

cynicism. The book offers much-needed nuance to our understanding of citizenship and democracy, giving voice to the skepticism and ambivalence with which even active grassroots leaders approach politics. The ways in which low-income Brazilian women strategically chose to identify with and invest in the Workers' Party discourses just as the party was rising to national dominance reveals their sophisticated and cautious political analysis, critical of a political project that purported to center them while leaving poverty and social exclusion largely intact.

The "cynicism" of these grassroots leaders, critiquing the "*papo furado*" (bogus discourse) (4) of Brazilian democracy at a time that it was broadly celebrated and held up as a model around the world, demonstrates the importance of centering the voices of ordinary citizens through the lenses of gender, class, race, and place. Although Junge at times substitutes his own "inferences" for the voices of his interlocutors (14-15) and centers himself in explaining their motivations (93), he nevertheless provides invaluable insights into the nuance and complexity of democracy by foregrounding the voices of ordinary citizens who are "simultaneously active and cynical" (7).

In many ways, Junge's interlocutors sounded the alarm about the limitations of the Workers' Party political project, foreshadowing the severe strain Brazilian democracy would subsequently endure, engendered by "weariness and loss of faith in the capacity for progressive reform initiatives . . . to bring about the society and citizens envisioned in the official discourse" (111).

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
yanilda@uchicago.edu

YANILDA GONZÁLEZ

Politics in Uniform: Military Officers and Dictatorship in Brazil, 1960–1980. By Maud Chirio. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2018. Pp. xii, 280. Photographs. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$28.95 paper.
 doi:10.1017/tam.2020.88

Several books have been written about the Brazilian military, and today some of those books are considered classics in the literature, for example, Walder de Góes's *O Brasil do General Geisel*, Hélio Silva's *O poder militar*, and Alfred Stepan's *Rethinking Military Politics: Brazil and the Southern Cone*. Most of the books discuss the Brazilian military and its coup d'état as a homogenous event devoid of any opposition to the top brass in the aftermath of the March 31, 1964 putsch that overthrew the government of João Goulart. Maud Chirio provides readers with a fresh interpretation of the events that transpired in 1964. Her hypothesis is that the lack of any real military resistance and, indeed, the confidence and enthusiasm with which the overwhelming majority of

officers regarded the overthrow of João Goulart's government played a major role. She also argues that the building of this consensus, which conflicted with the constitutional requirements of the military institution, began not long before the coup, that is, later than 1961 (17).

Writing from a bottom-up rather than a top-down perspective, Chirio tells the story of young captains, majors, and colonels who believed they deserved to participate in the exercise of power. From a top-down perspective, a respect for discipline and complete abstinence from political activity was demanded of lower-ranking officers, while their commanders ran the highest functions of state. As Orlando Geisel, Army Minister of the Third Military Government, stated during a meeting of the Army High Command, "We [the Armed Forces] must project the image that we do not think about politics" (11). While the officers of '64 thought of themselves and their army as an "apolitical" institution, Brazil's political history is nothing but a footnote to the importance of the military in shaping the nation's future. The Brazilian army has always exercised its "*poder moderador*" (moderating power) when the nation's core values are under attack, according to its perspective. Brazil's core values are family values, defense of the country's Judeo-Christian traditions, and an adamant opposition to Marxism, a cause to which João Goulart was accused of being sympathetic.

Those officers who opposed President Castelo Branco, a general, used two tools to express their dissatisfaction with the regime, namely, military inquiries (the IPMs) and LIDER. The "IPM colonels" were the figureheads of an organized military opposition to Castelo Branco, which for several months had been presenting a "revolutionary" alternative (75). LIDER was another group opposed to Castelo Branco. LIDER officers adopted the rhetoric of Admiral Silvio Heck: economic nationalism and the "authenticity" of a radical revolution (75). Even LIDER, despite its opposition to Castelo Branco, was not a monolithic organization. Within the organization, there were several military traditions and factions which attempted to advance the "authenticity" of a radical revolution. One advantage LIDER officers held over the IMP colonels is that many of them were reserve military personnel and thus less liable to disciplinary actions than their serving colleagues (78).

As the Brazilian military consolidated its grip on the soul of the nation, organized actors resistant to the generals continued to advance their own agenda. Among these was the "first hard line," who lived behind the scenes, the developing agencies of political repression, right-wing paramilitary and terrorist groups, and the captains' generation (99). While other books treat the Brazilian military as a coherent and apolitical organization, Chirio's book presents it as an institution wherein the "subversion of the hierarchy" started right from the beginning of the 1964 coup. As Chirio points out, "defining the revolutionary idea was the leitmotif of military protest" (89).

I recommend this book to anyone interested in Latin American Studies or Brazilian history. Chirio presents a fresh outlook on the history of the 1964 coup, telling it from

the perspective of those officers directly involved in the coup and their dissatisfaction with the direction and consolidation of the revolutionary hard-liners. As she argues, “the history in this book is a history of the vanquished, of the middle ranking officers who were not able to prevent the consolidation of a hierarchical military regime despite their past, their involvement in the state apparatus, or even a ‘spirit of the times’ that occasionally looked kindly on actions by reform-minded junior officers” (239-40).

Georgia Southern University
Savannah, Georgia
US Army War College
Carlisle, Pennsylvania
jdacruz@georgiasouthern.edu

JOSÉ DE ARIMATÉIA DA CRUZ

CHILE

Science and Environment in Chile: The Politics of Expert Advice in a Neoliberal Democracy. By Javiera Barandiarán. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2018. Pp. 261. \$90.00 cloth; \$32.00 paper.
 doi:10.1017/tam.2020.89

This timely and important study uses four environmental conflicts and their respective environmental impact assessment (EIA) processes to examine the politics of expertise, science, and environmental protection in neoliberal Chile. Barandiarán argues that Chile’s “umpire state,” unlike an “empire” state with the power and resources to “make the world it wants to govern” (James Scott, *Seeing Like a State*), is “rooted in the belief that markets aggregate and process information better than governments, which cannot possibly know everything necessary to manage the economy” (6). This umpire state model, combined with the subsidiary principle established in Chile’s constitution—the state may do only what the law expressly permits, and private entities may do all that which is not expressly prohibited by law—has created a situation in which who does science, what counts as science, and how science should be used in policy-making are wholly unresolved and contested questions.

The consequences of the market-driven umpire state are manifold, from anemic public funding for science, a lack of agreed-upon standards for scientific research, and unclear boundaries between scientists and industry consultants. Barandiarán finds that Chileans suspect both state- and industry-sponsored science of being tainted by financial and political conflicts of interest, even as the primacy of market ideology has led to the belief that “the amount of funding drives legitimacy, so that good science is expensive science” (123). The devaluation of science and lack of consensus on scientific standards, combined with layers of distrust and tension between scientists, consultants, government, and the general public, have marginalized science and scientists from policy-making, development debates, and responses to environmental crisis.