

Nixon years than of admittedly hardline policies directed towards some other Latin American regimes. Certainly Secretary of State William Rodgers' declaration that "the Nixon administration was a 'business administration' in favor of business and its mission was to protect business," (p. 89), is evidence of a less than subtle, sophisticated approach to U.S.-Chilean relations, 1970-1973. But it is not evidence of any direct causal relationship.

The book is extensively documented; nearly a quarter of its 217 pages consists of appendix and notes, but an overwhelming amount of documentation comes from English-language newspapers and published secondary sources. Extensive, selective use of the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* stories is no substitute for scrutiny of available Chilean materials.

In sum, this is a one-sided version of a tragic episode. It does not offer any new interpretations, nor is it convincing in its attempt to blame the United States for Allende's downfall.

Portland State University

FREDERICK M. NUNN

*Latin America: The Struggle with Dependency and Beyond.* Edited by RONALD H. CHILCOTE and JOEL C. EDELSTEIN. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1974. Schenckman Publishing Company. Maps. Tables. Figures. Glossary. Bibliography. Pp. xii, 781. Cloth.

This book represents the first survey of Latin American history written from the perspective of dependency theory. Five political scientists, five sociologists, and one historian have contributed to this hefty tome, which treats six countries with much more depth and scope than the average textbook. Guatemala, Mexico, and Argentina have been chosen as examples of pre-1960 conservative Latin American society, while Brazil, Chile, and Cuba represented new directions within the region before September 1973.

The editors contend that dependency is more than a theory, but a "defining characteristic" of the Third World. Foreign capitalist penetration is the principal cause of underdevelopment in Latin America. Only through its complete elimination can these countries independently develop new internal structures and regularize their relations with industrialized nations. Neither the Cuban nor the Chilean revolution is singled as the only way to break these dependent relationships, but the editors foresee the inevitable demise of capitalism and the eventual creation of a classless, egalitarian socialist society.

Unfortunately, for this reviewer, the introduction, in which the diffusion and dependency models of development are analyzed, is the weakest part of the entire book. In their effort to simplify their explanation of dependency theory, the editors have, in fact, oversimplified their historical analysis, particularly colonial economic patterns and institutions. Their continual reliance on the writings of André Gunder Frank is hard to explain, after they admit his analyses, for some unknown reasons, are incomplete. The introduction also suffers from a lack of logical development. On the one hand, they inadequately discuss diffusionist literature as a whole, while, on the other hand, they append sections that are peripheral or repetitive. For example, the discussion of the works of Pablo González Casanova, José Luis Imaz, and Aníbal Quijano only reiterates previous analyses of the role of dual societies, national bourgeoisie, and ruling classes in development.

The chapters on Guatemala and Mexico, by Susanne Bodenheimer Jonas and James Cockcroft, more closely follow the dependency model developed by Frank than any of the other chapters. Thus, both authors are forced to insist that the pre-Hispanic societies were “developed” civilizations in terms of class structure, level of culture, prosperity, and agricultural technology, and that the Spanish conquest brought nothing but exploitation and the seeds of “underdevelopment.” Probably the history of Guatemala before the revolution of 1944 more closely fits the dependency model than any other country, with the possible exception of Cuba, because of its monocrop economy. Jonas contends the Revolution from 1944 to 1954 was an urban petty bourgeois movement, supported by only a small number of politicized peasants and urban workers.

The Revolution of 1910 becomes the major focus of Cockcroft’s chapter on Mexico. Rather than a classically bourgeois (antifeudal) revolution, he interprets it as “an explosive confrontation between proletarians and capitalists, with heavy anti-foreign overtones” (p. 251). The enlightened bourgeoisie, including Madero, Carranza, and Obregón, took control of the Revolution by granting concessions to the proletariat, which constituted the major fighting forces. The real role of the workers and peasants in the Revolution, however, is never fully developed. Misdevelopment of the Revolution is due essentially to four factors: the prevalence of a capitalist social structure in 1910 dominated by a dependent bourgeoisie, the isolation of urban and rural revolutionary movements, the opportunism of labor movements, and the role of the United States in supporting the enlightened bour-

geoisie. To demonstrate the growing dependence of Mexico's emerging state capitalist system, Cockcroft stresses the developmentalist and capitalist nature of the Cárdenas régime. In view of the recent literature published on this subject, this interpretation of Cárdenas as the champion of the national bourgeoisie is particularly important.

Juan Eugenio Corradi and Theotonio Dos Santos have probably contributed the two best chapters of the book on Argentina and Brazil. They more successfully analyze the superstructural elements of a "modernizing" dependent society. Corradi concentrates on the consolidation of the landed bourgeoisie and the contrasting weakness of the industrial bourgeoisie before and after the rise of Peronism. Dos Santos demonstrates his expertise in weaving into his narrative the role of ideology in the packaging and merchandising of "modernization." Perhaps the most significant sections of both these chapters cover the controversial 1960s, when military régimes set the stage for the widespread penetration of multinational companies.

The chapter on Chile by Marcelo Cavarozzi and James Petras begins by describing the three stages of economic dependency experienced by Chile since the late nineteenth century and how they have differed from those experienced in Brazil and Argentina. A summary of political movements up to 1970 follows closely the organization of Petras' earlier book. In an epilogue written for *Ramparts* by Betty and James Petras after the 1973 coup, the successes and failures of the Allende régime are summed up. The authors conclude that his overthrow was principally caused by the unwillingness of the middle class to accept the régime after 1972, Allende's cooperative attitude towards his worst enemies, the military, and the political polarization of society into two armed camps, immeasurably helped by U.S. intervention, which paralyzed the economy.

The final chapter on Cuba by Donald Bray and Timothy Harding concentrates on Castro's pluralist and egalitarian approach to socialism. Although the brief history of prerevolutionary conditions is clear and succinct, it carefully avoids making any reference to the Communist Party and the reasons for its uneasy relations with the July 26th Movement. The claim that the July 26th Movement was basically a working-class movement, desirous of bringing about the total transformation of Cuban life, will undoubtedly be questioned. The comprehensive and balanced treatment of Castro's revolutionary programs from agrarian reforms to health care is the greatest strength of the chapter.

Bradley University

HEATHER FOWLER SALAMINI