

Washington Beltrán, who was killed by a fatal shot to the chest. For supporters of the duel, legalization represented a triumph of the rule of law and proof of Uruguay's democratic bonafides by formally codifying elements of gentlemanly law into legal codes. For opponents of the duel, who ranged from members of the Catholic Church to leaders of the Socialist party, the duel epitomized the barbaric and classist customs that hindered Uruguay's progress and incorporation into the ranks of modern nations.

The final chapter concentrates on the decades following the 1920 legalization. During this period dueling steadily declined, save for a brief spike in the late 1950s. By then, however, the compulsion to duel had lost its force, as the rise of mass literacy and mass politics changed the contours of Uruguay's public sphere. In 1971, when Uruguay's last duel was fought, "the community of duelists . . . was tiny, shrinking and aging" (144). Following years of military dictatorship, dueling was finally outlawed in 1992, rejected by the overwhelming majority of Uruguayans as a violent anachronism.

The book makes a convincing case for the importance of the duel in the context of elite partisan conflicts and state-building. Throughout, Parker emphasizes his choice to shift focus from the duel as "a marker of some epochal transformation of attitudes toward violence or in class or gender relations" (4). Though the book does not brush aside the role of honor and masculinity, a closer look at changing concepts of honor and manhood could have enriched the analysis, especially regarding the decline of the duel in the second half of the twentieth century as traditional gender roles radically shifted.

Drawing on the press, case law, legal theory, and the transcripts of dozens of duels, the study concludes with a helpful appendix on methodology and sources, which outlines Parker's examination of 150 dueling incidents. Detailed and written in an engaging style, the book will hold appeal for legal historians and for scholars of the press and state-building in Latin America.

Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut
jadair@fairfield.edu

JENNIFER ADAIR

NINETEENTH-CENTURY NEW MEXICO AND RACIALIZED COMMUNITIES

Hispano Bastion: New Mexican Power in the Age of Manifest Destiny, 1837–1860. By Michael J. Alarid. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2022. Pp. 272. \$65.00 cloth; \$9.99 e-book.
 doi:10.1017/tam.2023.72

New Mexico's Latinx past, especially its Nuevomexicano history, stretches for centuries yet remains understudied. Michael J. Alarid's new book is a much-needed contribution to the

historical study of Nuevomexicanos before and during nineteenth-century US Anglo occupation. In five chapters, Alarid argues that “large landholding Hispanos [Mexican New Mexicans] maintained a great deal of political, economic, and social autonomy in the age of Manifest Destiny,” opening a “Hispano bastion” lens to explore the nuanced classed, racial, and political formations of the region (3). The author maintains that the territory’s transition to US occupation was successful, in due in part, to how “large landholding *patrones* embraced American capitalism, which offered all the class advantages they enjoyed under Mexican rule but with none of the responsibilities of caring for people in need” (3). What readers have, then, is a compelling and exciting study into how collaboration and agency saturated the territory’s political milieu, and the surprising political alliances that resulted.

Alarid begins *Hispano Bastion* with the story of Santa Fe Hispano Manuel Chaves to help make sense of how Nuevomexicanos “projected power in New Mexico territory” (2). When Chaves began to construct a barrier on his land that was in close proximity to Santa Fe’s Guadalupe Chapel, the landowner clashed with ecclesiastical authorities. Armed with rifles, he and others entered the chapel to demonstrate Chaves’s resistance to the Church’s political power (1). The author uses this story as an anchor to grapple with the large landowners’ (*patrones*) claims to agency, accommodation, and authority in the Southwest. The book follows some of the largest sheep-trading Nuevomexicano families: “Armijo, Chávez, Otero, Perea, and Yrizarri” to show how this group “sought ways to translate their landholdings into various forms of wealth” (8).

The first chapter compares social tensions during the years between the 1837 Chimayo Rebellion and the 1847 Taos Rebellion, and the second and third chapters focus on the compromises Nuevomexicanos made during US occupation. Alarid posits that the increase in economic inequality in New Mexico “led to an increase in vecinos’ larceny,” which has ramifications for how criminology is historicized (12). The remaining three chapters detail Nuevomexicanos’ responses to their own stratified class system, and how they influenced New Mexico’s legal system under US rule. In doing so, *Hispano Bastion* shows readers how “New Mexico resembled a colonized society in some ways and a racist southern society in others,” by exploring racial tensions with whites (Anglos) and between New Mexican Nuevomexicanos and Native Americans (167).

A key contribution to the historiography is the study of New Mexico’s diverse inhabitants during the US’s colonial takeover of the region, and how some of these residents negotiated society. As Alarid points out, “increased class differences. . . arose in nineteenth-century New Mexico,” as the territory became home to “vecinos, Indios de los pueblos, *genízaros*, unfree people,” and others (3). The author explains that poor and working-class vecinos not only relied on these landowners for basic needs, but also sought their “defense against Apache, Comanche, Navajo, [and] Pueblo attacks,” while *patrones* exploited poorer vecinos “for labor and to fill the ranks of their militias when threats to New Mexico arose” (6).

To complicate these social strata, Alarid offers, some Nuevomexicanos “forged treaties with the Comanche, and the Pueblos followed,” showing that political power was anything but stagnant (7). Following the US intervention in 1847, New Mexican patrones “worked alongside older white [Anglo] immigrants to acquire property and increase their influence” (14). The exploration of nineteenth-century New Mexico is an excellent case study for how racialized communities—Nuevomexicanos, not only detribalized Native people, enslaved people, Indigenous nations, and Anglos—negotiated power, security, and land, but also subverted each other.

Connecticut College
New London, Connecticut
kbernande@conncoll.edu

KRIS KLEIN HERNÁNDEZ

MEXICAN POLITICS, COMMUNITY HISTORIES, AND THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Abandoning Their Beloved Land: The Politics of Bracero Migration in Mexico. By Alberto García. Oakland: University of California Press, 2023. Pp. 260. \$85.00 cloth; \$29.95 paper; \$25.00 e-book.
 doi:10.1017/tam.2023.73

Alberto García argues that “bracero migration was a deeply politicized process shaped by a complex web of national, regional, and local factors” (4). “[B]racero migration,” he maintains, “cannot be fully explained as a strictly socioeconomic phenomenon wherein Mexican officials dispassionately identified impoverished campesinos who stood to benefit materially from migrating” (4). To support his central claim in this book, García explores local Mexican politics, including the effects of the Cristero War (1926-29) between conservative Catholics and the Mexican federal government, the short-changing of *ejidatarios* under agrarian reform, and the power of municipal governments in the bracero selection process.

García concludes from these examples that “these findings provide nuance to an enduring but relatively simple narrative regarding the factors that fuel Mexican migration to the United States, one that treats the migration phenomenon as a straightforward socioeconomic affair that can be effectively managed via government intervention” (152).

The book’s five chapters are arranged around different experiences of the Bracero Program and supported by an introduction, a conclusion, illustrations, and a full 58 pages of endnotes. These underscore “the limits of the postrevolutionary Mexican state’s administrative capacities and the broad array of political factors that prompted migratory departures” (149-50). Rather than tell the stories of the Bracero Program in a strictly chronological fashion, García dedicates the first chapters of his book to