

chapters, creating an unevenness of coverage and an impression of choppiness. There is a short index and bibliography. Those with limited library budgets may wish to pass this by, but it is a better addition to Latin American holdings than some of the many edited collections that keep appearing.

Tulsa University

I. E. CADENHEAD, JR.

*The Rockefeller Report on the Americas. The Official Report of a United States Presidential Mission for the Western Hemisphere.* By NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER. Introduction by TAD SZULC. Chicago, 1969. Quadrangle Books. Tables. Figures. Charts. Pp. x, 144. Paper. \$1.25.

In this survey Governor Rockefeller reports to President Nixon that on each of the four "saturation visits [more than 20] members of your mission were able to sit down and talk, as knowledgeable colleagues, with experts of all sorts on specific problems and to gain new sensitive insights on what could be done more effectively to achieve our common objectives." However, the pages of the report abound with mushy (rather than sensitive) expressions, sloppy (rather than common) assumptions, and statements which remain unintelligible or absurd, in and out of context.

The report claims to have "looked at the challenges and opportunities from the point of view of the hemisphere as a whole" (p. 15). What it does communicate effectively is the style and substance of recent U.S. policy regarding Latin America. For example, on p. 40, we find a recognition that "our style may often have more important effect than what we actually do in the hemisphere." Rockefeller illustrates his style by proclaiming: "There is no system in all of history better than our own flexible structure of political democracy, individual initiative, and responsible citizenship in elevating the quality of man's life" (p. 39).

Other quotations also give the flavor of the report: "The US cannot renege on its commitment to a better life for all of the people of the hemisphere, because of moral disagreement with regimes which the people themselves did not establish and do not control" (p. 59). "Many of our neighbors find it incomprehensible that the US will not sell them military equipment which they feel is required to deal with internal subversion" (p. 60). "Thus many military leaders in the other American republics see the US acting to hold them back as second-class citizens, and they are becoming increasingly estranged

from us at a time when their political role is on the rise. Our dilemma is how to be responsive to their legitimate desires for modern equipment without encouraging the diversion of scarce resources from development to armaments which, in some cases, may be unrelated to any real security needs" (p. 61). "In addition there is not in the US a full appreciation of the important role played by the police. There is a tendency in the US to equate the police in the other American republics with political action and repression, rather than with security" (pp. 61-62).

Rockefeller has much to say about training programs: "In view of the growing subversion against hemisphere government, the mounting terrorism and violence against citizens, and the rapidly expanding population [*sic*] it is essential that the training programs which bring military and police personnel from the other hemisphere nations to the US . . . be continued." The same training programs are mentioned earlier in an even more surprising context; speaking of the "new military," "will they become radicalized, statist and anti-US? In this connection, special mention should be made of the appeal to the new military, on a theoretical level of Marxism. 1) it justifies, through its elitist-vanguard theories, government by a relatively small group; . . . and 2) produces a rationale for state-enforced sacrifices to further economic development. One [and the only one mentioned] important influence counteracting this simplistic kind of Marxist approach is the exposure to the fundamental achievements of the US way of life that many military . . . receive through training . . . in Panama and the United States" (p. 33).

In addition to training programs, Rockefeller lays great stress on explicit economic policy which would permit a closer integration of the Latin American and US markets—and in evident contrast with his misleading statements about the actual size of US aid programs to Latin America. He says, for example, that "United States assistance has played a helpful role in hemisphere development; . . . the \$1 billion a year which represents the US commitment to the Alliance for Progress has made its contribution." But the Rockefeller report hides information contained in *House Report 143* ("New Directions for the 1970's: Towards a strategy of inter-American development," Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, July 22, 1969): "In fiscal year 1969, 98 percent of AID expenditures for goods financed with loans and grants extended to Latin America were tied to US procurement. While helping our neighbours we have helped ourselves. . . . Another point to be noted is that the American aid figure includes

\$1.4 billion of credits extended by the Export Import Bank. That Bank was created as a gift to a foreign country; if anything, the credits are an aid to American exporters. Our farm sector has not been neglected in the Alliance for Progress. We have moved nearly \$1.1 billion worth of farm commodities under our Public Law 480 program, selling about one-half of them to Latin America, either for dollars or for local currencies. . . .”

“Two additional points require attention: first, the net flow of US government assistance to the Alliance for Progress, after repayments and allowance for the undelivered goods, has amounted to \$4.1—rather than \$8.3 billion; and second, there has been a sharp decrease in US appropriations for the Alliance for Progress in recent years. Fiscal 1969 appropriations for the Alliance amounted to 64 percent of the average of the preceding years” (pp. 6-7).

The House resolution concludes: “As a result of those priorities, little of our aid had been visible to the masses of Latin American people. And little of it has been reflected in basic social and structural reforms, which are supposed to be the cornerstone of the Alliance for Progress. As a matter of fact, by being channeled largely through the central governments of Latin American countries, our aid in at least some instances, may have helped to stiffen resistance to change” (p. 7).

Considering the explicit statements of Rockefeller’s report on positive US policy for economic integration of the Hemisphere and military repression and his neglect to face up to the socio-economically destructive effects of current economic Hemisphere policy, the following statement from President Nixon appears in an ominous light: “This I pledge to you tonight; the nation that went to the moon in peace for all mankind is ready to share its technology in peace with its nearest neighbors.”

Centro Intercultural de Documentación

IVAN D. ILLICH

#### BACKGROUND

*Los señoríos independientes del imperio azteca.* By CLAUDE NIGEL BYAM DAVIES. México, 1968. Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. Serie Historia. Maps. Tables. Bibliography. Index. Pp. 257. Paper.

R. H. Barlow, in *The Extent of the Empire of the Culhua Mexica* (1949), was the first to deal specifically with the problem of enclaves