women never separated themselves from the general opposition and it emerges from the examples she cites in the book that their whole style of protest was completely different. Moreover the discussion of the Spanish case is based more on the personal experience of the author than on a thorough research process. As I have already indicated, the Spanish case is so different that it cannot support the general arguments of the book. Less emotion and more rigid analysis would have made this book essential reading about social movements and direct action.

Tamar Groves

Tel Aviv University & UNED, Madrid


Argentina’s prominent radical rightists, or Nationalists, have attracted considerable scholarly attention. Most of the studies of this political movement analyze the writings of a handful of male intellectuals who figured among its leaders. Only a few researchers have examined the beliefs and practices of the majority of Nationalist men and women, and Federico Finchelstein has joined them. His work also marks a new and welcome direction in the historiography of Nationalism. Stanley Payne, Emilio Gentile, George Mosse and many other experts on fascism have pointed to its emphasis on myths, ceremonies and symbols, but Argentinists have not followed their lead. Ronald Dolkart alluded to the “myth of September” that Nationalists created to celebrate the revolution of 1930 and General José F. Uriburu’s place in this myth. Cristián Buchrucker also referred briefly to the myth that sprang up around this leader, who died shortly after leaving office in 1932. Taking up this topic and adding the perspective of historical memory, Finchelstein is the first to explore at length how Argentine Nationalists employed myth and ritual.

Although Uriburu did not easily fit the image of a strong charismatic leader, his Nationalist admirers regarded him as such. No doubt the fact that he was no longer alive made it easier for them to do so. Those loyal to Uriburu and his ideas shared his manly traits by association. Thus the cult of Uriburu helped spark community among Nationalists, which they saw as one of virile men.

One way of expressing their masculinity was through violence. By shouting “Long Live Uriburu” while attacking their opponents in the streets, Nationalists tied themselves to his mythic heroism. Fabricated by a Nationalist writer, the imaginary pest killer “Uriburol” would clean the country of the Marxists, Radicals, Jews and other infestations. Nationalists extolled their comrades who
perished in combat, which they saw as regenerative and purifying. These martyrs shared Uriburu’s presumed Christian virtues and quasi-religious crusade, one that represented much more than politics as usual. In this sense, Nationalists seemed to echo the Spanish and Romanian fascists who cried “Long Live Death!”

Finchelstein cites as many different voices as possible, including those of women. Female Nationalists dedicated poems to Uriburu, wept at his grave and displayed his photo in their homes. Uriburu’s widow donated his personal possessions to several museums, thus helping create spaces of memory. Women of the Legión Cívica Argentina, the most important Nationalist group of the early 1930s, marched to his tomb and adorned it with flowers. They illustrated both the conservative and radical sides of fascism: the flowers representing a traditional construction of feminine softness, beauty and purity, while the marching hinted at new and militarized roles for women. Yet in reality Nationalists retained and reinforced existing gender models, and women played only a subsidiary role in this hyper-masculine movement. Even so, their participation demonstrated the many forms of political engagement in the dawning age of mass politics.

Various political groups contested the memory of Uriburu. Radicals and socialists claimed that Uriburu and the revolution of 1930 lacked the transcendent qualities Nationalists assigned to them. Some socialists also declared that Nationalists were too hasty in declaring Uriburu a hero; one had to await historical judgment. Interestingly, both radicals and Nationalists experienced politics through the memory of their fallen leaders, Yrigoyen and Uriburu, respectively.

The myth of Uriburu offers a lens through which to view the relationship between Nationalism and the Catholic Church. Nationalists appropriated Catholic spaces to celebrate the myth. They held masses in honor of the general and posted announcements of Nationalist activities at church exits. These services served as preludes to Nationalist marches, meals and other events. Such acts affirmed Nationalist ties to the Church and thus helped legitimize the movement. They also reinforced the notion of Uriburu’s Christian virtues, an essential element of the myth. What the Nationalists regarded as his martyrdom and self-sacrifice made him further akin to Christ, in their view. The myth of Uriburu heralded the union of the military and the Church, which characterized Argentina in the late 1930s and 1940s. The Church’s acceptance of the Nationalists’ use of religion for political purposes demonstrated its willingness to overlook its principles, perhaps for its own political reasons.

Finchelstein sheds light on the relationship between fascism and conservatism, movements that overlapped and nourished each other yet also parted ways. Both Nationalists and conservatives appropriated the myth of Uriburu, but for their own respective reasons. Conservatives appeared alongside Nationalists at
commemorative events and facilitated the renaming of streets and other locations to honor the former president. Yet many Nationalists scorned their presence, blaming conservatives for tilting Argentina back toward a corrupt liberalism they abhorred. Conservatives celebrated the coup of September 1930 because it helped reinstall them in power, and Uriburu’s sole importance for them was the fact that he had led it. For Nationalists, however, Uriburu was a mythic figure embodying very different political aims.

The author points out that not all Nationalists partook of the myth. Rodolfo and Julio Irazusta, Manuel Gálvez and H. V. Passalaqua Eliçabe were notable exceptions. One wonders what Leopoldo Lugones’s position was. In 1931 he joined the Irazustas in the shortlived Acción Republicana, which advocated economic nationalism and at least implicitly criticized Uriburu’s policies. On the other hand, in 1933-34 Lugones headed Guardia Argentina, one of many attempts to bring Nationalists together under one umbrella, and he may have utilized the myth to forge unity and present himself as Uriburu’s heir.

Finchelstein analyzes photographs, documents from Uriburu’s archive and Nationalist publications. He utilizes insights from a wide range of secondary studies on fascism, ritual and historical memory. His imaginative use of these sources helps make his book the most exciting, original and creative one to date on Argentine Nationalism.

Sandra McGee Deutsch

University of Texas, El Paso


Marta Traba es un personaje tan rico como difícil de asir. Puede ser pensada como crítica de arte, intelectual latinoamericanista, escritora de géneros diversos, pintora, organizadora cultural y, en el más despersonalizado e infeliz de los casos, “esposa de” Ángel Rama. Cada una de estas aristas conduce a partes de una trayectoria vital e intelectual compleja y controvertida. Las obras aquí comentadas eligen caminos disímiles a la hora de dar cuenta de este itinerario.

La compilación de Ana Pizarro entrega una visión fragmentaria de Marta Traba en cuanto el libro se compone de seis ponencias que forman parte de un Coloquio en torno a la obra de la autora en el Wellesley College, Estados Unidos (1998). Los trabajos reunidos son: “Marta Traba, la transgresión” de Ana Pizarro, “Meditaciones en torno al sur” de Marjorie Agosín, “Sujeto mujer y gobierno