

## CONTEMPORARY SOVIET RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICA\*

*J. Gregory Oswald, The University of Arizona*

THIS ESSAY IS DIVIDED INTO THREE PARTS: A DISCUSSION OF THE PERVASIVE role of Marxism-Leninism in Soviet Latin American studies; an examination of the contents of a collection of translated readings of USSR scholars tentatively entitled *The Soviet Image of Latin America, 1945–1965: A Documentary History*; and a general survey of certain basic works devoted to the principal Latin American themes prescribed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

### IDEOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL INFLUENCES

Soviet interest in Latin America is motivated by political considerations, both domestic and international, and has evolved through three discernible stages: the period down to 1935, during which time members of the Executive Committee of the USSR-dominated Third Communist International issued revolutionary pronouncements and directives to Soviet and Latin American Communist writers; the period from 1935 to 1956, when such directives were in force and when the personality and objectives of Joseph Stalin were dominant; and the period since 1956, when changes in the USSR and in Latin America invited reappraisals of the facts and forces of modern Latin American history.

The themes pursued by Soviet writers in the first period are clearly expressed in Henryk M. Iaakobson's 1934 bibliographical survey of periodical and non-periodical literature on Latin America published in the Soviet Union.<sup>1</sup> Iaakobson, considered "an erudite Soviet researcher" by M. S. Al'perovich, leading present-day USSR Latin American historian, also wrote several highly-informed articles on revolutionary conditions of Latin America in the 1930's.<sup>2</sup> In Iaakobson's bibliographical survey are titles of several hundred works concerned with general economic problems and crises in Latin America; economic imperialism and competition among the imperialist powers; problems of revolution and the Latin American communist movement; the status of the working class; problems confronting the revolutionary trade union movement; and

\* The author wishes to express appreciation for the collaborative assistance of Gordon O. Packard, Jr., University of Arizona Graduate Assistant in Research. Various aspects of the research activities described herein were made possible by support from the Mershon Foundation of The Ohio State University, The Ford Foundation, The Hispanic Foundation of the Library of Congress, and The University of Arizona.

analyses of the Pan American Federation of Labor, the Amsterdam labor movement, and the relative status of the Profintern. Country-by-country lists of publications include scores of articles on the labor movement in Argentina and Brazil; relatively few articles on the labor movement in Colombia and Cuba; and at least seventy-five titles on the Mexican Revolution of 1910, the counter-revolution, agrarian problems, the peasant movement, and the labor movement. About 100 articles discuss economics and politics in Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Chile, Ecuador, and Central America—Chile and Uruguay receiving the greatest attention.<sup>3</sup> The Seventh Congress of the Comintern in 1935 stressed radically different themes to be employed by Soviet Latin Americanists, themes which emphasized the desirability of united front coalitions of workers against fascism and the proliferation of war, themes governed more by considerations of expediency than by the imminence of revolution as evinced in the theses, resolutions, decisions, and proclamations of the Sixth Congress in 1928.<sup>4</sup>

Stalin is accused by present-day Soviet scholars of having made a shambles of Soviet Latin American studies in the period between 1935 and 1956. Until 1945, only about a dozen historical monographs and articles were published in the USSR, most of them dedicated to exposing U.S. imperialism in Latin America.<sup>5</sup> M. S. Al'perovich has stated that Stalin induced USSR Latin American historians to "lose their proper bearings and fail to deal objectively and distinctively with the evolutionary problems of different Latin American states."<sup>6</sup> He observed that Stalin categorically refused to believe that the Latin American states were anything less than hopeless reactionary members of the counter-revolutionary camp; in his eyes, they were the "aggressive nucleus of the UN" anxious to foster new wars in 1951. Worst of all, from the viewpoint of the present-day Soviet historian, he ". . . characterized the entire Latin American bourgeoisie as a primary enemy of the liberation movement, incapable of joining in the struggle for national sovereignty and independence."<sup>7</sup>

Important changes began to occur in Soviet writing on Latin America in the period after the death of Stalin, particularly after the pronouncements made at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU in 1956. Historians and social scientists were called upon to prepare a new Marxist-Leninist evaluation of "the wars of liberation" in Latin America, which in the past had been characterized as expressions of bourgeois goals and ideals; now they are interpreted as broad "national" movements, wars of liberation from foreign political and economic imperialism.<sup>8</sup> Instead of writing about past territorial imperialism of the U.S., Soviet scholars emphasize the study of economic imperialism because of its subtle penetration of the social, economic, political, and military fabric of Latin American life.

They have altered their categories of thought and have revised their estimates of individuals. They have embarked upon a detailed appraisal of the

socio-political impact of U.S. economic relations with Latin America, particularly of the nuances of middle-class response to external economic influences. They have for the first time established Marxist periodizations of Argentine, Brazilian, and Mexican history of the national period. In their new attitude toward national heroes, Bolívar emerges from the category of exponent of bourgeois Creole separatism and becomes the critic of conservatism, the indigenous liberator, the Creole leader expressing the will of the popular masses. Even the hitherto unassailable Karl Marx is censured for having misled Soviet historians before 1956 by his use of "tendentious and incomplete source materials in his evaluation of Bolívar." San Martín and O'Higgins are also accorded rehabilitation as selfless and heroic leaders of a national cause.<sup>9</sup>

Decisions reached at meetings of world communist and workers' parties in Moscow in 1957 and 1960 as well as doctrines enunciated at the Twentieth, Twenty-first, and Twenty-second Party Congresses of the CPSU laid down the pattern for academic research on Latin American history in the USSR. In 1961, the USSR Academy of Sciences of the Latin American Institute was established for the study of contemporary economic and political problems, while the more traditional study of Latin American history remained the primary responsibility of Soviet historians belonging to the Latin American Section of the Institute of History. Guidelines for Latin American historical research and writing in the USSR were established in a series of pronouncements by S. S. Mikhailov and B. N. Ponomaryov in 1962.<sup>10</sup>

Mikhailov, former USSR Ambassador to Uruguay and presently director of the Latin American Institute, declared in October,

Though our scientific literature on Latin America contains a number of works of known interest, there has been completely inadequate attention paid to research problems in contemporary economics and politics of Latin America. Current problems such as the development of the national liberation movement, the workers' movement, and other progressive social movements in Latin America have been inadequately studied. Not enough research is being done on problems connected with the colonial policy of the imperial powers confronting one another in Latin America. Relations between the Soviet Union and other socialist states and the Latin American countries have not been summarized. The potentials and prospects for economic, scientific-technical, and cultural collaboration between the countries of the socialist camp and those of Latin America have not yet been properly elucidated.<sup>11</sup>

In a later exhortation, Mikhailov urged Soviet historians and economists to examine the nineteenth-century antecedents of modern revolutionary movements in Latin America and, as good Marxists, to remain cognizant of all aspects of state capitalism, capital accumulation, and economic integration in contemporary Latin American history.<sup>12</sup>

Academician Ponomaryov, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, ad-

dressed a national conference of Soviet historians in Moscow in December, 1962, and after reminding them that they could have “no greater honor than to promote the world-wide advancement and establishment of communism—the most just of all systems . . .”, he stated that *Latin America is a region with great revolutionary prospects* and that Soviet historical research was not keeping pace with contemporary events. “In order to carry out the revolutionary changes for which the world is ripe,” he stated, “we must be familiar with the past and the present of that world; we must have precise knowledge of what has to be changed.”<sup>13</sup>

In addition to the topics for research mentioned by Mikhailov, Ponomaryov added that new vigor must be displayed in Soviet studies of the history of the Cuban revolution, the struggle for a united anti-imperialist front, the peasant movement, and the history of the national bourgeoisie.<sup>14</sup>

#### THE SOVIET IMAGE OF LATIN AMERICA, 1945–1965\*

Soviet historians, economists, and anthropologists have explored Latin American history from the pre-Columbian epoch to the present, but in the period since World War II one finds the greatest depth of materials and the most sophisticated application of Marxist dialectics. For this reason, the translated readings in *The Soviet Image of Latin America, 1945–1965: A Documentary History* are limited to the contemporary period.

The book will contain four parts, which, except for the last, are arranged topically into theoretical, socio-political, and economic categories. Soviet Communist Party documents and policy decisions included in Part One reveal the purpose of Soviet research on Latin America—namely, to evaluate its economy, political and ideological traditions, social structure, and international relations in order to determine the appropriate tactics for promoting national liberation movements. The second and third parts demonstrate how rapidly Soviet scholars have responded to academic programs recommended by the Communist Party. Proceeding from the extreme left to the extreme right, Part Two will contain chapters devoted to political movements and the classes generally associated with these movements, while Part Three probes Latin America's basic economic problems. A final section will include historical essays on Cuba, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile.

Inasmuch as the ultimate purpose of Soviet Latin American research as reflected in Part One is to promote socialist revolution, it is appropriate to begin Part Two with a chapter devoted specifically to the national liberation movement. Introductory articles in this chapter describe the basic causes and signifi-

\* Footnotes in this section will be restricted generally to direct quotations. Detailed references are incorporated in the work described.

cant aspects of the national liberation movement while others detail the role of the nationalist and petty bourgeoisie, students, intelligentsia, proletariat, and peasants in fomenting Marxist revolutions. A study of the Cuban revolution measures its impact upon Latin American national liberation movements and demonstrates how its leaders manipulated middle and lower classes to overthrow the Batista regime. A leading Soviet historian surmised that the Cuban revolution succeeded because all forms of political struggle were flexibly applied with the appropriate action dependent upon the exigencies of each particular situation.<sup>15</sup>

Revolutionaries who advocate armed rebellion as the only means of achieving national liberation receive criticism for maintaining erroneous and dogmatic positions and are labeled "petty bourgeois ultra-leftists."<sup>16</sup> A study of peasant warfare in Colombia substantiates the more pragmatic Soviet approach which eschews unnecessary or abortive armed confrontations. Despite intermittent guerilla warfare in parts of Tolima and Cundinamarca, the Colombian peasant rebellion seems to have been premature, for "the overwhelming majority of the peasants still believed in the illusions sown in their minds by the liberals."<sup>17</sup>

Although economic and social inequities have inspired national liberation movements in Latin America, Soviet writers emphasize that motivation alone cannot attain revolutionary changes without the cooperation of all political organizations, labor unions, and social classes which oppose American imperialism. One article explains how the Communist Party can unify these groups and why it must maintain or obtain control of revolutionary movements. In harmony with this popular-front concept, a labor analyst criticizes the petty sectarianism which has divided Latin American socialists and communists and lauds their recent cooperative efforts in Chile and Uruguay.

To promote wars of national liberation in Latin America, it has been necessary for Soviet scholars to analyze the middle classes and social democratic reform movements. Many of these studies, which are included in the succeeding chapter, establish definite categories within the middle classes in order to ascertain precisely "which of the local bourgeois strata are capable of participating in the anti-imperialist struggle, and to what degree."<sup>18</sup> Earlier categorizations solely based on wealth and social status were revised in order to reclassify the middle classes according to their attitude toward national capital and foreign imperialism.

The middle-class groups which cooperate closely with foreign interests and which actively oppose national liberation movements are the pro-imperialist and wealthy conciliatory bourgeoisie. Traditionally, the commercial bourgeoisie participating exclusively in international trade were epitomized as the principal pawn of foreign interests. Since the second world war, however, Soviet writers

have expanded the pro-imperialist category to include foreign business representatives and officials of national or mixed companies which are partially owned or financed by foreign capital. Members of the wealthy conciliatory bourgeoisie depend financially on the maintenance or development of the state sector. Although the latter's emphasis upon economic protection and state planning separates it from the pro-imperialists, both benefit by aid from capitalist nations.

The national bourgeoisie, encompassing the majority of the small and medium-scale merchants, and the petty bourgeoisie, which include most salaried workers, merit careful scrutiny by Soviet scholars. Their significance lies both in their considerable ideological influence upon the working class and in their anti-imperialistic potentialities. Selections which analyze the national bourgeoisie reflect equivocal attitudes. While the national bourgeoisie are antagonized by American economic imperialism, they accept Soviet support not to embrace socialism but to counter imperialism and thereby enhance the growth of national capital. Some sectors of the petty bourgeoisie, particularly students and professors, form the vanguard of national liberation movements; yet a significant sector supports social democratic reformist parties which solicit foreign investment and cooperate with the United States. Separate interpretive accounts of APRA, the MNR, and Acción Democrática clarify the Soviet view of these social democratic parties.

Transcending class distinctions and their allied political movements is a chapter which examines the social doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and the Christian Democratic Movement. An initial selection predictably portrays the Church in Latin America as the bulwark of conservatism and anti-communism. More recent articles, however, reflect Soviet anxiety over the increasing flexibility of the Church toward social and economic reforms and its deliberate efforts to disassociate itself from unpopular political regimes. Catholic labor organizations have flaunted their opposition to faltering dictatorships. Even the Church hierarchy favored workers' demands in arbitrating labor disputes in order to mislead the masses and gain their favor. Thus the Church no longer anesthetizes the masses' class consciousness by extolling Christian humility and self-sacrifice, but instead allies itself with popular demands in order to pacify the masses and avoid a radical atheistic revolution.

Having identified the cunning of the Church's expedient measures, Soviet historians anticipated the growing ascendancy of the Christian Democratic Movement in certain Latin American countries. For many years a minor political group of Catholic progressives, it has been embraced recently by part of the conservative hierarchy as a political antidote to reformist and national liberation movements. The Christian Democrats, like the national bourgeoisie, seek a third position independent of the capitalist and socialist blocs in international affairs and advocate social reforms to mitigate class conflicts at home.

While questioning the sincerity of their most radical proposals, Soviet writers assert that the communists "are seeking unity with those Catholics who, regardless of their approach to the problem of basic goals or methods of achieving them, are ready to work jointly for the good of the working class."<sup>19</sup>

Materials in the succeeding chapter on the forces of conservatism expose the interrelationships among the Latin American "triad of reaction": the rural oligarchy; the wealthy bourgeoisie; and U.S. imperialism. Since World War II, the landed elite began investing heavily in banking and light industries. Simultaneously, the wealthy bourgeoisie, unable to compete with American and West European heavy industries, have used their investment to acquire land. American corporations complete the conservative combination by establishing joint companies with the rural and urban elite and by collaborating in the suppression of labor unions and social reforms.

Several selections analyze post-war dictatorships in general and the Pérez Jiménez, Rojas Pinilla, and Laureano Gómez dictatorships in particular. According to Soviet writers, U.S. companies tried to check the impressive proliferation of Latin American competitors established during World War II by supporting these dictators. Thus, the timing of the post-war military coups was not coincidental but "represented in actuality an attempt at the forcible resolution of this conflict in favor of the American monopolies and domestic reaction."<sup>20</sup>

A comprehensive section on international problems could easily circumscribe the entire book because U.S. imperialism and other foreign influences play vital roles in almost every Soviet discussion of Latin America. To counterbalance this obsession and to avoid excessive repetition, only Soviet analyses of the Pan Americanism, Pan Hispanism, *Latinidad*, Third Force Movements and of Latin America's relations with the socialist bloc countries and the United Nations are evaluated in the chapter on international forces.

Pan Americanism, the most objectionable of the international forces, was initiated under the guise of American spiritual and democratic unity. The United States deceitfully twisted these lofty ideals in order to bolster dictatorial puppets who embraced American economic interests and discriminated against their European competitors. During Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration, the United States broadened the social base of Pan Americanism to include sectors of the nationalist and petty bourgeoisie, "but it could in no case succeed in creating any kind of unity between American capitalists and the Latin American working class."<sup>21</sup> Roosevelt's policy was quickly erased by John Foster Dulles. Rejecting the concept of liberty, equality, and brotherhood, Dulles stressed the belief in the spiritual realm as the common bond of Pan Americanism, thus shifting to a slogan more congenial with his reactionary-clerical allies in Latin America.

The idea of maintaining a third position in international affairs is less

objectionable but more dangerous to the fruition of the national liberation movement. It stimulates an intermediate posture between the “two imperialisms—that of the United States and the ‘imperialism’ of the Soviet Union”<sup>22</sup>—and is promoted by a number of bourgeois nationalists as a method to uphold Latin America’s political and economic sovereignty. France and other Latin-European nations have exploited this idea to promote *Latinidad*, a concept of cultural unity with Latin America which “is a convenient screen to cover up their sharp competition with the more important partner [the United States].”<sup>23</sup> The Cuban revolution supposedly demonstrates the impracticality of the third force position, for “the machinations of U.S. imperialistic elements aimed at strangling Cuba called for immediate brotherly solidarity. . . .” This vital support was not given to Cuba by nations espousing a third force but “by the Soviet Union and by all the other countries of the socialist camp. . . .”<sup>24</sup> It therefore follows that independence from the United States can only be upheld through alignment with the socialist camp and that Cuba, in spite of the missile debacle, is presumably an independent nation.

Part Three, concerned with economic problems, opens with a chapter on the urban working class and organized labor. Soviet economists trace the growth of the proletariat, its altered role in an increasingly industrial society, and its problems which are aggravated by automation and the great migration of rural workers to the city. One persistent issue is wage discrimination against women, Indians, Negroes, and Latin Americans in contrast to the lucrative positions held by U.S. and European employees. American companies frequently hold salaries below legal minimums by a system of permanent apprenticeship whereby an employee works at a reduced salary and is dismissed when he qualifies as a journeyman.

Labor abuses are endured by the working class because it remains divided by bourgeois-inspired trade unions. Soviet writers assert that the leaders of the *Organización Regional Interamericana de Trabajadores (ORIT)*, which is controlled by its major affiliate, the *AFL-CIO*, collaborate with foreign and domestic business interests by opposing the national liberation movement and deliberately creating labor disunity. Other labor organizations which eschew class struggle and are allied with bourgeois political groups such as the *Apristas*, *Peronistas*, and *Christian Democrats*, are also analyzed and criticized. Despite these obstacles to labor unity, the communists are consoled by the cooperation of socialist-communist trade unions in Chile and are confident that the rank and file of bourgeois-oriented unions will overthrow their leaders as the condition of the working class deteriorates.

Two articles which categorize the rural classes and analyze the principal methods of exploiting the peasantry provide a fundamental background to the themes outlined in a succeeding chapter on agricultural and agrarian problems. Soviet scholars maintain that the landed elite and the wealthy, or *kulak*, farm-



ers continually expand their properties at the expense of small and middle landholders. Not only do they receive lower transportation rates from commercial middle-men and lower interest rates from state banks but frequently they control private banks and commercial organizations which charge small farmers exorbitant interest rates. The system of issuing government credits to wealthy landholders who in turn grant usurious loans to small farmers is detailed in an article about Brazilian agriculture.

With the capitalization of agriculture and the concentration of financial and commercial sources in the hands of the rural elite, there has been a marked decrease in the number of small and middle farmers. Many of them either migrate to urban centers or join the semi-proletariat class which must work part-time as peons, sharecroppers, or tenant farmers in order to retain their symbolic parcel of land. Their plight is brought into sharp focus in a study of the forms of land rent in Argentina.

Although sectors of the national and petty bourgeoisie are seeking solutions to agrarian problems, a Soviet analyst explains why their measures are inadequate. Rather than confiscate *latifundias*, the bourgeois reformists merely distribute public lands or unused private property. He predicts that wealthy agricultural capitalists with their financial and commercial resources intact will continue to extend their holdings at the expense of the new colonists. Selections on the status of Mexican agriculture during the Alemán administration and the failure of the Bolivian revolution indicate why even radical bourgeois reforms have been inadequate.

Not unaware of the importance of agricultural development, Soviet economists nevertheless write more extensively on industrialization and Latin America's primary industrial problem, economic imperialism. An initial selection describes the stimulus to the growth of national industries in Latin America provided by the second world war with its shortages of manufactured products and consequent surplus of foreign exchange.

Succeeding articles describe the various techniques employed by the U.S. government and American corporations to undermine the expansion of national industries. One method was to extend U.S. foreign aid to only those Latin American nations which lowered import tariffs and abolished import licensing and multiple currencies. While this effectively removed the protective shield from Latin America's infant industries, the Export-Import Bank subsidized American exporters and foreign subsidiaries. U.S. foreign aid also insulated American power companies from the wrath of Latin American nationalists who were angered by power shortages and the consequent retardation of national industrial development. When nationalization of these companies appeared imminent, the United States granted new credits conditional to the extension of renegotiation of favorable contracts with American utilities.

When the national bourgeoisie realized their inability to withstand the en-

croachment of the foreign interests, they turned to the state. The Soviet attitude toward this expedient, as reflected in an article on Latin America's state petroleum companies, is strongly affirmative. Yet nationalization is not extensively employed by bourgeois ruling circles, and Soviet economists are dissatisfied with many characteristics of state capitalism in Latin America. The system has revived revisionist groups in the labor movement which shun class struggle and advocate a peaceful transition to socialism through state monopolies. Having grasped the implications of state capitalism, American corporations are now forming mixed companies with state entities in order to merge their interests with those of the national bourgeoisie. The Alliance for Progress, discussed at length in two articles, further increased U.S. rapport with the national and petty bourgeoisie, thereby partially fulfilling its purpose—the alienation of these sectors from the national liberation movement.

The Latin American and Central American common markets are more recent manifestations of the national bourgeoisie's determination to expand local industry and forge a hemispheric market protected from foreign competition. Contrary to the spurious reasoning of bourgeois economists, however, "Latin American integration is by no means regarded by U.S. monopolistic capital as an economic threat."<sup>26</sup> Very few national industries command the capital resources necessary to compete in a common market with U.S. affiliates in Latin America. Moreover, the lowering of customs barriers inevitably intensifies competition, necessitates the reduction of production costs through cutting wages, and consequently increases the misery of the lower classes. Instead of a common market of mutually competitive Latin American nations, Soviet economists recommend the expansion of trade with socialist bloc nations, whose economies complement those of Latin America.

In contrast to the preceding sections of the book, the readings in Part Four present the history and specific problems of individual nations. The chapters on Cuba, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile are not exhaustive surveys but sketches revealing Soviet thought on the fundamental issues of contemporary historiography.

No other event in Latin American history has been so well documented in Soviet writing as the Cuban revolution. An introductory selection accentuates the abuses of the Batista dictatorship and its intimate ties with American business and governmental coteries. A detailed study of the revolution emphasizes the infinite variety of revolutionary techniques and exhaustive use of anti-imperialistic forces which were indispensable factors in achieving national liberation. Succeeding selections analyze the results of Cuban agrarian, industrial, and educational reforms and conclude with a treatise on political reorganization and the creation of a new party.

Soviet writers interpret with qualified approval the Mexican revolution as

it has evolved during the Cárdenas administration. They view the reforms of the latter as preliminary steps characteristic of the radical wing of the national bourgeoisie. An historical account of Pemex stresses its achievements and the subtle methods employed by American petroleum companies to continue harassing it. While retaining most of the state capitalist institutions founded by Cárdenas, the Avila Camacho and Alemán administrations initiated legislation which subverted the intentions of the Mexican revolution and placed its control firmly in the hands of the wealthy bourgeoisie. Articles on Mexican state capitalism and Mexican labor also reflect the deterioration of revolutionary principles at the expense of the working classes.

The history of contemporary Brazil is focused largely upon one man, Getulio Vargas. Soviet writers label his dictatorship as fascistic, demagogic, and reactionary. His pro-allied foreign policy reflected geographical pragmatism rather than the rejection of nazism. The Soviet view of his post-war administration is equivocal, but his growing opposition to American foreign interests seems to have redeemed his former shortcomings. Although Vargas initiated many inflationary measures, Soviet economists reserve their strongest criticism for Kubitschek's policy of inflationary expansion. Ultimately the working classes paid dearly for this expansion as pay raises invariably lagged behind the soaring cost of living. The Quadros and Goulart governments are viewed as the most progressive in Brazilian history, yet their fate, like that of Vargas, was sealed by the disunity and consequent inability of anti-imperialist forces to withstand the inevitable attack of Brazilian reactionaries.

One figure, Juan D. Perón, dominates the contemporary history of Argentina to an even greater extent than does Vargas in Brazil. Soviet historians vilify the Perón dictatorship and detail the insidious manner in which he gained control of the working classes and ultimately subordinated their interests to those of the national bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, they respect his perception of popular needs and attempt to reduce the Anglo-American stranglehold upon Argentine industries, utilities, and transportation media. Moreover, Soviet writers praise members of the left wing of the present Peronista Party and express confidence that they will overthrow their demagogic leaders, who, like Perón, give only lip service to the workers' demands.

Unlike that of Brazil and Argentina, the Chilean working class is united, and the nation is on the threshold of revolutionary reforms. While Soviet analysts express confidence in the ultimate electoral victory of the Frente de Acción Popular, they recognize the challenge and appeal of Christian Democratic propaganda. An article on the Christian Democratic Party questions the sincerity of its conservative members who, though currently passive, could block the basic reform legislation advocated by the Party's more progressive leaders.

Implementing themes set by Soviet political leaders in the several aforementioned congresses, USSR scholars have produced many books and articles on Latin America.<sup>26</sup> The following discussion will comment only on recently published major works which serve to orient the reader on Soviet views in: 1) general surveys of Latin American history; 2) works on economics; 3) revolutionary movements; 4) collections of essays on the history of Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, and Mexico, and; 5) literary criticism. Periodical literature on these subjects is extensive and frequently reveals outstanding Marxist scholarship, but analysis of this vital aspect of Soviet writing is not possible in the present context. All the books mentioned are published in Russian, but for the convenience of those who do not read Russian, titles will be given in English.

The only general textbook on Latin American history used in Soviet universities and advanced institutions is V. G. Revunenkov's *A Contemporary History of the Countries of Latin America*.<sup>27</sup> A country-by-country survey, the volume limits itself to a discussion of twentieth century problems of only ten of the nations of Latin American—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, and Chile. The author concentrates on socio-economic developments, internal political conflicts, the evolution of the communist and labor movements, the impact of North American economic imperialism, and the relevance of these aspects to political conflicts and revolutionary movements in Latin America. Heterogeneous collections of essays on contemporary socio-political problems are found in *Essays on the Contemporary History of Latin America* by S. A. Gonionskii, *Latin America Past and Present* by V. V. Vol'skii *et al*, and *Nations of Latin America* by A. V. Efimov *et al*.<sup>28</sup>

Two works of Latin American diplomatic history that deserve mention are S. A. Gonionskii's *Latin America and the U.S.A., 1939–1959* and M. V. Antiasov's *Contemporary Panamericanism*.<sup>29</sup> Gonionskii investigates the relations between the Latin American states and the U.S., emphasizing alleged economic exploitation by American business. He reviews numerous U.S.-Latin American conferences and economic aid programs and explains the varieties of revolutionary movements in Latin America in this period. Antiasov's study is a careful analysis of the origins and development of the Pan American idea since the nineteenth century.

A number of excellent treatises on economics have been published in the Soviet Union since 1962. The most thorough and impressive study is one edited by V. Ia. Avarina and M. V. Danilevich, *Economic Problems of the Countries of Latin America*.<sup>30</sup> This general survey, a symposium prepared by ten scholars—most of them economists—discusses such questions as the general economic environment of contemporary Latin America, foreign capital investment

and the varieties and significance of U.S. aid, natural resources and their uses, the development of the manufacturing industry, socio-economic conditions in agrarian production, problems of agriculture and the struggle of peasants for agrarian reform, foreign trade, the state sector in economic development, and the arrangement of class forces in the liberation movement. Excellent monographic studies on separate problems include Z. I. Romanova's *Economic Expansion of the U.S.A. in Latin America* and *Problems of Economic Integration in Latin America*, M. V. Danilevich's *The Working Class in the Liberation Movement of the Nations of Latin America*, and V. V. Vol'skii's *Latin America: Oil and Independence*.<sup>31</sup>

Revolutions and liberation wars are discussed in *The Liberation Movement in Latin America*,<sup>32</sup> edited by S. S. Mikhailov, a compilation by fifteen Russian authors of such diverse revolutionary subjects as political problems in the development of the Cuban revolution, the struggle for trade-union unity in Latin America, the ideology and policy of the national bourgeoisie, Latin American revolutions in the theory and practice of socialists, revolutionary processes and the role of Christian democracy, student movements, and the exploitative nature of the Alliance for Progress. Other significant symposia related to the subject of revolutions include: *Nations of Latin America in the Struggle Against American Imperialism*, edited by M. I. Rubinshtein; *The Wars of Independence in Latin America, 1810–1826*, edited by N. M. Lavrov; and *The Present Stage of the National Liberation Movement*, edited by V. Ia. Avarina and M. V. Danilevich.<sup>33</sup> Russia's attitude during the wars of independence is discussed in L. Iu. Slezkin's *Russia and the War of Independence in Spanish America* and in L. A. Shur's *Russia and Latin America: Essays in Their Political, Economic, and Cultural Relations Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution*.<sup>34</sup>

Only one significant collection of essays on Argentina has been published, *Essays in Argentine History*, edited by V. I. Ermolaev.<sup>35</sup> The volume, beginning with the colonial period, includes discussions of the La Plata War, the Rosas dictatorship, the struggle for national unification, the growth of capitalism in Argentina at the close of the nineteenth century, the domination of the bourgeois agrarian oligarchy, economic crises in Argentina, the class meaning of Peronism, and the failure of the Perón regime.

*Essays in Brazilian History*,<sup>36</sup> edited by V. I. Ermolaev, is a symposium which chronologically surveys Brazil under Portuguese rule, the movement for independence and the formation of an independent state, the popular movements of the 1830's and 1840's, the struggle to end slavery, the rising revolutionary movement and emerging crises in the landholder-bourgeois republic, the world economic crisis and the beginning of the national liberation movements in Brazil, and the struggle against U.S. imperialism and internal reaction. An important monograph, A. N. Glinkin's *Contemporary History of Brazil*,

## *Latin American Research Review*

1939–1959,<sup>37</sup> examines the struggle of the masses for socio-political democracy and national sovereignty. *Brasilia*,<sup>38</sup> edited by A. V. Efimov *et al*, contains essays on Brazil's economics, politics, and culture. Four concluding chapters survey Soviet-Brazilian relations.

Three volumes examine the Cuban revolution and its background. The first of these, *Cuba*,<sup>39</sup> edited by A. V. Efimov, comprises a symposium which begins by analyzing the economic, political, and diplomatic environment in which the Cuban revolution occurred. The volume surveys Cuban history, then concludes with a discussion of the cultural history of Cuba since the time of José Martí, surveying art, music, poetry, and the impact upon education of the most recent Cuban revolution. The second volume, *Five Years of the Cuban Revolution*,<sup>40</sup> edited by A. V. Efimov *et al*, contains important observations on the international position of Castro's Cuba. The third booklet, by N. N. Razumovich, *The State Transformation of Revolutionary Cuba*,<sup>41</sup> assesses the new laws introduced since the revolution and discusses the reorganization of the Cuban government, its attitude toward agrarian reform, the nationalization of the economy, and changes in the class structure of Cuban society.

Mexico's history, politics, economic situation, and international relations have been studied more than those of any other Latin American state. The leading Mexicanist, M. S. Al'perovich, has sought to evaluate the importance of the Mexican revolutions of 1810 and 1910 and has explored the political, economic, and international relations of that country.<sup>42</sup> *Essays in the Modern and Contemporary History of Mexico*,<sup>43</sup> a symposium edited by Al'perovich and M. N. Lavrov, contains a dozen chapters which survey Mexican history since the pre-Conquest period. Other important works on Mexican history include E. L. Shifrin's *The Expansion of American Imperialism in Mexico After World War II*, N. S. Larin's *The Struggle of Church and State in Mexico*, I. K. Shermet'ev's *State Capitalism in Mexico*, and two excellent essays on the *encomienda* and *repartimiento* systems in Mexico, by G. I. Ivanov, in Volume XXXV of the Ivanovo State Pedagogical Institute Historical Series.<sup>44</sup>

Vera Nikolaevna Kuteishchikova appears to be the leading Soviet Latin American literary critic. Her *The Latin American Novel in the Twentieth Century*<sup>45</sup> discusses Mariano Azuela and novels of the Mexican revolution, José Eustacio Rivera and the literature of the "infierno verde," the writings of Rómulo Gallegos and his "barbarism-civilization" concept, Ricardo Güiraldes and the gaucho image in the literature of the Río de La Plata, the Indian novel in the Andes, *Huaspungo* by Jorge Icaza and *El mundo es ancho y ajeno* by Ciró Alegria, the anti-imperialist novel in the Caribbean, an assessment of the characteristics common to the Latin American novel, and a brief discussion of the development of the novel in Latin America since 1945. *The Brazilian Novel in the Twentieth Century*<sup>46</sup> by Inna Artashesovna Terterian discusses the novel-

ists of the "northeast school" and realism in the Brazilian novel as evidenced in the writings of Euclides da Cunha and A. Lima Barreto.

Translations of Latin American literature into Russian have increased significantly in recent years. A bibliography of 1,519 partial and complete translations published in Russian since 1765, and a list of almost one thousand items of literary criticism comprise the volume *Literatura Latinoamericana en la imprenta Rusa, 1765–1959*, compiled by Leonid Avelevich Shur.<sup>47</sup> This monumental, largely annotated bibliography refers generally to the works of progressive and Marxist writers. Receiving greatest attention, in order of sequence, is the literature of Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Peru, Brazil, and Ecuador. Few significant Argentine works have been translated into Russian. They include several authors who extol gaucho virtues, as exemplified by Ricardo Quirraldes' *Don Segundo Sombra*, and such anti-Rosas writers as Domingo Faustino Sarmiento. Omission of any translation by Brazil's finest novelist, Machado de Assis, is balanced by the inclusion of brief passages of Venezuela's Ulsar Pietri. Mexico's greatest romantic poet, Manuel Acuña, is mentioned briefly, while six of José Mancisidor's mediocrities are translated in full. One of the best balanced, least prejudiced selections of excerpts and translations is that of Uruguayan writers. Fascinating in its subtlety is the extensive excerpting of works of Chile's non-Marxist poetess and liberal, rural educator Gabriela Mistral, former member of Vasconcelos' radical circle in Mexico. Ercilla y Zúñiga's "La Araucana," a sixteenth-century pro-Indian epic poem, is fully appreciated in nineteenth and twentieth century Russian critical literature, whereas, unless the situation has changed recently, Jorge Icaza's *Huasipungo* is translated and published in only a twenty-page Russian excerpt.

The USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy has published *Progressive Thinkers of Latin America of the Nineteenth and the Early Twentieth Centuries*.<sup>48</sup> Compiled by A. R. Burgete, the volume contains selected writings by Estevan Echeverría, Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, Gabino Barreda, Tobías Barreto, José Martí, Enrique José Varona, Manuel González Prada, José Enrique Rodó, Euclides da Cunha, Florentino Ameghino, and José Ingenieros—progenitors all of today's Soviet prototype of the Latin American leading his people to social and economic justice.

Soviet interest in Latin America represents "an aspect of a more pragmatic international concern," but the degree of refinement in the application of the Marxist dialectic to problems of contemporary Latin America has caused Charles A. Gibson, distinguished colonialist, to state that "Soviet research has reached a point where a Latin Americanist who cannot read Russian finds himself at a disadvantage."<sup>49</sup> Woven into a pattern of impressive purposefulness, Soviet writings focus on social, economic, literary, political, and international problems in a manner which invites continued study from many points of view.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> G. Ia-n, "Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' periodicheskoi i ne-periodicheskoi literatury o stranakh Latinskoj Ameriki [A Bibliography of Periodical and Non-Periodical Literature on the Latin American Countries]," *Revoliutsionnyi vostok* (1934), Nos. 3–4, pp. 346–364.

<sup>2</sup> M. S. Al'perovich, "Izuchenie istorii Latinskoj Ameriki v Sovetskom soiuze [The Study of Latin American History in the Soviet Union]," *Latinskaia Amerika v proshlom i nastoiashchem*, ed. V. V. Vol'skii *et al* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960), p. 451.

<sup>3</sup> G. Ia-n, *Revoliutsionnyi vostok*, Nos. 3–4, pp. 348–364.

<sup>4</sup> G. Dimitrov, "Nastuplenie fashizma i zadachi Kommunisticheskogo internatsionala v bor'be za edinstvo rabocheho klassa protiv fashizma. Iz doklada i zakliuchitel'nogo slova na VII kongresse Kommunisticheskogo internatsionala 2 i 13 avgusta 1935 g. [The Coming of Fascism and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for the Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism. From the Report and Concluding Remarks at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, 2nd and 13th of August, 1935]," *Kommunisticheskii internatsional*, Nos. 23–24 (437–438), August 20, 1935, pp. 26–66;

cf., Kommunisticheskii internatsional [Communist International], *Stenograficheskii otchet VI kongressa Komintern, Vypusk #6: Tezisy, rezoliutsii, postanovleniia, zozhvaniiia* [Stenographic Account of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, Release #6: Theses, Resolutions, Decisions, Proclamations] (Moscow-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1929), pp. 19–23; p. 71.

<sup>5</sup> Al'perovich, *Latinskaia Amerika v proshlom . . .*, p. 451.

<sup>6</sup> M. S. Al'perovich, "Izuchenie istorii stran Latinskoj Ameriki [The Study of the History of the Countries of Latin America]," *Sovetskaia istoricheskaia nauka ot XX k XXII s'ezdu KPSS: Istoriiia zapadnoi evropy i ameriki* [Soviet Historical Science from the Twentieth to the Twenty-second Congress of the CPSU: The History of Western Europe and America], ed. N. M. Druzhinin *et al* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963), p. 161.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> M. S. Al'perovich, "Issledovanie problem istorii Latinskoj Ameriki [Research in the Problems of Latin American History]," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR* (1964), No. 12, pp. 27–28.

<sup>9</sup> Al'perovich, *Sovetskaia istoricheskaia nauka ot XX k XXII s'ezdu . . .*, p. 157.

<sup>10</sup> S. S. Mikhailov, "Izuchenie Latinskoj Ameriki v Sovetskom soiuze [The Study of Latin America in the Soviet Union]," *Voprosy istorii* (April, 1962), No. 4, pp. 98–106;

S. S. Mikhailov, "Izuchenie problem Latinskoj Ameriki [The Study of Latin American Problems]," *Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR* (1962), No. 5, pp. 54–59;

B. N. Ponomaryov, "Zadachi istoricheskoi nauki i podgotovka nauchnopedagogicheskikh kadrov v oblasti istorii [The Tasks Confronting Historical Sciences and the Training of Historians and History Teachers]," *Voprosy istorii* (1963), No. 1, p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Mikhailov, *Vestnik AN SSSR* (1962), No. 5, p. 54.

<sup>12</sup> S. S. Mikhailov, "Nekotorye problemy izucheniia Latinskoj Ameriki [Some Problems in the Study of Latin America]," *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia* (1964), No. 2, p. 35.

<sup>13</sup> Ponomaryov, *Voprosy istorii* (1963), No. 1, p. 7.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>15</sup> A. F. Shul'govskii, "Rasstanovka klassovikh sil v borbe za osvobodzenie [The Arrangement of Class Forces in the Struggle for Liberation]," *Ekonomicheskie problemy stran Latinskoj Ameriki* [Economic Problems of the Countries of Latin America], ed. V. Ia. Avarin, M. V. Danilevich (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963), IX, p. 483.

<sup>16</sup> S. S. Mikhailov, "Kubinskaia revoliutsiia i natsional'no-osvoditel'noe dvizhenie v Latin-



skei Amerike [The Cuban Revolution and the National Liberation Movement in Latin America],” *Piat’ let Kubinskoï revoliutsii* [Five Years of the Cuban Revolution], ed. A. V. Efimov, E. V. Ananova, I. R. Grigulevich, S. S. Mikhailov and G. J. Seleznev (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963), p. 24.

<sup>17</sup> R. A. Molochkova, “O krest’ianskoi samooborone v Kolombii [On Peasant Self-defense in Colombia],” *Voprosy mezhdunarodnogo rabocheho i natsional’no-osvoboditel’nogo dvizheniia na sovremennom etape* [Contemporary Problems of the International Workers’ and National Liberation Movements], ed. A. A. Guber and V. V. Levin (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Vysshei politicheskoi shkoly i Akademii obshchestvennykh nauk pri Tsentralnom komitete Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo soiuza, 1963), p. 190.

<sup>18</sup> A. A. Guber, *Bo’ba za edinyi rabochii i antiimperialisticheskii front v stranakh Latinskoï Ameriki* [The Struggle for a Single Workers and Anti-imperialist Front in the Countries of Latin America] (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo VPSH i AON pri TsK KPSS, 1963), p. 8.

<sup>19</sup> N. A. Koval’skii, “Politika katolicheskoi tserkvi v rabochem dvizhenii Latinskoï Ameriki [The Policy of the Catholic Church in the Latin American Workers’ Movement],” *Osvoboditel’noe dvizhenie v Latinskoï Amerike* [The Liberation Movement in Latin America], ed. S. S. Mikhailov (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Nauka, 1964), p. 202.

<sup>20</sup> A. F. Shul’govskii, “Sverzhenie diktatorskikh rezhimov v Latinskoï Amerike (na primere Venesuely) [The Overthrow of Dictatorial Regimes in Latin America (as in Venezuela)],” *Problemy sovremennoi Latinskoï Ameriki* [Problems of Contemporary Latin America], ed. M. V. Danilevich and A. F. Shul’govskii (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Instituta mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii, 1959), p. 245.

<sup>21</sup> M. V. Antiasov, *Sovremennyi panamerikanizm* [Contemporary Panamericanism] (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo IMO, 1960), p. 201.

<sup>22</sup> S. S. Mikhailov, *Piat’ let Kubinskoï revoliutsii*, p. 32.

<sup>23</sup> Iu. A. Zubritskii, “Latinidad i ego sushchnost [The Meaning of Latinidad],” *Vestnik istorii mirovoi kul’tury*, XXV, No. 1 (January-February, 1961), p. 116.

<sup>24</sup> S. S. Mikhailov, *Piat’ let Kubinskoï revoliutsii*, p. 33.

<sup>25</sup> Z. I. Romanova, *Problemy ekonomicheskoi integratsii v Latinskoï Amerike* [Problems of Economic Integration in Latin America] (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo “Nauka,” 1965), p. 247.

<sup>26</sup> *Latin America in Soviet Writings, 1945–1958: A Bibliography*, comp. Leo A. Okinshevich and Cecilia J. Gorokhoff (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1959);

cf. *Strany Latinskoï Ameriki: Rekomendatel’nyi ukazatel’ literatury* [Countries of Latin America: A Recommended Guide to the Literature], comp. N. A. Akimova et al (Moscow: Gosudarstvennaia biblioteka SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina, 1962). The Library of Congress Slavic and Central European Division has in preparation two supplementary bibliographical volumes to be published in 1966, which will list Soviet writings on Latin America, 1917–1964.

<sup>27</sup> V. G. Revunenkov, *Istoriia stran Latinskoï Ameriki v noveishee vremia* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo ‘Vysshiaia shkola,’ 1963).

<sup>28</sup> S. A. Gonionskii, *Ocherki noveishei istorii stran Latinskoï Ameriki* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo prosveshchenie, 1964);

V. V. Vol’skii et al (eds.), *Latinskaia Amerika v proshlom i nastoiashchem* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo sotsial’no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960);

A. V. Efimov et al (eds.), *Natsii Latinskoï Ameriki* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo ‘Nauka,’ 1964).

<sup>29</sup> S. A. Gonionskii, *Latinskaia Amerika i SSBa, 1939–1959* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Instituta mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii, 1960);

M. V. Antiasov, *Sovremennyi panamerikanizm* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo IMO, 1960).

<sup>30</sup> V. Ia. Avarina and M. V. Danilevich (eds.), *Ekonomicheskie problemy stran Latinskoï Ameriki* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963).

## *Latin American Research Review*

<sup>31</sup> Z. I. Romanova, *Ekonomicheskaia ekspansia SSbA v Latinskoj Amerike* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1963);

*Idem*, *Problemy ekonomicheskoi integratsii v Latinskoj Amerike* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1965);

M. V. Danilevich, *Rabochii klass v osvoboditel'nom dvizhenii narodov Latinskoj Ameriki* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1962);

V. V. Vol'skii, *Latinskaia Amerika, nef' i nezavisimost'* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury 'Mysl,' 1964).

<sup>32</sup> S. S. Mikhailov *et al* (eds.), *Osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie v Latinskoj Amerike* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1964).

<sup>33</sup> M. I. R. Rubinshtein (ed.), *Narody Latinskoj Ameriki v borbe protiv amerikanskogo imperializma* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1951);

N. M. Lavrov *et al* (eds.), *Voina za nezavisimost' v Latinskoj Amerike (1810–1826)* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1964);

V. Ia. Avarina and M. V. Danilevich (eds.), *Natsional'no-osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie v Latinskoj Amerike na sovremennom etape* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1961).

<sup>34</sup> L. Iu. Slezkin, *Rossia i voina za nezavisimost' v Ispanskoj Amerike* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1964);

L. A. Shur, *Rossia i Latinskaia Amerika: Ocherki politicheskikh, ekonomicheskikh i kul'turnykh odnoshenii* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury 'Mysl,' 1964).

<sup>35</sup> V. I. Ermolaev *et al* (eds.), *Ocherki istorii Argentiny* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo sotsial, no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1961).

<sup>36</sup> V. I. Ermolaev *et al* (eds.), *Ocherki istorii Brazili* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1962).

<sup>37</sup> A. N. Glinkin, *Noveishaia istoriia Brazili (1939–1959)* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo IMO, 1961).

<sup>38</sup> A. V. Efimov *et al* (eds.), *Braziliia* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963).

<sup>39</sup> A. V. Efimov and I. R. Grigulevich (eds.), *Kuba* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1961).

<sup>40</sup> A. V. Efimov *et al* (eds.), *Piat' let Kubinskoj revoliutsii* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963).

<sup>41</sup> N. N. Razumovich, *Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia revoliutsionnoi Kuby* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo 'Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia,' 1964).

<sup>42</sup> M. S. Al'perovich, *Voina za nezavisimost' Meksiki (1810–1824)* [The Mexican War of Independence (1810–1824)] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1964), 480 p.;

*Idem*, with B. T. Rudenko, *Meksikanskaia revoliutsiia 1910–1917 gg. i politika SSbA* [The Mexican Revolution of 1910–1917 and the Policy of the USA] (Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1958), 328 p.;

*Idem*, ed. with N. M. Lavrov, *Ocherki novoi i noveishei istorii Meksiki, 1810–1945* [Essays in the Modern and Contemporary History of Mexico, 1810–1945] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960), 471 p.;

*Idem*, "Voina za nezavisimost' i formirovanie meksikanskoj natsii [The War of Independence and the Formation of the Mexican Nation]," *Natsii Latinskoj Ameriki, Formirovanie, razvitiie*, ed. A. V. Efimov, R. Grigulevich, and S. A. Gonionskii (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1964), pp. 105–132;

*Idem*, "Grazhdanskaia voina v Meksike (1914–1916 gg.) i politika SShA [The Civil War

## CONTEMPORARY SOVIET RESEARCH ON LATIN AMERICA

in Mexico (1914–1916) and the Policy of the USA],” *Uchenye zapiski po novoi i noveishei istorii, Vypusk III* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1957), pp. 288–353;

*Idem*, “Hidalgo und der Volksaufstand in Mexiko,” *Lateinamerika zwischen Emanzipation und Imperialismus, 1810–1960* (Berlin: 1961);

*Idem*, “Velikaia frantsuzskaia revoliutsiia XVIII v. i ispanskiie kolonii v Amerike [The Great French Revolution of the Eighteenth Century and the Spanish Colonies in America],” *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, No. 1 (1965), pp. 26–40;

*Idem*, “Imperialisticheskaia politika SShA v Meksike v 1913–1914 gg. [The Imperialistic Policy of the USA in Mexico, 1913–1914],” *Voprosy istorii*, No. 5 (May, 1950), pp. 100–114;

*Idem*, “K voprosu o chislennosti indeiskogo naseleniia Meksiki v kolonial'nyi period [The Question of the Number of the Indian Population of Mexico in the Colonial Period],” *Sovetskaia etnografiia*, No. 3 (1962), 71–80;

*Idem*, “O kharaktere i formakh ekspluatatsii indeitsev v amerikanskikh koloniakh Ispanii (XVI–XVIII v.) [The Character and Forms of Exploitation of the Indian Population in the American Colonies of Spain (Sixteenth–Eighteenth Century)],” *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, No. 2 (1957), 49–68;

*Idem*, “Pod'em natsional'no-osvoboditel'nogo i demograticeskogo dvizheniia v Latinskoj Amerike posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny [The Rising National Liberation and Democratic Movement in Latin America After the Second World War],” *Prepodovanie istorii v sbkole*, No. 4 (1959);

*Idem*, “Rol' narodnykh mass v voine za nezavisimost' Meksiki [The Role of the Popular Masses in the Mexican War of Independence],” *Novaia i noveishaia istoriia*, No. 5 (1960), pp. 52–63;

*Idem*, “Ob osvoboditel'noi voine ispanskikh kolonii v Amerike (1810–1826) [Regarding the Liberation War of the Spanish Colonies in America (1810–1826)],” *Voprosy istorii*, No. 11 (November, 1956), pp. 52–71 (With V. I. Ermolaev, I. R. Lavretskii, and S. I. Semenov);

*Idem*, “Voina za nezavisimost' Meksiki v osveshchenii burzhuaznykh istorikov XIX–XX vv. [The War of Mexican Independence from the Point of View of Bourgeois Historians of the Nineteenth–Twentieth Centuries],” *Voina za nezavisimost' v Latinskoj Amerike, 1810–1826* [The War of Independence in Latin America, 1810–1826] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka,' 1964), pp. 270–300;

*Idem*, “Izuchenie istorii Latinskoj Ameriki v Sovetskom soiuze [The Study of Latin American History in the Soviet Union],” *Latinskaia Amerika v proshlom i nastoiashchem* [Latin America Past and Present] (Izdatel'stvo sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960), pp. 450–462;

*Idem*, “Izuchenie istorii stran Latinskoj Ameriki [The Study of the History of the Countries of Latin America],” *Sovetskaia istoricheskaia nauka ot XX k XXII s'ezdu KPSS: Istoriia zapadnoi Evropy i Ameriki* [Soviet Historical Science from the Twentieth to the Twenty-second Congress of the CPSU: The History of Western Europe and America] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963), pp. 151–170;

*Idem*, “Issledovanie problem istorii Latinskoj Ameriki [Researching the Problems of Latin American History],” *Vestnik Akademii nauk*, No. 12, (1964), pp. 24–29;

*Idem*, “Istoricheskaia nauka v Meksike [Historical Science in Mexico],” *Voprosy istorii*, No. 8 (August, 1962), pp. 198–202;

*Idem*, “Istoriia otnoshenii mezhdou Meksikoi i SShA v poslevoennoi meksikanskoj istoriografii [The History of Mexican-U.S. Relations in Post-War Mexican Historiography],” *Voprosy istorii*, No. 3 (1958), pp. 171–183;

*Idem*, “Osveshchenie nekotorykh voprosov novoi i noveishei istorii Meksiki v poslevoennoi burzhuaznoi literature SShA [Views Regarding Certain Problems of the Modern and Con-

## *Latin American Research Review*

temporary History of Mexico in the Post-War Bourgeois Literature of the USA],” *Doklady i soobshcheniia In-ta istorii AN SSSR, Vypusk X* (Moscow: 1956);

*Idem*, “Sovremennaia meksikanskaia istoriografii voiny za nezavisimost’ [Contemporary Mexican Historiography on the War of Independence],” *Voprosy istorii*, No. 2 (1961), pp. 166–176.

<sup>43</sup> M. S. Al’perovich and N. M. Lavrov (eds.), *Ocherki novoi i noveishei istorii Meksiki, 1810–1945* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo sotsial’no-ekonomicheskoi literatury, 1960).

<sup>44</sup> E. L. Shifrin, *Ekspansiiia amerikanskogo imperializma v Meksike posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1952);

N. S. Larin, *Bor’ba tserkvi s gosudarstvom v Meksike (Vosstanie ‘kristeros’ v 1926–1929 gg.)* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo ‘Nauka,’ 1965);

I. K. Sheremet’ev, *Gosudarstvennyi kapitalizm v Meksike* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963);

G. I. Ivanov, “Enkom’enda v Meksike i vosstaniia indeitsev v XVI veke [The Encomienda in Mexico and the Indian Rebellions of the Sixteenth Century],” *Iz istorii narodnykh vosstanii protiv feodalizma i kolonializma* [From the History of Peoples’ Rebellions Against Feudalism and Colonialism] (Ivanovo: Ivanovskii gosudarstvennyi pedagogicheskii institut imeni D. A. Furmanova, 1964), XXXV, pp. 99–157;

*Op. cit.*, “Repartin’ento v Meksike v XVI–XVIII vv. [Repartimiento in Mexico from the Sixteenth through the Eighteenth Centuries],” pp. 158–195.

<sup>45</sup> V. N. Kuteishchikova, *Roman Latinskoj Ameriki v XX veke* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo ‘Nauka,’ 1964).

<sup>46</sup> I. A. Terterian, *Brazil’skii roman XX veka* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo ‘Nauka,’ 1965).

<sup>47</sup> L. A. Shur (comp.), *Kbudozhbestvennaia literatura Latinskoj Ameriki v russkoj pechatii* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Vsesoiuznoi Knizhnoi palaty, 1960).

<sup>48</sup> A. R. Burgete (comp.), *Progressivnye mysliteli Latinskoj Ameriki (XIX-nachalo XX v.)* (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo sotsial’no-ekonomicheskoi literatury ‘Mysl,’ 1965).

<sup>49</sup> Earl J. Pariseau (ed.), *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, No. 26 (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1964), p. 39.