Mexican policy makers shifted from extreme protectionism to radical liberalism and from nationalism to globalization, with problematic results. In his overview, Enrique Cárdenas points to the policy tension between import substitution and economic liberalism. The former, he notes, produced sustained growth until the 1970s, when stagnation set in. Politicians and technocrats opened the economy but failed to implement completely the liberal reforms. Analysis of gross domestic product shows that the agrarian sector declined after the 1940s and that in comparison with Spain, South Korea, and Brazil, Mexico fell behind (Graciela Márquez). Its low level of tax collection impeded Mexico's ability to stimulate the economy or improve social welfare through public spending (Fausto Hernández Trillo). Meanwhile, the private sector suffered as public policy swung from nationalism and protectionism to globalization and international competition (Gonzalo Castañeda). A technologically modern banking system failed to penetrate the economy sufficiently to make credit accessible to the general population (Gustavo A. del Ángel Mobarak). Corruption and inefficiency plagued the energy and transportation sectors (Guillermo Guajardo Soto, Fernando Salas, and Daniel Velázquez). Protectionist post-1930 trade policy helped Mexico industrialize but distorted the allocation of resources and undercut long-term growth. Liberalization had good trade results but was hampered by incomplete reform of public policies (J. Ernesto López Córdova and Jaime Zabludovsky K.). The 1970s petroleum boom and debt crisis led to structural changes but failed to sustain long-term growth (Jaime Ros and Juan Carlos Moreno-Brid). Until 1960 the agrarian sector grew, with regional variations, but then stagnated despite statist attempts to promote it (Antonio Yúnez Naude).

This outstanding volume reflects the maturity of historical studies about the Mexican economy. The individual chapters, nearly all written by Mexican scholars, are not narrowly focused cases of microhistory but broad, thoughtful overviews. Rather than depicting Mexico as a uniform whole, these works skillfully show regional diversity. Although some were written by economists, the chapters are not laden with jargon and formulae; historians will find them accessible. Indeed this anthology provides a sophisticated foundation for all who want a nuanced understanding of Mexican economic history.

KENDALL W. BROWN, Brigham Young University

DOI 10.1215/00182168-1545728

Copyright of *Hispanic American Historical Review* is the property of Duke University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.