

man, “science” (philology and phrenology) and romanticism, which stressed that the descendants of the true Aryans would rule over the inferior peoples of the world. While these “racial” theories fell on fertile ground in the United States, North Americans made their own contribution as they fused them with older ideas of destiny, derived from the Puritans and the Revolutionary Era, the demonstrated growth and expansion of the United States, and the actual experience of dealings with Native Americans and Blacks. In the process, the special mission of the United States was transformed from the excellence of its republican institutions and virtues and its dedication to liberty to the “racial” superiority of the North American Anglo-Saxon. Nevertheless, this doctrine strongly and broadly permeated United States society, which, undergoing rapid change and dislocation of values, was seeking to justify its continental expansion and global ambitions. The confrontation with Mexicans in the Southwest, Horsman questionably argues, provided the catalyst for the overt adoption of racial Anglo-Saxonism.

Horsman succeeds admirably in tracing the origins of what he terms United States racialism and in analyzing how it infected society, cutting across political, sectional, and class lines. He is somewhat imprecise, however, in differentiating between doctrines of cultural superiority and “racialism.” He is also less than convincing in demonstrating how “racialism” affected the course of United States expansion. For, as Albert K. Weinberg and Frederick Merk have shown, there were other elements that constituted Manifest Destiny and there were other fears shared by North Americans at mid-century. Still, this extremely well written book is a valuable contribution to the understanding of nineteenth-century ideology in the United States.

University of New Mexico

NOEL H. PUGACH

*Estado y política en América Latina.* Edited by NORBERT LECHNER. Mexico City: Siglo Veintiuno Editores, 1981. Notes. Figures. Index. Pp. 340. Paper.

Theories of the state are multiplying at precisely the time antistate sentiment, globally, seems also to be increasing. This paradox and contradiction must be in the forefront of any consideration of this Ford Foundation-sponsored anthology of writings by, mainly, Latin American authors on the state and politics in Latin America.

The title is suggestive of the book's main thrust, but, as with all collections, this one is sometimes unfocused and uneven. Norbert Lech-

ner's excellent introduction emphasizes the absence of historical political theory in Latin America of the stature that sets the tone of an entire society or defines its developmental model (à la Hegel or Pareto, for example), and calls also for recognition of the independence of the political variable. He and other contributors employ some of the rhetoric of Marxian analysis; but they also emphasize the multiple social and political divisions of society (Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Guillermo O'Donnell), the phenomenon of class cooperation as well as class conflict (Adam Przeworski), and the autonomy of the Latin America state systems from any simplistic and overly rigid class analysis (Oscar Landi, Fernando Rojas). Ernesto Laclau similarly criticizes the "hyperdeterminism" of some Marxian analysis, and calls, à la Gramsci or Poulantzas, for greater attention to political factors and what has come to be called the "relative autonomy of the state."

Sergio Zermeño argues that the late-developing nations of Latin America require independent analysis and particularly urges attention to the interventionist state and its relation to societal and corporate groups. Edelberto Torres Rivas urges rejection of Eurocentrism and the developmental theories derived from it, arguing that the African, Asian, and Latin American experiences are in many ways unique and particularly criticizing Marxian historiography for elevating an exceptional experience into a universal one. Other authors suggest, somewhat uncomfortably, that only a despotic state historically could rule such fragmented and chaotic national territories; that the Latin American state systems should be examined in terms of their own often pyramidal and pillared formations; that the Latin American state is a product of multiple dimensions; and that the state systems are different in all the Latin American countries and therefore require a theory that is cognizant of such variety and is neither ahistorical nor asociological.

This book is a major addition to the literature. It should be read and understood in the context of an emerging Latin American political sociology strongly concerned with development and dependency and often cast in Marxian terms. In that context, this collection is especially refreshing because it often goes in directions contrary to the prevailing orthodoxies and suggests new directions for thought and research. Editor Lechner's introduction and epilog are to be particularly commended for their thoughtful commentaries on the literature and suggestions for further study on the role of the state, the state and change, and state-society relations.

The book, however, has major flaws. Frequently the rigidly Marxist-Leninist interpretations the authors criticize are replaced by a new form of unthinking Trotskyist populism. There is too much faddish name-drop-

ping (currently Gramsci, Habermas, Poulantzas). The sociological “establishment” (CEDES, FLASCO, CEPAL, CEBRAP) is too strongly represented. And, as often in the past, the Latin American intellectuals who contribute to this volume are prone to ape and emulate the current European intellectual culture, now strongly anti-Marxist-Leninist and anti-Soviet; but following this continental trend as they have so many earlier ones means the Latin Americans often ignore their own realities. Hence we still await, after nearly twenty years of Ford Foundation and other efforts to nurture Latin American sociology and political science, a political sociology of development that is genuinely Latin American and not so much based on imported foreign models.

University of Massachusetts and  
American Enterprise Institute  
for Public Policy Research

HOWARD J. WIARDA

*Latin American Populism in Comparative Perspective*. Edited by MICHAEL L. CONNIFF. Foreword by JOHN D. WIRTH. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982. Notes. Tables. Index. Pp. xiii, 257. Paper.

Editor Michael Conniff opens this volume of collected works with an essay delineating five characteristics of Latin American populism: urban, multiclass, electoral and representative, consensual and mass culture-oriented, and charismatic in leadership (pp. 13–22). Six of the ten chapters are devoted to Latin America: two to Argentina, and one each to Brazil, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela. Chile receives brief attention in the concluding chapter. The additional inclusion of case studies on the United States and Russia is designed to offer a comparative perspective of populism. As a comparative history methodology, the volume falls short of breaking new ground; as an anthology on Latin American populism—its real intent—this is a solid contribution, perhaps one of the best in years.

In his essay, Ferenc Szasz sees the rise of United States populism as not only decidedly rural but also antiurban; Allison Blakely sees in Russia a revolutionary movement that allied the rural peasantry and urban intellectuals. In both countries, however, populism failed to flourish, whereas in Latin America it thrived. David Tamarin’s fluid argument that Argentine populism bridged the preindustrial and industrial eras nicely complements Marysa Navarro’s fine piece on the charismatic Eva Perón,