

speaks so often that he cannot be expected to be original at all times. This particular contribution has not anything new in it but is good as intelligent constructive criticism of the United States and United States relations with Latin America.

Teodoro Moscoso, despite the constraints of public office, manages to state the goals of the Alianza straight-forwardly. His obvious faith in the possible contributions of improved education systems will find warm supporters in many circles.

Dean Rusk's contribution does him no credit. His last paragraph reads in part, "When we succeed in our Alliance . . . many will look back in later years and say with pride, 'I lived during the Alliance for Progress.' " Such sweetness and light sentiments may be fine for Mrs. Smith's address to her bridge club but not for a man who must confront the most dangerous enemy and the toughest problems that the United States has ever known. Earlier Rusk declares that "Our . . . destiny . . . is irrevocably joined to the destiny of our sister republics of the New World," which may be true, but I submit that our sister republics should be made to understand in firmer words than Rusk uses that if the hemisphere does not remain united they will suffer more than we will right up to the moment that our destiny is upon us. Elsewhere, Rusk cites ten examples—three in Mexico and none in Brazil—of outstanding achievements by individuals and groups in the various republics before the Alianza got under way. And he then writes "These and thousands of other examples serve to illustrate the range and effectiveness which is possible for public and private initiative within a free society." If these other thousands of examples actually exist the State Department should follow up with a list of them. Such a list would be useful for those of us who are at times at pains to defend private enterprise and public responsibility in Latin America.

This volume will be read by a relatively broad sector of the reading public. Dean Rusk is perfectly capable of tough mindedness. Why did he choose this occasion to make himself appear namby pamby?

Stanford University

JOHN J. JOHNSON

Historiografía soviética iberoamericanista, 1945-1960. By JUAN A. ORTEGA Y MEDINA. México, 1961. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Facultad de Filosofía y Letras. Seminario de Historiografía Mexicana Moderna. Notes. Pp. 193. Paper.

Related to the significance of Professor Juan A. Ortega y Medina's important contribution to Latin American historiography is an an-

nouncement in the April *Voprosy istorii* (Problems of History) of the recent opening of the Latin American Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The latter reflects a quickening concern among Soviet government leaders, strategists, and scholars for the problems of this realm. Disparaging the lack of Soviet publications specifically devoted to contemporary Latin American affairs, the announcement likewise calls for a crash program to "intensify to the maximum the study of Spanish and Portuguese in Soviet secondary schools, and the preparation in the shortest time possible of specialists not only in the history but also in the economic geography of Latin America."

The respected Mexican historiographer's volume of essays and interpretations of recent Soviet writings on Latin American history includes an extensive, interpretive introductory analysis of three long critique essays on Latin American historiography. The first essay, by Manfred Kossok, professor of history at universities in Berlin and Leipzig (Humboldt and Karl Marx), "Estado de la Historiografía Soviética referente a la América Latina," reviews a number of Soviet historical works published since 1945. Kossok notes that USSR historians have concerned themselves with five basic problems of Latin American history: 1) the significance of Spanish colonial rule in the general framework of European colonial expansion; 2) repercussions to the Spanish colonial system among indigenous peoples; 3) the function and position of the clergy in the Americas; 4) economic and ideological foundations of independence movements; 5) socio-revolutionary movements among the masses before and during the wars of independence.

The second essay, Iosif Romualdovich Lavretskii's Marxist-Leninist party-line, "Un análisis crítico de la *Hispanic American Historical Review* (1956-1958)" (*HAHR*, No. 3, August, 1960), receives relatively limited analysis from Ortega y Medina; he does note, however, referring to Lavretskii's article, that "Soviet historical interpretation, in accord with materialism, serves to justify Marxist-Leninist truths and conclusions reached by the CP USSR and its leaders. This interpretation of history is patent to all works of the Soviet Academy" (p. 17).

The third and most important essay is Ortega y Medina's "Crítica a la Crítica," a Mexican's views of several Soviet critique essays on the Mexican revolution. Two works are discussed: *La Revolución Mexicana* (Cuatro estudios soviéticos), Edic. de los Insurgentes, S.A., México 1960, 177 pp., and M.S. Al'perovich y B.T. Rudenko, *La Revolución Mexicana de 1910-1917 y la política de los Estados Unidos*, Fondo de Cultura Popular, México 1960, 344 pp. "Judging by the

four studies," states Sr. Ortega, "Soviet historiography presents a straightforward style: if you have read one author you have read them all. The tone is the same: monotonous, dry, anti-poetic, without any elevation or beauty whatsoever. It is bunched-up and cut-up; the language is for mass readers. It is plain, practical, and sometimes crude. But we believe that we would derive more if these writers showed a certain bit of aesthetic grace. As there are no disparities in the method, so are there none in the interpretation. The author voluntarily sacrifices his individuality to the effort of the whole—to the task of the team and thereby neutralizes his own personality. This manner of editing history is obedient, we believe, to two exigencies: methodology and politics" (p 25).

University of Arizona

J. GREGORY OSWALD

BACKGROUND

La iglesia de América en las Leyes de Indias. By RAFAEL GÓMEZ Hoyos, Pbro. Madrid, 1961. Instituto Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo in cooperation with the Instituto de Cultura Hispánica de Bogotá. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. 243. Paper.

This book, which was originally a thesis for the doctorate of canon law (Gregorian Pontifical University), was first published in Medellín, Colombia, in 1945. Since the first limited edition was typographically faulty, and out of print for a number of years, the high quality and value of the study itself called for a new edition. The extended availability of this scholarly work should contribute to a clearer understanding of the origins and nature of the *real patronato de las Indias*.

With respect to the origins of the *patronato*, the author takes careful notice of the various papal concessions to the Spanish kings, which resulted, either by clear grant or by interpretation, in the most complete union of altar and crown in the history of the Catholic Church. The royal jurisdiction was not confined to ecclesiastical persons and temporalities, but even encroached upon spheres of purely spiritual matters. For this reason it can be contended that the king was more than a patron in America; he exercised quasi-pontifical authority.

Because of the exceptional position of the king as veritable vicar of the Church, the Church in the Indies was founded, developed, and governed not by common canon law, but by a very special kind of law, the code of the Indies, the king's law issuing from his Council