

depict their different ideological leanings and status both in their own countries and in Latin America.

Economic matters are skillfully considered in the fourth section of this book. Schydrowsky presents the case for an export-oriented industrialization, stating quite daringly that "an important element in government policy to develop export markets must consist of the inducement, by carrot and/or stick, for multinational enterprises to become active users of Latin American industrial goods in the rest of their multinational enterprise system" (pp. 140-141). Hunt, in turn, throws some light on the foreign investment problem. He also affords some boldness: "although growth targets may suffer, quite possibly social welfare will be increased by stringent controls on foreign investment" (p. 160). Slighton's unimpressive note on income redistribution concludes this section.

The last two parts discuss the international setting, and they represent the most interesting portion of the book. Ronfeldt and Einaudi seem quite right in noticing that "now . . . some governments tend to view general U.S. economic hegemony, and sometimes the specific activities of particular U.S. firms, as problems or even limited" threats, "not only for economic development but also for national security" (p. 187); nevertheless, they do not elaborate. In his last paper, Einaudi cogently perceives that both the U.S. and Latin America are reacting "with the reflexes of the past," and he points out different ways for their reaching a more enlightening atmosphere.

Summing up, this book represents a meagre contribution for scholars devoted to Latin American affairs; for policy-makers it may be of significant assistance.

United Nations,  
Economic Commission for Latin America,  
Mexico Office

JOSEPH HODARA

*Latin America: From Dependence to Revolution*. Edited by JAMES PETRAS. New York, 1973. John Wiley & Sons. Tables. Bibliography. Pp. viii, 274. Cloth. \$8.95. Paper. \$5.95.

This puzzling and uneven collection of essays attempts to describe the Latin American political environment in 1970 and 1972 and, at the same time, to contrast the economic development approaches of Chile and Brazil. When finished with the book, published in 1973, on the basis of the evidence and material presented, you could be sure of two things—Brazil was ripe for revolution, and Chile was well on

the way to a peaceful and successful change in her social, political, and economic infrastructure. Yet in mid-1974 we find, in contrast, that the Chilean experiment has collapsed in a bloody revolution, and the Brazilians, apparently unaware that their model is not supposed to work, are continuing on their dynamic developmental path.

It is amazing to read such naive statements in the preface by the editor, James Petras, that the apathy of the 1960s is gone, that the Argentine military is on the defensive, that the Tupamaros are moving toward victory, and that in Bolivia a popular peoples' assembly has been organized. Such are the dangers of rushing into print.

The book is divided into three parts, with various authors contributing essays to each section. Part one is entitled "Alternative Approaches to Development: Left and Right." The essays on Chile, by Petras, probably help explain the downfall of Allende in a manner that I think was not intended. Everything was fine in Chile. The excellent description of the socioeconomic changes being brought about by the UP coalition never seem to take into consideration the tensions that were building up. Opposition reaction was badly misjudged. The Chilean working class, union or nonunion, did not have the dedication or understanding of its historic role in the process of eliminating external domination and thus paving the way for national economic development. Chilean labor unions, and especially the copper unions, were too much like the A.F. of L. and Teamsters in the United States. They wanted a fatter pay check and easier working conditions, not revolutionary rhetoric. The copper unions hurt the Allende administration badly with their strikes. Petras catches this when he writes, ". . . copper workers in Chuquicamata are salary conscious, not class conscious." But this should have been extended to the entire spectrum of Chilean labor unions. In addition, there is no support for the statement by Petras that after the Allende government expropriated over 2000 landed estates, agricultural production increased 6 percent in 1971.

The two articles on Brazil, also in the first section, are so badly translated and carelessly edited that they cannot be taken seriously. The first deals with a critique of Celso Furtado's "stagnation thesis," while the second discusses Brazil's "economic miracle."

Part two of the book, "Dependency in a Modern Setting," contains articles focused on Argentina. The third and final section of the book, "The United States and Latin America," is much better than the preceding two parts. A successful Allende administration clearly posed a greater threat to the United States business community than a Fidel Castro ever would. The U.S. response to economic nationalism in Chile

is such a good picture of how Washington, D.C., operates that I wonder how Petras got so lost in South America.

Pace College

JORDAN M. YOUNG

*Military Rule in Latin America: Function, Consequences and Perspectives.* Edited by PHILIPPE C. SCHMITTER. Beverly Hills, California, 1973. Sage Publications. Sage Research Progress Series on War, Revolution and Peacekeeping, III. Tables. Graphs. Pp. xiii, 322. Cloth. \$12.50. Paper. \$7.50.

Philippe Schmitter's compilation of five articles—four were presented at a 1972 conference on Latin American militaries—is a reaction to past and existing models of military rule. In this appeal for refinement of existing hypotheses and advancement of fresh approaches, he has encouraged eclecticism in theory and methodology. Consequently, linkage among the papers is relatively limited.

Schmitter's title is misleading, since only two articles directly address military rule. Alain Rouquie's paper—a protracted version appeared in 1971—identifies a left-wing trend in military interventions precipitated by the impact of external factors on changing domestic circumstances. Past case study and quantification approaches are then critically dissected by Jerry Weaver, who contrasts presumably ideologically antithetic military regimes' policy outputs and social consequences and portrays military interveners serving similar clients. Schmitter's and Geoffrey Kemp's contributions weigh other military topics. The former inductively evaluates the effects of several variables on levels of domestic military spending with resource availability having the greatest impact. Kemp articulates concern that arms control is dangerously underresearched in Latin America, and he formulates a thesis to determine the nexus for arms control negotiations focusing on geostrategic considerations and force capabilities. James Kurth's concluding article touches indirectly upon the military, while delving into causative explanations of big state policies and small state politics. He cites the consistent presence of strategic denial as a general rationale in major power policy-making and projects its future implications for United States foreign policy while claiming to refute exponents of external dependence.

In forging new paths the contributors have interwoven intriguing, perceptive insights with variations on contemporary methodological techniques. Considerable refinement is required, however. Much of the evidence is fragmentary—which invites inaccuracies—and imprecise