



PROJECT MUSE®

Authoritarian Legacies and Democracy in Latin America and
Southern Europe (review)

George D. E. Philip

The Americas, Volume 62, Number 4, April 2006, pp. 694-696 (Review)

Published by Cambridge University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/tam.2006.0088>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/197231>

However, as Dodd cogently establishes in his narrative, Carías' lifelong mission to consolidate political power for the sake of stability created a series of blind spots in his regime that ultimately ruined him. Carías was first and foremost a tactical thinker, masterful in constructing mechanisms that could satisfy or neutralize potential rivals while enhancing his own indispensability to the nation. Yet, Carías failed to comprehend fully the systemic changes occurring around him. As it neared the midpoint in the century, Honduras, like many of its Latin American counterparts, was experiencing the tidal forces of political and economic change. During the outbreak of World War II, at the seeming apex of his power, Carías was forced to contend with both expectations for tangible freedoms and the large-scale and unmet desire for prosperity. Although he was able to survive the tumult created by the war, Carías was never able to prevail over his new circumstances. Unlike Juan Perón, he did not manage to successfully forge a link between his leadership and the social welfare of Hondurans. As Dodd puts it, Carías was a leader who evoked awe and respect, but never the love of his people.

Dodd also points out that another major failure of the Carías regime was in its relationship with U.S. export companies. While he was effective in melding tradition with contemporary opportunities in the political realm, Carías fell far short with respect to economic development. Dodd clearly makes the point that Carías never took the subsequent steps to capitalize on the stability his government created. If he proved extremely adept at micromanaging his National Party, Carías was never able or willing to establish a foundation of economic sovereignty. In the end, his administration compounded Honduran economic dependency upon foreign capital. Loans from the American banana industry ultimately left his government permanently tied to foreign interests.

As a work of academic scholarship, *Tiburcio Carías* excels. The inclusion of primary documents taken from public and private Honduran collections is emblematic of a major work in the field. Similarly, Dodd's use of an extensive series of interviews with individuals who were witnesses to and participants in the Carías regime burnishes an already strong narrative. Overall, the author has incorporated an important story into the body of scholarship on Central America and accomplished this task with clarity, detail, and balance.

Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
Kutztown, Pennsylvania

MICHAEL D. GAMBONE

Authoritarian Legacies and Democracy in Latin America and Southern Europe.
 Edited by Katherine Hite and Paola Cesarini. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004. Pp. x, 350. Tables. Notes. References. Index. \$60.00 cloth; \$30.00 paper.

The editors of this book, who also co-author the first chapter, broadly define authoritarian legacies as interferences in or impairments to the quality of democ-

racy, which can be related specifically to unresolved or uncorrected inheritances from the past. These inheritances include institutional rules as well as norms and values. The authors hope to trace the sequence and mechanisms that are at work in this process rather than just pointing to historical continuities as evidence in themselves. The approach adopted is comparative and thematic, with several chapters taking a South American and a South European case on a "compare and contrast" basis. (Despite the words "Latin America" appearing in the title, there is little in the book on Mexico, Cuba or Central America). There are three chapters, by Hagopian on the economy, Cruz on citizenship and Aguero on the military, which cover Latin America alone. Most chapters deal with aspects of the role of the state, including the role of the judiciary, the role of the military, policing patterns and the question of how incoming democratic systems decided to deal with abuses committed under previous authoritarian systems. The word "legacy" is therefore interpreted very directly. The point that most of the countries under consideration have a significant, and complex, pre-authoritarian legacy as well as a more recent authoritarian legacy is mentioned in passing but not really considered at length.

The work as a whole is interesting and in some ways illustrative. This reviewer has no doubt that historical analysis can help illuminate contemporary realities in all kinds of ways, and the articles in this collection broadly succeed in doing this. Some patchiness is probably inevitable in view of the ambitious nature of the topic and the work does raise questions that are touched on only in passing, some of which might have merited more attention. One of these is the legacy of various kinds of hybrid politics in South America, in other words forms of politics that are not exactly dictatorial but not quite democratic either. Argentina's Peronism, at any rate prior to 1983, is one such example.

In a similar vein, most authors tend to focus more on the manifestly repressive features of authoritarian states (for example, heavy policing) than on the legacies of the more populist style of authoritarian politics that has also occurred in the region. The chapter by Felipe Aguero on the military is a case in point. It deals very competently with authoritarian transitions in several countries but does not deal at all with the kind of military populism that persuaded the Bolivian electorate to return ex-dictator Banzer to the presidency or persuaded the Venezuelan electorate to do the same with ex-golpista Chavez. Nor could I find any reference at all to Peru's Sendero Luminoso, which might well be regarded as an authoritarian legacy in itself. This is probably explained by the fact that Aguero, like other contributors, discusses Brazil and the Southern Cone much more than the Andean republics. However a broader approach to the entire region would require a conclusion that not all military officers are right-wing repressives and not all civilians are builders of democracy.

While the work makes a valiant effort to be genuinely comparative, the conclusion reached by this reviewer is that authoritarian legacies in Italy and Spain (or Europe in general) play a much lesser role in those countries than they do in South America. In Europe, the break with authoritarianism seems to have been much more complete and more successful than in most of Latin America, Uruguay being the

main exception. It is an interesting question why this should be so. Important factors include the transforming effect of economic change (economic growth was much higher in post-authoritarian Europe than post-military South America) and the role of the European Union and (in the case of Italy) Marshall Aid and NATO.

Overall, this edited collection includes some interesting discussion, and successfully illuminates some significant aspects of the behavior of state actors in Brazil and the southern cone of South America, and to a lesser extent elsewhere. It also contains a number of ideas that can and should be developed in future work.

London School of Economics
London, England

GEORGE PHILIP

Drowning in Laws: Labor Law and Brazilian Political Culture. By John D. French. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004. Pp. xviii, 233. Illustrations. Tables. Appendix. Notes. Glossary. Bibliography. Index. \$59.95 cloth; \$24.95 paper.

This book focuses on the history of the *Consolidação das Leis do Trabalho* (CLT), a body of corporatist labor law that President Getúlio Vargas signed into law on May 1, 1943. Its purpose was to give coherence to various pieces of welfare legislation for industrial workers passed since 1930, and it became one of the symbols of Brazil's twentieth-century developmentalist state. French's study is no history of the legislation as such or of CLT-based jurisprudence, but rather a "processual cultural history of labor law enactment, worker mobilization, and political culture in Brazil" (p. xi). The research is an extension of his ongoing project on the metalworkers of greater São Paulo, although he also draws on examples from other regions and states.

French argues that the labor regime under the CLT never became what the letter of the law promised. Under the Populist Republic (1945-64) and beyond, he asserts, working-class activists and leaders of legally recognized unions had a "fundamentally conflicted" relationship that counterbalanced a "rejection of the law" with "its idealization" (p. 98). French makes extensive use of interviews with labor leaders to demonstrate that their experience with continued state repression taught them not to take the CLT for granted. They knew that it was not the generous governmental "gift" (*outorga*) as which Vargas and his fellow "laborites" (*trabalhistas*) portrayed it; instead the workers took a pragmatic approach and used the law whenever possible to exert pressure on employers and the state. French shows convincingly that the *outorga* was a myth of the *trabalhistas*' making: they systematically misrepresented the labor regime under the First Republic as one that failed to acknowledge the importance of the social question and treated labor mobilization exclusively as a "case for the police" (*caso de polícia*).

The book is not a conventional historical monograph. To highlight change over time is not its primary concern. French draws on examples from the entire period