
TOPICAL REVIEW

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY: TRENDS SINCE 1965

Charles W. Bergquist, Duke University

UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY, SINCE THEIR EMERGENCE as a distinct body of literature in the early years of the twentieth century, have been much more tradition-bound than their counterparts in United States and European history. More descriptive than analytical, they concentrated on diplomatic, military, political, and institutional history. They were legalistic and elitist in their approach, a reflection in part of their subject matter. But many other factors accounted for their traditionalism. Narration and description seemed justifiable first steps in a field practically devoid of serious scholarly attention. The dearth of research aids and the accessibility of certain types of source materials influenced the nature of the work undertaken. Less tangible factors were also present. It was easy to justify studies about former Spanish territories later incorporated into the United States since, after all, such studies were really a part of "American" history, and a "romantic" part at that. A case could also be made for the study of Spain and her empire in the New World. Once Europe's greatest military power and master of a world-wide empire, Catholic, aristocratic Spain subsequently became the rival of England, source of the dominant liberal, Protestant culture of the United States. Moreover, as the United States itself began to acquire overseas colonies, was it not important to assess more objectively the Spanish experience with empire?²¹ But what was the importance of studying the dismal and chaotic post-independence history of Spain's former colonies in America?²² Perhaps concerned about the reception of their work in an area many people considered marginal, United States historians of Latin America produced impeccable scholarship on themes of proven acceptability. Working largely in isolation from United States social scientists, unlike their colleagues in United States history, they remained remote from the fascinating tools and concepts being developed in other disciplines. Moreover, although many first-rate scholars contributed works of solid

Latin American Research Review

worth and enduring value, the field as a whole seems to have failed to attract the most imaginative and original minds.³

After World War II, the traditional nature of Latin American history written in the United States began to change. Partly, change was the result of interpretive and analytic opportunities afforded by a solid foundation of monographs and a growing collection of research tools; partly it came as historians of Latin America belatedly began to participate more fully in long-term trends toward greater complexity and sophistication within the historical profession as a whole. But most importantly, the traditional nature of the field appears to have been transformed as a result of expanding United States interests and changing concerns with the advent of the Cold War. During the 1950s, a trickle of political scientists, economists, and sociologists joined historians in pursuing studies of Latin America. With the success of the Cuban Revolution, which brought Cold War tensions and preoccupations into the heart of the hemisphere, the trickle of social scientists concerned with Latin America became a torrent, and the number of historians engaged in the field expanded rapidly.⁴ During the 1960s, intensive United States interest in Latin America, the large number of historians pursuing research in the field, concern with economic development and social amelioration, increased contact with social scientists and their techniques, and the priorities of funding arrangements combined to bring about profound and lasting changes in the study of Latin American history in the United States. The extent and implications of these changes have yet to be properly assessed.

A recent commentary by Richard M. Morse, engagingly entitled "The Care and Grooming of Latin American Historians or: Stop the Computers, I Want to Get Off," takes a step in the direction of such an analysis.⁵ Emphasizing "post-Fidel" quantitative rather than qualitative growth in the field, Morse indicts United States Latin-Americanists for blindly applying sophisticated North American social science techniques out of historical and cultural context in their studies of Latin America. He calls for a renewed emphasis in university training on the unique, intuitive skills of the cultural historian as the antidote to an ethnocentric, mechanical, social science. Morse, perhaps overplaying his role of devil's advocate, neglects the many salutary effects that increased financial resources, closer contact with the social sciences, and the concern with economic and social development have brought to the field. Only when recent trends are compared with the traditional concerns of the field do many of these beneficial aspects of this influence stand out.

To some extent changes in the field can be measured statistically. Section I analyzes the topical, chronological, and geographical trends within the literature published during the last eight years and compares them to the traditional interests of the field. Because of the subjective nature of such judgements, demonstration of the improved quality of recent work is more difficult, but one fruitful way to approach the problem is to discuss innovations in methodology and source materials, the subject of Section II.

It could be argued, contrary to Morse's contention, that the greatest threat to the

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

integrity of United States studies in Latin American history lies not in their corruption by social science methodology (although that is a legitimate concern, which is discussed below), but rather in the uncritical acceptance of two basic assumptions which have enjoyed great popularity among United States Latin-Americanists. First, most United States studies have assumed the positive influence of foreign economic and cultural penetration of Latin America. Second, United States studies have rarely questioned the viability of incremental economic and social change in solving the developmental problems of Latin American societies. Examples of these trends are discussed in Section III.

To be sure, changing world economic and political realities have now brought this period of remarkable expansion of Latin American studies in the United States to an end. Retrenchment is undoubtedly caused by a variety of factors, including the fact that the enormous development of the field in the 1960s insures a relatively high level of continued activity. But the most important reasons for retrenchment are several inter-related consequences of the United States' involvement in Vietnam. These include serious trade and balance of payment problems as well as a changed domestic political climate. On the one hand, as the decade of the 1960s progressed, domestic social pressures necessitated that greater attention be given to the internal problems of race relations and urban crisis. On the other hand, the inauguration of a new presidential administration in 1969 led to a reordering of domestic and international priorities. The war also contributed to the politicization and polarization of the intellectual community in the United States and fostered a growing disenchantment with the assumptions of liberalism which held sway during most of the 1960s.

Among United States intellectuals the political polarization characteristic of the United States by the end of the 1960s has translated itself into a growth of both conservative and radical thought. While mirroring this development, United States Latin-Americanists also have been greatly influenced by recent political developments in important Latin American countries and by currents within the Latin American intellectual community itself. As a result, many recent United States studies evince a new appreciation for the vitality of a corporatist, authoritarian tradition in Latin America, a tradition which perpetuates gross social iniquities and inhibits the economic development of Latin American societies. While some idealists among United States historians of Latin America have stressed the Mediterranean and medieval origins of this authoritarian, corporatist tradition, and have sought to explain Latin American history primarily in terms of the area's Iberian cultural heritage, the most fruitful approach has been to incorporate these cultural concerns into a broader conceptual framework. Such a framework seeks to comprehend the cultural, social, and economic structure and politics of Latin American societies through time in terms of the area's ongoing dependent ties with the developed countries of the North Atlantic basin. Section IV discusses the strengths and weaknesses of several recent studies which adopt, however vaguely and hesitantly, this alternative conceptual framework which views Latin America as the underdeveloped West.

Latin American Research Review

I. RECENT TRENDS: THE LITERATURE AS A WHOLE

In order to gauge trends in the literature as a whole, I selected samples of articles and book-length studies. Sample articles included all those appearing in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* from 1965 through 1972. Drawing the sample from the mature, professional journal of Latin American historians in this country provided ease of access and control over a large number of articles. More importantly, such a survey allowed comparison with Lesley Bird Simpson's well-known analysis of the area, time, and subject focus of articles published in the *HAHR* during that review's first thirty years.⁶ Admittedly problems of scope and classification emerge in the comparison of Simpson's survey with the modest one presented here. Nevertheless, the comparison sketches in broad outline the changing concerns of the discipline.⁷

Following Simpson's "statistical" approach,⁸ the articles were tabulated according to their focus in time. Most of the articles fell within a single century, although a few overlapped two centuries. The distribution of the 128 articles is summarized and compared to Simpson's data (Table 1).⁹

Comparing the two surveys it is clear that since Simpson's study, interest in the twentieth century has surged dramatically, and attention afforded the national period as a whole has significantly increased. Meanwhile, the colonial period has suffered a

TABLE 1
Time Focus of Sample Articles

Century	8-Year Survey, 1965-72		Simpson's Survey of First 30 Years of <i>HAHR</i>
	Number of Articles	Percentage	Percentage
20th	29	23	10
19th-20th	9	7	
19th	45	35	44
Sub-total National	83	65	54
18th-19th	5	4	
18th	16	13	15
17th-18th	1	1	
17th	3	2	4
16th-17th	2	2	
16th	9	7	14
15th-16th	—	—	
15th	1	1	2
Colonial as whole	3	2	4.5
Sub-total Colonial	40	32	39.5
L.A. History as Whole	5	4	6.5
Totals	128	101 (rounding)	100

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

corresponding decline in attention. During the last seven years two-thirds of the articles published in the *HAHR* have dealt with the national period.

Many factors account for the changing pattern of time interest. To some extent it is the result of secular trends within the discipline, such as the gradual lengthening of the national period in relation to the colonial period, the increasing availability of source materials for the national period which have long been inaccessible to researchers in the relatively closed, aristocratic, political systems of Latin America, and the declining interest in romantic themes of discovery, exploration, and conquest. Noting these trends in 1957, Charles Gibson and Benjamin Keen concluded that the increased attention given the national period was "salutary" since the "long tradition of colonial concentration has not yet been redressed in modern times."¹⁰

But one suspects that the extreme concentration on the national period revealed in the survey of the last eight years is largely a reflection of trends in the field apparent since Gibson and Keen wrote. Since the Cuban Revolution, especially, scholarly attention has centered on questions of political and economic development often with the aim of strengthening Latin America against the threat of communism. As a result of political interests outside the realm of strictly professional concerns, and federal and private funding arrangements,¹¹ historians have concentrated their work increasingly on the national period, where the roots of current concerns are most obviously exposed.

The decline in interest in the colonial period is unlikely to continue indefinitely, however, for certain countertrends are at work. Some of the most exciting and innovative history continues to be done in the colonial period. Some young scholars, initially attracted to modern Latin American history, early recognized the colonial roots of many current conditions. Finally, the long-standing advantages of organized archives, fixed bodies of source materials, and removal from immediate questions of policy and ideology will continue to attract scholars to the colonial period.

The changing concerns of United States historians of Latin America are also evidenced in the geographical focus of recent studies. The geographical distribution of articles appearing in the *HAHR* during the last eight years, along with Simpson's data, are presented in Table 2.¹²

While detailed observations on the changing pattern of geographic interest, based on such a limited sample of the literature, are clearly unwarranted, certain broad trends emerge from the comparison. Although massive interest in Mexico has continued unabated, there has been a decided shift away from the borderlands (former Spanish areas now in the United States) and the Caribbean Islands. During the last eight years only one article appearing in the *HAHR* has been concerned with the borderlands. Only four articles dealt with the Caribbean Islands, three of them with Cuba. In contrast, over one-fifth of Simpson's percentage total was devoted to these two areas. With the partial exception of Mexico, interest now appears to be distributed over the whole of Latin America in rough relation to the size and historical importance of the various countries. This changing pattern would seem to reflect the

TABLE 2
Geographical Focus of Sample Articles

8-Year Survey of <i>HHR</i> 1965-72			Simpson's Survey of First 30 Years of <i>HHR</i>	
Country	Number of Articles	Percentage	Country	Percentage
Mexico	27	24	Mexico	24
Brazil	18	16	Brazil	11.5
Argentina	11	10	The Antilles	11.5
Peru	9	8	Borderlands	10
Chile	9	8	Argentina	9
Colombia	8	7	Spain	8
Spain	8	7	Central America	6
Bolivia	4	4	Peru	5.5
Cuba	3	3	Venezuela	5
Venezuela	3	3	Chile	2.5
Central America	3	3	Colombia	2
Paraguay	2	2	Portugal	} 5
Panama	2	2	Philippines	
Borderlands	1	1	Paraguay	
Ecuador	1	1	Ecuador	
Uruguay	1	1	Guiana	
Guatemala	1	1	Bolivia	
Honduras	1	1		
Portugal	1	1		
Haiti	1	1		
Totals	114	101 (rounding)		100

intensification of United States economic interests and security concerns in the hemisphere since World War II and especially since the Cuban Revolution. Again it should be pointed out that the shift registers geographically the abandonment of such traditional and romantic themes as discovery and exploration, which often found their setting in the Antilles and the borderlands. The heavy emphasis placed on Mexico by United States historians is often questioned. To the degree that this concentration reflects convenience of access and orderly archives, criticism is justified. But given the intrinsic interest of Mexican history from pre-Columbian times through the present day, and the tremendous amount of military, economic, and political interaction between the United States and Mexico (which is still imperfectly studied), Mexico continues to be a stimulating and important area for research by United States scholars.

Simpson claimed that his data on geographical distribution revealed that "the history of Latin America, as we write it, is in danger of depending upon a premise

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

which we may find it embarrassing to defend, namely that the importance given to a country varies directly as it affects the interests of the United States."¹³ Keeping in mind the expansion of United States interests since Simpson wrote, that statement continues to be true, but there is no longer much danger of any nation being ignored by the large number of United States historians now practicing in the field. The United States, increasingly, is interested in all Latin American nations, and therefore in their history. Furthermore, the recent history of any Latin American nation cannot be written without taking into account the influence of the United States; and United States scholars, because of their access to United States materials and well-endowed libraries, are among the best placed to elucidate the implications of that influence.

The attempt to classify the *HARR* articles by subject matter met with serious problems. Characterizing historical studies as "diplomatic history," "political history," "military history," etc., ultimately involves a large amount of arbitrary pigeonholing, as anyone who has attempted the task well knows.¹⁴ Owing in part to ignorance of Simpson's definition of terms and the degree of inevitable subjectivity involved, but also to changes in the nature of written history over time, a somewhat different classification scheme was employed in the eight-year survey. In spite of the use of different categories, some advantage results from the comparison of the tabulations listed in Table 3.¹⁵

Examining the figures, it is evident that there has been a dramatic decrease in biography and diplomatic history, although the latter continues to contribute sub-

TABLE 3
Thematic Focus of Sample Articles

8-year Survey of <i>HARR</i> 1965-72			Simpson's Survey of First 30 years of <i>HARR</i>	
Thematic Focus	Number of Articles	Percentage	Thematic Focus	Percentage
Economic and Social History	49	38	Diplomatic History	28
Political History	22	17	Biography	16
Diplomatic History	16	13	Economic History	13
Intellectual History	11	9	Social History	12
Military History	10	8	Institutional History	10
Historiography	8	6	Military History	9
Biography	6	5	Geography	8
Medical History	2	2	Historiography	2
Institutional History	1	1	Demography	1.5
Demography	1	1	Medical History	.5
Cultural History	1	1		
Urban History	1	1		
Totals	128	102 (rounding)		100

stantially to the articles published in the *HAHR*. On the other hand, the tabulation shows an increase in historiography, social, and economic history (subjects so closely intertwined in some studies as to defy separate classification), and intellectual history, a category Simpson did not even include.¹⁶

But some of the most important trends evident in the articles surveyed are not sharply defined by any of the statistical comparisons. Reading through the articles published in the *HAHR* during the last eight years, one is impressed by the virtual abandonment of narrative and descriptive techniques in favor of analytical approaches. Only diplomatic history continues to rely heavily on narration and description (only 2 of the 16 articles surveyed falling in this category could be called analytical). There also seems to be a growing appreciation for the interdependence of economic, social, political, diplomatic, and intellectual history. Maddeningly unwieldy for anyone engaged in the artificial task of classifying them according to subject matter, these articles were among the most rewarding to read, and as a group represent the best work being done in Latin American history today.¹⁷ Again one suspects that all these trends reflect in large part the increasing interaction of Latin American historians with social scientists, and the general concern with Latin American "development" prevalent in the United States throughout the last decade.

To some extent, this suspicion is confirmed by the survey of recently-published book-length studies, which can now be rapidly sketched. Although the books conform in broad outline to the trends discussed in connection with the *HAHR* articles, they emerge somewhat more traditional in their time, place, and subject focus. The longer time-period involved from conception to completion of book-length studies (several surveyed were conceived in the 1950s) explains much of this traditionalism.¹⁸ The sample consisted of all book-length United States studies in Latin American history published since 1965 and reviewed or noticed in the *HAHR* during the period 1965–72. In effect, this meant that the survey included most books of any importance in the field published during the seven-year period, 1965–71. Attempting to separate out the United States studies immediately involved definitional problems. After much consideration United States studies in Latin American history were defined for purposes of this survey as historical studies dealing primarily with the internal history of Latin America written by persons trained in Latin American history in the United States and residing in this country.¹⁹ Using this definition, a total of 157 titles were recorded, over a third of which were read, the *HAHR* reviews and notices providing information as to the nature of the rest.

Table 4 summarizes the geographical distribution of the books.²⁰

The figures reveal a striking traditionalism in geographical focus. One-fifth of the titles were devoted to borderlands history.²¹ Excluding the "Latin America as a Whole" category (which is primarily made up of teaching aids), almost two-thirds (65%) of the remaining 127 studies dealt with areas of traditional concern to the United States—the borderlands, Mexico, Central America, and the islands of the Caribbean. Only slightly more than a third (35%) of the studies dealt with the countries of South America.

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Distribution of the books according to time period revealed a heavy concentration in the national period, but not quite so great as in the *HARR* articles surveyed, as Table 5 shows.²²

The classification of the books according to thematic interests presented the usual difficulties. Nevertheless, certain trends appear in Table 6 despite the unavoidable haziness of classification.

At first glance Table 6 reveals the continuing appeal of traditional subjects to United States historians of Latin America. The bulk of the studies dealt with politics,

TABLE 4
Geographical Focus of Books Surveyed

Area	Number of Books	Percentage
South America (all countries)	44	29
Borderlands	32	21
Mexico	29	19
Central America	12	8
Caribbean Islands	10	7
Latin America as a whole	26	17
Totals	153	101 (rounding)

TABLE 5
Time Focus of Books Surveyed

Century	Number of Books	Percentage
20th	34	26
19th–20th	21	16
19th	25	19
Sub-total National	80	61
18th–19th	7	5
18th	16	12
17th–18th	1	1
17th	3	2
16th–17th	3	2
16th	5	4
15th–16th	–	–
15th	1	1
Colonial as Whole	4	3
Sub-total Colonial	40	31
L.A. history as Whole	10	8
Totals	130	100

TABLE 6
Thematic Focus of Books Surveyed

Classification	Number of books	Percentage
Political History	26	17
Teaching Aids	23	15
Diplomatic History	21	13
Social History	17	11
General History	13	8
Discovery, Conquest, Settlement	11	7
Military History	10	6
Biography	7	4
Institutional History	7	4
Economic History	7	4
Intellectual History	4	3
Historiography	3	2
Miscellaneous	3	2
Memoirs	2	1
Medical History	1	1
Demography	1	1
History of Science	1	1
Totals	157	100

diplomacy, discovery and conquest, military history, institutional history, and biography; relatively few concerned themselves with social, economic, or intellectual history. One category which reveals some of the current trends at work, however, is teaching aids. Generally "problem" books combining interpretive essays and documents, teaching aids are a response to the mushrooming of college-level courses in the United States in the 1960s. Teaching aids designed for graduate students got off to an auspicious start with Howard F. Cline's two-volume *Latin American History. Essays on its Study and Teaching, 1898-1967* (Austin, 1967), which has been cited frequently in this article, and which provides an indispensable introduction for anyone concerned with acquiring a knowledge of the development of the field of Latin American history in this country.

But the table masks important changes in the approach to traditional subjects. For example, the general history category includes the last two volumes in a continuing Oxford Press series under the general editorship of James R. Scobie, which emphasizes economic and social history. Rollie E. Poppino's *Brazil: The Land and the People* (N.Y., 1968) and Charles C. Cumberland's *Mexico: The Struggle for Modernity* (N.Y., 1968) emphasize the positive, viable, and transitional in each country's history, synthesize available information, and reveal the general poverty of economic and social monographs concerning even these large, important nations.

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Economic, social, and intellectual trends are convincingly related to political developments in E. Bradford Burns' fine general survey, *A History of Brazil* (N.Y., 1970).²³ The changing approach to traditional subjects is clearly shown in the political histories. Perhaps half of those surveyed, many of which are discussed in other sections of this paper, weave a great deal of economic, social, and intellectual history into their analyses. New departures are also manifest in the traditional field of diplomatic history. Robert N. Burr, in his *By Reason or Force—Chile and the Balancing of Power in South America, 1830–1905* (Berkeley, 1965), demonstrates the importance of diplomacy and power politics in intra-Latin American foreign relations, carefully placing his study within a context of world-wide economic and political trends. E. Bradford Burns likewise moves out of the narrow confines of traditional diplomatic history as he acknowledges the importance of structural economic ties to diplomacy in his *The Unwritten Alliance: Rio Branco and Brazilian-American Relations* (N.Y., 1966). David Bushnell's readable little book, *Eduardo Santos and the Good Neighbor, 1938–1942* (Gainesville, 1967), effectively integrates an analysis of the political philosophies of major Colombian politicians with an account of the internal political jockeying accompanying United States-Colombian accommodation in the years leading into World War II.

Most clearly a reflection of the preoccupations of the period surveyed is one of the several examples of military history, Neil Macaulay's *The Sandino Affair* (Chicago, 1967). Macaulay's study is generally clear, realistic, and candid, although he tends to over-emphasize the reformist elements of a primarily nationalistic movement. While Macaulay refrains from drawing them, the parallels between this early United States' involvement in counterinsurgency and more recent adventures are disconcertingly close. Macaulay describes early experiments with helicopter-like aircraft, strategic air strikes, and what are now called search and destroy missions. He elucidates the intricacies of high-level political and military influence and describes its legacy in the form of Somoza and his "apolitical" national guard. The book ends with a kind of primer on counterinsurgency.

Macaulay's second book, *A Rebel in Cuba* (Chicago, 1970) is without precedent in the field. An account of his participation in the last stages of Castro's successful guerrilla struggle against Batista, Macaulay's memoir, like his previous treatment of Sandino, avoids sermonizing and sentimentality. Personal and often candid, the book reveals Macaulay as an ambitious, romantic adventurer fascinated with weapons, infatuated with the military, sensitive to social injustice, and strongly committed to the ideals of liberal democracy and capitalism. His book is easy to read and full of colorful, first-hand information on the nature of the guerrilla struggle and the men who participated in it.

II. NEW SOURCE MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGIES

The tables and discussion up to this point have illustrated a changing pattern of interest on the part of United States scholars who write Latin American history.

Latin American Research Review

Gradually, something of a contrast between the traditional and the new has emerged. A consideration of source materials and methodology will intensify this contrast and provide evidence of improvements in the quality of the work being done in the field. "Living museum," to borrow a term from Charles Anderson, is the best description of the collection of United States studies in Latin American history published since 1965.²⁴ There are histories which utilize social science concepts, tools, and quantitative techniques; employ comparative frameworks; or tap previously ignored source materials to explore new viewpoints and subjects. These histories exist uneasily alongside others which apply time-tested historical techniques and source materials to traditional subjects. To be sure, the older forms far outnumber the new in this living museum of Latin American histories, but the most important and exciting work employs at least some elements of the new. The very best work may lie in imaginative synthesis of the traditional and the new.

The use of new kinds of source materials is best illustrated by James Lockhart's social history, *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560* (Madison, 1968). Lockhart's extensive use of notarial archives as sources of data produces a richer portrait of day-to-day realities for all classes of society during the period following the conquest. The theoretical implications of local notarial research as a key to social and economic history and as a vehicle for revision of history written from high-level official and legal documents, however, are more thoroughly explored by Lockhart in two subsequent articles. In "Encomienda and Hacienda: The Evolution of the Great Estate in the Spanish Indies," *HAHR*, 49:3:411–429 (Aug., 1969), Lockhart argues that emphasis on the legal distinctions between encomienda and hacienda has obscured the functional socio-economic continuities between them.²⁵ In a more recent article, "The Social History of Colonial Spanish America: Evolution and Potential," *LARR*, 7:1:6–45 (Spring, 1972), Lockhart extols the virtues of a new school of progressive, "youngish" social historians "of the English-speaking world" who have carved out a new frontier in colonial Latin American history. After attempting to define the new social history, Lockhart critically reviews the "cycle of sources" through which colonial Latin American historiography has passed and describes avenues for continuing research. Moving beyond his earlier emphasis on notarial research, Lockhart points out the possibilities for analyzing landholding and kinship structures and daily social realities from more traditional sources such as census data, records of corporate bodies, and even the legalistic reports of Spanish governmental officials.

Lockhart's detailed discussion ably demonstrates the value of a number of recent studies by United States colonial historians, some of which can be briefly noted here. David A. Brading's important study, *Miners and Merchants in Bourbon Mexico, 1763–1810* (Cambridge, Eng., 1971), uses a variety of traditional and new sources to explore economic trends and trace the origin and interaction of elite groups. Comprised of three separate, related essays, Brading's book greatly modifies our understanding of the causes of the Mexican silver boom of the late eighteenth century and clarifies the nature of the relationship between creoles and peninsulars during

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

the same period. Lockhart's own *The Men of Cajamarca* (Austin, 1972) modestly complements his earlier book. Through statistical analysis of what is essentially a collective biography, Lockhart seeks to explain the conquerors' behavior, both before and after the initial conquest, in terms of such "social determinants" as regional origin and social status. William B. Taylor's *Landlord and Peasant in Colonial Oaxaca* (Stanford, 1972) is a solid monograph based on local notarial archives and hacienda records as well as traditional sources on Indians and lands in the Mexican national archives. Taylor describes a rich variety of landholding patterns and establishes the existence of a vigorous Indian landholding tradition in that unique region in southern Mexico.²⁶

Although hampered by problems of access and poorly organized archives, historians of the national period can also make use of the rich new sources so fruitfully employed by the colonialists. Notary archives, official registers, tax records, municipal archives, and local church records should prove especially useful in clarifying the role of economic and demographic forces and assessing the local impact of central institutions, laws, and political transformations. All these source materials, recording as they do the daily life of the bulk of the members of society, can provide an important control on history written from the personal papers, public statements, and official documents produced by a social elite.

Oral history may provide another important source for recent history, although the approach is fraught with the difficulties involved in designing appropriate questions, minimizing the effects of recording devices on interviewees, and overcoming the suspicion of foreign interviewers. James and Edna Wilkie's transcribed interviews with important Mexican leaders have now been published as *México visto en el siglo XX* (Mexico City, 1969), and were previously used to advantage in James Wilkie's *The Mexican Revolution: Federal Expenditure and Social Change since 1910* (Berkeley, 2nd. rev. ed., 1970). Transcribed interviews are also used in Wilkie's *The Bolivian Revolution and United States Aid since 1952* (Los Angeles, 1969). Historians have so far restricted their use of oral Latin American history to elite participants, leaving anthropologists like Oscar Lewis to mine the popular tradition. Given the memory skills and oral traditions of non-literate people, non-elite oral history can elucidate the local realities of historical events, and explore the anxieties and hopes of the great mass of people whose motivations and expectations are too often assumed in elite-oriented histories.

Quantitative approaches, best illustrated by Wilkie's path-breaking *The Mexican Revolution*, provide another example of innovative use of source materials.²⁷ While serious objections have been made concerning Wilkie's use and interpretation of his data,²⁸ no one can deny the enormous contribution he has made by accumulating and extracting data from sources (budgets and censuses) heretofore imperfectly tapped by historians. Less successful is Wilkie's attempt to apply the same techniques to Bolivian expenditures since 1930. Much more clearly than his Mexican study, *The Bolivian Revolution* attests to Wilkie's preoccupation with statistical data to the

Latin American Research Review

exclusion of other factors involved in the complexity of historical processes. Although narrow policy and technical questions dominate his study, Wilkie again succeeds in providing useful statistics on budgets, United States aid, and tin prices. Moreover, he establishes that the budgetary shift toward increased social spending in Bolivia occurred in 1945, not after the revolution in 1952.

The use of quantifiable data, generated by historians asking new kinds of questions, is already evident in the field. Traditional sources can be used in imaginative new ways through the use of quantifying techniques, as Peter H. Smith shows in his *Politics and Beef in Argentina* (N.Y., 1969). Smith employs simple quantifying techniques to great advantage throughout the book; especially notable is his successful application of statistical and content analysis to Argentine congressional proceedings. Economic historians, long restricted by statistical sources concerned with the export sector, may turn increasingly to other sources for fragmentary data on domestic internal economies, as does William Paul McGreevey in *An Economic History of Colombia, 1845–1930* (Cambridge, Eng., 1971).

Questions of the utility and appropriateness of historical source materials ultimately involve philosophical issues. The role of impersonal economic and demographic forces, and the question of mass-oriented versus elite history have already been touched upon in this article. Similarly, while few historians would argue over the legitimacy and contribution of Smith's use of social science techniques and concepts to analyze complete, verifiable data, many would question the use of fragmentary and equivocal evidence. But assessments of the quality and reliability of data do not exist independently of the questions the historian asks. William McGreevey grapples with this problem in his article, "Recent Research on the Economic History of Latin America," *LARR*, 3:2:89–117 (Spring, 1968). McGreevey suggests ways of developing hypotheses to link scattered data and presents some methods of checking the reliability of uncertain data.

Another historian who utilizes questionable or unreliable materials is R. C. Padden, whose imaginative interpretation of the conquest of Mexico, *The Hummingbird and the Hawk* (Columbus, Ohio, 1967), is admittedly based on probability rather than certainty. Padden points out in his preface that a historian's reaction to use of uncertain data largely depends on the school of historical faith to which he belongs. Unlike those who are "steeped in the methodological ideals of the nineteenth century and the scientism of the early twentieth," he asserts, "the ethnohistorian imbibes the scientism of the present" and is accustomed to working within a theory of probability. Padden's comments have relevance outside the field of ethnohistory, as Latin American historians begin to ask questions for which little systematic data are available. But willingness to work tentatively with scattered, unreliable data should not inhibit the search for better evidence drawn from new, primary source materials, nor should it detract from the innovative use of traditional materials.

One methodological approach which is particularly appropriate to the present state of the discipline is the attempt to elucidate a large question through exhaustive

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

analysis of its component parts. While major trends and problems in Latin American history have been singled out, their surfaces charted, and important questions asked, the inner workings of Latin American societies through time are still poorly understood. John Leddy Phelan's *The Kingdom of Quito in the Seventeenth Century* (Madison, 1967) is perhaps the most impressive attempt to scrutinize the part to elucidate the whole. The primary research in the book concerns the administration of Antonio de Morga, president of the Audiencia of Quito from 1615 to 1636. But Phelan's concern with developing accurate generalizations for the colonial period as a whole leads him to modify and revise theses concerning population decline, ecological changes, labor systems, religiosity and morality, and graft and venality. In addition, Phelan's theoretical interest in bureaucracy leads him to attempt to distinguish a historical reality from Weber's ideal types. Another example of this approach is Ralph Della Cava's *Miracle at Joazeiro* (N.Y., 1970), an important study of the religious movement headed by Padre Cícero in the northeast of Brazil at the turn of the nineteenth century. Through his attempt to relate events in Joazeiro to national and international political, institutional, and economic structures, Della Cava offers a stimulating contribution to the study of millenarianism and, more importantly, a critique of the dualistic (traditional versus modern) conceptual framework so popular in the study of Brazil and Latin America in general.

Regional studies share some of the potential of the case-study approach illustrated by the books by Phelan and Della Cava, but generally they have been less concerned with theoretical problems. William B. Taylor's *Landlord and Peasant in Colonial Oaxaca*, discussed previously, modifies our conception of the voracious, land-absorbing hacienda and its consequences for indigenous population in the colonial period. Joseph L. Love, *Rio Grande do Sul and Brazilian Regionalism, 1882–1930* (Stanford, 1971), provides a detailed analysis of regional politics and traces the interrelationship of this southernmost Brazilian state with the national presidential politics of the Old Republic.

Comparative history is another methodological tool being employed by United States historians of Latin America. It is a new tool in the sense that, while all history is written with a degree of implicit cross-national comparison in mind, comparison is being made explicit, often through the adoption of a formal structure which accords equal treatment to the matters compared. Formally structured comparison is discussed in this section, but explicit, informally structured comparisons are also becoming more common.²⁹

The case for comparative American history was succinctly outlined by an early, great historian of Latin America, Edward Gaylord Bourne, in an address delivered at the St. Louis Exposition of 1904: "There are few fields better adapted for the comparative study of the spirit, the capacities, and the characters of these great peoples [the Europeans]; nor is it easy to find one where the economic and human factors which shaped the course of history can be more easily segregated and estimated."³⁰ Latin American historians in the United States, consistent with their general tradi-

Latin American Research Review

tionalism, were slow to capitalize on Bourne's suggestion. But in 1947, Frank Tannenbaum's *Slave and Citizen* (N.Y., 1947), a comparative history of slavery in the Americas, sparked considerable historical controversy. In 1967, Herbert Klein became the second historian of Latin America to join the debate over slavery in the New World, which has been dominated in large part by "American" historians.³¹ Klein's pioneering effort at structured, formal comparison, *Slavery in the Americas. A Comparative Study of Virginia and Cuba* (Chicago, 1967), strongly emphasizes the legal and institutional contrast sketched by Tannenbaum, but it provides impressive evidence of the impact of economic and demographic factors on slave society, factors which subsequently affected race relations. While Klein's study can be criticized for the failure to adequately separate and weigh cultural, economic, and demographic variables, it clearly demonstrates the great potential of the comparative technique.

Since Klein's pioneering attempt at formal, structural comparison of slave societies, historians have sought to exercise greater care in employing the comparative technique. An excellent example is Gwendolyn Mildred Hall's crisply written *Social Control in Slave Plantation Societies. A Comparison of St. Domingue and Cuba* (Baltimore, 1971). A socially committed scholar determined to explode some of the "mythology" surrounding slavery in the Americas, Hall pays great attention to the problem of multiple variables in her analysis. Since, as Hall convincingly demonstrates, the degree of enforcement of slave codes depended in large part on economic factors, she concentrates her comparative analysis on eighteenth-century St. Domingue and nineteenth-century Cuba, periods during which the sugar economy of those Caribbean colonies was booming. Despite her determination to supplement secondary works with primary research, Hall's important study, like many of its predecessors in the field of comparative slavery, suffers from an imbalance of source materials and, at times, overuse of secondary works.

United States historians of Latin America working outside the field of slavery have been slow to adopt comparative frameworks. One exception is Carl Solberg's tightly knit monograph, *Immigration and Nationalism: Argentina and Chile, 1890-1914* (Austin, 1970).³² Solberg presents a wealth of colorful data on the contrasting reactions to immigration in Chile and Argentina, and argues that the differing quality and quantity of immigration to the two countries stimulated the rise of nationalism and influenced its content and form. It could be argued that the greatest weakness of Solberg's otherwise excellent study is his failure to distinguish between dependent and independent variables. The divergent economic and social structures of Chile and Argentina at the turn of the century would seem to have been the primary factors in fostering radical nationalism in Chile and conservative nationalism in Argentina. If this is true, the differing attitudes toward immigration in the two countries, which Solberg documents so well, would be primarily a result of a differently emerging nationalism, not its cause.

The pitfalls of comparative history are many. For all but the most narrowly defined studies, some reliance on secondary sources, with attendant possibilities of

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

superficiality and distortion, is inevitable. Tremendous problems result from working with too many variables, and not distinguishing between dependent and independent variables. But whatever the dangers, the comparative technique, whether formally structured or implicitly integrated into analysis of a single subject, encourages the historian to strip away much that is marginal and concentrate on important, often theoretical questions. One such question, illuminated by all the comparative studies discussed, is the uneven, many-faceted process by which the Americas were integrated into the developing world capitalistic system.³³ Integration, of course, was political and cultural, as well as economic. But unlike the fate accorded most of England's former colonies in the New World, Latin America's experience with integration into the system dominated by the developing nations of the North Atlantic basin generally has been unfortunate if not tragic. Comparative history offers the best methodological tool for exploring the reasons for, and quality of, these differing historical experiences.

A danger exists that as historians become more attentive to social science concepts and techniques, and more analytical in their approach, they may lose their appreciation for paradox, their respect for the unique, their keen sense of intuition. Although their prose may remain relatively lucid and free of jargon, what they write may cease entirely to merit attention as literature. That there is no necessary causal relationship between an increasing awareness and appreciation for social science and analysis and a decrease in the traditional skills of the historian is shown in John Womack, Jr.'s impressive narrative history, *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (N.Y., 1969). Womack combines a profound knowledge of a uniquely Mexican event and a familiarity with revolutionary theory with a sensitivity toward the universal in human experience. Although the book's literary merits are uneven, some passages stand among the best written on Latin American history by United States scholars. Nor is Womack alone in his imaginative synthesis of the traditional and the new. In *The Hummingbird and the Hawk*, R. C. Padden makes lively use of source materials, combines narration with analysis, and employs knowledge of social science concepts and studies to produce an important historical work of solid literary merits.

III. LIBERAL VALUES AND ASSUMPTIONS IN UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

Historians, like all scholars, are products of their time, and unavoidably share some of the preoccupations and biases of their contemporaries. The emphasis on economic and social development in recent years—an attitude which contrasts with the concern for liberal political development so characteristic of the 1950s,—is apparent in many of the studies discussed in this article.³⁴ But economic and social development is generally viewed by leading United States Latin Americanists as an evolutionary process occurring within existing economic and political systems. Coupled with this evolutionary view of change are efforts to stress the naturalness and viability of

Latin American Research Review

existing structures,³⁵ attitudes sometimes accompanied by attempts to disparage revolutionary social change. Recent United States studies in Latin American history reflect an affinity and familiarity with these concepts.³⁶ In particular, Albert Hirschman's "reformmonger"—one who works for reform within an existing political system through clever, imaginative manipulation of a complex but often hostile political environment—appears to have achieved the status of a culture hero in the eyes of some United States historians of Latin America.

Take for example Fredrick B. Pike's *The Modern History of Peru* (N.Y., 1967). Pike disputes the "stereotyped assertions" that Peru is a good example of social and economic retardation resulting from rule by a selfish oligarchy. For Pike, the so-called Peruvian oligarchy has been enlightened and progressive about as often as it has been selfish and reactionary. He attacks the myth of progress based on attempts at revolutionary change. According to Pike, the doctrinaire radicals in Peruvian history, whose names are so well-known to foreigners, have had little effect on the course of that history. Rather, "men of moderation and a decided flair, sometimes even a genius, for compromise have directed the country toward its proudest achievements."³⁷ Who are these moderate, gifted Peruvians? Pike emphasizes three: Ramón Castilla, Nicolás de Piérola, and Fernando Belaúnde Terry. Ramón Castilla receives most detailed attention. Castilla worked out a compromise between liberals and conservatives in the mid-nineteenth century, thus providing the stability necessary for foreign development of guano deposits. Subsequently, as Pike himself points out, he initiated the system of cash advancements on guano exports which proved so disastrous for the economic development and political autonomy of Peru during the second half of the nineteenth century.

A description of "reformmongering" *par excellence* emerges from Kenneth R. Maxwell's article, "Pombal and the Nationalization of the Luzo-Brazilian Economy" (*HAHR*, 48:4:608–631; Nov., 1968). By placing his analysis in an Atlantic setting, Maxwell makes an outstanding contribution to our understanding of the Pombaline reforms and the complexities of the economic ties between Portugal, Brazil, and Britain. Maxwell argues that Pombal's policy was a "practical and logical one within the terms of the Anglo-Portuguese economic relationship. . . . His genius during the fifties was in seeing that statesmanship lies as much in assessing the power and limitations of friends as in assessing that of enemies. He saw that within the relationship with Great Britain there was room for maneuver, and that he could safely make major changes and take fundamental decisions on vital national interests without calling the framework itself into question."

In sum, Pombal's was a nationalism "not characterized by negative phobias but by a pragmatic and positive plan of action." Although it is difficult to criticize Maxwell's evaluation of Pombal on the basis of the information given in a single article, some of his own evidence seems to call his conclusions into question. During the five-year period, 1755–60, following the reforms, "the value of British exports to Portugal reached the highest level and produced the greatest favorable balance of the

century.”³⁸ Soon after, Pombal’s reforms were abandoned. The question arises as to whether Pombal in fact had acted to nationalize the Luzo-Brazilian economy, or whether his policies merely rationalized an exploitative economic system, making it more beneficial to the British government and certain limited groups in Portugal and Brazil.

A historian’s attitude toward the desirability of social change, and his opinion of the best means of achieving it, are often most easily detected in his study of social revolution. Two examples are Hugh Hamill, Jr.’s *The Hidalgo Revolt* (Gainesville, 1966) and John Womack, Jr.’s *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*, cited earlier. Hamill’s penetrating analysis cuts through a maze of historical controversy to indict the revolutionary Mexican priest for his unavailing destruction of life and property and his inability to perceive the reality of his society—the incompatibility of political and social revolution in 1810 and the gulf separating the interests of masses and creoles. For Hamill, the “man who appears to have had the welfare of the Mexican people most at heart was ironically a gachupín, Manuel Abad y Queipo. His liberal views, enlightenment, and concern for the country’s economic prosperity made this prelate the type of leader the country most sorely needed.”³⁹

Given the social structure of nineteenth-century Mexico and what is known about labor conditions on haciendas, in mines, and in obrajes, one might well question Hamill’s evaluation of Hidalgo and Abad y Queipo. How can one choose so easily between the intensive violence and destruction of life in an unsuccessful revolt against a repressive social system, and the systematic violence and long-term destruction of life institutionalized in such a society? The main distinction between the two is that in a revolt, some of the oppressors also suffer loss of life and property. Concerning Abad y Queipo, it is not at all certain that the main thrust of his economic reformism, a scheme for reviving the silk industry, was a viable solution that had the best interests of all Mexicans at heart.

One cannot doubt John Womack’s ultimate sympathy with the *zapatistas* in his treatment of Mexico’s twentieth-century revolution. Yet Womack judges the movement with a critical eye and demonstrates that the Morelos revolutionaries’ greatest strength—their incorruptible, militant intransigence—finally became a weakness when, after almost a decade of fighting, they became increasingly isolated from the mainstream of revolutionary politics. With the death of Zapata a new leader, Gildardo Magaña, emerges to consolidate the fragmenting *zapatistas*. Innovative, flexible, and politically astute, Magaña, according to Womack, maneuvers the *zapatistas* through the treacherous, shifting politics of the times; ultimately he succeeds in linking that local, agrarian revolution to the victorious, national, revolutionary faction under Obregón. Although Womack seems to go to great pains to point out the vital role of the politically skilled Magaña,⁴⁰ he does not completely abandon his appreciation for the ambiguity and complexity of human events; for example, he ends his analysis stressing the essentially conservative goals of the *zapatista* agrarians. But Womack’s own evidence seems to show that the *zapatistas* might have failed altogether had all the

chiefs joined Magaña in his abortive support of Carranza in late November 1919. The zapatista's successful linkup with the *obregonistas* would appear to have depended as much on the strategic support of the militant intransigents, especially de la O, as it did on the political leadership of Magaña.

United States historians have also tended to assume the positive nature of foreign penetration in Latin America. Benjamin Keen has argued that the concerted attempt by United States historians of the Spanish empire to counteract the Black Legend denigrating Spanish imperialism is ultimately related to the United States' experience with an empire of its own.⁴¹ That such concerns continue to motivate practitioners of the discipline in this country is forcefully demonstrated in Philip Wayne Powell's *Tree of Hate. Propaganda and Prejudices Affecting United States Relations with the Hispanic World* (N.Y., 1971). Sympathetic to the idea of a grand Anglo-Hispanic cultural alliance to protect western civilization from the onslaught of "Eurasian" communism, Powell states in his preface (p. vii) that the story of the Black Legend "should be of singular interest to the citizens of a summit power now burdened with similar twin responsibilities of defense of the West and aid to backward nations while also suffering the blows of global propagandas designed to destroy us."

But the parallels between Spain's mercantilistic empire of the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries and the United States' informal twentieth-century economic empire are tenuous and usually far removed from the mind of the colonial historian. Much closer to the United States' imperial experience is that of Britain, which during the nineteenth century exercised an economic, political, and cultural hegemony in Latin America in every way comparable to the present United States position. The one book discussed here which specifically addresses the problem of the impact of British influence in Latin America is Richard Graham's *Britain and the Onset of Modernization in Brazil, 1850-1914* (London, 1968). Graham views Brazil's relationship with Britain as a generally beneficial one, in which a backward, underdeveloped country's economic, political, social, and cultural affairs are favorably influenced by contact with a dynamic, progressive, "leading" nation. Evaluating Graham's solid contribution, one is struck by the importance of the interpretive model he chose. Virtually all of Graham's information could be transferred readily to a Marxist model which, by changing the emphasis and interpretation given the data, would lead to pessimistic conclusions concerning the impact of British imperialism on Brazil. Graham tacitly admits that Brazil has not developed satisfactorily. Rather than locating the cause in the structural defects inherited from the colonial period, which were reinforced and perpetuated by British influence, Graham blames the nation's cultural heritage, which he finds resistant to the positive influence of the British.

IV. TOWARD A NEW CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: LATIN AMERICA AS THE UNDERDEVELOPED WEST

Several factors have stimulated United States historians to explore new conceptual frameworks in their studies in Latin American history. The growing

disenchantment with liberalism in some quarters of the United States intellectual community by the end of the 1960s led to a reassessment of liberal assumptions and their applicability to Latin American history. But Latin American political and intellectual trends have also profoundly influenced the thinking of United States Latin-Americanists. The failure of liberal regimes in Argentina, Brazil, and Peru and their replacement by authoritarian military governments caused Latin American intellectuals to re-evaluate the viability of non-liberal solutions to the problems of development. Conservative intellectuals, most notably Claudio Véliz, have emphasized the strength of an authoritarian, hierarchical, corporatist tradition whose foundations were solidly laid during three centuries of Spanish colonialism. Véliz has argued that Latin America suffered a century-long liberal hiatus after independence, but that since 1930 the area has been re-discovering its Iberian heritage of centralized, authoritarian, corporatist, political systems and state-directed, technocratic, economic development.⁴² On the other hand, dismay at the consolidation of authoritarian military regimes in major Latin American countries coupled with the enthusiasm generated by the success of the Cuban Revolution and the election of a Marxist government in Chile led leftist intellectuals to re-evaluate Latin America's historical ties with the developing West and to insist on the necessity of nationalist, socialist revolutions. It would be a mistake to over-emphasize the mutual exclusiveness of these two alternatives to liberal historical interpretations. In the thought of some Latin American intellectuals the two have become uneasily combined under the rubric of what is vaguely called "dependency theory," that unstable mixture of Marxist doctrine, nationalism, and technocratic developmentalism which owes much of its original stimulus to the work of United States Marxist economist Paul Baran, but which has been adapted and extended by Latin American social scientists, notably Fernando Henrique Cardoso.⁴³

On the whole, United States historians of Latin America have been reluctant to adopt *in toto* any of these alternative conceptual frameworks, but many of their recent studies clearly reflect the influence of anti-liberal assumptions and values. Some of these studies, especially those dealing with intellectual and economic history, emphasize the unique experience of the area as the underdeveloped part of the industrializing Western world. These studies are proving remarkably successful in providing fresh insight into the central issues of Latin American history.

A growing number of studies assess the interplay and modification of European intellectual currents in Latin American settings, but Charles A. Hale has demonstrated most effectively the tremendous contribution which intellectual history, placed in an Atlantic setting, can make to the study of Latin American history.⁴⁴ Hale's Atlantic focus allows him to perceive similar contradictions in the espousal and application of liberal principles in both France and Mexico. He demonstrates that liberalism in Mexico was not always a benign, progressive force thwarted by conservative reactionaries and, in the process, illuminates much of the basis for the turmoil of nineteenth-century Mexican history.

Hale's emphasis on structural affinities between Mexico and France should not

Latin American Research Review

detract attention from another vital issue: the structural disparity between Latin America and the industrializing societies of Western Europe in general and Great Britain in particular. It is in Britain that liberalism reaches its fullest, most consistent expression. And it is Britain, the "leading nation" of the West in the nineteenth century, whose tremendous, many-faceted influence pervaded Latin America in that century. While Hale's framework emphasizes an Atlantic setting, it does not sufficiently stress the dependent, underdeveloped position of Latin America in that setting. Imbibing the liberal economic and political philosophy of the most advanced nation of the world, Latin America became saddled with large sections of a complex superstructure grossly inappropriate to the region's economic and social foundations. Clearly, understanding of the national period as a whole would be greatly enhanced through a conceptual framework sensitive to the tensions and contradictions involved in the imposition of cultural elements evolved in the leading industrializing nations on the underdeveloped economic and social structures of Latin America.

Recognition of the enormity of the impact of liberalism on Latin America should not obscure the influence of alternate responses to industrialization which have been articulated in the West. One such response has its roots in conservative philosophy and has expressed itself historically under such labels as Comtean positivism, corporatism, and fascism; the other is radical, leftist, and has been expressed most consistently as variants of Marxism. These alternate ideologies generally had only limited appeal in the leading countries of the industrializing West, although both seemed to threaten to become dominant in the twentieth century. Finally discredited in the developed West after World War II by a triumphant liberalism, their appeal or appropriateness to conditions in Latin America has until recently either been discounted or received little attention by United States historians.

That this attitude is changing is apparent in several recent studies which seek to re-appraise the influence of both conservative and radical philosophies in the hemisphere. While United States historians have long recognized the influence of "positivism," a vaguely defined term which often lumps Comteans and Spencerians together,⁴⁵ until recently these scholars left its study to Latin Americans. At present, important studies of positivism are in progress by United States historians, although little has yet been published.⁴⁶ Following the lead of Richard Morse, who has long stressed the medieval cultural heritage of Latin America and employed insights from corporatist theory,⁴⁷ Fredrick B. Pike and Ronald C. Newton have contributed studies stressing the pervasiveness of pre-capitalist, Hispanic, cultural values and assessing the political implications of the corporatist tradition in Latin America. Pike's *Hispanismo, 1898–1936* (Notre Dame, 1971) is concerned primarily with Spanish thinkers and their efforts to promote an anti-materialist Hispanic Atlantic community during the first decades of the twentieth century, but it also devotes considerable attention to like-minded Latin American intellectuals. Newton's difficult to read, but often insightful article, "On 'Functional Groups,' 'Fragmentation,' and 'Pluralism' in Spanish American Political Society," *HAHR* 50:1:1–29 (Feb., 1970) analyzes the

traditional socio-cultural matrix of Spanish American politics with an eye to explaining the frequent periods of political violence and governmental paralysis which he finds endemic to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

On the other hand, historians in this country long assumed that leftist intellectual currents had a negligible influence in Latin America during the nineteenth century. Their studies of the impact of Marxism in the twentieth century, strongly influenced by the Cold War, have been limited to analysis of the history, strength, and appeal of communism in the hemisphere. Recent studies indicate that this pattern is changing. A more relaxed attitude toward traditional Cold War concerns can be found in two studies dealing with communism in Mexico. Karl M. Schmitt's *Communism in Mexico* (Austin, 1965) dispassionately discounts major communist influence on Mexican history after the outbreak of the Revolution; analyzes the long-standing weaknesses of the movement; and describes the increasingly anti-communist stance of the Mexican government. Quite different conclusions are reached by Robert Paul Millon in his intellectual biography, *Mexican Marxist: Vicente Lombardo Toledano* (Chapel Hill, 1966). Millon enthusiastically describes and corroborates Lombardo Toledano's orthodox Marxist analysis of Mexican history, approves of his general tactics, and predicts the ultimate success of his movement. Recent work also provides evidence of a growing appreciation for the subtlety and diversity of Marxist influence in Latin America. In *Marxism in Latin America* (N.Y., 1968), a Borzoi teaching aid, editor Luis A. Aguilar largely succeeds in controlling his anti-communist bias and provides a varied selection of documents from both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although Aguilar includes some excerpts from Marxist-influenced intellectuals of various persuasions, the selection is weighted toward communist party polemics. Hobart Spalding's fine collection of documents, *La clase trabajadora argentina* (Buenos Aires, 1970), which vividly describes aspects of the early history of the Argentine labor movement, is drawn primarily from newspapers and public documents.⁴⁸ Mention should also be made of James Cockcroft's *Intellectual Precursors of the Mexican Revolution, 1900-1913* (Austin, 1968), which demonstrates the influence of European leftist thought on some Mexican intellectuals at the turn of the century.

Studies designed to probe the impact of conservative and radical political philosophies in Latin America, like those concerned with the influence of liberalism, profit greatly from a conceptual framework stressing Latin American dependency in a developing Atlantic world. Many of the works discussed have emphasized the structural disparities between the leading nations of the North Atlantic and the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, which provide insight into the two areas' quite different experiences with liberalism. These same structural disparities may also account for the persistent attractiveness of other Western ideologies in Latin America, despite the gravity of the sanctions imposed by the liberal powers (in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries) on any significant deviation from liberal economic orthodoxy.

Latin American Research Review

The other thematic approach which, along with intellectual history, is proving especially valuable in assessing Latin America's historical experience as the underdeveloped part of the Western world is the study of economic development. An outstanding collection of incisive essays by Stanley J. and Barbara H. Stein, *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America* (N.Y., 1970), illustrates the interpretive power of this approach. Beginning with an analysis of the dependency relationship of Iberia to the progressive, dynamic economies of Western Europe, the Steins proceed to evaluate the social and political consequences of Latin America's colonization by traditional, in many ways medieval, European powers. The reforms of the eighteenth century are imaginatively interpreted as inevitably unsuccessfully attempts by dependent Iberian nations to effect "defensive modernization" of their empires. Moving into the national period, the Stein's treatment remains highly suggestive, but increasingly sketchy. Beneath the turbulent surface of nineteenth-century politics and twentieth-century change, the Steins emphasize the colonial legacy of stable economic and social institutions inimical to development.

Recent studies concerned with Brazilian and Colombian economic development provide detailed contrast with the Stein's sweeping conceptualization of Latin America's ongoing dependency relationship with the developed West. John D. Wirth's *The Politics of Brazilian Development, 1930-1954* (Stanford, 1970) is not concerned with explaining Brazil's propensity for authoritarian, corporatist solutions to the problems of development; he assumes the traditional socio-cultural legacy analyzed in studies like those of Morse, Newton, and the Steins. Rather, Wirth's penetrating study seeks to describe the nature of economic policy-making during the Vargas years and assess the viability of "conservative modernization" as a model for overcoming economic underdevelopment and dependency in twentieth-century Brazil. Wirth's conclusions are mixed. While he convincingly demonstrates the success of Vargas' Estado Novo regime in developing a national steel industry, he shows how international conditions largely determined the fate of Vargas' corporatist approach to development. Acutely conscious of the need to view Brazilian history in an Atlantic setting, Wirth illustrates how the rise of German influence in Brazil during the 1930s permitted the Vargas regime considerable economic maneuverability while bolstering it politically and ideologically. With the coming of World War II, the defeat of Germany, and the initiation of the Cold War, the renewed ascendancy of United States interests and influence in Brazil created severe domestic and international political and economic pressures for Vargas. By the 1950s, these pressures spelled failure for Vargas' authoritarian political style and sabotaged his right-wing nationalist approach to the problems of economic development.

Dealing with a slightly earlier period of Brazilian economic development, Warren Dean's *The Industrialization of São Paulo, 1880-1945* (Austin, 1969), stresses the cultural continuities that limited the vitality of Brazilian industrialization and ultimately compromised its autonomy. Although Dean does not emphasize the importance of an Atlantic setting, he grants the influence of macro-economic conditions

as causes for industrialization. Thus, the timing of the demand for coffee in the developing world, the nature of Brazilian international trade (buying and selling in different markets), the structure of the coffee industry in Brazil, the transformation of Atlantic labor and immigration patterns, the timing of world depression and war—all these factors are skillfully woven into Dean's analysis of the genesis of industrialization in São Paulo. But the book as a whole forsakes the Atlantic framework and focuses on the most immediate determinant of the nature of industrialization—the entrepreneurial elite. That approach contributes to the insight and revisionism characteristic of the entire book, especially with regard to the implications of the traditional attitudes and values of the elite, but the focus builds a bias into the study which emphasizes the cultural obstacles to vigorous autonomous development at the expense of domestic and international structural impediments to that process.⁴⁹

Like Dean, Wirth, and the Steins, William Paul McGreevey emphasizes the cultural factors involved in economic development in his provocative study, *An Economic History of Colombia, 1850–1930*, cited earlier. In the last analysis, McGreevey attributes the successful early twentieth-century Colombian economic development to a conscious decision by a regional elite (the *antioqueños*) to pursue developmentalist policies. But much of McGreevey's evidence, and a great deal of his analysis, supports the contention that the potential for economic development in a dependent export economy is ultimately determined by the structure of that economy. Thus, the foreign-controlled, tobacco-enclave economy of mid-nineteenth-century Colombia impeded development. Conversely, the widely diffused, Colombian-controlled coffee economy that evolved after the turn of the twentieth century stimulated the country's economic and social development and fostered the industrialization of Antioquia, the major coffee-producing area.⁵⁰

Although McGreevey's explanation of the origins of Colombia's early twentieth-century economic development is open to serious question, his great methodological resourcefulness in generating (admittedly controversial) statistics on Colombian trade, production, transport costs, and population growth is of much value for the study of the long-neglected history of that important Andean nation. Moreover, especially in the early chapters of his study, dealing with the failure of liberal policies in the nineteenth century, McGreevey tellingly demonstrates the value of an Atlantic focus in understanding the problems of Latin American economic development.

The discussion of the usefulness of a conceptual framework emphasizing Latin America as the underdeveloped West has depended primarily on works of general application or those concerned with Mexico, Brazil, and Colombia to illustrate the argument. But such a framework may prove especially useful in gaining new perspectives toward Argentine history, a field which has not lent itself to conventional historical interpretations. The problem areas of recent Argentine history have been concisely outlined in Thomas F. McGann's well-written overview, *Argentina: The Divided Land* (Princeton, 1966). Such themes as post-1930 economic stagnation, the internal weaknesses of Radicalism, the growth of right-wing nationalism, the resurg-

Latin American Research Review

ence of conservatism, the rise of Perón, and the emergence of the military in politics could all be profitably approached through the framework advocated here. Analysis could start with an investigation of the domestic and international implications of Argentina's agricultural export economy, stressing in particular the economy's impact on social structure, politics, and culture.

Two recent studies utilize parts of the indicated conceptual framework, and demonstrate the utility of such an approach to Argentine history. Peter H. Smith's narrowly defined study in political economy, *Politics and Beef in Argentina*, which has been cited previously, concentrates on the beef industry, the activity which dominated the Argentine export economy. Smith argues that until 1940, contention over political issues relating to the beef industry is best understood as an intra-class, intra-rural cleavage, not as a rural-urban split. Only with the rise of Perón do urban consuming and working classes finally redress the economic and political imbalance characteristic of rule by the landed elites. But Smith's neglect of Argentina's dependent position in the West in formulating his revision of the rural-urban political dichotomy leads him to classify foreign packing house interests as "rural" and consistently to deemphasize the subtle and potential political power of foreign interests. Perhaps more meaningful distinctions revolve around the metropolitan interests of those tied directly to the export sector, and the nationalistic, albeit reactionary, interests of those further removed from the economic advantages of the export sector. Samuel L. Baily's important study, *Labor, Nationalism, and Politics in Argentina* (New Brunswick, 1967), implicitly recognizes the importance of Argentina's interrelationships with the countries of the North Atlantic. His central thesis argues that as massive European immigration slows to a trickle in Argentina during the 1930s, to be replaced by internal migration from the provinces, Liberal nationalism in the labor movement is undermined by the growth of "criollo" nationalism, embodying traditional, anti-liberal, Hispanic values. "Criollo" nationalism is astutely cultivated by Perón, and leaves a divisive legacy with his fall. Baily also notes the liberal pressures from abroad among the forces which caused Perón to abandon much of his nationalistic economic program during his last years in power. But how would Baily explain the "criollo" nationalism so appealing to many Argentine intellectuals, estancieros, and entrepreneurs? Clearly it is misleading to explain Peronism primarily in terms of internal migration. Domestic social and economic structures and international economic and political considerations related to the export economy may prove to have played the greatest roles in fostering this distinctly Argentine attempt at corporatist, conservative modernization.

As these examples from Argentine historiography show, United States historians of Latin America have generally failed to exploit the enormous interpretive power of studies in political economy. Discussion of two other studies will further illustrate the point. The subject of June Hahner's *Civilian-Military Relations in Brazil, 1889-1898* (Columbia, S.C., 1969), the story of the displacement of the military regime which overthrew the Empire in 1889 by a civilian elite supported by the

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

coffee interests of São Paulo, offered an excellent opportunity to relate that political event to economic and social forces at work in the society. Hahner seems to grasp the importance of political economy to her analysis, but she skews her study in favor of an attempt to discover the mechanics of a transition from military to civilian government. Although she provides some information on the rising wealth and power of coffee-producing São Paulo, and notes the *paulistas'* "profit" mentality and their desire to insure the flow of immigration, capital, and technology from abroad by enhancing Brazil's international reputation for stability, she generally fails to explore fully the subtleties of the relationship between the *paulistas'* world view and their political activities and economic interests.

John V. Lombardi's *The Decline and Abolition of Negro Slavery in Venezuela, 1820–1854* (Westport, Conn., 1971) also attempts to relate a political process, the abolition of slavery, to the rise of the coffee economy. While Lombardi provides suggestive insights into the economic foundations of abolition, his spadework into the analysis of early nineteenth-century Venezuelan political economy suffers from certain conceptual problems and methodological deficiencies. As Lombardi shows, slavery was relatively unimportant in Venezuela; consequently, attitudes toward slavery or interests in its perpetuation are not at the heart of the political divisions of the period. Nor is it clear that during the period under analysis the coffee economy was of such inordinate influence in Venezuelan affairs as Lombardi contends. Lombardi offers little systematic evidence to document his assertions that Liberals and Conservatives represented different economic interests. Investigation of the economic affairs, the regional concentrations, and world views of Liberal and Conservative factions might provide such data.

The possibilities of elucidating the political and ideological conflicts of nineteenth-century Venezuela—and indeed of enriching our understanding of the whole of Latin American history—through the systematic investigation of the economic interests of political factions remains a promising and virtually untapped area for study. Domestic economic interests, like domestic ideologies, generally have international dimensions, and it is precisely through the process of locating national political events within the context of an Atlantic economic setting that the fullest understanding of Latin American societies through time will emerge.

V. CONCLUSION

The growth of Latin American historiography in the United States in recent years cannot be appreciated fully in terms of physical expansion, although the increase in the number of scholars engaged in the field has been large. The field has grown also in terms of its approach to history, by developing and utilizing new and more sophisticated analytical, methodological, and conceptual tools. These changes have come about in large part through an increased concern with development and more intimate contact with the social sciences. Large numbers of scholars engaged

Latin American Research Review

in increasingly ambitious projects, often with ideological or policy-making implications, will generate greater controversy and criticism within the field. This trend is encouraging: good criticism, traditionally low-keyed in the field, is vital to scholarship. The pursuit of Latin American history in the United States promises to be an increasingly demanding and stimulating endeavor.

1. On this point see Benjamin Keen's introduction to the recent edition of Edward Gaylord Bourne's *Spain in America*, reprinted in Howard F. Cline, ed., *Latin American History. Essays on its Study and Teaching, 1898–1967* (2 vols., Austin, 1967), 1:57.
2. James Alexander Robertson, the first editor of the *Hispanic American Historical Review*, alluded to one answer in 1919, noting that the increase in interest in Latin American history in the United States was "largely fostered by the narrowing bonds set to the earth by the demands of commerce and by the industrial development of our age." "A Symposium on the Teaching of the History of Hispanic America in Educational Institutions in the United States," in Cline (1967:1:231).
3. As late as 1958, Robert Burr lamented the failure of Latin American historians to make clear that their field offered "real intellectual challenges, either within the framework of contemporary historical thinking or in opening up new currents of historical thought." "History: Needs and Prospects," in Cline (1967:2:542).
4. A comparison of the first (1966) and second (1971) editions of *The National Directory of Latin Americanists*, prepared by the Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, readily confirms the great increase in the number of United States scholars specializing in Latin America and also attests to the recent vintage of a large proportion of United States Latin Americanists.
5. Morse's comments, his contribution to a 1968 conference devoted to exploring problems of training and research in Latin American area studies in the United States, are published along with other conference papers and commentary in Stanley R. Ross, ed., *Latin America in Transition* (Albany, N.Y., 1970).
6. "Thirty Years of the Hispanic American Historical Review," *HAHR*, 29:2:188–204 (May, 1949).
7. Since an earlier version of this article was submitted to the *HAHR* in May 1971, the editors have adopted a similar scheme for monitoring the geographical, temporal, and thematic distribution of the articles submitted and published in the journal. See "From the Editor's Desk," *HAHR*, 51:4:714 (November, 1971), for an introduction to this policy.
8. Simpson included documentary pieces as well as articles since the former were, he believed, "in effect, short articles." He excluded the "Notes and Comment" section as generally devoted to "ephemeral articles of no great weight." Simpson (1949:188). Pieces dealing with archives were not mentioned by Simpson. I found these distinctions to be tenuous at best for recent issues of the *HAHR*. "Notes and Comment" sometimes included pieces of importance, while pieces dealing with documents were often little more than transcriptions. Recently, few documents have appeared in the *HAHR*. To avoid this tangle, I have surveyed only full-fledged articles and avoided the tabulation by number of pages, the procedure Simpson used to weight the shorter documentary pieces he included.
9. See Simpson (1949:189) for the list from which these data are taken.
10. "Trends in United States Studies in Latin American History," in Cline (1967:2:538).

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

11. These criteria are rarely made explicit in guidelines for funding, but John J. TePaske has recently pointed out that the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies has restricted its funding of cooperative projects by North American and Latin American scholars to studies dealing solely with the national period. "Spanish America: The Colonial Period," in Roberto Esquenazi-Mayo and Michael C. Meyer, eds., *Latin American Scholarship since World War II* (Lincoln, Neb., 1971), 6. This useful volume contains some excellent historiographical articles on their respective specialties by a number of United States historians. The collection has the virtue of demonstrating that the bulk of important scholarship on Latin American history continues to be done outside the United States by scholars in Latin America and Europe. Reviewing the literature as a whole since World War II, the book offers a very different perspective from the one presented in this article on trends within the United States community of Latin American historians.
12. Following Simpson's procedure, all articles of general application were not tabulated. In Simpson's sample these amounted to 22% of the whole; in my survey, 14 articles or 11% of the whole were omitted. The smaller percentage of articles of general application may itself be an indication of the increasing specialization characteristic of the field. Simpson (1949:192).
13. Simpson (1949:193).
14. For Simpson's harried statement of the problem, see Simpson (1949:194).
15. Simpson's table is found in Simpson (1949:194).
16. For a criticism of Simpson's survey in general, and his classification scheme in particular, see Howard F. Cline, "Reflections on Traditionalism in the Historiography of Hispanic America," in Cline (1967:1:135-138).
17. Some examples from the articles surveyed in the *HAHR* would include those by Charles A. Hale, "José María Luis Mora and the Structure of Mexican Liberalism" (May, 1965); Ralph Lee Woodward, Jr., "Economic and Social Origins of the Guatemalan Political Parties (1773-1823)" (Nov., 1965); Richard Graham, "Causes for the Abolition of Negro Slavery in Brazil: An Interpretive Essay" (May, 1966); Warren Dean, "The Planter as Entrepreneur: The Case of São Paulo" (May, 1966); Asunción Lavrin, "The Role of the Nunneries in the Economy of New Spain in the Eighteenth Century" (Nov., 1966); Richard E. Greenleaf, "Vice-regal Power and the Obrajes of the Cortés Estate" (Aug., 1968); Kenneth R. Maxwell, "Pombal and the Nationalization of the Luzo-Brazilian Economy" (Nov., 1968); James Lockhart, "Encomienda and Hacienda: The Evolution of the Great Estate in the Spanish Indies" (Aug., 1969); Stuart B. Schwartz, "Magistracy and Society in Colonial Brazil" (Nov., 1970); Robert G. Keith, "Encomienda, Hacienda and Corregimiento in Spanish America: A Structural Analysis" (Aug., 1971); Warren Dean, "Latifundia and Land Policy in Nineteenth-Century Brazil" (Nov., 1971); Mark Falcoff, "Raúl Scalabrini Ortiz: The Making of an Argentine Nationalist" (Feb., 1972).
18. On the other hand, as will become apparent in the next section, the space available in a book-length study may encourage innovation since the author enjoys ample room to develop and defend his ideas and methodology.
19. Unable to control Simpson's data, for the article survey I tabulated every article published during the period surveyed. These included a very few by persons who would not meet the strict definition outlined here.
20. Not tabulated were four books for which geographical focus did not apply. They are: Howard F. Cline's handy *Directory of Latin American Historians* (Durham, 1966); the second edition of the same editor's *National Directory of Latin Americanists* (Washington, D.C.,

Latin American Research Review

- 1971); the volume edited by Stanley Ross, cited previously; and J. Fred Rippy's memoirs, *Bygones I Cannot Help Recalling* (Austin, 1966). Recommended for prospective United States historians of Latin America, Rippy's book conveys some of the flavor of the profession in decades past and often candidly treats his long experience in academic life.
21. A few of these studies abandon the tradition of romantic narrative accounts and collections of documents related to exploration, conquest, and settlement so characteristic of borderlands history in the past. Leonard Pitt's *The Decline of the Californios, A Social History of the Spanish-Speaking Californians, 1846-1890* (Berkeley, 1966) stresses the traditional nature of Spanish Californian society and documents the racism and economic exploitation to which the Spanish-speaking population was subjected after United States acquisition in 1848. A solidly researched study, which interlaces the traditional style and concerns of borderlands historians with attention to economic and social factors and an interest in the comparative study of frontier institutions is C. Alan Hutchinson's *Frontier Settlement in Mexican California. The Hajar-Padrés Colony, and Its Origins, 1769-1835* (New Haven, 1969). A descriptive economic history, devoted primarily to the first half of the nineteenth century is David J. Weber's *The Taos Trappers: The Fur Trade in the Far Southwest, 1540-1846* (Norman, Okla., 1971). Joyce Elizabeth Harman works from ship manifests and customs records to document extensive economic ties between Spanish Florida and the English colonies in her *Trade and Privateering in Spanish Florida, 1732-1763* (St. Augustine, 1969). Some evidence of changing interests among Gulf coast historians can be found in two collections edited by Ernest F. Dibble and Earle W. Newton, *In Search of Gulf Coast History* (Pensacola, Fla., 1970) and *Spain and her Rivals on the Gulf Coast* (Pensacola, Fla., 1971). See especially the interesting comparative study by John J. TePaske of French, Spanish, and English Indian policy published in the latter volume. All in all, published evidence of the changing concerns of borderlands scholars is limited, but judging from the research opportunities and interest in social and economic history attested to in William S. Coker, *et al.*, "Research in the Spanish Borderlands," *LARR* 7:2:3-94 (Summer, 1972), the future of borderlands history may be significantly different.
 22. Teaching aids (23 books) and the four books not tabulated in the analysis of geographical focus were not included in the table.
 23. In his recently published *Latin America: A Concise Interpretive History* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), which falls outside the time-span of books tabulated, Burns somewhat less successfully applies the same approach to the history of the area as a whole.
 24. At this point the discussion abandons the restrictions employed in the surveys for purposes of control over the data and includes significant studies published since 1971.
 25. In a stimulating recent article, "Encomienda, Hacienda and Corregimiento in Spanish America: A Structural Analysis," *HAHR*, 51:3431-446 (Aug., 1971), Robert G. Keith seeks to modify Lockhart's conception of the relationship between encomienda and hacienda by emphasizing the discontinuities and tensions between the two institutions. As an ideal type, he argues, encomienda perpetuated pre-capitalistic, indigenous structures while hacienda, in its ideal form, is a capitalistic institution.
 26. Other pioneers in the use of notarial research, parts of whose work are at present only available in dissertation and article form, are Frederick P. Bowser and Karen Spalding. The potential of another kind of source available to colonial historians, metropolitan appointment files, is demonstrated by Stuart B. Schwartz' recently published study of the career patterns and local interests of judges serving on the high court of Bahia, *Sovereignty and Society in Colonial Brazil* (Berkeley, 1973).
 27. Studies in Latin American history employing quantification have recently been reviewed for

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

- the colonial and national periods by John J. TePaske and William Paul McGreevey in their contributions to V. Lorwin and Jacob Price, eds., *The Dimensions of the Past: Materials, Problems, and Opportunities for Quantitative Work in History* (New Haven, 1972). TePaske's judicious survey demonstrates the greater development of studies in the colonial period and illustrates for the neophyte the advantages and promise of computer techniques. McGreevey's treatment of the relatively meager literature on the national period primarily offers suggestions for future work.
28. See Thomas E. Skidmore and Peter H. Smith's searching criticism of Wilkie's book—and Wilkie's rebuttal—in *LARR*, 5:1:71–91 (Spring, 1970).
 29. Two fine examples of the use of explicit, informally structured comparison are John Leddy Phelan's book discussed above, and Stanley J. and Barbara H. Stein's *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America* (N.Y., 1970), which is treated in the next section.
 30. "The Relation of American History to Other Fields of Historical Study," in Cline (1967: 1:54).
 31. With the exception of Eugene D. Genovese, who has taken a truly American approach to the problem of comparative slavery, "American" historians have been interested in Latin American slavery largely insofar as it can shed light on United States slavery. Contrast the approaches of the first part of Eugene D. Genovese, *The World the Slaveholders Made* (N.Y., 1969), and Laura Foner and Eugene D. Genovese, eds., *Slavery in the New World* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969) with Stanley M. Elkins, *Slavery* (Chicago, 1959) and Carl N. Degler, *Neither Black Nor White* (N.Y., 1971). Degler's formally structured comparison of slavery and race relations in Brazil and the United States takes issue with much previous work on the problem. Degler argues that slavery in the United States was probably milder than in Brazil and that the future of race relations in the United States is, in many respects, more hopeful than in Brazil. With its close attention to the problem of the free black and mulatto, Degler's book reflects a recent trend in the historical study of slave societies. In this regard see the excellent contributions in David W. Cohen and Jack P. Green, eds., *Neither Slave Nor Free* (Baltimore, 1972). United States historians of Latin America contributing to that volume include Frederick P. Bowser, Gwendolyn Mildred Hall, Franklin M. Knight, and Herbert S. Klein.
 32. Another example, not included in this discussion because of the strict definition adopted for United States historians of Latin America, is Rayford Logan's *Haiti and the Dominican Republic* (N.Y., 1968). Depending on secondary sources, Logan compares the historical experiences of the two countries with an eye to accounting for their disparate economic, political, and cultural development. Although Logan's study suffers from many of the pitfalls discussed below, his analysis raises a number of challenging questions. Discounting racial factors, Logan suggests that the divergence between the two nations is accountable in terms of the varying impact of slavery, the timing and nature of the independence movement, and continuing relations with great powers.
 33. The importance of this question was particularly stressed by Eugene D. Genovese in a paper delivered to the CLAH luncheon at the American Historical Association meeting in December 1969. Genovese's plea for comparative history was similar to Bourne's statement quoted previously: "There are at least two reasons for bringing our work into comparative focus, the first being the need to maximize control of our generalizations, and the second being the need to write the history of the social process by which a single world community has been developing since the sixteenth century."
 34. Books by William J. Griffith, *Empires in the Wilderness: Foreign Colonization and Development in Guatemala, 1834–1844* (Chapel Hill, 1965), Wayne M. Clegern, *British Honduras: Colonial Dead End, 1859–1900* (Baton Rouge, 1967), and Ralph Lee Wood-

Latin American Research Review

- ward, Jr., *Class Privilege and Economic Development: The Consulado de Comercio de Guatemala, 1793–1871* (Chapel Hill, 1966), are examples of the concern with development in studies of smaller Latin American countries which do not receive attention in other sections of this article.
35. Especially noteworthy in this respect are the influential contributions of Albert O. Hirschman in economics and Charles W. Anderson in political science. See, for example, Hirschman's *Journeys Toward Progress* (N.Y., 1963), and Anderson's *Political and Economic Change in Latin America* (Princeton, 1967).
 36. A prime example, which does not figure in the subsequent discussion, is James Wilkie's *The Mexican Revolution*, cited previously. Wilkie argues that the greatest "social change" since the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution has occurred since 1940. The implications of Wilkie's study are clear, since it was in 1940 that the Mexican government abandoned its aggressive economic nationalism and its emphasis on bringing about social change directly. Since 1940, Mexican governments have given highest priority to a policy of capitalistic economic development which was to produce the trickle-down effect which Wilkie claims to have measured.
 37. Fredrick B. Pike, *The Modern History of Peru* (N.Y., 1967), xvii.
 - 38 Maxwell (1968:625,630,631).
 39. Hugh Hamill Jr., *The Hidalgo Revolt* (Gainesville, 1966), 220.
 40. Albert Hirschman has emphasized the importance Magaña assumes in Womack's narrative in his article, "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding," *World Politics*, 22:3:329–343 (April, 1970).
 41. In this regard see the spirited exchange between Keen and Lewis Hanke in the HAHR, which began with Keen's "The Black Legend Revisited: Assumptions and Realities," *HAHR*, 49:4:703–721 (November, 1969). Hanke responded with "A Modest Proposal for a Moratorium on Grand Generalizations: Some Thoughts on the Black Legend," *HAHR*, 51:1:112–127 (February, 1971). Keen's rejoinder, "The White Legend Revisited: A Reply to Professor Hanke's 'Modest Proposal'," *HAHR*, 51:2:336–355 (May, 1971), contains his most explicit statements of the relationship between scholarship and the concerns of empire. Keen has also examined the other side of the coin. In his perceptive and handsomely published *The Aztec Image in Western Thought* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1971) he adopts a sociological perspective to assess changing Western evaluations of the Aztec empire since the sixteenth century. Recent additions to the literature on the Black Legend include Charles Gibson, ed., *The Black Legend* (N.Y., 1971), a Borzoi teaching aid, and William S. Maltby, *The Black Legend in England* (Durham, N.C., 1971).
 42. See Claudio Véliz, ed., *Obstacles to Change in Latin America* (London, 1965), and Claudio Véliz, ed., *The Politics of Conformity in Latin America* (London, 1967).
 43. See Paul Baran's pathbreaking, *On the Political Economy of Growth* (N.Y., 1957), and Fernando Cardoso and Enzo Falleto, *Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina* (México, 1969).
 44. See his seminal article, "José María Luis Mora and the Structure of Mexican Liberalism," *HAHR*, 45:2:196–227 (May, 1965), and his book, *Mexican Liberalism in the Age of Mora* (New Haven, 1968).
 45. Ralph Lee Woodward, Jr.,'s much needed teaching aid, *Positivism in Latin America, 1850–1900* (Lexington, Mass., 1971), unfortunately fails to deal with this definitional problem.
 46. A promise of things to come is contained in William D. Raat, "Leopoldo Zea and Mexican Positivism: A Reappraisal," *HAHR*, 48:1:1–18 (Feb., 1968).

RECENT UNITED STATES STUDIES IN LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

47. An excellent example is his article, "Toward a Theory of Spanish American Government," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 15:1:71–93 (Jan., 1954).
48. Publishing his book in Spanish, Spalding, like the Wilkies before him, has set a good example for those United States historians of Latin America who are concerned that the products of their research reach beyond an English-reading public living primarily in the United States.
49. Previously, Thomas E. Skidmore in his *Politics in Brazil, 1930–64* (N.Y., 1967) had assessed the failure of Brazil's "experiment in democracy" against a background of growing domestic and international developmental dilemmas faced by the country in the decade 1954–64.
50. The fact that entrepreneurial elites appeared on the scene to seize the opportunities for development in the coffee-producing areas of both Brazil and Colombia would appear to be the strongest evidence militating against a cultural explanation of economic development. Rather than resort to cultural arguments to explain industrialization, as both Dean and McGreevey ultimately do, it would seem more fruitful to emphasize the structural opportunities for development seemingly inherent in the nature of large-scale coffee production as it expanded in the two countries in the early twentieth century.