

exemplified as the symbolic American eagle viciously clutching the hapless Dominican Republic in its proverbial claws. He decries imperialist *yanqui* aggressions that turned his beloved homeland into a vast military encampment with the portent of dire consequences for the future.

University of South Alabama

R. MICHAEL MALEK

*Os Donos do Poder: Formação do Patronato Político Brasileiro*. 2 vols. By RAYMUNDO FAORO. 3d ed. Porto Alegre, 1976. Editora Globo. Notes. Pp. xiv, viii, 750. Paper.

Giving shape to the Brazilian past in order to understand its present, Raymundo Faoro's vision has already strongly colored how others have come to understand Brazil. He takes issue with those who see Luso-Brazilian history as a gradual erosion of a feudal hegemony by a rising capitalist bourgeoisie. Rather, he relates how a bureaucratic estate or order, created by the king and allied with the merchants, steadily and successfully opposed the pretensions of landed seigneurs. This estate's grasp for power not only gave birth to the Portuguese state in 1385, but also has characterized every stage of Brazilian history to the present. At times made up of the *letrados* and *bacharéis* described by Stuart Schwartz and Thomas Flory for the colony and the nineteenth century, at times including also military officers, this estate was not, says Faoro, a broker but an agent of power. Although the king chose political leaders from this group, he was himself part of it, and the end of monarchy did not alter the thrust of the bureaucratic estate's search for dominance.

Heavily influenced by Max Weber—to whose categories he gives a twist all his own—Faoro thus portrays a patrimonial state constantly in charge, not as a creature of the landed class but as its dominator. To be sure, in Brazil until 1700, a new group of would-be feudal lords, enjoying their distance from the crown, imposed their own authority. But an alliance of the state and merchants against planters then carried forward a systematic reimposition of centralizing force, a movement brought to a high point by the arrival of the court itself in Rio de Janeiro in 1808. Independence represented the counteroffensive of the landowners, but they were able to retain their leadership—and carry out a series of liberal reforms—only briefly. The conservative, centralizing onslaught that followed in 1837 was not the victory of landowners as

often portrayed, but of the bureaucratic estate which then ruled almost unquestioned until the end of the empire.

With the new prosperity of coffee-export agriculture, the landed element slowly regained its strength and, by winning over the army, succeeded—although once again, just temporarily—in creating the decentralized republic. The Vargas era reimposed the hegemony of the bureaucratic estate and did so by bringing back into it that disaffected portion, the military.

The second edition of this book published in two volumes in 1975, was a vastly expanded and rewritten version of the 1958 edition. In it, Faoro clarified the distinction between estate and class and between bureaucratic estate and elite, added extensively to the citations of theoretical and monographic literature, took into account information derived from works published in the interval, added two new chapters on the period from 1930 to 1945, and reworked the text throughout. Only the fact that he argued the same case justified maintaining the same title. The third edition, now under review, is a reprint of the second. Two printings in two years reflect the book's current popularity, inspired, I think, in part at least by the congruence between his vision of Brazil through time and how many Brazilians perceive the present scene there. Brazil, he argues, is and always has been shaped from above by a small group; this group is unresponsive not only to the needs of the people as a whole but also to the interests of particular classes. It interferes directly and extensively in the economy, yet does so with no clear vision of ultimate purpose except to expand its own power. Other authors, such as Simon Schwartzman in Brazil and Rioridan Roett in the United States have used parts of the same conceptual scheme to work out interpretations of particular aspects of the Brazilian reality.

Those who have been swayed by Faoro's conceptual scheme have not always been sufficiently critical of his argument. For Faoro does not always rely on firm historical evidence or even sound reasoning. A conflict between the bureaucratic order and the landed oligarchy is easier to posit than to document. To take a few examples from the period I know best, many of the *bacharéis* of the nineteenth century were also landowners. When the powerful Baron Cotegipe (1815–1880) was not prime minister he was likely as not directing his various sugar estates in Bahia: was he a bureaucrat or a landowner? Faoro does not tell us. And surely the reality was more complex than such a choice implies. If men of little wealth sometimes rose to power (p. 454), they were nevertheless related by family ties to the propertied. Faoro ar-

gues that the empire witnessed the predominance of the centralizing bureaucrats and that the Land Law of 1850, for instance, was their victory over the landowners (p. 410); why, then, did they not enforce it? Warren Dean's thesis that the landowners were themselves divided between the coastal region and the interior seems more believable (not to mention better documented). Why military officers sometimes sided with the opponents of the bureaucratic estate is not sufficiently explained, and probably cannot be within the limitations of this scheme. Nor does Faoro consider alternative explanations. It may be that the very self-centeredness of a "bureaucratic estate" renders it vulnerable to manipulation by those who wield economic power. If new visions of Brazil are to be shaped, they need to be based on careful reasoning as well as on sound information derived from archives and not on theoretical speculation and evidence chosen arbitrarily from other authors.

Such canons of good scholarship are all the more important when books shape events. We may quarrel with Faoro as we may with other authors such as Gilberto Freyre and Caio Prado Júnior, but his impact, like theirs, will remain. His is a pessimistic view—"a distant nightmare" (p. xi) he calls it—of Brazil's "past, stubbornly implanted in the nation's soul: State and nation, government and people, disassociated and in veiled antagonism marching on separate tracks within a contradiction renewed in every century" (p. 94). Although Faoro, as a lawyer and jurist, is today a courageous critic of the present regime, his book suggests that regardless of particular governments, the Brazilian people are destined to be ruled and not to rule.

University of Texas

RICHARD GRAHAM

*Os Militares no Poder.* By CARLOS CASTELLO BRANCO. 2d ed. Rio de Janeiro, 1977. Editora Nova Fronteira. Illustrations. Pp. 680. Paper.

The daily "Coluna do Castello," usually written in Brasília, has long provided readers of Rio de Janeiro's *Jornal do Brasil* with the political interpretations of columnist Carlos Castello Branco, together with the timely observations of congressmen.

This collection of the columns, running from April 4, 1964, to March 15, 1967, reveals the day-to-day thoughts that existed in political circles, but it is not for the reader who is primarily interested in knowing what