

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND THE STATE IN BRAZIL

Joel Wolfe
Williams College

- A FORMAÇÃO DA CLASSE TRABALHADORA: MOVIMENTO ANARQUISTA NO RIO DE JANEIRO, 1888–1911.* By Maria Conceição Pinto de Góes. (Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1988. Pp. 110.)
- O SONHAR LIBERTARIO: MOVIMENTO OPERARIO NOS ANOS DE 1917 A 1921.* By Cristina Hebling Campos. (São Paulo: Editora Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 1988. Pp. 189.)
- THE MANIPULATION OF CONSENT: THE STATE AND WORKING-CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS IN BRAZIL.* By Youssef Cohen. (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989. Pp. 185. \$29.95 cloth, \$12.95 paper.)
- ESTRATEGIAS DA ILUSÃO: A REVOLUÇÃO MUNDIAL E O BRASIL, 1922–1935.* By Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro. (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1991. Pp. 379.)
- A INVENÇÃO DO TRABALHISMO.* By Angela de Castro Gomes. (Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Universitário de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro, 1988. Pp. 343.)
- EMANCIPATING THE FEMALE SEX: THE STRUGGLE FOR WOMEN'S RIGHTS IN BRAZIL, 1850–1940.* By June E. Hahner. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990. Pp. 301. \$42.50 cloth, \$16.95 paper.)
- ENGENDERING DEMOCRACY IN BRAZIL: WOMEN'S MOVEMENTS IN TRANSITION POLITICS.* By Sonia E. Alvarez. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990. Pp. 304. \$45.00 cloth, \$14.95 paper.)

Scholars of Brazil are increasingly turning their attention to the relationship between social movements and the state. This is an encouraging and important trend. The state, the economy, and civil society are no longer being viewed as simple legacies of the colonial experience and nineteenth-century monarchy. In different ways, the seven works reviewed here all speak to the complex and changing relationship between state-making and social movements, although the conclusions reached often diverge. These works explore the issue by focusing on different periods of twentieth-century Brazilian history and using a variety of methodologies. All of them, however, emphasize leadership and elite discourses. As a result, while these authors recognize the complexities of relations between

the state and social movements, they largely fail to recognize complexities within the social movements themselves that often shape their relations with the state.

Both Maria Conceição Pinto de Góes and Cristina Hebling Campos analyze the early-twentieth-century alienation of Brazilian Anarchists from the state and the intense repression faced by labor organizations in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. Pinto de Góes points out in *A Formação da Classe Trabalhadora* that although federal and municipal authorities often negotiated strike settlements, Anarchist labor leaders eschewed any involvement with the government or electoral politics (pp. 44–46). She makes this point by detailing the opposition of the Anarchist *libertários* to the Socialist participation in the electoral system (pp. 57–59, 82–87). Pinto de Góes ends by analyzing the decline of the Anarchist movement in the face of government repression and the unwillingness of Anarchist leaders to recognize the rank and file's desire to participate in the municipal political system of Rio de Janeiro (pp. 104–5).¹

Campos's *O Sonhar Libertário: Movimento Operário nos Anos de 1917 a 1921* addresses the failure of the Anarchist movement to take advantage of the "revolutionary potential" of the years following the General Strike of 1917 and prior to the increasingly effective state-sponsored repression of the 1920s. Her argument rests on the belief that Anarchist activists initiated and ran all strikes and other labor activities. Thus once the state arrested many of the leaders, the movement practically ceased to exist (pp. 42–52). Campos does not consider workers to be social actors who are capable of formulating their own ideas or initiating organizing and protest activities on their own. In her view, when workers struck in the years from 1917 to 1920, it was because Anarchist activists had successfully inculcated revolutionary ideas in their heads (pp. 42–43). Campos also argues that the rank and file abandoned the Anarchist movement because industrialists and the state had gained control of worker consciousness. Indeed, Campos claims that the failure of the movement in the 1920s "reflected much more . . . the 'power of capital' to impose hegemonic values on the workers than it did the theoretical limits, strategies, or ideological tactics of the anarchists and revolutionary syndicalists" (pp. 178–79).

Because both Pinto de Góes and Campos cite the radical press rather uncritically and ignore other sources and theoretical perspectives (such as gender analysis), they do not consider members of the rank and file as any-

1. Because Rio was the national capital, the organizing and protest activities of Cariocas seem to have had greater political impact than the actions of workers in other cities. This topic remains regrettably understudied. On popular participation in various forms of Rio politics, see José Murilo de Carvalho, *Os Bestializados: O Rio de Janeiro e a República Que Não Foi* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1987); Jeffrey D. Needell, "The Revolta Contra Vacina of 1904," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 67, no. 2 (May 1987):233–69; and Michael L. Conniff, *Urban Politics in Brazil: The Rise of Populism, 1925–1945* (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1981).

thing more than objects to be won or lost by labor leaders. In not addressing structural weaknesses within the union movement (neither author discusses thoroughly the key divisions according to race, sex, or ethnicity within the working classes of Rio and São Paulo), Pinto de Góes and Campos are left with only Foucaultian notions of the omnipresent power of capital and the state to transform and manipulate consciousness (Pinto de Góes, pp. 48–50; Campos, 177–80). If these authors had accepted the assumption that no working class is undifferentiated and that relations of the rank and file with union and leftist activists are often conflictual, they would not have arrived at a position that robs workers of any sense of agency.²

Recent adoption of Michel Foucault's notions of power by many Brazilian social historians is a development that all Latin Americanist scholars will have to confront.³ The works by Pinto de Góes and Campos reveal the problems inherent in such a perspective. These historians distort their subjects beyond recognition by drawing an analogy between Foucault's omnipotent "Panopticon," on the one hand, and weak government institutions and early industrialist associations in Rio and São Paulo, on the other.⁴ In reality, state and industrialist institutions of repression and control had little impact on workers' lives during the first three decades of the twentieth century. The "state" as an institution rarely considered urban workers' issues in São Paulo before the mid-1920s, and industrialist associations in the two cities did not implement their first tentative policies of social control (beyond repressing leadership cadres) until the 1920s and 1930s, after the era studied by Pinto de Góes and Campos.

Youssef Cohen makes similar claims about the malleability of workers' consciousness in *The Manipulation of Consent: The State and Working-Class Consciousness in Brazil* by focusing on the state's power over workers. He asserts that the corporatist labor system put in place by Getúlio Vargas

2. The intense ethnic and racial divisions within the Carioca working class are detailed in Sidney Chalhoub, *Trabalho, Lar e Botequim: O Cotidiano dos Trabalhadores no Rio de Janeiro da Belle Époque* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986); and Sheldon Maram, *Anarquistas, Imigrantes e o Movimento Operário Brasileiro, 1890–1920* (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1979), among others. On racial divisions in São Paulo, see George Reid Andrews, "Black and White Workers: São Paulo, Brazil, 1888–1928," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 68, no. 3 (Aug. 1988):491–524. On the impact of divisions by sex and gender ideologies, see Joel Wolfe, "Anarchist Ideology, Worker Practice: The 1917 General Strike and the Formation of São Paulo's Working Class," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 71, no. 4 (Nov. 1991):809–46.

3. Foucault's influence can also be detected among Brazilians studying how gender is socially constructed. Two recent examples of this trend are Martha de Abreu Esteves, *Meninas Perdidas: Os Populares e o Cotidiano do Amor no Rio de Janeiro da Belle Époque* (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1989); and Margareth Rago, *Os Prazeres da Noite: Prostituição e Códigos da Sexualidade Feminina em São Paulo, 1890–1930* (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1991).

4. For Foucault's discussion of Jeremy Bentham's "Panopticon," see Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1979), 195–228. Although Pinto de Góes and Campos refer to Foucault, their analyses of power seem to owe more to Gramscian notions of hegemony than to the ideas of Foucault, who believed that all forms of repression and control contain the possibility for resistance to them.

had succeeded by the 1970s in “securing the consent of the working class, thus obtaining its cooperation in shouldering most of the enormous burden of delayed capitalist industrialization” (p. 118). While few would disagree that Brazil’s popular classes have suffered throughout the process of industrialization, the historical record challenges Cohen’s conclusions about the “manipulation of consent.” He supports his claims in two ways. First, he uses survey data collected in 1972 and 1973 in which workers told academic researchers that they trusted the state and its representatives more than they did union representatives or opposition politicians (pp. 39–49). Then Cohen simply asserts that workers were intellectually incapable of challenging the state’s hegemony. The workers’ responses to his questionnaire demonstrate to Cohen their “cognitive limitations” (p. 81) and their “underdeveloped cognitive skills” (p. 73). In his view, the immense power of the state to co-opt worker consciousness creates an environment in which the popular classes “are therefore often unable to understand the criticism [offered by] counterelites” (p. 81).

Cohen fails to take into account several important issues. First, a rich heritage of worker activism has existed since the corporatist structure was implemented. Cohen never mentions the 1968 strikes in Cotagem and Osasco nor the Novo Sindicalismo (New Unionism) initiated by metalworkers and others in São Paulo in the late 1970s, both of which arose during the military dictatorship. The other issue Cohen ignores is how his subjects might have reacted to his interviewing them. Workers in 1972–73 were likely to fear the repressive regime of Emílio Garrastazú Médici, and they therefore may have given the researchers answers that conformed closely to the military government’s rhetoric.

The three works reviewed thus far demonstrate that scholars need to move beyond making simple declarations about the power of capital and the state to manipulate workers. Analysts will have to begin the long, hard undertaking of studying the complex set of relations among workers, the state, and industrialists. It should not be accepted as a given that contact between agents of the state or capital and popular-class groups produces a pliant working class. Recent research on U.S. history has provided important clues to the multifaceted nature of such relationships. For example, historians of social work have demonstrated that the presence of social workers and the state among the working class does not necessarily translate into social control. Unwed mothers, victims of domestic violence, workers, and others have been able to use their interactions with representatives of the state in struggles with male relatives, bosses, and others.⁵

5. Two recent examples of such studies are Linda Gordon, *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence* (New York: Vintage, 1988); and Regina G. Kunzel, “The Professionalization of Benevolence: Evangelicals, Social Workers, and Unmarried Mothers, 1890–1945,” Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1990. On the debate over social control, see Linda Gordon, “Family Violence, Feminism, and Social Control,” *Feminist Studies* 12 (Fall 1986):453–78.

Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro's well-documented and forcefully argued *Estratégias da Ilusão: A Revolução Mundial e o Brasil, 1922–1935* provides the kind of nuanced assessment of leftist activists and the state that is so often missing from studies of Brazil. Pinheiro focuses on the tendency of political elites and insurrectionists in the 1920s and 1930s to view Brazil's workers as simple objects to be mobilized and manipulated. Rather than addressing relations between the popular classes and activists, he analyzes the evolving ideology and praxis of the Partido Comunista Brasileiro (PCB). After a painstaking review of an array of sources, Pinheiro concludes that the PCB was doomed to estrangement from Brazilian workers because one of its primary responsibilities within the Communist International (and other subsequent Soviet international structures) was to aid in the global defense of the Soviet Union in the face of British and later U.S. hostility. One of the book's most fascinating sections recounts how the Soviet Union implemented Lenin's theory of imperialism. According to Pinheiro, the Soviets did not support insurrectionary movements to bring about more equalitarian states. The International preferred instead to disrupt the smooth functioning of formal and informal British and U.S. colonies in order to foster revolution in those capitalist societies (pp. 153–73). The ultimate goal was to undermine the Soviet Union's enemies, not to liberate the exploited (pp. 23–50).

Pinheiro carefully demonstrates how the PCB's activities on behalf of the International weakened the political standing of the Brazilian working class. By following the orders of a foreign government, the PCB provided confirmation of elites' paranoid fantasies about ties between workers' strikes and foreign subversion. Pinheiro also analyzes thoroughly how the Soviet Union encouraged PCB militants to accept Luís Carlos Prestes as their leader. The Soviets' fascination with military uprisings and their disdain for grass-roots organizing in countries like Brazil led them to believe that Prestes and his military allies could bring down the Brazilian government (pp. 209–26). These PCB activities—especially the ill-conceived attempted putsch in 1935—had a net negative effect on workers because PCB efforts encouraged and justified increasingly authoritarian state responses in the 1920s and 1930s.

A major contribution of this book is its background analysis of the extraordinarily problematic relationship between Brazilian workers and the PCB.⁶ Pinheiro reveals the dangers that arise from conflating the public discourse of leftist activists (in this case, members of the PCB) with the consciousness and praxis of rank-and-file workers. His analysis of the PCB's goals and tactics in *Estratégias da Ilusão* helps explain, for example,

6. It should be pointed out that one of the disservices of this book is its impenetrable style of source notation, which resulted from the many years that Pinheiro spent writing the book. The other problem is the failure to provide a bibliography.

why the so-called *Partidão* (Big Party) opposed workers' strikes in 1945 and 1946, advising them instead to suffer through inflation via the "Tighten Your Belts" campaign.⁷ In the final analysis, Pinheiro provides a thorough and nuanced explanation of why the PCB remained so alien to workers, especially those in industrial cities like São Paulo.

In *A Invenção do Trabalhismo*, Angela de Castro Gomes analyzes the origins of Vargas's ideology of *trabalhismo* (state-sponsored unionism). In doing so, she takes up some of the same themes covered by Pinheiro. Seeking to understand the process by which Brazilian workers received full political rights, Castro Gomes looks for the key in the pro-labor ideology that Vargas and his labor ministers articulated in the 1930s and early 1940s. In her view, the reason that the workers embraced *trabalhismo* was that it reflected their images of themselves as hard-working and therefore deserving of full citizenship and full participation in society. According to Castro Gomes, by co-opting the rhetoric of the early labor movement, Vargas was able to entice workers into his political camp (pp. 16–31).

The first two substantive chapters of the book document the connections between Vargas's *trabalhismo* and the ideologies of early Socialist and Anarchist groups. These chapters are closely argued and extremely well documented. For example, Castro Gomes uncovers the compatibility between many Socialist and Anarchist ideals, especially regarding citizenship. She demonstrates that although the Anarchists painted their opponents as "*amarelos*" (unionists beholden to employers), Anarchists shared the desire of Socialist and other labor leaders to establish workers' rights to unionize and to strike. Castro Gomes also differentiates carefully between Anarchist ideology on the ultimate organization of society following a social revolution and their pragmatic politics (pp. 85–137).

Next Castro Gomes details the connections between Vargas's *trabalhismo* and previous labor and leftist ideologies. Her careful research in a variety of primary sources (newspapers, government publications, and papers of Vargas and his ministers) reveals the complex construction of an official pro-labor ideology. In this regard, *A Invenção do Trabalhismo* makes an invaluable contribution to Brazilian political history. The limits of the study, however, manifest themselves in its application as social history. In the introduction, Castro Gomes states that she will analyze the process through which workers became political actors (p. 10). The problem is that the study only analyzes leadership discourses. Castro Gomes fails to address the relationship between the rank and file and leftist and (later) government unionists. A careful scholar, Castro Gomes acknowledges

7. On the PCB's opposition to strikes, see Leôncio Basbaum, *História Sincera da República de 1930-1960*, 4th ed. (São Paulo: Alfa-Omega, 1976), 182–85. The PCB's support of Vargas's corporatist structure and a call to suffer through the hard times is presented in João Amazonas, *Pelo Fortalecimento e Unidade Sindical* (Rio de Janeiro: Horizonte, 1945).

this failure in her analysis of Vargas's corporatist system. She notes that few Brazilian workers participated in the corporatist system in the 1930s and early 1940s and that the comprehensive 1943 campaign for unionization brought relatively few additional workers into the state-sponsored *sindicatos* (pp. 269–75).

Thus the primary strength of *A Invenção do Trabalhismo*—its analysis of labor and government discourses—also becomes its central weakness. Castro Gomes presents these discourses without relating them to their intended consumers—Brazilian workers. Nor does she address the relationship between Socialist and Anarchist groups on the one hand and the rank and file on the other, and she fails to analyze comprehensively how the popular classes reacted to radical and government labor ideologies. This problem is exacerbated by her exclusive focus on Rio de Janeiro, the only city in which the labor ministry operated effectively in those years. The labor ministry in the state of São Paulo did not even run the industrial relations system in the 1930s and 1940s (labor laws were administered by the state labor department), and the labor ministry referred to all areas other than Rio as “*o interior*.” Castro Gomes's original and provocative analysis should therefore be read along with studies that focus on the impact of *trabalhismo* on workers outside Rio.⁸

One problem shared by all the studies reviewed thus far is their tendency to view workers as some sort of undifferentiated “mass” that is available for mobilization or manipulation or both. Recent works by feminist scholars have begun to undermine this view. June Hahner's *Emancipating the Female Sex: The Struggle for Women's Rights in Brazil, 1850–1940* details various gender ideologies and their impact on Brazilian history, culminating with the struggle for women's voting rights in the 1920s and early 1930s. She focuses primarily on elite and middle-class women, and in doing so, she uncovers important differences between the women's suffrage movements and broad-based social movements. For example, Hahner points out that some working-class women participated in the middle-class *Federação Brasileira pelo Progresso Feminino*, but she also notes the limits on women's cross-class organizing (pp. 167–69). Such limitations left women without a powerful social movement with which to pressure Vargas in the 1930s to implement planks in the 1934 constitution guaranteeing equal rights for women.

The weakness of Hahner's book is its failure to depict the process of women's activism. By concentrating on telling the story of the suffrage movement (an important task in itself), Hahner glosses over fundamental aspects of Brazilian women's history. Nor does *Emancipating the Female Sex*

8. One such study details the weakness of Vargas's political machine in São Paulo. See Maria Victória Benevides, *O PTB e o Trabalhismo: Partido e Sindicato em São Paulo, 1945–1964* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1989).

provide an analytical framework for understanding this women's movement. One finds only a brief discussion of changing social mores,⁹ and Hahner presents gender as static. If gender is a set of ideologies delineating appropriate behavior for men and women, then political activism like that of the Brazilian suffrage supporters must have had some impact on gender. Hahner fails to analyze not only the changes in gender ideologies brought about by new technologies, foreign ideas, and other sources, but she does not address the question of how women's activism shaped popular notions about the appropriateness of such behavior.

These issues are confronted in Sonia Alvarez's analysis of women's struggles to create a broad-based feminist movement to oppose the military dictatorship in power from 1964 to 1985. Alvarez's *Engendering Democracy in Brazil: Women's Movements in Transition Politics* is the only work under review that attempts to integrate race, class, and gender in order to understand the complex relationships taking place within a social movement and also the relationship of social movements to other opposition groups and the state. Alvarez skillfully maneuvers among debates about transition politics, the use of gender analysis, and the problematic relationship that social movements often have with institutions like political parties and the state.

Engendering Democracy details one of the most fascinating aspects of Brazil's transition to civilian rule: the rise of a powerful feminist social movement. Alvarez carefully traces its development. She notes that women's opposition politics that called on established gender ideologies in challenging the dictatorship (Alvarez refers to this stance as "militant motherhood") were not feminist because such early politics did not "constitute deliberate attempts to push, redefine, or reconstitute the boundary between the public and the private, the political and the personal, the 'natural' and the 'artificial'" (p. 23). Various other factors combined to foster a feminist consciousness and a truly feminist social movement in the 1970s and early 1980s: middle-class and elite women's experiences in leftist political groups, influences from European feminism brought back by exiles, and the praxis of organizing poor women in the *favelas* of São Paulo and Rio.

Alvarez recounts the rise of the movement by analyzing both the establishment and radical presses. She also relies on a series of oral histories that she obtained from activists. This combination of sources allows her to paint a rich yet subtle picture of the women's movement in Brazil. Alvarez also uses these sources to scrutinize the gender politics of opposition parties. She concentrates on the Partido Movimento Democrático

9. Susan K. Besse provides a fascinating account of changing social mores for middle-class and elite Paulistanas in "Freedom and Bondage: The Impact of Capitalism on Women in São Paulo, Brazil, 1917-1937," Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983.

Brasileiro (PMDB) and the Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT) to reveal the problems that feminists continued to face in the 1980s. Her analysis of the PMDB shows the struggles women encountered when they pressured PMDB officials (such as São Paulo's Governor Franco Montoro) to implement campaign pledges they had made to satisfy recently mobilized women voters. Alvarez's discussion of the PT centers around the conflicts between leftist church activists and feminists within the party over issues like abortion.

Engendering Democracy will stand as one of the most innovative, challenging, and debated works on Latin American politics. Still, it suffers from a few noteworthy shortcomings. One problem with Alvarez's methodology is its concentration on the leadership cadre. The study obviously called for interviews with activists, but Alvarez seems to have concentrated her work on middle-class and elite women. Readers get little sense of the reactions of women in the favelas to these leaders. She discusses the problems experienced by leftist political groups in organizing among poor women, but she seems to assume that little or no tension existed within the growing women's movement along class and racial lines. This shortcoming is notable because Alvarez states in her introduction that she is seeking to integrate race, class, and gender analyses. Further, she examines the impact of middle-class women's politics on the popular classes but does not discuss how working-class women's ideas and experiences shaped the politics of their more prosperous sisters. Alvarez could have analyzed this issue had she conducted more interviews with poor women. But even with these limitations, *Engendering Democracy* remains a wonderful contribution.

The seven books reviewed here all address aspects of the creation, operation, and institutionalization of social movements and leftist political parties. Each has its particular strengths and weaknesses, but a few tendencies seem to characterize the lot. First, these books are about the leaders of movements rather than those who populate the movements.¹⁰ Even Alvarez falls back on discussing leadership cadres. Although studying the leaders of movements is necessary, it is important to know who made up the groups' grass roots. Also, scholars must begin to address the internal dynamics of social movements.¹¹ We need to know how and from among whom the leadership was chosen and what impact creating a formal leadership cadre and other forms of institutionalization has had on the movements.¹²

10. This problem does not affect Pinheiro's work because he does not attempt to analyze a social movement. Instead, he details some of the reasons why Brazilian workers ended up not joining the PCB.

11. Alvarez is careful to detail conflicts among feminist activists throughout her book.

12. For an informative analysis of the tension between grass-roots organizing and the process of institutionalization, see Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward, *Poor People's*

Equally important is the issue of popular-class consciousness and historical memory. Scholars tend to interpose artificially established methodological boundaries (such as periodizations) on historical experiences and then argue that individuals and their ideas fail to cross those boundaries. By concentrating on leadership ideologies and politics, such works fail to reveal other legacies of organization, resistance, and rebellion. For example, none of the seven authors discuss how historical memory of counterhegemonic ideologies, popular religion, and previous negotiating and protest activities may have shaped the relationships of workers and others to unions, feminist groups, and the state.¹³ The popular classes are too often presented as a blank slate upon which movement leaders can write opposition or state discourses.

In short, many scholars of Brazilian social movements have failed to address the methodologies and findings of the not-so-new “new social history.” This intellectual current tends to envision the popular classes—with their many cleavages according to sex, race, region, and other factors—as groups of individuals whose actions (within structures often not of their choosing) shape history. Such a focus has shifted attention away from elite and leadership discourses and concentrated analysis on workers, peasants, slaves, and other such sectors. Scholars of Brazilian social movements must begin to address the relationships that popular-class groups have had with elites, the state, and union and other leftist leaders.¹⁴ After all, a social movement is not a social movement because a narrow leadership cadre or state policymaker declared it to be so. A social movement is by definition an organized group of individuals who congregate to push for defined common goals. It is therefore time that we turn our attention to the people who make up these movements.

Movements: Why They Succeed and How They Fail (New York: Pantheon, 1977). See also Eric Hobsbawm's thoughtful critique in the *New York Review of Books*, 23 Mar. 1978, 44–50.

13. Students of urban social movements should also start to consider the impact of rural organizing and protest activities on individuals before they migrated to cities. Two recent studies of rural social movements are Todd A. Diacon, *Millenarian Vision, Capitalist Reality: Brazil's Contestado Rebellion, 1912–1916* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991); and Clifford Andrew Welch, “Rural Labor and the Brazilian Revolution in São Paulo, 1930–1964,” Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1990.

14. Two works in Latin American labor history that analyze the problematic relationship of the rank and file with union and political leaders are Peter Winn, *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); and Daniel James, *Resistance and Integration: Peronism and the Argentine Working Class* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).