

*Freedom and Reform in Latin America.* Edited by FREDERICK B. PIKE. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959. Pp. ix, 308. \$6.00.)

The present volume, like Professor Johnson's *Political Change in Latin America*, represents the sort of mature, interpretive analysis of Latin-American affairs whose audience has no doubt been increased by the Venezuelan anti-Nixon rioters and by the monstrous barbarisms of Somoza, Trujillo, Batista, Castro & Co. *Freedom and Reform in Latin America* is comprised of twelve essays by eleven different scholars in history, economics, sociology, anthropology, literature, education, and political science.

Political scientists will be particularly attracted to historian Pike's treatment of *Sources of Revolution*, which provides a rather perceptive analysis of the baneful consequences of intermixing religion and politics — consequences which include the interjection into political controversy of a peculiarly dogmatic, uncompromising, almost theological note. Professor Pike quite ably comments on the violent break with Spain, the role of personalism, and other factors as contributing to the violently disruptive traditions of Spanish-American political life. Another historian, Professor Charles C. Cumberland, stresses that the reliance in much of Latin America on many disparate traditions — "democracy and autocracy, equality and stratification, community service and individualism, liberty and paternalism" — has created a corresponding gulf between constitutional theory and actual practice, and hence an inducement to instability and authoritarianism.

Professors William S. Stokes and Russell H. Fitzgibbon, whose names are quite familiar to political scientists, offer useful commentaries, respectively, on the Latin-American search for a conceptual *Hispanidad*, and on the impact of depressed economy and changing politics on Uruguayan democracy.

The article by Professor Alceu Amoroso Lima, distinguished Brazilian literary scholar, may also be said to offer something in the way of a quick, very well-organized sketch of principal reformist trends in colonial, imperial, and republican Brazil. Problems of organization, or subject-matter, or depth of treatment, tend to make remaining articles rather less productive for political scientists.

An occasional and disturbing tendency of a few contributors is to treat Latin-American freedom and reform in rather rarefied, esoteric terms which must have little or no meaning to an agitating political leader, worker, peasant, student, or journalist. In his introductory essay (which does not match the high quality of his article on *Sources of Revolution*) Editor Pike dwells on the theme that expanding governmental functions related to reform movements pose threats to certain middle-class freedoms, which may drive affected people into a kind of withdrawing, introverted "inward reform" or internal substitute for the external

freedoms denied by "apostolic bureaucrats." The result: A possible upsurge of religious faith, particularly in terms of a new reliance on "the value of inward discipline based upon formal dogma as interpreted by designated ministers." In order to sense a loss of external freedom, there must be some external freedom to lose. Even when all the many distinctions among Latin-American countries are considered, it seems hardly likely that the loss of freedom as a consequence of reform poses a very real problem to many people in the area. One hastens to report that the general tendency of the remainder of the book, including other parts of Editor Pike's introduction as well as his subsequent article, is to give unbiased, almost painfully objective consideration to the roles of religion, Church and churches in Latin-American freedom and reform.

If anything is slighted in the volume, it would be the place of land monopoly in contemporary Latin-American programs for economic and political change. The minimization of this topic is notably evident in Professor Richard N. Adams' article on, of all things, *Freedom and Reform in Rural Latin America*, where three out of twenty-seven pages are devoted to a sort of off-hand report on the land tenure question. Other articles either give the subject passing mention only, or omit it altogether.

Several of the articles in *Freedom and Reform in Latin America* do add up to a fruitful, enriching contribution to Latin-American studies, and it is in that light that the book is recommended for the shelves of political scientists in general and Latin Americanists in particular.

JAMES L. BUSEY

*University of Colorado*