

it is not clear how the persons interviewed in those settlements were selected, or what kind of distortion was introduced by interviewing approximately equal numbers of owners and tenants when the reader is given to understand that ownership is the norm, not tenancy. Nor is it specified whether the landlords were a group apart or simply some of the owners who also rented.

But these are minor details in what was undoubtedly an extensive undertaking, with its concomitant difficulties of organizing and coordinating three separate local survey teams. Two of those teams have published separate individual studies, which permit a fuller presentation of the data collected and the incorporation of other data that did not fit into the parameters of this study.

In all, this is a fascinating book, and I suspect that it will be considered a real find by history students of the twenty-first century who try to recreate the past. It will stand as testimony to one of the most disheartening problems of our times: the lack of a place to call home.

SUSAN BERGLUND, Universidad Central de Venezuela

*Contemporary Societies in a Comparative Perspective: Eastern Europe and Latin America in the Twentieth Century.* Compiled by the POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. Latin American Studies, vol. 14, parts 1 and 2. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of History, 1992. Tables. Graphs. Notes. 418 pp. Paper.

For many years, Polish students of Latin America have been proving themselves to be innovative and dynamic. What's more, before Poland's freedom from Soviet control, its scholars showed themselves to be remarkably independent and incisive students of their own Eastern European reality, both past and present. To take just one example, Witold Kula's theory of feudalism, based on Polish historical experience, was also remarkably enlightening when applied to the analysis of traditional Latin American rural society.

Against this background, a group of Polish scholars organized a most ambitious international and interdisciplinary conference in May and June 1990 with the purpose of comparing twentieth-century Latin America and East-Central Europe. Two years later, the proceedings appeared in print. The main organizer was a Latin Americanist historian, Ryszard Stemplowski. By limiting the time period to the last century and recommending the "world system" and a variety of "modernization theory" as key theoretical tools, Stemplowski hoped to impose some degree of unity on the project. The impression conveyed by the published proceedings, however, is one of extreme diversity.

In theoretical terms, the best-known participant, Jerzy Topolsky, sharply criticizes Immanuel Wallerstein as well as the modernization concept. He recommends the comparison of macroregions (such as Eastern Europe and Latin America) "as integrated wholes in their dynamic structure" (1:30-32), however such a compari-

son might actually be carried out. In other papers, varieties of dependency theory and the “informal sector” approach are also tried. Yet for all the methodological discussion, there is a notable lack of understanding of the crucial distinction between “close” and “distant” comparison. Comparing Latin America and “Eastern Europe” (referring mostly to East-Central Europe, although some authors do not exclude the Soviet Union as of 1945) is necessarily a case of distant comparison. Even so, many papers discuss some of the ubiquitous differences rather than the more or less surprising similarities. Indeed, explicitly comparative papers are actually fewer than those dealing with either “Eastern European” or Latin American topics. Some are rather lengthy, others extremely short (two to four pages). There is one attempt to summarize the discussion of economic contributions (2:401–4), but none concerning the other debates.

From this reviewer’s late-1993 perspective, some of these 1990 discussions have unavoidably become outdated—above all the recent recovery of Spanish American economies after the “lost decade.” Meanwhile, expectations in “Eastern Europe” have declined. Nevertheless, several very stimulating and valuable contributions can be found. One is the study by the German scholar Dittmar Dahlmann (1:181–97) comparing the Zapatismo of Morelos with the contemporary movement of Nestor Makhno in the Ukraine. Analogies are surprisingly numerous. Two contributions by the Pole Wojciech Roszkowski, on land reform in Eastern Europe after World War I (2:213–42) and uniformity versus diversity there before and after 1945 (1:49–64), stand out as excellent comparative syntheses in *one* of the two macroregions. Another Pole, Henryk Szlaifer, persuasively argues that the 1930s lend themselves quite well to a comparison of the economic policies of Latin American and Eastern European states (1:162–72). Most interesting is a truly comparative paper on the Comintern’s policy toward Eastern Europe and Latin America from 1919 to 1943, by the Pole A. Kochański (2:15–41). Yet this is a very preliminary study, as relevant archives in Russia remained closed to the author.

I also found the critical review by U.S. writer David Ost of the latest transition-to-democracy analyses of recent developments in Eastern Europe to be very fine indeed (2:137–46). Students of transition in, for instance, Latin America may analyze the phenomenon in terms of elite competition for national power in the framework of a capitalist economy securing a “civil society.” But as Ost rightly points out, this approach is impossible in the Eastern European case. There, the Communist system rooted out civil society. The first and crucial step took place when nonelite groups tried to build up an independent civil society once again as a “public sphere of social interaction that has nothing to do with government” (2:142). Transition theorists have blatantly ignored this crucial distinction.

The Polish conference organizers found in the 1989 European transition a stimulus for launching their large-scale comparative project. As Ost and others show, however, the methodological problems of comparison become clearly more difficult to tackle after 1945 and even 1989. Since then, the Eastern European

countries have found themselves in a profoundly different situation from those of Latin America, with the sole exception of Cuba.

MAGNUS MÖRNER, Uppsala

*The United States and Latin America in the 1990s: Beyond the Cold War.* By JONATHAN HARTLYN et al. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992. Map. Tables. Notes. Bibliography. Index. xii, 328 pp. Cloth, \$39.95. Paper, \$15.95.

A little more than half a century ago, in times not so different, in some ways, from these, when in the United States the lines outside soup kitchens were lengthening and the ranks of the homeless swelling, and when this country was in disrepute beyond its own borders for such practices as gunboat diplomacy, a newly elected Democratic president pledged nonintervention and ushered in a period of Good Neighborliness toward Latin America. Under cover of the Cold War, and more recently the drug war, subsequent U.S. presidents failed to honor that pledge. And the gunboat diplomacy of the late twentieth century has proved as subversive to the spirit of American democracy as it did in the century's youth.

It is by no means clear whether the Clinton administration will rediscover Good Neighborliness, but it might as well; as this book makes clear, the end of the Cold War and the loss of its rationales have changed dramatically the agenda of U.S.–Latin American relations. The “commonality of interests” theme that has always garnished U.S. diplomatic rhetoric still may lack credibility, but the increasing commonality of problems is unmistakable.

It is refreshing to find a book about the Western Hemisphere in the post-Cold War era that does not celebrate the victory of the United States or of capitalism and democracy, and that deals straightforwardly with a range of real issues. This one represents a collaborative effort between the Chilean branch of the Latin American Social Science Faculty (FLACSO) and two North Carolina universities, Duke and UNC, Chapel Hill. It is not immediately apparent which chapters were contributed by North Americans and which by Latin Americans, testifying to the homogenization of concerns and perspectives that has taken place in studies of Latin American affairs over the last couple of decades.

Among the topics covered are new actors and power configurations at global, hemispheric, and national levels and the challenges they present to the traditional security system; debt, development, and trade; democracy, human rights, and the armed forces; narcotraffic and drug wars; environmental politics; and migration. The unevenness of chapters that typifies edited texts does not really affect this book. Sophisticated analysis and a high level of readability are maintained throughout.

I found Abraham Lowenthal's chapter on U.S. interests and policies particu-