

In ocean politics, we then have a reflection in part of a more general evolution of the inter-American system from hegemony and confrontation toward flexibility and diversification of foreign policy links. The international system has paralleled this evolution in moving from military-oriented bipolarity toward greater economic and political multipolarity in which smaller states may be able to have more influence. The developing states, Latin America included, regard such developments as favorable to their interests, and through cooperation believe they can assist the emergence of a new ocean and global order.

The book itself is a reflection of these broad political trends. In addition to the sophisticated, pragmatic nature of the discussions, the book is a cooperative venture, with authors from ten different Latin American states. Significantly, one of these authors, Dr. Kenneth O. Rattray, the Rapporteur-General of UNCLOS, is from Jamaica, reflecting the trend in UNCLOS and other United Nations meetings to include the English-speaking Caribbean states in the Latin American group. Unfortunately, the limited printing and modest marketing of the book, not to speak of the lack of an English translation, will tend to limit its impact. Hopefully this review will stimulate interest in the book and help give it the broader audience it deserves.

Clemson University

MICHAEL A. MORRIS

*Las crisis políticas latinoamericanas y el militarismo.* By ISAAC SANDOVAL RODRÍGUEZ. México, 1976. Siglo XXI Editores. Pp. 195. Paper.

In this study Isaac Sandoval analyzes military interventionism from the perspective of economic dependency. His main theme is that Latin America has gone through four major political crises in each of which the military has intervened to defend certain economic interests or social groups. Briefly stated, the first crisis was the Independence struggle that led to political, but not economic, emancipation. The second occurred when political power passed from the liberators to regional caudillos, who were to serve as guardians of oligarchic interests. The third crisis arose a century later when the force of "demo-bourgeois populism" emerged to challenge the traditional oligarchy. The fourth—and current—crisis arises from the

confrontation between popular forces and the national bourgeoisie and multinational corporations.

Following the line of the more radical *dependentistas*, Sandoval states in a long chapter on "Nationalist Populism and Continental Military Occupation" that after World War II, the traditional concept of national security gave way to that of "pentagonismo," whereby the state forms part of a hemispheric community whose purpose is to perpetuate the capitalist system. Latin American armies no longer defend national frontiers but serve instead the hegemonic interests of the United States by ruthlessly imposing internal order and by standing ready to defend imperialism through inter-American defense agreements. He labels as "colonial-fascist" dependent regimes that use military force to impose imperialist control, the most notorious being Brazil's.

The author, a Bolivian who was labor minister under leftist President Juan José Torres (1970–71), presents, within a Marxist framework, a sweeping indictment of the old and the new imperialism, but he breaks no new ground in analyzing Latin American-style militarism. The study contains very little original research, ignores much of existing scholarly analysis of military politics, and offers insufficient evidence to demonstrate the validity of its thesis.

University of Missouri, Columbia

WINFIELD J. BURGGRAFF

*Revolution and Reaction in Cuba, 1933–1960: A Political Sociology from Machado to Castro.* By SAMUEL FARBER. Middletown, Connecticut, 1976. Wesleyan University Press. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xix, 283. Cloth. \$15.95.

The search for the roots and sources of the Cuban Revolution began almost immediately after New Year's Day, 1959. As the revolutionary processes deepened, the scope of the search widened. A number of benchmark dates—1868, 1895, 1898, 1906, 1912, 1917, 1933, 1952, to name but a few—passed under increasing scrutiny. And while, to be sure, the order of importance assigned to the events associated with these dates remained subject to debate, an uncommon consensus soon developed around 1933. That this consensus rested for the most part on impressionistic formulations did nothing to diminish the importance ascribed to 1933.

In 1972, Luis Aguilar transformed these impressions into hypoth-