

Drawing a breath, I ducked into the market. I hurried past the butchers' stands, and the smells to which I, Gringa that I am, would never become accustomed. Heading for the relative safety of the produce, I began buying my week's provisions. Eventually, arms full of cilantro, tomatoes, avocados, and a few bunches of flowers to brighten my kitchen, I was ready for the final item on my list. I stood still for a moment, searching, as the chaos washed over me. I spotted a woman seated nearby with a towel-covered basket in front of her. I darted over and lowered myself to the floor next to her, out of the way of passing feet. We finished our negotiations and she was wrapping up some of her still-warm tortillas when I felt a hand gently stroke my hair. I looked up into the deeply wrinkled face of an elderly woman. She returned my look with a near-toothless smile and a sharp nod. "What a smart Gringa you are to know that hand-made tortillas are so much better than the ones from a machine."

It was only a moment in an otherwise unremarkable Sunday. I was "off-duty." My notebooks, shovels, and buckets were at home. I wasn't in the market to work but to stand alongside my neighbors and shop. Yet in that fleeting exchange, the woman, a stranger to me, brought me back to reality, to my studies, with a thud. Everywhere I looked, I found this tension between the hand- and machine-made, the ancient ways and the modern. It is a tension that is indelibly inscribed on the landscape of rural Mexico.

SLIDE TWO: REGIONAL MAP The dramatic transformation of Mexico's countryside wrought by the Spanish conquest is widely accepted; less acknowledged are the profound material impacts of Mexico's late-19th century period of modernization. The research discussed here centers on work done from 2003-2008 in western Puebla's Valley of Atlixco at the Hacienda San Miguel Acocotla and its associated descendant communities. Through archival and archaeological research, I highlight the material transformations in landscape and

architecture that were implemented during the late-19th century to increase worker productivity, reform social organization and worker experience, and remake Mexico into a modern, industrialized, capitalist nation.

Though transformative and exploitative, the Spanish colonial regime had done a great deal to protect indigenous communities (Charlton 2003, 224, 228, Wolf 1969, 13). These protections vanished with the establishment of Mexican Independence in 1821, and as the 19th century progressed, indigenous workers came under ever-escalating attacks by the government and upper classes who intended to “modernize” rural communities. Mexico’s indigenous populations, with their subsistence agriculture and communal lands, were seen as inefficient, and, worst of all, “poor consumers.” American visitors and businessmen labeled Mexico’s Indians as the greatest bar to Mexico’s progress, and the Mexican government agreed (Ruiz 2014). Community-held lands were dismantled, a practice that was intended to undermine the social bases of agrarian, indigenous villages (Assies 2008, Knowlton and Orensanz 1998, Ruiz Medrano 2010, Tutino 1986, 2008, Womack 1969). In so doing, the 19th century architects of Mexico’s progress believed they were moving Mexico’s indigenous people away from an outmoded past and towards contemporary forms of industrial capitalist production (Kourí 2002, 85, Ruiz 2014).

With the expropriation of communal land came a revamping of the rural economy and its landscape. Just as mechanized tortilla production heralded a modern consumer era in which women’s labor was commodified as it never before had been, rural landscapes of production and consumption were transformed by the same set of social and economic processes. Modernization brought greater economic stability to urban and upper class sectors of Mexican society; however, it came at a cost for many agrarian institutions. Modernization meant that haciendas focused on

the production of food for regional markets faced increased national and international competition and falling prices (Tutino 1986). As prices became more volatile, hacienda owners were forced to find ways to increase control over their workers and stabilize their enterprises (Newman 2013, 2014a).

SLIDE THREE: SETTLEMENT PATTERNS Though, as we will see, the 19th century was socially and economically transformative, engagement with the wider market began centuries before. **(CLICK)** Spanish settlers entered the Valley of Atlixco early in the colonial period and enmeshed the Valley in New Spain's economy. Atlixco's pre-conquest populations were relatively low thanks to regional political disputes (Plunket 1990, Dyckerhoff 1988, Gerhard 1993, Paredes Martínez 1991). What population there was dropped precipitously under Spanish rule from an estimated 35,000 families when Cortes first visited in 1519 to approximately 5,000 by 1570, and, another 75 years later, to a nadir of approximately 2,500 (Gerhard 1993, 57). Unlike many other areas of Mexico, Atlixco's populations did not rebound significantly; in 1803, Indian tributaries numbered only 6,153 (Gerhard 1993, 57), which represented less than 20 percent of the estimated pre-conquest population.

(CLICK) The combination of low population levels, geographic location, and climate made the Valley of Atlixco an attractive place for early Spanish investment. Following a severe plague and drought in 1576, the prices of grains skyrocketed in Mexico City and meat prices plummeted (Knight 2002, 77). **(CLICK)** As the financial incentive to farm cattle disappeared, the Spanish viceroyalty offered inducements to Spaniards willing to establish wheat haciendas (Chevalier 1963, 64). **(CLICK)** These Spaniards found the Valley of Atlixco ideal for the production of wheat. Land was readily available, the climate was kind for the production of grains, and the location, between Mexico City and Puebla, was ideal for getting goods to market.

(CLICK) By 1610, 393 haciendas had been established in the Valley (Paredes Martínez 1991). Ultimately, Atlixco became so important to New Spain's economy that it has been called, "the granary of New Spain's Viceroyalty" (Morales 2006). Thus, in the first 100 years of Spanish settlement, the social, economic, and physical landscape was significantly transformed.

Haciendas were established soon after the arrival of the Spaniards ostensibly for economic purposes, but they were also prime loci for the control and assimilation of indigenous populations (Newman 2013, 2014a, In Press, 2014b, Gibson 1964, Wolf 1969, Wolf and Mintz 1957, Chevalier 1963, Van Young 1983, Knight 2002). **SLIDE FOUR: 1686 ASSESSMENT** These two intertwined goals were made physically manifest in the architecture of the colonial hacienda. We don't know what Acocotla looked like when it was first established, but an assessment written a century later describes the Hacienda and its holdings. **SLIDE FIVE: 1686 ASSESSMENT FOCUS ON DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE** Acocotla's architecture, or casco, was simple. There were four bedrooms (some with doors, others without), a common living space, a kitchen, a hen house, and a few storage areas. Materials were adobe and thatch.

Textual emphasis is placed not on the living areas of Acocotla's casco but rather on its chapel and associated trappings, as well as the materials necessary to keep the business of farming going. **SLIDE SIX: 1686 ASSESSMENT FOCUS ON RELIGIOUS ARCHITECTURE** Where description of the living areas is almost cursory, we are given extensive details about the chapel including what it is constructed out of—materials such as brick and stone that are significantly more expensive and substantial than the adobe and thatch living areas—along with details about the decoration and objects necessary to hold a Mass. These items were costly, and included an altarpiece of satin, a silver cup, and wooden candleholders and a cross, both painted in gold. The greatest emphasis in this document—textual, architectural, *and*

monetary—is placed on Acocotla’s chapel, something that highlights the role of the hacienda in assimilating local, native populations and ensuring their active Catholicism. **SLIDE SEVEN: ASSESSMENT FOCUS ON FARMING MATERIALS/LIVESTOCK** Secondary importance is accorded the tools and livestock necessary for farming. From the number of oxen, to lengths of rope, to a reservoir, the assessment makes clear that the hacienda is an active farming business. In the seventeenth century, Acocotla’s significance was not in grand architecture, but in its ability to operate jointly as church and farm.

(SLIDE EIGHT: 1859 ASSESSMENT) Nearly two hundred years later, significant shifts may be seen in the valuation of the Hacienda and its holdings with emphasis in the architectural description being placed on domestic rather than religious structures. This 1859 assessment describes a building that is still significantly smaller than the ruins we see today. Immediately following this assessment, Doña Ana Cristina Treviño de Ruelas purchased the Hacienda San Miguel Acocotla. When Treviño de Ruelas took possession of the property, the casco would have been more humble than it is now, measuring only about fifty meters by fifty meters square. As the assessment tells us, in those twenty-five hundred square meters, the structure had two stories, spaces for living and working, a kitchen, a granary, stables, a threshing floor, a carpenter’s shop, and a chapel with a burial ground.

(SLIDE NINE DRAWING OF HACIENDA) The contrast between the archival accounts of Acocotla’s architecture, made fewer than two hundred years ago, and what one sees on the ground now is impossible to ignore. The structure today is larger and more elaborate. Acocotla’s five-meter high walls enclose a total of 14,632 square meters of domestic, administrative, and workspace in five patios and an 8,122 square meter protected garden. Outside these walls, the Hacienda’s architectural core also includes the calpanería **(CLICK)**, composed of thirty-four

small rooms that would have each housed a family of workers, an open field in which these families would have conducted their domestic activities, **(CLICK)** a threshing floor, **(CLICK)** a chapel, **(CLICK)** a brick kiln, **(CLICK)** and a reservoir.

Clearly, much changed between the writing of the 1859 assessment and Acocotla's abandonment in the 1930s. Archaeological evidence from excavations at Acocotla indicate that the contemporary ruins of the Hacienda are the result of a program of construction and expansion dating to after 1860 (Newman 2014a, b). **(SLIDE NINE B SMALLER SECTION OF HACIENDA)** Prior to this period, the hacienda's buildings seem to have centered on what is now the Patio del Limon. After 1860, however, Acocotla underwent drastic remodeling that made the structure more complex, a remodeling that would have created a highly controlled, hierarchical space. **(SLIDE NINE C ORIGINAL)** Though functional, architecture, whether domestic or industrial, is embedded with social meanings that shape the behavior of its occupants and communicate with the "outside" world (Blanton 1994, Bourdieu 1973, Glassie 1975, Hillier and Hanson 1984, Rapoport 1969). The redesign of the Hacienda San Miguel Acocotla's casco was not accidental; it was a "sign of the times." The mid-nineteenth century redesign of the Hacienda's buildings signified a reorganization of the hacienda's workforce, as well as a shift in management paradigms.

Archaeologists working on historic period sites throughout the world have identified architectural designs during the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that are driven by the need to create and control a subservient population (e.g. Baxter 2012, Beaudry 1989, Chapman 1991, Delle 1999, 2009, Epperson 1990, Fellows and Delle 2015, Jamieson 2000, Johnson 1996, Joseph 1993, Leone 1984, 1995, Meyers 2012, Meyers and Carlson 2002, Miller 1988, Mrozowski 1991, Mrozowski, Ziesing, and Beaudry 1996, Nashli and Young 2013, Pogue 2002,

Potter 1994, Potter and Leone 1992, Singleton 2001, Upton 1983, Whelan and O’Keeffe 2014). The design of both public and private spaces was intended to exhibit, maintain, and perpetuate discipline (Leone 1995, 255). **(SLIDE TEN NODES)** Acocotla’s redesigned architecture exhibits just such a pattern that is illustrated by distilling the architectural space of the casco to nodes on a tree (Hillier and Hanson 1984). Each circle, or node, represents a space, either a room or patio, and the connections between the nodes represent access paths, or doorways and hallways. This diagram ignores the length of hallways, the size of patios, or the number of locks on a door, and, in doing so, it highlights the difficulty of getting from one space to another in a way that might not necessarily be obvious on a more complex architectural plan. For example, it becomes clear that it is very easy to move from the outside of the hacienda into any of the calpanería rooms; only one doorway separates the outside world from the private family space inhabited by Acocotla’s workers. But at each successive “level,” it is just a bit harder to access the space than it was at the preceding level. The most difficult access is the tower room (21), with the rooms surrounding the Patio del Limón, the living spaces of the hacienda owner and her family, coming in second. These spaces would have been the most private, safest, and most easily controlled.

Domestic spaces in this diagram are shown in blue, workspaces are highlighted in red. **(CLICK)** Domestic spaces of the hacienda’s inhabitants were separated, with the workers occupying homes at the first level of access, **(CLICK)** and the hacienda owner occupying a domestic space at the sixth and seventh level of access. The working areas of the hacienda created a barrier, both conceptual and physical, between the workers and the owners. This design facilitated control and supervision of the workforce with the hacienda owners needing to pass through the working areas to enter and leave their home.

The casco's complexity allows the hacienda owner to determine the movement of people through the space to control the ways in which workspace and home are defined and used—because, above all else, the casco was not a home but a business. Architectural compartmentalization and specialization like what we see at Acocotla has been shown time and again to be part of processes of modernization and embedded in the development of capitalism (Deetz 1977, Foucault 1979, Giddens 1984, Glassie 1987, Jamieson 2000, Johnson 1996, Leone 1995). By creating spaces with highly specific and clearly defined uses, the hacienda's owner was creating an environment in which the ways individuals moved through the casco, used time, and completed tasks could be monitored.

(SLIDE 11 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS) I began this paper about landscape, architecture, and the physical transformations wrought by the 19th century push to modernize rural Mexico by talking about tortillas. It was, perhaps, not an obvious introduction for this paper, and yet the battle over who, or what, made your tortillas began during this same period and grew out of the same push to modernize. In 1859, the year to which dates the second of our textual descriptions of Acocotla's architecture, Julián González patented Mexico's first tortilla mill (Pilcher 1998, 102). Over the next fifty years, his machine would be designed and redesigned as part of the effort to mechanize tortilla production, an effort that was driven by the desire to liberate Mexico's women from the drudgery of the metate and move them into the industrial workforce (Pilcher 1998, 100-105). During this same period, Acocotla's casco was designed and redesigned to transform all of the rural indigenous laborers there, male and female, into productive, modern workers. Though the Spanish conquest was undoubtedly transformative, ultimately, it was this 19th century drive to modernize, to commodify agrarian labor as it never before had been, that led Mexico's rural poor into armed Revolution. It is an

ambition still visible on Mexico's rural landscape, and it is an ambition that continues to be negotiated in Mexico's markets and fields today.

Bibliography

- Assies, Willem. 2008. "Land Tenure and Tenure Regimes in Mexico: An Overview." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8 (1):33-63. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0366.2007.00162.x.
- Baxter, Jane Eva. 2012. "The Paradox of a Capitalist Utopia: Visionary Ideals and Lived Experience in the Pullman Community 1880–1900." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 16 (4):651-665.
- Beaudry, Mary C. 1989. "The Lowell Boott Mills Complex and its Housing: Material Expressions of Corporate Ideology." *Historical Archaeology* 23 (1):19-32.
- Blanton, Richard E. 1994. *Houses and Households: a Comparative Study, Interdisciplinary Contributions to Archaeology*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1973. "The Berber House." In *Rules and meanings; the anthropology of everyday knowledge*, edited by Mary Douglas, 98-110. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin Education.
- Chapman, William. 1991. "Slave Villages in the Danish West Indies: Changes of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries." *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 4:108-120.
- Charlton, Thomas H. 2003. "On Agrarian Landholdings in Post-Conquest Rural Mesoamerica." *Ethnohistory* 50 (1):221-230.
- Chevalier, François. 1963. *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico: the Great Hacienda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deetz, James. 1977. *In Small Things Forgotten: The Archaeology of Early American Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Delle, James A. 1999. "Landscapes of Class Negotiation on Coffee Plantations in the Blue Mountains of Jamaica: 1790-1850." *Historical Archaeology* 33 (1):135-158.
- Delle, James A. 2009. "The Governor and the Enslaved: An Archaeology of Colonial Modernity at Marshall's Pen, Jamaica." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 13 (4):488-512. doi: 10.1007/s10761-009-0086-x.
- Dyckerhoff, Ursula. 1988. "La Región del Alto Atoyac en la Historia: La Época Prehispánica." In *Milpa y Hacienda: Tenencia de la Tierra Indígena y Española en la Cuenca del Alto Atoyac, Puebla, México (1520-1650)*, edited by Hans J. Prem, 18-34. Puebla: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social.
- Epperson, Terrence. 1990. "Race and the Disciplines of the Plantation." *Historical Archaeology* 24 (4):29-36.
- Fellows, Kristen R., and James A. Delle. 2015. "Marronage and the Dialectics of Spatial Sovereignty in Colonial Jamaica." In *Current Perspectives on the Archaeology of African Slavery in Latin America*, 117-132. New York: Springer.
- Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gerhard, Peter. 1993. *A Guide to the Historical Geography of New Spain*. Rev. ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Gibson, Charles. 1964. *The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico 1519-1810*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Glassie, Henry H. 1975. *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: A Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Glassie, Henry H. 1987. "Vernacular Architecture and Society." In *Mirror and Metaphor: Material and Social Constructions of Reality*, edited by Daniel W. Ingersoll and Gordon Bronitsky, 229-245. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hillier, Bill, and Julienne Hanson. 1984. *The Social Logic of Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jamieson, Ross W. 2000. *Domestic Architecture and Power: the Historical Archaeology of Colonial Ecuador, Contributions to global historical archaeology*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Johnson, Matthew. 1996. *An Archaeology of Capitalism, Social archaeology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Joseph, Joe W. 1993. "White Columns and Black Hands: Class and Classification in the Plantation Ideology of the Georgia and South Carolina Low Country." *Historical Archaeology* 27 (3):57-73.
- Knight, Alan. 2002. *Mexico: the Colonial Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knowlton, Robert J., and Lucrecia Orensanz. 1998. "El Ejido Mexicano en el Siglo XIX." *Historia Mexicana* 48 (1):71-96.
- Kourí, Emilio. 2002. "Interpreting the Expropriation of Indian Pueblo Lands in Porfirian Mexico: The Unexamined Legacies of Andrés Molina Enríquez." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 82 (1):69-117.
- Leone, Mark P. 1984. "Interpreting Ideology in Historical Archaeology: Using the Rules of Perspective in the William Paca Garden in Annapolis, Maryland." In *Ideology, Power, and Prehistory*, edited by Daniel Miller and Christopher Tilley, 25-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leone, Mark P. 1995. "A Historical Archaeology of Capitalism." *American Anthropologist* 97 (2):251-268. doi: 10.2307/681960.
- Meyers, Allan D. 2012. *Outside the Hacienda Walls: the Archaeology of Plantation Peonage in Nineteenth-Century Yucatán*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Meyers, Allan D., and David L. Carlson. 2002. "Peonage, Power Relations and the Built Environment at Hacienda Tabi, Yucatán, Mexico." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 6 (4):225-252.
- Miller, Henry. 1988. "Baroque Cities in the Wilderness: Archaeology and Urban Development in the Colonial Chesapeake." *Historical Archaeology* 22 (2):57-73.
- Morales, Luz Marina. 2006. "Trigo, trojes, molinos y pan, el dorado de la oligarquía poblana." *THEOMAI: estudios sobre sociedad, naturaleza y desarrollo* (13):3.
- Mrozowski, Stephen A. 1991. "Landscapes of Inequality." In *The Archaeology of Inequality*, edited by Randall H. McGuire and Robert Paynter, 79-101. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Mrozowski, Stephen A., Grace H. Ziesing, and Mary C. Beaudry. 1996. *Living on the Boott: Historical Archaeology at the Boott Mills Boardinghouses, Lowell, Massachusetts*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Nashli, Hassan Fazeli, and Ruth Young. 2013. "Landlord Villages of Iran as Landscapes of Hierarchy and Control." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 17 (1):143-158. doi: 10.1007/s10761-012-0213-y.
- Newman, Elizabeth Terese. 2013. "From Prison to Home: Coercion and Cooption in 19th Century Mexico." *Ethnohistory* 60 (4):663-692.

- Newman, Elizabeth Terese. 2014a. *Biography of a Hacienda: Work and Revolution in Rural Mexico*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Newman, Elizabeth Terese. 2014b. "Historical Archaeology at the Hacienda San Miguel Acocotla." *Latin American Antiquity* 25 (1):27-45.
- Newman, Elizabeth Terese. In Press. "De colonia a país: los trabajadores de la Hacienda Acocotla y la cultural material en el Mexico del siglo XIX " In *Enfoques en torno a la Arqueología Histórica Mesoamericana: Homenaje a Thomas H. Charlton*, edited by Patricia Fournier. Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.
- Paredes Martínez, Carlos Salvador. 1991. *La Región de Atlixco, Huaquechula y Tochimilco. La Sociedad y la Agricultura en el siglo XVI*. Mexico City: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social, Fondo de Cultura Económica, Gobierno del Estado de Puebla.
- Pilcher, Jeffrey M. 1998. *Que Vivan los Tamales!: Food and the Making of Mexican Identity*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Plunket, Patricia. 1990. "Arqueología y Etnohistoria en el Valle de Atlixco." *Notas Mesoamericanas* 12:3-18.
- Pogue, Dennis J. 2002. "The Domestic Architecture of Slavery at George Washington's Mount Vernon." *Winterthur Portfolio* 37 (1):3-22.
- Potter, Parker B. 1994. *Public Archaeology in Annapolis: A Critical Approach to History in Maryland's Ancient City*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Potter, Parker B., and Mark P. Leone. 1992. "Establishing the Roots of Historical Consciousness in Modern Annapolis, Maryland." In *Museums and Communities: The Politics of Public Culture*, edited by Ivan Karp, Christine Mullen Kreamer and Steven D. Lavine, 476-505. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Rapoport, Amos. 1969. *House Form and Culture, Foundations of Cultural Geography Series*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Ruiz, Jason. 2014. *Americans in the Treasure House: Travel to Porfirian Mexico and the Cultural Politics of Empire*. First edition ed. Austin: University of Texas Press. text.
- Ruiz Medrano, Ethelia. 2010. *Mexico's Indigenous Communities: Their Lands and Histories 1500-2010*. Translated by Russ Davidson. Edited by David Carrasco and Eduardo Matos Moctezuma, *Mesoamerican Worlds*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Singleton, Theresa A. 2001. "Slavery and Spatial Dialectics on Cuban Coffee Plantations." *World Archaeology* 33 (1):98-114.
- Tutino, John. 1986. *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tutino, John. 2008. "From Involution to Revolution in Mexico: Liberal Development, Patriarchy, and Social Violence in the Central Highlands, 1870–1915." *History Compass* 6 (3):796-842. doi: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00527.x.
- Upton, Dell. 1983. "The Power of Things: Recent Studies in American Vernacular Architecture." *American Quarterly* 35 (3):262-279.
- Van Young, Eric. 1983. "Mexican Rural History Since Chevalier: The Historiography of the Colonial Hacienda." *Latin American Research Review* 18 (3):5-61.
- Whelan, David A, and Tadhg O'Keefe. 2014. "The House of Ussher: Histories and Heritages of Improvement, Conspicuous Consumption, and Eviction on an Early Nineteenth-Century Irish Estate." *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 18 (4):700-725. doi: 10.1007/s10761-014-0276-z.

- Wolf, Eric R. 1969. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. 1st ed. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolf, Eric R., and Sydney Mintz. 1957. "Haciendas and Plantations in Middle America and the Antilles." *Social and Economic Studies* 6:380-411.
- Womack, John. 1969. *Zapata*. 1st ed. New York: Knopf.