

innovative or sophisticated to interest scholars who do not specialise in Canada. Even university librarians ought to think twice before ordering the volume.

If there is a vague connecting theme to the papers, it is the authors' concern to weigh the contribution that entrepreneurship or lack of it made to the failure of the Atlantic provinces to keep pace with the economic growth of the rest of Canada. A number of what might be called "anti-locational" hypotheses have been suggested to explain the region's relative decline. Those of the authors who address the matter in this book tend to dismiss theories stressing deficient entrepreneurship, Marx's distinction between commercial and industrial capital, or a Central Canadian conspiracy to hold the Atlantic region in colonial fiefdom. It is interesting to ask why they should have taken the theories seriously in the first place (the quick answer, of course, is that the theories all deny the inevitability of the decline). Most historical geographers will have only a limited interest in this playing out of an odd dialogue among confused scholars.

The true issue raised by the publication of *The Enterprising Canadians* is that of the justification for publishing the proceedings of unsuccessful conferences. Most of these "preliminary findings"—some so preliminary that intelligent undergraduates could have produced them as research papers—would not be accepted for publication in journals which ensure that contributions are sent to referees; the very limited distribution which they deserve could more efficiently be achieved by other methods of duplication. The chief reason for the book's appearance seems to have been the willingness of the Canada Council to subsidize yet another conference that no scholar would pay his own money to attend, along with the willingness of Memorial University of Newfoundland to subsidize the actual publication. The volume is a fine example of the way in which the hothouse approach to scholarship in Canada is leading to unnatural, unnecessary and uninteresting publications. If this trend continues, Canada is in danger of becoming to scholarship what Monaco is to stamp collecting.

*University of Toronto*

MICHAEL BLISS

ANDRE GUNDER FRANK, *Mexican Agriculture 1521–1630. Transformation of the Mode of Production* (Cambridge and Paris: Cambridge University Press and Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1979. Pp. xiv+91. £6.95)

Students have looked forward to this history of Mexican agriculture by Andre Gunder Frank. The author is well known for his work on dependency and his argument that Latin American underdevelopment was a consequence of capitalist exploitation. Frank's writings have received much favourable attention, but they have been criticized too, for emphasizing exchange over production, for theorizing without sufficient evidence, and for other weaknesses. Frank's history of Mexican agriculture was designed both to meet these criticisms and to fill a long-standing gap in the literature. He began work in 1965, intending to cover the four centuries from the Conquest to the Revolution. What we have here is the first part, dealing with the period from 1521 to 1630.

It is very disappointing. The brief volume contains no original research whatsoever and a large part of the agricultural history of the period is simply overlooked. The text consists mainly of quotations from secondary writings available in 1965 with what I can only call uninformed commentary by Frank. The original text has not been brought up to date or otherwise revised. None of the scholarly research of the past fourteen years on Mexican agriculture has been utilized. In the preface, written in 1978, Frank states that he was diverted from his original project and never able to finish it: "I face the alternatives of leaving my existing manuscript to rest forever in my files or of publishing it as it is." The decision to publish, he continues, is based on the hope that other students may derive some benefit from the work, on the belief that it may contribute to the dependency debate and on the desire to present to critics a work dealing with "production". The decision to publish was supported by Cambridge University Press, the Maison

des Sciences de l'Homme, and other bodies. I have no hesitation in stating that I would have voted the other way.

Frank's treatment of agriculture may be described as schematic, derivative and incomplete. The periodization is borrowed, with slight modifications, from Enrique Florescano's work on grain legislation. There are four chronological subdivisions. In the first period, from 1521 to 1548, we are told that an effort was made to maintain a pre-hispanic economic organization but that tribute and a number of other features of *encomienda* nevertheless inclined Mexico towards a capitalist economy. A separate Spanish and Indian economy was still being sought in the second period, from 1548 to 1575, after the epidemic of 1545-8, but the Spanish sector continued to increase, resulting in an expansion in the commercial production of wheat, sugar and other goods. The new demographic crisis of the third period (1575-80) led directly to the final phase (1580-1630) with a decline in mining and, most important to Frank, an increase in hacienda agriculture and debt peonage.

If I read this work correctly the author's main point relates to the profit motive among hacendados. The hacendados were, he says, concerned with marketing their goods and making money. But in the strongly worded arguments for this position, it is not clear whom he is arguing against. He quotes with approval Jan Bazant, who identifies Molina Enríquez, McBryde, Tannenbaum and Simpson as supporters of the opposite position, namely that haciendas were essentially self-sufficient and independent of the market and that their production was "in units of small operation". But even if Bazant is correct in the attributions, all of those writers belong to earlier generations. The unmistakable trend in hacienda scholarship, in 1965 as in 1979, supports Frank's position. Indeed it is from this scholarship that all his evidence comes. Additionally, Bazant admits that Molina Enríquez and others "were really referring to Porfirian times", and he can make them relevant to the colonial period only by supposing that "the hacienda did not change essentially in the course of its existence". This is shaky ground. The argument becomes increasingly superfluous. Of course hacendados were concerned with marketing their goods and making money. No serious scholar disputes that obvious fact.

Frank's ideological position is honestly expressed, I believe, and that is as it should be. But it is this ideological position that makes profit-making by the hacendados so "significant". What is lacking in it is an appreciation of the humanistic dimension of the term "capitalism", and, by extension, the humanistic dimension of all nomenclature. It is as if the author already *knows* what capitalism was and did, and as if his greatest effort therefore is dedicated to demonstrating that this *was* capitalism. If it is not capitalism it has to be feudalism. It is as if the author wants it to be capitalism so that the attendant historical problems can be solved, as he wants them to be solved, without fear and without research. Once we achieve the classification of our matter as capitalistic, the remainder becomes familiar. We need no further guidelines to understanding. We assume the connection with world-wide capitalism, something we know all about. So the critical step is to establish the fact that the hacendados were concerned with profit. I do not believe that this is worth a book in 1979, particularly a book that depends for its data, as this one does entirely, on aging secondary sources.

*University of Michigan*

CHARLES GIBSON

RICHARD H. JACKSON (Ed.), *The Mormon Role in the Settlement of the West* (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1978. Pp. xiii+169. \$6.95)

This small book's eight authors, six of whom are geographers, ambitiously aspire to "a stimulating insight into the Mormon experience" which gives the reader "an entirely new viewpoint" and avoids "common stereotypes regarding the Mormon role in the settlement of the West" (p. vii). Such aspirations are common to many if not most