

The volume leaves it a bit unclear, in my opinion, whether there is a bigger project of MST “territoriality” as an alternative to the state and corporate presence. That is, is the forging of new identities, perspectives, and alliances with other movements, including in urban areas, an intricate aspect of an intentional collective rethinking of the economic, social, political, and cultural model that offers prospects for significant changes within the state and in society? Are alternative models of territoriality being imagined in rural and urban settings, or does the MST’s engagement, close cooperation, mutual dependency, and constructive interaction with institutions (as summarized in the conclusion) render the movement’s strategy something that other movements also adopt as a tool in their own quest for inequality reduction and autonomy?

The chapters in part 4 (and the conclusion and epilogue) address this, in part. The MST’s work with recent governments (of Presidents Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Lula da Silva, as well as Dilma Rousseff) and through the courts to further the impact of land reform indicates a strong intent that new precedents be set that begin to shift the legislative and legal culture toward emphasizing the social function of land and territory, as George Mészáros suggests in his chapter on the MST and the rule of law.

In its summary of the impact of government-MST negotiations, it is interesting that the book ends by describing two paradoxes. The Workers’ Party leadership has, on the one hand, aligned with agribusiness and corporations, thus, on the other hand, forgoing the path toward a more constructive part in “advancing Brazil’s long-term and open-ended democratization process,” which the rural workers themselves have undertaken (424). The second paradox is that we are all at a particular crossroads in the context of climate change when it is important to pay much more substantive attention to adopting policies that emerge from the thinking and actions of the indigenous, peasant, family farmers and other sectors that fight for their dignity and earn their livelihood from the land. Alternative territoriality merits perhaps greater specificity in the aftermath of having “broken through the asphalt,” with an eye to maintaining the historical and comparative analyses.

Patricia Rodríguez
Ithaca College

J. Patrice McSherry, *Chilean New Song: The Political Power of Music, 1960s–1973*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 2015. Notes, index, 229 pp.; hardcover \$97.50, paperback \$44.95, ebook \$44.95.

In this book, Patrice McSherry argues that politically engaged musicians in mid-twentieth-century Chile acted as catalysts for many of the dramatic social and political changes that took place during this period. Based on a series of interviews with key protagonists of the New Song (*nueva canción*) movement in the 1960s, the book seeks to highlight ways that musical creativity and performance served to unite and mobilize people in a “common cause” (3). Her account weaves together extended excerpts from those interviews with descriptions of key historical changes that took

place at this time, including the rise of the popular Left in the 1960s and the election of the Popular Unity government of Salvador Allende before its deposition in a violent coup.

McSherry draws on the theories of Antonio Gramsci to argue that the New Song movement functioned in a counterhegemonic fashion, resisting the dominance of the right-wing establishment. For McSherry, New Song provided “an alternative to the coldness of capitalist market relations” (7) and expressed “critiques and visions silenced by the mass media” (9). McSherry emphasizes throughout that music possesses “innate political power,” reflected in its ability to bring people together, create a sense of “unity,” embody egalitarian forms of social life, and “tap human emotions and reach rational minds” (15). It is in these ways, she argues, that New Song can be seen to have exerted an influence on the political culture of Chile.

The book’s first chapter, “*La Nueva Canción* and Its Significance,” serves as an overview of the history of New Song provided by the study as a whole. McSherry describes the expansion of a “culture of participation” that arose in Chile in the 1960s in the face of inequality and class division (15), and contextualizes it in relation to Gramscian ideas of “hegemony” and “counterhegemony.” In the second chapter, “Art and Politics Intertwined in Chile: A Selected History,” the author provides a background for the development of *nueva canción*, tracing the emergence of the Chilean Communist Party and labor movement in the early twentieth century alongside a cultural movement toward the increasing valuation of traditions from the Chilean countryside. As McSherry points out, this trend was encouraged by Chilean government institutions under the Popular Front regime in the 1940s in order to stimulate a sense of national identity (33). It was in this context that Violeta Parra, an iconic figure for Chilean New Song artists, began to operate, collecting folk songs and integrating them into a novel compositional style.

Chapter 3, “The Emergence of *la Nueva Canción Chilena*,” picks up this narrative in the mid-twentieth century, as musicians reacted against the foreign music, such as rock and roll, boleros, and tango, which began to dominate mainstream radio in the 1950s. Both Neofolklore and New Song—genres that drew on musical traditions from, or associated with, the Chilean countryside—are placed into this broader context. As McSherry describes in this chapter, at the end of the 1960s, the term *New Song* was coined, and the artists associated with it, like Victor Jara, Inti Illimani, Quilapayún, and Violeta Parra’s children Ángel and Isabel, along with a number of activists from the political left, began to organize meetings, set up music labels, and record and distribute albums. Particularly interesting is the material on DICAP, a label created by activist organization La Jota to record and distribute politically engaged music, and how those running this label negotiated divisions on the left over armed revolution (73–74).

The book’s fourth chapter, “*La Nueva Canción* and the Unidad Popular,” examines New Song musicians’ activities under the Allende regime (1970–73), when Chile saw, according to McSherry, a “flowering of cultural activity” (87). Countering voices suggesting that there was a “creative crisis” among New Song musicians during this period, the author argues that it actually witnessed “an ava-

lanche of unforgettable, beautiful and enduring classics” of the genre, chief among which was Victor Jara’s 1972 album *La Población* (104–6). The following chapter, “Politically Committed Artists and Their Music,” interrupts the linear historical trajectory of the book, focusing in greater depth on the personal experiences of New Song musicians and activists over a greater span of time. In this chapter, McSherry intersperses a number of brief discussions of the scholarly literature on music and politics, linking them to the interview excerpts she employs. (There are almost 20 such excerpts in this chapter, some of which are over a page long). Such an approach allows her to set New Song musicians in dialogue with this literature; indeed, McSherry appears to have conducted some of her research with this in mind; for instance, directly asking her consultants what they felt about some of Mark Matern’s (1998) arguments concerning music. This leads McSherry to critique Matern, charging that he understands music in an excessively instrumental fashion and fails to recognize what she describes as the “magic of music” (127).

Chapter 6, “Musical and Political Contributions of *la Nueva Canción*,” functions as an effective summary of the arguments made in the book. Here McSherry argues that New Song “transformed the culture of Chile” in a number of ways (152). It “embodied an alternative worldview” and raised political awareness (156–57); furthermore, it gave “voice to the voiceless” and unified people “in a common struggle” (157–58). New Song compositions and performances served “as an innovative means of popular social communication,” helped to “democratize” Chilean culture, and “formed a permanent part of Chile’s cultural patrimony and heritage” (158–59). In all these ways, McSherry concludes, New Song “wrote a new page in the political and cultural history of Chile” (165). Nevertheless, this transformation was short-lived, since, as detailed in the final chapter, “The Coup and Its Aftermath,” the Pinochet regime that deposed Allende banned New Song and suppressed many other forms of popular culture. This situation drove New Song underground and led to the emergence of *canto nuevo*, a genre similar to New Song that tended to contain coded subversion rather than overt political gestures (177).

McSherry writes in a clear and engaging style, and the book is highly accessible to the general reader. As mentioned, McSherry weaves a narrative built heavily on interviews with New Song musicians themselves, and often cites them at length. Some of these interviews constitute revealing, valuable sources for understanding the nuances of the New Song movement, such as that conducted with Juan Carvajal, who points to ways that disagreements among the left about armed struggle occasionally led to “self-censorship” among musicians (73).

These merits notwithstanding, for this reader *Chilean New Song* also contains some shortcomings worth mentioning. To begin with, McSherry often tends to reiterate what her interviewees told her, instead of analyzing this discourse critically or (perhaps) inquiring about the relationships between musicians’ own rhetoric and their interests and social positions.

Furthermore, the book’s thesis, that Chilean New Song represented a counter-hegemonic form of expression, little reflects the complexity of the story actually told here. It sometimes appears that the terms *hegemonic* and *counterhegemonic* (or *dom-*

ination and resistance) are used as respective synonyms for *right-wing* and *left-wing*. The end result is that on occasion, it seems that this theoretical framework can little account for New Song musicians' exerting power themselves. For instance, when describing how Victor Jara "brought a sense of discipline to the young musicians of Quilapayún," the author makes sure to state that Jara nonetheless "never imposed himself" (151). As many authors have demonstrated, the act of "bringing discipline" may itself be considered a means of exerting control—and often occurs by means of imposition or coercion—but the model of domination and resistance used here leaves little room for the recognition of subtler forms of power.

Although the book succeeds, in general, in linking Chilean New Song to its broader political context, it sometimes leaves the reader to do a lot of work to make this connection. McSherry opts to provide extended accounts of political developments in the 1960s and 1970s alongside descriptions of the emergence of a New Song scene, often without integrating the two. This reflects the reality that linking cultural and political analysis is a great challenge for contemporary scholarship, and McSherry, a political scientist, is to be lauded for taking on this project. Students of politics may find *Chilean New Song* an interesting introduction to the topic; in particular, it makes the case well for the titular "political power of music." Students of music, meanwhile, may wish to read it alongside some of the work of popular music scholar Jan Fairley (e.g., 2014, 13–58).

Andrew Green
Institute of Musical Research
University of London

REFERENCES

- Fairley, Jan. 2014. *Living Politics, Making Music: The Writings of Jan Fairley*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Mattern, Mark. 1998. *Acting in Concert: Music, Community, and Political Action*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Bruce M. Bagley and Jonathan D. Rosen, eds., *Colombia's Political Economy at the Outset of the Twenty-First Century: From Uribe to Santos and Beyond*. New York: Lexington Books, 2015. Figures, tables, notes, bibliography, index, 354 pp.; hardcover \$100, ebook \$99.99.

In early March 2016, Colombia's president, Juan Manuel Santos, traveled to Washington, DC to celebrate the success of Plan Colombia, the counternarcotics initiative launched under the Clinton Administration. On a stage at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, President Santos detailed his country's progress from a "failed state, a state in a defensive situation" to one on the verge of achieving a negotiated peace with the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC). President Santos touted his country's successes in building strong political institutions, an economy that was outperforming most others in Latin America, and progress in human rights and poverty alleviation, thanking the American people