

To sum up, the trajectory of trade unionism at the CSN has everything to do with politics, even electoral politics, which are present in Dinius's description but not his analysis. During a tumultuous era of presidential resignations and suicides, military interventions, and close elections, the CSN was engaged in efforts to control the levers of local, state, and federal power. This effort intensified as new steel companies emerged, among them COSIPA, also state-owned, in Santos, São Paulo. In *Operários em luta* by Braz José de Araújo (1985), the triangular relationship between COSIPA, labor, and government is the key to the strengthening of the union prior to the 1964 military coup. Going further, Araújo notes that even union victories did not necessarily represent defeats for management. This suggestion is echoed by Regina Luz Moreira's brief description of the 1952 contract signed shortly after Getúlio Vargas's return to power. Hailed by Dinius as transformative, the agreement did contain "conquests" for workers, she writes in her book *CSN* (2000), but it also served as leverage for the CSN's attempt to convince the federal government to authorize price increases for steel.

In its wide-ranging research and emphasis on industrial and labor relations, Dinius's work has the admiration of this reviewer. However, I am saddened that forced interpretations have been combined with willful blindness to the work of Brazilian scholars who might have helped direct a promising project along more productive lines.

Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

JOHN D. FRENCH

NATION-BUILDING AND NATIONALISM

Mexicans in Revolution, 1910–1946: An Introduction. By William H. Beezley and Colin M. MacLachlan. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009. Pp. viii, 189. Illustrations. Notes. Index. \$20.00 paper.

It never fails to impress when two prolific historians are able to come together and compose an effectual analysis of a complex moment like the Mexican Revolution and do so with elegant economy. William Beezley and Colin MacLachlan's *Mexicans in Revolution, 1910–1946: An Introduction* is an accessible primer to one of the most important events of Mexico's twentieth century. Their arguments are not new, but they ably clarify what is often clouded by discordant interpretations. "The first social revolution of the twentieth century," they explain, "mobilized the majority of the nation's people in a campaign to make the good life lived by the Porfirian elites available to everyone" (p. 11). Overall, Beezley and MacLachlan contend that what began as a political revolution wrought by disunity and regionalism evolved into a social revolution that forged unity through cultural nationalism and a relatively better existence for most Mexicans by the middle of the century.

Keeping in line with more traditional histories of the Mexican Revolution, the first chapter offers the requisite assessment of the Porfiriato as well as elucidation of the

more familiar revolutionaries: Francisco Madero, Venustiano Carranza, Álvaro Obregón, Pancho Villa, and Emiliano Zapata. It is in the next five chapters, however, where the authors make headway by adapting updated approaches and recent contributions to the historiography of the revolution. Beezley and MacLachlan go beyond the orthodox endpoint of the Constitution of 1917 to devote considerable focus to the period of consolidation during the twenties and thirties under Plutarco Elías Calles and Lázaro Cárdenas. Their attention is directed mainly toward the political: the ambitious jockeying in presidential elections, the emergence of institutionalized corporatism between party functionaries and peasant confederations, and, more importantly, the growth of labor unions. They also demonstrate that the period also witnessed the construction of a revolutionary nationalist ideal through a common cultural identity.

Mexicans in the Revolution should be praised for its efficiency and clarity, especially in light of its relatively wide scope. A little shy of two hundred pages, its value lies in the authors' ability to navigate deftly the well-known yet perplexing transformations in the country—from the downfall of the president-dictator, through a protracted, chaotic and violent period of revolutionary factionalism, and into an even longer (and perhaps more important) period of political formation and consolidation. For example, the authors' appraisal of the Partido Nacional Revolucionario's drive in the 1920s to incorporate "all revolutionary groups" through "an all-inclusive ideology" lends well to explaining the party's electoral hegemony throughout the century (p. 87).

The book's title is somewhat deceiving, as if to suggest that it is wholly a popular history of ordinary Mexicans' participation in their revolution. While the authors afford this constituency time and space, the greater part of the text is concerned with the more noteworthy historical actors. Somewhat de-emphasized is the argument of martyrdom that came to support heroes like Villa and Zapata by the 1930s; the latter is hardly mentioned again after the first chapter. The authors' continuous appraisal of the role of the United States during the motley events of this saga may cause some concern, but is probably included to satisfy the authors' intended audience of North American students. Oddly, and perhaps most disappointingly, the authors have chosen to limit their discussion of agrarian reform to a few small paragraphs buried here and there through the middle of the text. They argue that urbanization shifted the focus away from the countryside, but have difficulty reconciling this with the scale of redistribution during the Cárdenas *sexenio*.

Both students of history and the lay reader would benefit from reading *Mexicans in the Revolution*. Its brevity, combined with its clear analytical review of the major transformations and developments through the period, would provide a useful roadmap in undergraduate or graduate level courses. Beezley and MacLachlan provide an updated introduction to the Mexican Revolution that diligently addresses the formative post-1917 years that shaped the country's modern politics, economics, society, and culture, and do it in such a way as to demonstrate the schismatic but nonetheless unifying endeavors of Mexicans in their revolution.

Central Michigan University
Mount Pleasant, Michigan

FRANK J. KLACKLE