describes. On the contrary, the adoption of American political culture in Puerto Rico was the result of contingent events, the kinds of things that historians are likely to point out—which, as an historian, is one reason why I found the book so enjoyable.

Frank Ninkovich

St. John’s University


In this study of Bolivian rural political and social movements, Laura Gotkowitz seeks to stitch together two different historiographic traditions. The older approach discounts or ignores rural unrest before the National Revolution of 1952, but acknowledges peasant activism in the revolution’s wake—especially in the department of Cochabamba. A newer interpretation, known as Katarismo, emphasizes the combative tendencies of Bolivia’s Aymara population and stresses the strength and persistence of rural activism in the decades before the revolution but generally dismisses the changes of 1952 as cosmetic or even pernicious. Gotkowitz’s book seeks to illuminate the rural currents that stoked the National Revolution without adopting Katarismo’s negative opinion of the revolution’s results. To do this, she focuses on two events in the 1940s: Bolivia’s 1945 Indigenous Congress and the 1947 rural unrest that followed the overthrow and lynching of President Gualberto Villarroel.

Gotkowitz begins with a consideration of nineteenth-century political debates concerning the compatibility of Bolivia’s indigenous population with classically liberal economic and political principles. Next, she examines a favorite topic of Katarismo scholarship: the emergence of a network of Quechua and Aymara activists in the 1910s, 1920s, and 1930s known as the caciques apoderados. These individuals sought to represent the interests of the nation’s traditional Indian communities and the indigenous population in general. For the years after the disastrous Chaco War (1932-1935), the book describes the political fall-out of the military misadventure and the rise of reformist military leaders and new political parties such as the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (MNR). Gotkowitz notes that the countryside developed into a zone of persistent dispute and debate during this period. In the Quechua-speaking departments of Cochabamba, Chuquisaca, and Potosí, a new network of rural activists developed to defend the interests of hacienda laborers: the Alcaldes Mayores Particulares. The new network did not always agree with the older association of caciques apoderados.
In her chapter on the 1945 Indigenous Congress, Gotkowitz describes how this rural agitation propelled the reformist military government of President Villarroel and his allies in the MNR to convene a national gathering in an attempt to bring order to the countryside. The Indigenous Congress instead produced a series of decrees open to wide interpretation by indigenous Bolivians seeking to change the rural status quo. The oligarchy’s repudiation of these decrees played a significant role in provoking the violent overthrow and murder of President Villarroel. In response to this reactionary backlash, Bolivian peasants engaged in a variety of resistance movements in early 1947 ranging from sit-down strikes to violent rebellion. Gotkowitz focuses on rural movements in the departments of La Paz and Cochabamba. She argues that these movements, although defeated by the government, fed into the National Revolution of 1952.

The book has one additional chapter not yet mentioned. Gotkowitz’s chapter on mestizaje and gender—Chapter Six “The Unwilling City: Villarroel, Populism, and the Politics of Mestizaje”—is a chapter out of place. Here, Gotkowitz argues that the Villarroel-MNR government promoted a special, nationalist form of mestizaje (a mixture of Hispanic and Indian ethnicity) centered on the image of the market women of Cochabamba. The military government of Villarroel promoted the cult of the “Heroines,” a group of mestiza market women that fought against a Spanish royalist occupation of Cochabamba in 1812. This chapter contains some of Gotkowitz’s most original observations (and a good discussion of MNR anti-Semitism), but the topic does not mesh with the rest of the book. This chapter’s subject is barely mentioned in the introduction, and Gotkowitz never returns to it in the conclusion and epilogue.

*A Revolution for Our Rights* does an excellent job of organizing the history of rural movements in early-twentieth-century Bolivia. Many of the topics discussed by Gotkowitz have been explored by scholars both Bolivian and foreign, but she puts the history together in a convincing and detailed narrative. Gotkowitz supplements her excellent grasp of existing secondary literature with a solid infusion of her own primary research. She draws on documents from a number of archives in the department of Cochabamba: the archive of the Superior Court; smaller judicial archives in Cliza and Punata; municipal archives in Punata, Quillacollo, and Cochabamba; the archive of the prefecture; and the archbishopric of Cochabamba’s archive. She also worked in the congressional archive in La Paz as well as the Archivo de La Paz. Finally, Gotkowitz used the country’s national archive and library in Sucre.

Gotkowitz’s central thesis about the continuity of rural activism during the first half of the twentieth century is convincing despite some minor lacunae. The author acknowledges the connections that existed between rural movements and mining and urban labor organizations, but the reader is left with the sense that
these political and ideological connections deserve even greater emphasis. The title of the book, *A Revolution for Our Rights*, even comes from a 1947 letter written by a peasant leader in Cochabamba and a “mineworker comrade” to Juan Lechín, the leader of the Syndicalist Federation of Bolivian Mine Workers (FSTMB). In this letter, the two authors write, “luckily it has been publicly decreed that there be a revolution against exploitation and misery” (p. 242). Gotkowitz cannot explain this belief in a revolutionary decree and attributes it to a misunderstanding. The most likely explanation is that the letter was referring to the “Thesis of Pulacayo” adopted by the FSTMB in November 1946—a Trotskyist-inspired program for socialist revolution. Also, Gotkowitz declines to engage in a detailed presentation of events in rural Bolivia between 1947 and 1952. While this is only a handful of years, it stands as an odd empirical omission considering the author’s broad assertion of continuity.

*A Revolution for Our Rights* is the most readable and comprehensive work currently available on Bolivia’s rural peasant and indigenous movements of the first half of the twentieth century. Gotkowitz makes her point that the country’s National Revolution of 1952 had deeper rural roots than previously acknowledged by scholars of twentieth-century Bolivian history.

Robert L. Smale

*University of Missouri, Columbia*


Total history, like total football, is no longer much in fashion. Fernand Braudel and Johann Cruyff belong to another era; but, in thinking about what type of history *People of the Volcano* represents, I could come up with no better analogy. The geographical scale is, of course, different: the Colca Valley is not the Mediterranean. The timeframe, too, is different; although, on a much more modest scale, *People of the Volcano*, like *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, ranges forward and backward in time. Where the analogy fits best is the sheer multiplicity of historiographical approaches employed by David Cook Noble and his collaborator Alexandra Parma Cook. *People of the Volcano*’s most compelling characteristic is the almost seamless way in which environmental, social, cultural, economic, epidemiological and ecclesiastical historiographical approaches, as well as ethnohistorical methods, interweave in order to produce a comprehensive and possibly definitive account of the Colca Valley’s history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As *People of