

Napoleonic France, as it was frequently described by the author, than in the state of Italy. Secondly, Tarrow almost apologetically uses the term system. It appears that this attitude is unnecessary since the concept of social system and other systems has been critically and usefully accepted into sociology.

JIRI KOLAJA

University of West Virginia
Morgantown

HOWARD J. WIARDA. *Corporatism and Development: The Portuguese Experience*. Pp. x, 447. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1977. \$20.00.

Professor Wiarda's study is a major contribution to the English language literature on Portuguese politics. Indeed, there is no other book length analysis which covers twentieth century Portugal so thoroughly.

The principal thesis of the book may be stated simply. It is that "corporatism"—a form of political and social organization through which, in effect, the central government controls the structures of interest representation—is more or less natural to the Iberic-Latin tradition. How is such a system different from outright totalitarianism? Although Wiarda does not stress the point, the hallmark of Portuguese authoritarianism during the Salazar-Caetano era (from the early thirties to the early seventies) was mass demobilization. Widespread popular participation in politics was not encouraged, not even symbolically, as in certain totalitarian systems; the apolitical nature of the Portuguese political system set severe limits to the implementation from above of corporate organizations and activities.

Wiarda recognizes that there are at least two problems with the Ibero-Latin thesis. One is that it tends to degenerate into an explanation of authoritarian rule based on national character or a vaguely defined political culture. After all, modern authoritarianism is not peculiarly Latin. The second difficulty concerns the reality of the corporatist organizations, which, in theory,

were supposed to thrive during the renaissance of Ibero-Latin authoritarianism in Portugal. In fact, these organizations existed for the most part on paper. The workers' syndicates had almost no real power. For that matter, the employers' associations were largely window dressing. Salazar himself did not take corporatist theory, such as it was, very seriously. The actual system of power appears to have been highly personalistic and based, as well, on rather clearcut differences between classes.

Thus, Wiarda's central hypothesis does not seem to go far in explaining Portuguese politics. To be sure, he is aware of competing theories, and he does not press his own to the exclusion of others. The trouble with this approach is that it entails much "on the one hand, on the other hand" discussion, with the result that the book begins to lose focus and a definite point of view.

Nevertheless, despite the conceptual uncertainty, Wiarda's presentation of the ins-and-outs of Portuguese politics during the Salazar-Caetano years is impressively rich. His book constitutes a baseline on which subsequent studies of Portuguese authoritarianism can build. The defects of Wiarda's study are real, but they do not outweigh the value of his pioneering effort.

PETER J. MCDONOUGH

The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor

UNITED STATES

HERMAN BEITZ. *A New Birth of Freedom: The Republican Party and Freedman's Rights, 1861-1866*. Pp. xv, 199. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977. \$16.95.

Some historians, sympathetic with the civil rights movement of the 1960s, have berated Republicans for failing to legislate complete equality a century ago. The failure, these writers explain, was due to the Republicans' racial prejudices or their laissez faire convictions.