

the use of the concept of identity. Peter Waldmann stresses the need to examine the guerrilla movements and investigates the causes of their rise in Argentina. His essay is more analytical than Donald C. Hodges's book on the same subject (*Argentina, 1943-1976: The National Revolution and Resistance*) and provides a good companion volume. Angel Rama discusses the conflict of cultures from a literary and political point of view.

There is no conclusion to this book; nor are there any definitive recommendations. Indeed, given the state of our understanding of contemporary Argentina, there could be none. Nevertheless, this is a book of ideas and insights that clearly further the state of our knowledge of this tragic country. It will be of interest to all Latin Americanist historians.

Rutgers University

SAMUEL L. BAILY

*A UDN e o Udentismo: Ambiguidades do Liberalismo Brasileiro (1945-1965)*. By MARIA VICTÓRIA DE MESQUITA BENEVIDES. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1981. Notes. Tables. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. Pp. 297. Paper.

This excellent monograph is a fine example of the first-class research on contemporary history now being done in Brazil. Mesquita Benevides has published an outstanding study of the delicate balance of political forces during the presidency of Juscelino Kubitschek (1956-61). In her new study, she has given us a close to definitive account of the rise and fall of Brazil's principal conservative party, the União Democrática Nacional (UDN).

The party was born in 1944-45 out of the opposition to Getúlio Vargas's dictatorial Estado Novo. Benevides clearly shows the ambiguities inherent in the UDN's founding—would it be a coalition or party? It soon became the latter, with a strongly anti-Vargas orientation. Dominated by lawyers, the party saddled itself in 1945 with a remorselessly uncharismatic presidential candidate, Air Force Brigadier Eduardo Gomes. This stiff, thoroughly unpolitical officer ran unsuccessfully for president in both 1946 and 1950. In 1950 he lost to Vargas, whose political comeback confirmed the deepest fears of the UDN. By the election of 1960, the party was desperate for a candidate who could defeat the heirs of Vargas. The UDN's would-be savior was Jânio Quadros, who won the 1960 election but who inexplicably resigned in 1961 after only seven months in office.

From then on, the UDN lost any reasonable hope of winning control of national government. It was not surprising that the party should have become increasingly involved in military-civilian conspiracies to overthrow

the government of João Goulart, the one-time protégé of Vargas. When the overthrow came in 1964, many Udenistas thought their hour had arrived. UDN leaders were appointed to key positions in the Castelo Branco government, but their electoral weakness came back to haunt them. The increasingly authoritarian military government soon violated the UDN's most cherished legal principles (by packing the Supreme Court and suspending habeus corpus). Less than two years after the 1964 coup, the UDN, along with all other political parties, was abolished. Many of its best-known names entered ARENA, the progovernment party. In retrospect, the UDN's history had been one of frustration and failure. Neither its ideology nor its social orientation suited it to become the broadly based electoral party that might have won control of the federal government.

The author has painstakingly consulted all the available sources, supplemented by in-depth interviews with key UDN leaders. She skillfully examines the UDN's contribution to the tradition of Brazilian liberalism, while also showing how the party lost its original interest in free labor unions and in a constructive reappraisal of the role of foreign capital. Most important, Benevides gives us a careful reexamination of the UDN's role in politics over two decades. At a time when political parties have again become important in Brazil, this is a significant contribution.

University of Wisconsin

THOMAS E. SKIDMORE

*The Struggle for Land. A Political Economy of the Pioneer Frontier in Brazil from 1930 to the Present Day.* By JOE FOWERAKER. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981. Maps. Tables. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xxi, 260. Cloth.

Joe Foweraker uses a Marxist framework to analyze the struggle for land on the Brazilian frontier. The Brazilian frontier is in a relatively dependent position in the hierarchical world capitalist order, in which politics and economics are seen as part of the same social process. This framework minimizes the importance of ecological conditions and dominant crops, national character, or autonomous ideological, institutional, or political developments as independent explanatory factors. Frontier settlement is a window through which the political economy of Brazil is exposed. The author attempts to explain how the apparent chaotic state of land tenure, administrative ineffectiveness, and violence of the frontier are not individual aberrations or systemic failures. Rather, they are seen as predictable consequences of the process of accumulation under capitalist social relations.