

includes seven pieces dealing with economic and social-political conditions on a regional basis. The second, "Class and Class Conflict," has ten short articles on the political role of specific functional groups (the military, industrialists, miners, etc.), mainly but not always within the context of a single country. The third section, "Development and Politics," contains six case studies. One is a general commentary by Oscar Delgado on "Revolutions, Reform, Conservatism," and the rest individual country studies. The three sections are related to each other by a short but adequate general introduction and by commentaries of the editors before each contribution.

As a collection of important Latin American writings on development problems, this book would be a contribution at any reasonable price. At the paperback price of less than a dollar it is a real bargain.

University of Illinois

ROBERT E. SCOTT

Régis Debray and the Latin American Revolution. Edited by LEO HUBERMAN and PAUL M. SWEEZY. New York, 1968. Monthly Review Press. Notes. Pp. 138. \$5.00.

Régis Debray's *Revolution in the Revolution?* had an enormous impact when it was published in 1967. The present volume is a symposium on the basic idea in Debray's book—that of the establishment and uninterrupted development of a guerrilla *foco* as the key to the revolutionary process. The nine essays were originally published in the July-August 1968 issue of *Monthly Review* and the four reviews appeared first in the *New York Review of Books*, *New Politics*, and *Caribbean Studies* and in a lecture at the University of Manchester. The contributors include the late Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, editors of *Monthly Review*, Andre Gunder Frank and S. A. Shah, visiting professors at Sir George Williams University (Montreal), Clea Silva, the pen name of a radical Brazilian sociologist, William Pomeroy, who played an active role in the Philippine Huk movement, Simón Torres and Julio Aronde, Cuban revolutionaries, Robin Blackburn and Perry Anderson, editors of *New Left Review* (London), Eqbal Ahmad, a Pakistani who teaches at Cornell University, William A. Williams of Oregon State University, Donald McKelvey, a member of the Radical Education Project, Juan Bosch, former president of the Dominican Republic, James Petras of Pennsylvania State University, Gordon Lewis of the University of Puerto Rico, and Peter Worsley of the University of Manchester.

Most of the contributors are critical of Debray and some highly

critical. However, most of them also agree with Debray's charge that Communist parties in Latin America lack the tradition, courage, and leadership to consider seizing power, and that they suffer from bureaucratization, obsessive pursuit of alliances, political bargaining, and electoral maneuvers. Nearly all of the contributors pay tribute to the importance of Debray's book in focusing attention on the need for a new revolutionary program in Latin America.

The book suffers from repetition since quite a few of the contributors make much the same criticism of the Debray thesis. Essentially, this criticism can be summarized as follows:

1. Debray offers no convincing evidence to prove his thesis that all of Latin America, or a considerable number of the Latin American countries, are ripe for revolution. His book particularly fails to present any meaningful economic, political, or social analysis of Latin America.

2. Debray's analysis of the forces and events leading up to the Cuban Revolution is faulty. His account is a distortion of Cuban revolutionary experience, and he shows no understanding of the social forces which enabled the Cuban Revolution to succeed.

3. Debray fails to understand that armed struggle is not enough to forge revolutionary consciousness and that only a strong base of urban support (from both the military-logistical and the political points of view) can progress and triumph.

4. Debray fails to grasp the fact that after the Cuban Revolution the United States determined not to be taken by surprise again, and that the revolutionary struggle elsewhere in Latin America will be more difficult than it was in Cuba.

5. By advocating the same revolutionary tactics for all Latin American countries, Debray ignores the varying possibilities of revolutionary action within each individual country.

6. Debray fails to understand or underestimates the role of the ideological and political struggles, and he does not understand that there can be no separation between the political and military cadres.

7. Debray commits a fundamental error in attempting to define a sole form of struggle—i.e., guerrilla warfare—since the experience of successful revolutions indicates that all forms of struggle must be utilized and combined.

8. Debray fails to understand that to succeed the revolutionary movement must build and organize a politically conscious mass base along with an armed force. It is essential that political cadres function as part of the guerrilla movement. Debray's position that a

guerrilla *foco* is the "small motor" of the masses is rejected by the majority of the contributors.

9. Debray errs in condemning all alliances and pacts between classes and political organizations and errs doubly in citing the Cuban experience to prove the validity of his thesis. The point is not to condemn all alliances but only certain forms of unity that lead to betrayal of fundamental principles.

Debray's book was published before the death of Che Guevara in Bolivia, where Debray himself is unjustly imprisoned for revolutionary activities. In the wake of Che's tragic death, criticism of the Debray thesis has increased. No doubt *Revolution in the Revolution?* will continue to be read, especially by the younger generation. But in the light of the sharp and meaningful criticism to which it has been subjected, it will probably not be regarded as a guide for solving the problems faced by Latin American revolution.

Lincoln University

PHILIP S. FONER

Communism in Latin America, An International Bibliography: 1900-1945, 1960-1967. By MARTIN H. SABLE. Los Angeles, 1968. University of California. Latin American Center. Indices. Pp. 220. Paper. \$2.00.

This volume is another valuable research tool in the growing list of bibliographies compiled and published by the Latin American Center at UCLA. Designed to supplement and update Ludwig Lauerhass' *Communism in Latin America. A Bibliography. The Post-War Years (1945-1960)* (reviewed in *HAHR*, May 1963), it goes well beyond that pioneer effort both in the number of entries and in the range of its sources. It contains more than two thousand items in twenty-two languages. For the most part these materials are readily available in major university libraries.

Although it virtually ignores such likely sources as the *World Marxist Review* and *Peking Review*, this select bibliography is nonetheless excellent for the student of contemporary Latin American politics. For the historian, however, the uneven distribution of entries, chronologically and by country, leaves much to be desired. More than 85 percent of all items date from the 1960s. About half of these deal with Cuba and constitute perhaps the most complete political bibliography yet published on the Cuban revolution. In contrast, only 140 of the entries were published between 1900 and 1945. This reflects the tremendous upsurge of interest in Latin American