

Gordillo has written an intelligent book that attempts to explain the creation of a culture of resistance and confrontation in Córdoba in the period between the overthrow of Perón in 1955 and the Cordobazo of 1969. She does this not to explain the Cordobazo, the large worker-student riot that changed the fate of the Onganía regime, but to explain the radicalization that occurred in the Córdoba labor movement. Gordillo believes that to understand the radicalized perspective of the workers in the 1970s it is not enough to examine the nature of the dominant industry (automobile manufacturing). Here lies her principal difference with Brennan.

Gordillo focuses on the development of the ideological world of the workers, using both extensive written sources and numerous interviews. She looks at the national and local political scenes, as well as the nature of industry and work. She carefully examines the development of unions, both at the national level and in Córdoba. Among other points, she discusses their interaction with governmental structures, particularly their struggle to revive Peronism in a political system that had rejected it. Gordillo emphasizes the desire of the Córdoba unions to remain independent of Buenos Aires. She also examines the growth of the Left within political movements and inside the church. In Córdoba there existed considerable interaction between students and workers. The book ends with an interesting description of the Cordobazo drawn largely from the oral histories of participants.

This book is well done. The two criticisms that I have are contradictory in some ways. First, I would like to have seen an acknowledgment that radicalization was, in part, a worldwide phenomenon, especially among students, and that this undoubtedly contributed to what took place in Córdoba. Second, at times when discussing the workers' cultural and ideological world, the author relies too much on what happened in Buenos Aires rather than in Córdoba. Undoubtedly this reflects the nature of the secondary sources, but it is problematical.

Despite these caveats, Gordillo has written an interesting and important book that needs to be read by those interested in labor in Latin America, as well as by those interested in the tumultuous Argentina of the 1960s.

JOEL HOROWITZ, Saint Bonaventure University

*Los liberales reformistas: la cuestión social en la Argentina, 1890–1916.*

By EDUARDO A. ZIMMERMANN. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1995.

Notes. Bibliography. 250 pp. Paper.

The historiography of the 1960s and '70s—particularly that of the labor movement—was biased in its discussion of the Argentine state vis-à-vis the social question at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth. Predominant was a vision of the state as the clear executor of policies that specifically expressed the interests of a range of groups within the elite. According to this historiography, although there were many sectoral struggles at the moment of defining policies, the state functioned as a

bloc, inhibiting any relatively autonomous development of the political agenda of the elites. Thus, in confronting social conflicts, conservative governments did not offer anything new but instead took advantage of a state apparatus that was not only repressive, but also incapable of channeling social demands.

In the last few years, this approach has been revised from a variety of perspectives that go beyond labor history. *Los liberales reformistas* is part of this renewal. Its thesis points to the existence of a liberal reformist current that permeated both official history as well as the opposition during the years of the República Conservadora, and which at times coexisted with other reformist influences of a different ideological strain, such as socialism and social Catholicism. Similar to what had occurred in other countries—the Third French Republic, Spain under Canalejas, and even the labor policies of Theodore Roosevelt in the United States—liberal reformism was identified with the values of a “new liberalism” that recognized the need of an interventionist state, proposed a certain degree of social equality, promoted a communal ethic, and sought to present an alternative to the positions that upheld individualism or collectivism. According to Zimmermann, this reformist liberalism not only gave impetus to a political and institutional regeneration that would consolidate the principle of citizenship from above, but it also encouraged the development of strategies to confront the social question. This, in turn, led to the formation of groups, made up mostly of active professionals in the academy and politics, that argued for the application of social sciences to guide state policies in matters as diverse as social hygiene, immigration control, the regulation of labor relations, the construction of housing, and the exclusion of anarchism. In many of these initiatives, legitimacy was sought in other interventionist experiences at the international level.

This reconsideration of liberal reformism is a welcome addition to the historiography of the period. Zimmermann has written a clear, concise book, with a solid treatment of primary sources. My reservations are directed, however, to the disproportionate attention the author pays to the liberal current, which could indeed have marked the climate of ideas during this period, although it may not necessarily have shaped the concrete political practices of the conservative government nor generated legislation that was particularly relevant. An evaluation of the content of these social initiatives shows that while in some cases they can be attributed to liberal reformists, in many others they represent clear examples of conservative reformism.

Another issue to consider is the association of social reform with liberal reformism. Any definition of an ideological group is necessarily limited, and the one that Zimmermann offers of the liberal reformists is no exception. Perhaps for this reason many of the social initiatives put forth by the burgeoning specialized state bureaucracy—where other political ideological currents also existed—are presented as the legacy of liberal reformism. The social reformers were in fact a much more heterogeneous group, with many points of convergence, but also many differences. Given this heterogeneity, emphasis could be placed either on the commonalities or the differences. Zimmermann chose the first, and in that sense his contributions are timely. Had he also

emphasized the differences, he would have been able to reconstruct a more nuanced picture.

DIEGO ARMUS, Kean College

*Más allá de la pantalla: cine argentino, historia y política.* By ALBERTO CIRIA.

Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Flor, 1995. Photographs. Tables. Notes. xiii, 287 pp. Paper.

The author of this collection of essays, Alberto Ciria, is well known for his work on the history of twentieth-century Argentine politics. Here he adds personal reminiscences and his passion for the movies to political and cultural analysis in an interesting melange that is sometimes a bit too charming.

The book is arranged on the conceit that the essays are like films which make up a cinema bill. Ciria begins with a short subject, "Lo que el cine me enseñó." His approach is deliberately personal, even autobiographical, beginning with memories of his own childhood, growing up after the 1930s in a Buenos Aires apartment building on the ground floor of which was a movie theater specializing in Spanish films. Ciria's interest in films was encouraged by his father (who took him to see Spanish films), his mother and aunt (who preferred Argentine productions), his uncle (who was most interested in those from Hollywood), and, later, by friends (with whom he discovered French, Italian, Mexican, German, and Soviet cinematography).

In the book's first major section, and feature presentation, Ciria analyzes the Aries film production company through a reading of selected films made between 1956 and 1991, with special attention to the content and context of *El jefe* (1958), *La fiaca* (1968), *La Patagonia rebelde* (1974), *Plata dulce* (1982), and *La noche de los lápices* (1986), as well as a few picaresque comedies and police thrillers.

The next two essays (coauthored with Jorge M. López) fall under the title "Intervalo." Each provides a quick examination of the work and context of an internationally renowned Argentine film maker: Leopoldo Torre Nilsson (1924–78) and María Luisa Bemberg (1922–95).

The second major essay focuses on the aesthetics of the Argentine film industry and the world market constraints it confronted from 1983 to 1989. Ciria includes tables on foreign and domestic films' relative shares of the Argentine market and on the numbers of spectators who attended screenings of the most popular Argentine productions. These include not only films such as *Camila* (1984), *La historia oficial* (1985), and *Sur* (1988) that were acclaimed by foreign critics, but domestically popular productions like *Los Parchís contra el inventor invisible* (1981), *Los colimbas se divierten* (1986), and *Rambito y Rambón, primera misión* (1986). Unfortunately, since these totals seem to be summed strictly on the basis of calendar years, the totals do not accurately reflect the aggregate audience and relative ranking of films that were screened in two successive years.

For those insomniacs and night owls who choose to remain in their seats, the col-