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would have to be vigorously employed if sovereignty was to be preserved. Though the results were certainly uneven, the effort was successful in meeting the threat given the technology of the time and so long as certain assumptions (such as the typical size of corsair fleets) were not challenged.

On the whole, Hoffman's treatment of his subject is comprehensive, but in some cases the discussion might have been deepened. Though the author gives a clear picture of the growth and organization of militias, a similar treatment of royal garrisons is not as complete. He indicates that garrisons, usually temporary in nature, were recruited from both the Indies and Spain. It would be enlightening to know the proportion of individuals provided by each area and perhaps the social type involved. Certainly the extent to which the Indies were expected or able to provide hired garrisons for their own defense is a significant factor, and a discussion of it would have strengthened the work.

The only real technical drawback is in some sections of narrative prose, notably those dealing with fleet movements. With their many references to commanders, fleets, and an occasionally choppy chronology, they can become confusing and tedious. Surely these sections could have been streamlined to retain the details without leading the reader through a morass of names and dates. It must be emphasized, however, that these structural flaws are relatively minor, and most of the writing is clear and informative. Hoffman always summarizes his discussion, minimizing any confusion which might arise from parts of the text. He has demonstrated that the sixteenth-century Caribbean saw the establishment of important precedents for defense which would lead to the more successful systems of the following centuries. Both his innovative use of sources and groundbreaking conclusions bring fresh insights to an old problem.

Robert S. Haskett
University of California, Los Angeles

São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation, 1889-1937. By JOSEPH LOVE.
Illustrations, tables, appendices, notes, bibliography, index. $25.00.

Recently some American Brazilianists have begun to question their approach to Brazilian history. This developing school of thought has decided that the use of the term "Brazil," when applied to the period from 1889 to about 1940, is inaccurate and misleading. During this period, it is argued, Brazil was not one unified entity but rather an extremely loose association of diverse and geographically separate regions which can only be truly understood in their separateness. Joseph Love is one of the three main founders of this new view and his book forms the third part of a trilogy of Brazilian regional studies by the founders of the school. (The previous two works in this trilogy are Minas Gerais in the Brazilian Federation, 1889-1937 by John Wirth and Pernambuco in the Brazilian Federation, 1889-1937 by Robert Levine.) All three are concerned with the period in Brazilian history known as the "First Republic."

The basis of this regionalist history, according to Love, is an almost complete erosion of a centralization which had characterized colonial and pre-republican Brazil. From 1822, the year of
Brazil's independence from Portugal, political and economic power began to devolve from a strong central government based in Rio de Janeiro to the various state capitals. By 1889 regional politics had far outstripped national politics in importance. The various individual states, not "Brazil" as a nation, became the basic focus of political loyalty and organization. Love points out, for example, that the concept of a national political party was completely alien in Brazil until 1922, when the first national political party was founded: the Brazilian Communist Party.

While the focus of this study is on São Paulo's internal developments, it is impossible to discuss São Paulo in this period without discussing its role in Brazilian national politics. In no other Brazilian state during the First Republic was state politics so nearly synonymous with national politics. Love points out that from 1894 to 1930 Paulistas held the vast majority of important national posts, including the Presidency for eighteen years. From the lofty heights of national office, Paulistas were able to facilitate the dominance of São Paulo's economic interest over the other states. São Paulo's emergence during the First Republic is the most influential factor in Brazil's political economy is in fact one of the major themes of this book. As Love points out in great detail, the importance of São Paulo's coffee industry was the basis of this Paulista dominance. While the coffee growers waxed fat on the international demand for coffee (supported in lean times by large federal subsidies), the rest of Brazil waned terribly.

The Brazilian specialist will find this book of extreme interest because of Love's treatment of the "dependency" issue. Most scholarship on Brazil now routinely incorporates the arguments of the dependency school of analysis, which has come to dominate the field. This school of thought, founded and made popular by Andre Gunder Frank, holds that Brazil's underdevelopment came about as a result of its economic domination by the capitalist world. Love, however, argues that São Paulo's development, at least, was not retarded by western-based capital. Love believes Paulistas held enough political and economic advantages to "offset an importers monopoly" and increase their share of coffee profits sufficiently to control their own destiny. With enormous capital accumulation based on coffee, São Paulo was free of the stymying effects of foreign "dependence."

Love buttresses his argument concerning São Paulo's development with a plethora of charts, graphs, and statistical tables, the results of feeding his raw research data into a computer. Practitioners of the cliometric school think computer results provide their conclusions with irrefutable scientific objectivity. Yet São Paulo, despite Love's protestations to the contrary, was indeed a classical mono-crop dependency of the capitalist world, its destiny controlled not locally but by western capitalists. What Love unwittingly relates is a classical case of growth without development.

Love's use of the cliometric methodology can best be understood as another attempt by a conservative western scholar to offer a "scientific" alternative to the dependency school of analysis, with its clear foundation on the Marxist critique of capitalism. In his ideological zeal to present a quantified version of São Paulo's development from 1889 to 1937, Love completely overlooks important social factors. An excellent example of this point is Love's myopic focus on São Paulo's elites; they are the only social group he deems worthy of his consistent concern. Except for a scant few pages on the workers' union movement in São Paulo, the common man is all but ignored. For Love, political and economic history is reduced to a mere recounting, albeit in encyclopedic
detail, of the political and economic vicissitudes of the "elite" members of São Paulo's ruling class. His focus was obviously dictated by the availability of written sources, yet more progressive-minded social scientists are transcending such straitjackets by using oral sources and by borrowing some research methodology from social anthropologists.

In the introduction to this book Love writes that he hopes to see many more regionalist works produced in the near future, even suggesting the regions most in need of attention. While this call for further research is worthwhile, it is hoped that the sophistry of cliometric methodology will be abandoned. It is also hoped that further regionally-based research will fully integrate all the social classes of the region into its discussion.

Darryle John Gatlin
University of California, Los Angeles


Alfredo Stroessner, the last of Latin America's "traditional" dictators, has ruled Paraguay for the past twenty-seven years, surpassing even Fidel Castro in tenure. Unlike the Cuban revolutionary, however, Stroessner has rarely been the subject of scholarly analysis. Now, Paul H. Lewis has written a finely-crafted study that treats the reading public to a non-polemical look at the political structure of contemporary Paraguay.

Lewis discredits the "man on horseback" image often associated with the Paraguayan chief of state. Instead, the Stroessner portrayed here is a consummate politician whose durability in office can be traced to his use of a very modern set of strategies. By transforming the Colorado Party into a highly centralized and disciplined apparatus, Stroessner has enhanced his regime's ability to mobilize considerable support among the peasantry. At the same time, his manipulation of traditional hatreds and development of an "ideology" of Coloradismo have extended the Party's network into other social classes. Finally, Stroessner has co-opted the military and fused Party and state bureaucracies into a coherent unit, thus creating in Paraguay an insulated and self-sustaining regime.

The examination of Stroessner's political prowess is provocative and unusually well-balanced. Lewis relies extensively on secondary sources and material garnered from interviews with political exiles. With most primary materials under lock and key, the extent of Lewis's analysis is all the more remarkable. All opposition groups are described with reference to program and internal organization, including the Roman Catholic Church, which remains the most formidable opponent of the regime. Lewis, it should be noted, is no stranger to the world of Paraguayan opposition politics; his account of the Febrerista Party, The Politics of Exile (1968), provides the English-reading public with a rare look at underground activities in a South American context.

Some of the background information, however, is misleading. It is perhaps premature to draw too many conclusions from Colorado-Liberal rivalry in the late nineteenth century. One could debate, for example, whether Bernardino Caballero really represented an