

STUDYING THE HISTORY OF
LATIN AMERICA:
A Case of Hemispheric Convergence*

Thomas E. Skidmore
Brown University

The belief survives among us
[Latin Americans] that United States
scholars would write better histories
of Latin America if they studied
less and invented more.
Daniel Cosío Villegas
History and the Social Sciences
in Latin America

This article will analyze the way in which U.S. historians' writing on Latin America, especially on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, has been influenced by the changing relationship between the United States and Latin America. It will also trace more briefly the changing approaches of historians from Latin America. In my view, the two groups have taken different routes but have arrived at much the same destination.

Because I intentionally present a selective view of the trends in the field, my references to specific texts have been chosen to illustrate specific points rather than to provide an exhaustive survey of the major contributions made in the various subfields of Latin American history. The authors discussed here are those who define themselves as historians. Scholars from other disciplines who have written notable works that are essentially

*The original version of this article was written for a June 1995 conference, "The State of Historical Writing in North America," sponsored by the Department of History at Brown University and the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of San Marino and held in San Marino, Italy. I am grateful to Anthony Molho for involving me in the conference. Its aim was to emphasize the unique aspects of writing by U.S. historians on various areas of the world. I received valuable suggestions on that version from more than three dozen Latin Americanist history colleagues. Woodrow Borah and Robert Potash made valuable suggestions at an earlier stage. Felicity Skidmore worked her usual editorial magic, and Healan Gaston and Frances Mejía supplied excellent research assistance. Lisabeth Pimentel aided greatly in the final revision. The anonymous *LARR* readers made many valuable suggestions. Final responsibility is, of course, mine.

historical are also acknowledged in the notes. My discussion will encompass three overlapping generations of historians: the generation writing in the 1950s and early 1960s, when Fidel Castro first grabbed the world's attention; the generation who came to intellectual adulthood in the late 1960s and 1970s; and the generation beginning careers in the 1980s and early 1990s. I call these three successive generations, with what I hope is forgivable oversimplification, the optimists for democracy, the radicals, and the integrators. To set the stage briefly, I will begin with the world before Fidel.

Latin American Studies before Castro

The historical perception of Latin America in the United States was long dominated by the views of nineteenth-century scholar William Prescott. His classic narrative study of the conquest of Mexico and Peru was complemented by his equally impressive works on fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Spain.¹ Between Prescott's time and World War II, historical writing on Latin America was generally unexciting, conducted in an atmosphere of condescension by U.S. intellectuals toward Latin America that paralleled the relentless spread of U.S. military and economic influence in the region. A few dedicated scholars were at work, such as Edward Gaylord Bourne, Herbert Eugene Bolton, and (primarily after 1945) Arthur Whitaker and Frank Tannenbaum. But they labored in an ambiance of general scholarly indifference toward Latin America in which few university courses were offered, few graduate students were trained, and limited research resources were available. In this low-key atmosphere, the Rockefeller Foundation's effort to upgrade scholarly interest in the region by financing creation of an interdisciplinary program on Latin America at the University of California, Berkeley, stands out as an exception.

U.S. entrance into World War II sparked a new political and academic interest in Latin America. The government began to invest in a significant intelligence capacity on Latin America, which was included in the newly created Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).² This organization furnished the personnel and concepts that would predominate in area studies programs in U.S. universities in the decades following the war.

Because of Washington's concern over possible penetration of the region by the Axis powers, funding from the U.S. State Department and

1. William Prescott, *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic*, 3 vols. (Boston, Mass.: American Stationers, 1838); *History of the Conquest of Mexico*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, Pa.: Lippincott, 1868; 1st ed. 1843); and *History of the Conquest of Peru*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brother, 1847).

2. Barry M. Katz, *Foreign Intelligence: Research and Analysis in the Office of Strategic Services, 1942–1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989).

private sources became available. Most important was the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, headed by Nelson Rockefeller, which oversaw an ambitious propaganda campaign aimed at Latin America that included numerous artistic, cultural, and scholarly exchanges. But as combat intensified in Europe and Asia, political and academic interest concentrated on those regions, while interest in Latin America plummeted.³

The low priority given to Latin America carried over into the early years of the cold war, when the Soviet Union, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa became the foci of policy and research. As a reflection of these priorities, Latin America was the last of the major world areas to receive Ford Foundation funding for area studies.⁴ This lack of interest in Latin America was in part a hangover from the prewar attitude that the region was “inferior” and did not merit serious intellectual or political consideration. Such condescension was consistent with a widespread U.S. public view of Latin America as an area peopled with racial inferiors and primitive dictators.⁵ The neglect led to serious consequences, however, depriving Latin American area studies of the kinds of funds for expanding faculty, field fellowships, library acquisitions, and publications that were going to other areas. All that changed with the advent of Fidel Castro’s Cuba.

Optimists for Democracy

The Cuban Revolution took power in 1959. By 1960 Fidel Castro was already turning to the Soviet Union for military help against the U.S. invasion he clearly believed to be inevitable. This set of events coincided with the general consensus in the United States at the time of President John F. Kennedy’s election: that the world’s preeminent economic power and foremost democracy could and should promote the cause of freedom around the world. The watchword among U.S. policy makers, whether acknowledged or not, was “the export of democracy.” According to this logic, the world’s ills could be traced to a lack of democracy, of which Soviet and Chinese authoritarianism were merely the most troublesome examples.

The primary U.S. economic and social response in the early 1960s to the spread of the cold war to Latin America—that part of the “Third World” with the closest historical ties to the United States—was the Alliance for Progress. This initiative reflected the pervasive belief in the United States that “democracy” was a natural goal for developing as well

3. Howard F. Cline, “The Latin American Studies Association: A Summary Survey with Appendix,” *LARR* 2, no. 1 (1966):59–60.

4. Melvin J. Fox, “Universities in Latin American Studies,” in *Latin American History: Essays on Its Study and Teaching, 1898–1965*, vol. 2, edited by Howard F. Cline (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967), 803–8.

5. This attitude can be seen graphically in John J. Johnson, *Latin America in Caricature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1980).

as developed nations and that transferring U.S. know-how, capital, technology, and political perspective was the key to lifting Latin America into the "modern world."⁶ As it turned out, U.S. policy makers underestimated substantially the obstacles to economic growth and improved social welfare in Latin America, a recognition that came much later.

Increased U.S. government interest in Latin America led predictably to increased financial support for studying the region. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, which had excluded funding for Latin American studies, was now amended to include Latin America. The American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council began to take an active role in promoting the growth of the field, and private funds from organizations such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation became more plentiful.

U.S. historians lost little time in capitalizing on their newfound resources and institutional encouragement, most of them sharing the prevailing optimism about Latin America's future. No scholar was more effective in this endeavor than Howard Cline, longtime Director of the Hispanic Foundation in the Library of Congress. Cline himself noted that the Cuban Revolution had proved so crucial to the consolidation of Latin American studies in U.S. academia that the Latin American Studies Association "might well erect a monument to Fidel Castro, a remote godfather."⁷

A specialist on Mexico, Cline coordinated a flurry of activities, including publication of the first *National Directory of Latin Americanists*⁸ and the first directory of U.S. historians of Latin America.⁹ Cline was also a leader in the Conference on Latin American History (CLAH), the field's professional organization. For that group, he edited a two-volume collection of articles on Latin American history going back to the mid-nineteenth century.¹⁰ For several decades, Cline led in raising funds from government and private foundations for both Latin American history and Latin American studies.

Cline was also a widely read interpreter of modern Mexican history. He wrote the volume on that country for the American Foreign Pol-

6. The premier statement of this optimistic view was W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960). This view was systematically critiqued in Robert Packenham, *Liberal America and the Third World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1973).

7. Cline, "Latin American Studies Association," *LARR* 2, no. 1:64.

8. Library of Congress, *National Directory of Latin Americanists: Bibliographies of 1,884 Specialists in the Social Sciences and Humanities*, Hispanic Foundation Bibliographical Series no. 10 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

9. *Historians of Latin America in the United States, 1965: Bibliographies of 680 Specialists*, edited by Howard F. Cline (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1966).

10. *Latin American History: Essays on Its Study and Teaching, 1898–1965*, vols. 1–2, edited by Howard F. Cline (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967).

icy Library series published by Harvard University Press.¹¹ The official electoral party in Mexico, the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), had sold its image in the United States as a uniquely “democratic institution.” Cline largely followed this official version and tended to accept Mexican government statistics at face value, failing to look for a possibly darker side to Mexico’s political consensus. This view of modern Mexico was widely shared in the U.S. historical community in the early 1960s.

Another extremely productive member of Cline’s generation of historians of Latin America was Lewis Hanke, an authority on colonial Spanish America. Like Cline, Hanke proved indispensable in helping historians capitalize on the newly favorable funding climate of the 1960s. Strengthening the profession in the United States had been Hanke’s life-work since the 1930s, when he helped found and edit the *Handbook of Latin American Studies* in 1936. This handbook became the premier bibliographical instrument in the field and the model for all “non-Western fields.” Hanke also edited an extensive series of paperback editions of historical readings that became standard fare in university courses.

Hanke resembled Cline in reflecting the general view held by the U.S. policy makers and the public on the problems and potential of Latin America. His main intellectual contribution was a major effort to refute the “black legend,” the caricatured view of the Spanish as uniquely evil conquerors.¹² Hanke’s efforts could be interpreted as taking up the Spanish cause against Anglo-Saxon ethnocentrism. He did not change the terms of that ancient debate, however. He simply chose to emphasize the pro-Indian element in the Spanish tradition.

Many other U.S. historians of Latin America in the early 1960s were also deeply influenced by their own country’s crusade to promote democracy, although the effect was clearest among specialists on the modern period (the era since independence). A few illustrations make the point. Most urgent on the intellectual agenda was addressing the Cuban Revolution. U.S. historians sought to explain how the Cuban Revolution had transformed the context for U.S.–Latin American relations and the study of Latin American history. Prominent among them was John Johnson, who had served as an analyst in the U.S. State Department before joining academe.

11. Howard F. Cline, *The United States and Mexico* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953). A 1963 edition (published by Athenaeum) did not alter the analysis. The original edition ended with this stirring observation: “Mexican *kulaks* are now driving Fords and hope soon to buy Buicks or Nashes, made in Mexico. Can Communism match this?” See Cline, *United States and Mexico*, 407.

12. Lewis Hanke, *The First Social Experiments in America: A Study in the Development of Spanish Indian Policy in the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935); and *The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1949).

One of Johnson's early interests was Latin America's forgotten actor—the middle class. Johnson avoided the term *class*, using instead the term *sector*, a choice symptomatic of the broad U.S. aversion to Marxist methodology.¹³ He thought the chances were good that a growing “middle sector” would develop in the principal Latin American countries. Given U.S. assumptions, this conclusion provided support for the democratic transformation envisioned in the Alliance for Progress. Johnson's *Political Change in Latin America* won the Bolton Prize, given each year by the Conference on Latin American History for the best book in the field. He wrote next about the military, which he viewed as continuing to be a major force in Latin America.¹⁴ His analysis paralleled the Washington policy climate, which was then encouraging Latin American militaries to “modernize” while resisting any threat from the Left. Johnson had been followed to the State Department in the mid-1950s by budding historians who eventually found university positions (scarce in the 1950s), such as Robert Potash,¹⁵ Rollie Poppino,¹⁶ and Karl Schmitt.¹⁷ All of them researched themes of central interest to the U.S. government and the wider U.S. public in the early cold war, including the role of the Latin American military and Communist potential in the region.

Yet another scholar whose work reflected the same commitment to promoting democracy through “enlightened U.S. policy” was Fredrick Pike. His first book, published in 1963 and named another winner of the Bolton Prize, analyzed U.S.-Chilean relations since the late nineteenth century.¹⁸ Pike had spent a year in Chile just as the Cuban Revolution was erupting in the Caribbean. He foresaw political disaster ahead for Chile if its ruling classes did not open the society to full participation by the lower sectors, but he also judged (at least implicitly) such an opening to be a feasible goal. His recipe was close to Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, which was announced just as Pike was finishing his book.

13. John J. Johnson, *Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958).

14. John J. Johnson, *The Military and Society in Latin America* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964).

15. Robert A. Potash, *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1928–1945: Yrigoyen to Perón* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1969); *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1945–1962: Perón to Frondizi* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1980); and *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1962–1973: From Frondizi's Fall to the Peronist Restoration* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1996).

16. Rollie E. Poppino, *International Communism in Latin America: A History of the Movement, 1917–1963* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964).

17. Karl M. Schmitt, *Communism in Mexico: A Study in Political Frustration* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965).

18. Fredrick B. Pike, *Chile and the United States, 1880–1926: The Emergence of Chile's Social Crisis and the Challenge to United States Diplomacy* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963).

Pike continued in his historical writing to seek Latin American actors who could bring about acceptable reform and thereby head off the Left. He wrote next about Peru, where the military and the Left had long duelled for power. Pike paid particular attention to the role of APRA (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana), the reformist political party that the military had kept out of power for decades.¹⁹ APRA's role was being vigorously debated in U.S. government circles, some arguing in favor of its inherently democratic nature, others claiming it harbored dangerously leftist, if not Marxist, tendencies. Much like the U.S. government, Pike could never make up his mind about Raúl Haya de la Torre. Pike's three books gave startlingly inconsistent interpretations of this leader, as he himself acknowledged later in his career.²⁰

The Radicals

As the 1960s wore on, the triple goals of the Alliance for Progress—economic growth, social reform, and political stability—proved far more elusive than the Kennedy advisors had envisioned. As a result, the faith in U.S.-style democracy and U.S.-style institutions (like family farms, progressive business schools, and responsible local school boards) projected by policy makers and accepted implicitly by most academics began to erode. Conservative forces appeared more deeply entrenched throughout Latin America than had been assumed. U.S. rhetoric and U.S. dollars did not seem to be enough to force change. U.S. historians of Latin America consequently began to rethink their assumptions.

It happened that this new questioning of the pace of change in Latin America coincided with the domestic U.S. trauma produced by the Vietnam War, which hit the younger generation via the military draft, including the next generation of scholars. The public's growing horror over U.S. combat tactics in Vietnam led to a deeper questioning of the nature of U.S. power abroad, the character of U.S. capitalism, and even the very possibility of peaceful change in the Third World. The Cuban Revolution was pursuing an alternative solution, which although it offered no political freedom, was enjoying widespread popular support and demonstrating impressive results in raising health and education levels. The experiment in Chile led by President Salvador Allende (1970–1973) represented another example of popularly backed Marxist government in Latin America (although never by a majority of Chilean voters).

19. Fredrick B. Pike, *The Modern History of Peru* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967); *The United States and the Andean Republics: Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977); and *The Politics of the Miraculous in Peru: Haya de la Torre and the Spiritualist Tradition* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986).

20. Fredrick B. Pike, *FDR's Good Neighbor Policy: Sixty Years of Generally Gentle Chaos* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995), xxii.

Another new factor was also changing the perceptions of U.S. historians of Latin America. The emerging generation of U.S. scholars had done their fieldwork in Latin America in the 1960s and 1970s, a time when Marxist and radical nationalist sentiment in the Third World was peaking. Lacking roots in the liberal consensus, those still experiencing their intellectual formation were open to the radical critique. They were more ready to accept class analysis and to entertain the proposition that the United States, rather than leading the way to constructive change, could be mainly reinforcing the status quo that had produced and was sustaining archaic societies and gross inequalities.²¹

Another significant factor was not related directly to Latin America: the influence in U.S. academic circles of such eminent radical, if not Marxist, historians as E. P. Thompson and Erik Hobsbawm. Their way of writing history showed that class analysis could be applied in a sophisticated manner. This tendency was reinforced in the U.S. academy by such "populist scholars" as sociologist C. Wright Mills and anthropologist Oscar Lewis.

Two works of narrative history illustrate the new approach being taken to historical inquiry. The first is John Womack's biography of Mexican agrarian revolutionary Emiliano Zapata.²² Although Womack avoided any explicit conclusions, he clearly perceived in Zapata an authentic revolutionary, in contrast to the bureaucrats and political bosses who had appropriated the original Mexican Revolution by the 1940s. Womack subsequently studied the labor movement in the Veracruz region from a similar perspective.

A second example is Peter Winn's study of the seizure of a textile factory by its Chilean workers during the Allende presidency.²³ Winn clearly sympathized with the workers, who initially gained control but were expelled after the military coup of 1973. And he was less cautious than Womack in drawing larger conclusions. Winn endorsed the Allende government's militant wing, which had sought a tougher line against conservative and centrist opposition.

These radical historians turned much of their fire on U.S. government and corporate policies in Latin America. The leader in this respect

21. For changes in the U.S. academy, see *History and the New Left: Madison, Wisconsin, 1950–1979*, edited by Paul Buhle (Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press, 1990); and *The Left Academy: Marxist Scholarship on American Campuses*, edited by Bertell Ollmann and Edward Vernoff (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1982). On the effect on Latin Americanists, see Miles D. Wolpin, "Latin American Studies: For a Radical Approach," *Journal of Developing Areas* 5 (Apr. 1971):321–29. For the dyspeptic reaction of one member of the older generation, see George I. Blanksten, "Latin American Studies: Radicalism on the Half Shell," *Journal of Developing Areas* 5 (Apr. 1971):330–36.

22. John Womack Jr., *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution* (New York: Knopf, 1969).

23. Peter Winn, *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

was diplomatic historian William Appleman Williams, whose critique of U.S.-Cuban relations helped create a new school of interpretation of U.S. foreign relations that focused on U.S. complicity in aiding, directly or indirectly, the repressive forces within Latin America.²⁴ Much of the radical scholarly production appeared in new periodicals founded by radical scholars who believed (often justifiably) that editors of established journals were not viewing their work objectively.²⁵

In hindsight at least, this response was notably American in that it overattributed power to the U.S. government and corporations and underestimated the power of conservative forces within Latin American societies themselves, just as the generation before had done from a different perspective. The radical approach, however, had the great merit of shaking up the U.S. historical establishment and forcing the profession to look more closely at class analysis as an analytic technique for helping illuminate the precise character of foreign influence in Latin America.²⁶

The amount of radical scholarship was in fact modest. It was significant, however, because it helped alter the intellectual climate. This change, in turn, helped shift the focus of less ideologically interested colleagues to the lives of the disenfranchised—slaves, Indians, rural dwellers, urban workers, outlaws, and women.²⁷ All had been largely left out of the writing of history because as nonmembers of the elites (except for a

24. William A. Williams, *The United States, Cuba, and Castro* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1962); and *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy* (New York: Delta, 1972).

25. For a sampling of recent examples of radical analysis, see Susan Besse, "Introduction to Latin American Civilizations," *Radical History Review*, no. 61 (Winter 1995):125–38; "Rural Latin America: Wrestling with the Global Economy," *NACLA Report on the Americas* 18, no. 3 (Nov.–Dec. 1994):15–41; and Barbara Weinstein, "The Model Worker of the Paulista Industrialists: The 'Operário Padrão' Campaign, 1964–1985," *Radical History Review*, no. 61 (Winter 1995):92–123.

26. Some examples of this large literature are Charles Bergquist, "Latin America: A Dissenting View of 'Latin American History in World Perspective,'" in *International Handbook of World Studies: Contemporary Research and Theory*, edited by Georg G. Iggers and Harold T. Parker (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979), 371–86; Bergquist, *Latin American Historical Studies in the 1980's: One View*, Wilson Center Working Papers, no. 111 (Washington: Latin American Program, Wilson Center, 1982); and Bergquist, "Labor History and Its Challenges; Confessions of a Latin Americanist," *American Historical Review* 98, no. 3 (June 1993):757–64.

27. This process is described well in Charles Bergquist, *Labor in Latin America: Comparative Essays on Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, and Colombia* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1986); Ralph Della Cava, *Miracle at Joazeiro* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970); Donna J. Guy, *Sex and Danger in Buenos Aires: Prostitution, Family, and Nation in Argentina* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991); June E. Hahner, *Emancipating the Female Sex: The Struggle for Women's Rights in Brazil, 1850–1940* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990); Sandra Lauderdale Graham, *House and Street: The Domestic World of Servants and Masters in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); and Florencia E. Mallon, *The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860–1940* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1983). See also Mallon, "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History," *American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (Dec. 1994):1491–515.

few women), they had little influence on events as recorded and reflected in traditional sources. Typical records such as notarial files, church records, government archives, and newspapers and periodicals seldom include the voices of the “underdogs” (as opposed to their alleged actions).

One of the richest areas for this kind of research was slavery and race relations. Building on work on U.S. slavery starting in the 1950s, U.S. historians of Latin America launched into research on slavery and race relations in key countries like Brazil, Cuba, and much of the Caribbean. New insights were provided by Robert Conrad’s work on the history of slavery and its abolition in Brazil, Mary Karasch’s pioneering work on urban slavery in Brazil, and Rebecca Scott’s careful analysis of the context of abolition in Cuba.²⁸

The history of indigenous peoples, especially in Mesoamerica and the Andes, was stimulated by a similar interest in non-elites.²⁹ As a pioneering scholar in this area, Charles Gibson published in the early 1960s an investigation of the evolution of indigenous society in the Valle de México during the Spanish colonial era.³⁰ That tradition has been carried on by James Lockhart, who first demonstrated his skills in a pioneering use of the notarial records in colonial Peru by linking individual legal records to create a rich genre of social history.³¹ He has now devoted several decades to reconstructing the survival through the colonial era of the Nahuatl-speaking peoples of Mexico.³² Although not the first to use these sources, Lockhart has dramatized the potential in a new way for a host of U.S. researchers on colonial Latin America.

Historians such as Gibson and Lockhart turned the traditional approach to colonial Spanish America on its head. Previously, scholars had concentrated on the role of the Spanish or the Portuguese in the New World.

28. Robert Edgar Conrad, *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 1850–1888* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972); *Children of God’s Fire: A Documentary History of Black Slavery in Brazil* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994); Mary C. Karasch, *Slave Life in Rio de Janeiro, 1808–1850* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987); and Rebecca J. Scott, *Slave Emancipation in Cuba: The Transition to Free Labor, 1860–1899* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985).

29. Nancy M. Farriss, *Maya Society under Colonial Rule: The Collective Enterprise of Survival* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984); Steven J. Stern, *Peru’s Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1982); and *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World: 18th to 20th Centuries*, edited by Steven J. Stern (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

30. Charles Gibson, *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519–1810* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964).

31. James Lockhart, *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968).

32. James Lockhart, *Nahuas and Spaniards: Postconquest Central Mexican History and Philology* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1991); and *The Nahuas after the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1993).

The indigenous peoples were merely a side story, their reactions recounted by others (usually members of the religious orders). The new historians were “radicals” not in the political sense but because they offered an alternative to the elite-centered writing of history that had been the norm for U.S. historians of Latin America for the colonial and modern periods.

The Integrators

The newest generation of U.S. historians of Latin America find themselves confronting a paradox. On the one hand, part of the U.S. hope of the 1960s for Latin America has been fulfilled. Every country boasts an elected government, save Cuba. On the other hand, the distribution of wealth, income, and services remains far more unequal than in most developed countries. And the rule of law remains a rarity, especially for the lower echelons of society.

To try to understand the roots and dimensions of this paradox, and possible ways out, historians of Latin America are adding new methodologies and new subject matters to the traditional historian’s tools and topics. These include collaboration with specialists in popular culture (often anthropologists) in analyzing the evolution of nationalism and nationalist sentiments. In practical terms, these efforts have led historians to investigate poststructuralist and postmodernist methodologies, which are proving difficult to apply in practice.³³

Fredrick Pike, strongly identified with the search for evidence of responsible reformers in Latin American history, has now turned to this new approach. He has written a lengthy survey of how Latin America has appeared in U.S. perceptions.³⁴ In choosing this topic, Pike was implicitly asking how much was “reality” and how much was the public perception of “reality.” For postmodernists, the latter is as important as the former. For more conventional historians, the contrast highlights the degree to which the real Latin America may have disappeared into the mists of the U.S. collective imagination.

This shift of focus is hardly coincidental. Pike’s survey of U.S. perceptions was written as Latin America was coming out of a “lost decade” of economic stagnation. By then, the search for agents to bring about structural reform (and their predecessors) was but a memory, despite the

33. Gordon S. Wood, “The Lovable Past,” a review of *Telling the Truth about History*, edited by Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *The New Republic*, 7 Nov. 1994, pp. 46–49. For a discussion of the problems for historians in general, see William Rowe and Vivian Schelling, *Memory and Modernity: Popular Culture in Latin America* (New York: Verso, 1991); and Marjorie Becker, *Setting the Virgin on Fire* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995).

34. Fredrick B. Pike, *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992).

return of formal democracy. Pike's work on U.S. perceptions of Latin America paralleled a loss of U.S. interest in the region, where the end of the cold war had left Washington without a long-term policy rationale. Pike's perspective can be interpreted as capturing the new consensus of the policy makers and historians who had once pinned their hopes on exporting U.S.-style democracy and encouraging structural reform and were left with little but the history of their past perceptions. In 1995 Pike published what he described as his "last book," a nostalgic look back at the peculiarities of U.S. and Latin American national characters as they interacted during the era of Franklin Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Policy.³⁵ In fact, this work represented a return (with some modification) to the diplomatic history that dominated U.S. historians' writing on Latin America decades earlier.

Ironically, the decline of U.S. politico-strategic interest in Latin America may have proved a godsend to the writing of history on the region in the United States. No longer obligated either to counsel power or document its malevolence, historians can get on with the task of attempting to elucidate the history of a region that is thoroughly fascinating in its own right.

A number of recent works by U.S. historians illustrate the trend toward a more integrative focus. A good example is Florencia Mallon's recent book comparing the relationship between peasant culture and nationalism in Mexico and Peru.³⁶ Mallon probes deeply into the local rural reactions to nineteenth-century foreign invasions of both countries (Chile's invasion of Peru and France's of Mexico). She links the level of "non-elites" (through an analysis of popular culture via unusual local sources) to national-level discourse about nationality. Mallon borrows the methodologies of anthropology and literary criticism (for popular culture) while writing the story of growing nationalism in nineteenth-century Mexico and Peru. In both cases, she shows a dialectic of thought and action manifested in two dimensions. The first occurred between the rural elites and the national elites, the second between indigenous (and mestizo) peoples and the elites on both local and national levels.

A second example of this integrative style is the volume recently edited by Gilbert Joseph and Daniel Nugent, *Everyday Forms of State Formation*.³⁷ Although restricted to Mexico, the approach resembles that of Mallon, who contributed an essay to this volume. Joseph too attempts to link local and national levels via the inclusion of popular culture.

35. Pike, *FDR's Good Neighbor Policy*.

36. Florencia E. Mallon, *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995).

37. *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1994).

Both Mallon and Joseph seek to integrate differing levels of Latin American history. First, they link the national to the regional (or state) levels, which have often been separated in accounting for the evolution of Latin American societies. Such works can be aided by the rich monographic literature on the two levels produced by U.S., European, and Latin American historians.³⁸ Second, Mallon and Joseph incorporate the non-elites in a new way, giving agency to these “underdogs” by viewing them not in isolation but in the context of their relationship with the “authorities” of their day. These historians thus fill a major gap by tracing the subtle ways in which non-elites have shaped the cultures and discourses of elite-dominated institutions. An ample rationale for this “integrative approach” is provided in the collaborative volume *Confronting Historical Paradigms*, authored by three Latin Americanists and two Africanists. Their goal is to overcome the “fragmentation” that has characterized the historiography of Latin America and Africa, especially in the general context of the writing of history on these regions by U.S. historians.³⁹

The posthumous history of Brazil’s Atlantic Forest by Warren Dean provides yet another example.⁴⁰ In writing this pioneering environmental history, which covers the colonial as well as the national periods, Dean supplemented regional history by drawing on other specialties ranging from botany to anthropology. The result is one of the most ambitious studies to date of the encounter between man and nature in Latin America.

Trends in Writing History among Latin Americans

Changes in the way Latin Americans approach the writing of their history have followed a different pattern. As the world entered the 1960s, Latin American leaders had been demanding “fairer terms” in their economic relations with the industrial world for almost a decade. They sought commodity agreements to stabilize world prices for their exports and more liberal terms for their loans. These demands acquired a systematic rationale during the later 1960s in the publications of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) and in the doctrine of depen-

38. Brazil has been the subject of numerous regional-level studies, including Robert M. Levine, *Pernambuco in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1978); Levine, *Vale of Tears: Revisiting the Canudos Massacre in Northeastern Brazil, 1893–1897* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992); Joseph L. Love, *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1980); and John D. Wirth, *Minas Gerais in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1977).

39. Frederick Cooper, Allen F. Isaacman, Florencia E. Mallon, William Roseberry, and Steve Stern, *Confronting Historical Paradigms* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

40. Warren Dean, *With Broadax and Firebrand: The Destruction of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995).

dency, whose proponents viewed Latin American backwardness as being caused as much by a perversely structured international economic system as by archaic domestic structures.⁴¹ Marxists and radical nationalists put even more emphasis on “exploitation” by foreign forces, especially the U.S. government and private capital. By the 1960s, the social sciences had taken a radical turn in major Latin American universities in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Peru.

History written by Latin American historians followed this radicalized ideological scene, but after a lag. As of the early 1960s, history was still perceived in Latin America as having little to do with the social sciences, themselves in a relatively undeveloped state by U.S. and European standards. Partisan politics often intruded as well. In Peronist Argentina (1945–1955), for example, the teaching of history at the University of Buenos Aires followed strict Peronist lines. In many universities and among the numerous amateur practitioners of history in Latin America, two major approaches were employed. The first was the writing of *historia patria*, chronicles of the local history of a town, state (province), or region. These accounts were usually uncritical chronologies that resembled family sagas more than analytical histories. The second approach was to write a eulogistic biography to show the subject’s exceptional patriotic exploits.⁴² Writers of such works cast a pall over the writing of history in general. Notable exceptions were Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda in Brazil and Daniel Cosío Villegas in Mexico, who edited high-quality pioneering collaborative histories of their countries.⁴³

By the late 1960s, however, the established order was being challenged by a new generation. Energized by the success of the Cuban Revolution, younger Latin American historians adopted Marxist or dependency approaches in reinterpreting their national history.⁴⁴ They were

41. Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, translated by Marjory Mattingly Urquidí (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979). The Spanish-language original version was published in 1969. Charles Bergquist, “Latin America: A Dissenting View of ‘Latin American History in World Perspective,’” in *International Handbook of World Studies: Contemporary Research and Theory*, edited by Georg G. Iggers and Harold T. Parker (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979), pp. 371–86.

42. In reviewing Argentine historiography as of 1971, one U.S. scholar noted, “numerous biographies indicate that the Argentine cult of the heroic has lost none of its earlier vitality.” See Joseph T. Criscenti, “Argentina: The National Period,” in *Latin American Scholarship since World War II*, edited by Roberto Esquenazi-Mayo and Michael C. Meyer (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971), p. 103.

43. *História geral da civilização brasileira*, 10 vols., edited by Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda (São Paulo: DIFEL, 1960–1981); and *Historia Moderna de México*, 9 vols., edited by Daniel Cosío Villegas (Mexico City: Hermes, 1955–1974).

44. For examples, see the historical chapters on Argentina (by Juan Corradi) and Brazil (by Teotônio dos Santos) in *Latin America: The Struggle with Dependency and Beyond*, edited by

reinforced in this approach by the strong French intellectual influence in Latin America. Most foreign-educated Latin Americans in the humanities had studied in France and maintained close ties with French intellectual life. Most lacked training in documentary research, and their foreign training tended to reinforce (especially for those interested in the modern period) an essayistic approach that was light on factual underpinnings. Most were little influenced by the French tradition of archival research. U.S. historians accused Latin American historians of resorting to "theory without facts," while Latin American historians accused their gringo counterparts of producing "facts without theory." As of the 1960s, this oversimplification was a fair summary of how U.S. scholars and radical Latin American historians viewed each other.

In the ensuing years, the Latin American intellectual scene has witnessed major changes. The luster has long disappeared from the Cuban Revolution. The revolutionary path in Latin America has led to a dead end. The collapse of socialism in East Europe and the former Soviet Union has tarnished the appeal and legitimacy of Marxism and radical nationalism. They have been replaced by neoliberalism, which has swept the region. As a result, Latin American scholars have largely left behind the patriotic histories and the Marxist megahistories. Latin American scholars growing up under the dominant Marxist assumptions in their universities have become impatient with the rigidity of Marxist dogma and also with the authoritarian manner of the local Communist parties, which maintained tight control over many Marxist scholars.

Latin Americans have also noted the failures in political action of the Communist parties, which were usually cautious about taking up arms, as well as those of the Marxist-inspired radical nationalists like the Fidelistas and the many breakaways from the Soviet-line Communist parties in the 1960s and 1970s. In country after country (including Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Brazil), these revolutionaries failed to defeat with arms the established order in the form of military dictatorships, and they paid a heavy price in loss of life and flight into exile.⁴⁵ The loss of many of the brightest of the younger generation sobered the Left, leading them to reconsider the rhetoric that had proved so at variance with reality.

A beneficial by-product of this scattering into exile was the arrival of many in the United States and Europe, where they came into close contact with scholarly communities in the North Atlantic. Participating in a pluralistic academic atmosphere helped many to rethink their scholarly

Ronald Chilcote and Joel C. Edelstein (New York: John Wiley, 1974). For an unsympathetic view of this trend by a French conservative, see Jean-François Revel, "The Trouble with Latin America," *Commentary* 67, no. 2 (Feb. 1979):47–50.

45. This point is powerfully made by Jorge Castaneda in *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War* (New York: Knopf, 1993).

orientation.⁴⁶ This rethinking was confirmed by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc at the end of the 1980s. Such radical changes in the political context, in both Latin America and the larger world, reinforced the growing skepticism of many Latin American intellectuals about Marxist social science, including Marxist-oriented history. Thus it was the political as well as the intellectual rigidity of the Marxist academic presence that helped drive younger scholars to look elsewhere for thematic and methodological inspiration. But reaction to Marxist dogma was only one of many factors at work, including the increasing professionalization of the universities, improved availability of research funding, and the expansion of scholarly publishing outlets for books and articles.

One field to which Latin American historians turned was social and economic history. This choice was ironic in that Marxist scholarship had already claimed an exclusive hold on that field. The problem was that the Marxist scholars had usually buried the historical human beings under a wealth of abstractions such as “the proletariat,” “the bourgeoisie,” and “lumpen,” losing track of the flesh-and-blood actors in the clash of “historical forces.” Latin American historians are now helping reconstruct these actors via careful research in the archives and well-planned interviewing of survivors of the dictatorships and other eras, invaluable sources of “oral history.”

Several examples delineate this new trend in social history among Latin American historians. In Brazil, Eclea Bosi recaptured the world of early-twentieth-century São Paulo by interviewing elderly Paulistanos,⁴⁷ and José Reis provided a premier account of an early-nineteenth-century Bahian slave revolt.⁴⁸ In Mexico, Luis González produced a classic local study that depicted one town over the decades.⁴⁹ Another Mexican historian, Carlos Tello Díaz, created an in-depth portrait of two families forced into exile by the Mexican Revolution.⁵⁰ In Peru, exemplary work in social history has been done by Alberto Flores Galindo and Nelson Manrique.⁵¹ Latin American historians are now going to the sources (archival and oral)

46. Some exiled Latin American historians, such as Tulio Halperin Donghi and Emília Viotti da Costa, were at the forefront of the profession in their own countries when they arrived in the United States. They subsequently made significant contributions to research and training in Latin American history in the United States.

47. Eclea Bosi, *Memória e sociedade: Lembranças de velhos* (São Paulo: T. A. Queiroz, 1979).

48. João José Reis, *Slave Rebellion in Brazil: The Muslim Uprising of 1835 in Bahia* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993).

49. Luis González, *San José de Gracia: Mexican Village in Transition* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1974).

50. Carlos Tello Díaz, *El exilio: Un retrato de familia* (Mexico City: Cal y Arena, 1993).

51. Alberto Flores Galindo, *Aristocracia y plebe: Estructura de clases y sociedad colonial* (Lima: Mosca Azul, 1984); and Nelson Manrique, *Yawar Mayu: Sociedades terratenientes serranas, 1879–1910* (Lima: DESCO, 1988).

in a systematic manner that would have been the exception rather than the rule in the early 1960s.

The shift has been reinforced by increasingly close contact between Latin American historians and their U.S. counterparts. This trend has been facilitated by the rapid growth in this period of new research centers at U.S. universities such as the Center for U.S.-Mexico Studies at the University of California, San Diego, and the Kellogg Institute at Notre Dame University and other research institutions like the Woodrow Wilson Center in Washington, D.C. Academic exchange between Latin America and the United States surged in the 1970s and 1980s, aided by funding from the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation (which sponsors a special competition for Latin American scholars), the Tinker Foundation (which has endowed visiting chairs for Latin American scholars at five U.S. universities), and the Fulbright program of the U.S. government.

Equally important has been the growth of active scholarly collaboration between U.S. and Latin American historians, paralleling such contacts in the humanities and the social sciences.⁵² Such collaboration was institutionalized under the leadership of Bryce Wood, with the “internationalization” of the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Latin American Studies in the 1970s (the first SSRC-ACLS area committee to be “internationalized”). Since that time, the committee has included members from Latin America, and Latin Americans have become eligible for research grants (funded primarily by the Ford and Mellon Foundations). Finally, the military dictatorships taking power from the mid-1960s through the early 1980s forced many Latin American intellectuals into exile. Encouraged by the availability of funding, many came to universities in the United States, where they were influenced by the practices of U.S. historians. This widening and deepening of the scholarly infrastructure has helped promote a convergence of professional standards and the creation of a genuinely inter-American scholarly community.

Conclusion

I see four major changes in the way U.S. historians have approached the writing of Latin American history over the past thirty-five

52. *The Latin American Economies: Growth and the Export Sector, 1880–1930*, edited by Roberto Cortés Conde and Shane Hunt (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985); *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*, edited by Frederick Katz (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1988); and *Rethinking the Latin American City*, edited by Richard M. Morse and Jorge E. Hardoy (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992). Political scientists writing comparative studies with heavy historical input have reinforced the comparative trend. Among numerous examples are Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991).

years. The first trend has moved away from straightforward institutional and political history. Second, the spotlight has increasingly fallen on social history for both the colonial and modern eras.⁵³ Third, historians have borrowed more and more from other social science methodologies in a kind of traffic that can go both ways, as has been demonstrated in African studies.⁵⁴ Fourth, historians have brought the non-elites into their stories. Finally, comparative analysis has burgeoned.

Over the same period, Latin American historians' writing of their own history is no longer influenced predominantly by French approaches but by Anglo-U.S. ones. History is now firmly rooted in the leading Latin American universities, where regular contact occurs among the social sciences, especially anthropology, political science, and economics. As a result, historians' writings have become more research-oriented, with greater attention devoted to the use of evidence and documentation of findings.⁵⁵

In the 1990s, the intellectual and personal contact between these U.S. and Latin American scholars is incomparably greater than in the early 1960s. In 1995, for example, the Nineteenth International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association brought 168 Latin American scholars to participate in the meeting. A generous number were historians. Exchange programs such as the Fulbright and those of individual U.S. universities and research centers have facilitated an extraordinary flow of historians in both directions. Although many clouds are presently hanging over the future financing of research and exchange, the success of past programs is evident in today's rich harvest of scholarship in the United States and Latin America.

53. For an excellent overview, see William B. Taylor, "Between Global Process and Local Knowledge: An Inquiry into Early Latin American Social History, 1500–1900," in *Reliving the Past: The Worlds of Social History*, edited by Olivier Zunz (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985), 115–90.

54. *Africa and the Disciplines: The Contributions of Research in Africa to the Social Sciences and to the Humanities*, edited by Robert H. Bates, V. Y. Mudimbe, and Jean O'Barr (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1993). Comparative studies have been frequent in the area of slavery, abolition, and race relations after abolition. One of the most influential such works was Frank Tannenbaum, *Slave and Citizen* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1946), which appeared well before the period being assessed here. A worthy successor to that tradition by a non-Latin Americanist was Carl Degler, *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1971). For an excellent historiographical overview of writing on race in Brazil, with comments on comparative studies, see Stuart B. Schwartz, *Slaves, Peasants, and Rebels: Reconsidering Brazilian Slavery* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992). A larger geographical focus was adopted in Leslie B. Rout, Jr., *The African Experience in Spanish America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976). For an impressive example of comparative analysis of the varying European claims for "possession" of new lands, see Patricia Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

55. Alan Knight, "Latin America, History, and Historiography: Interview with Alan Knight," interview by Bill Schwartz, *History Workshop Journal* 34 (1992):159–76.

The result has been a convergence between U.S. and Latin American historians of Latin America. For their separate reasons, they have come to approach history writing in a highly similar manner. This outcome does not represent the triumph of one scholarly culture over another. Rather, the reciprocal dogmas of the early 1960s have been superseded. A closer and deeper relationship between the two communities has transformed their practitioners into fellow scholars in a common hemispheric project. In the spirit of Daniel Cosío Villegas, it may even be said that U.S. and Latin American historians today are studying more *and* inventing more.

REFERENCES

- BATES, ROBERT H., V. Y. MUDIMBE, AND JEAN O'BARR, EDs.**
 1993 *Africa and the Disciplines: The Contributions of Research in Africa to the Social Sciences and to the Humanities*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- BECKER, MARJORIE**
 1995 *Setting the Virgin on Fire*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- BERGQUIST, CHARLES**
 1979 "Latin America: A Dissenting View of 'Latin American History in World Perspective.'" In IGGERS AND PARKER 1979, 371–86.
 1982 *Latin American Historical Studies in the 1980s: One View*. Wilson Center Working Papers, no. 111. Washington: Latin American Program, Wilson Center.
 1986 *Labor in Latin America: Comparative Essays on Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, and Colombia*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
 1993 "Labor History and Its Challenges: Confessions of a Latin Americanist." *American Historical Review* 98, no. 3 (June):757–64.
- BESSE, SUSAN**
 1995 "Introduction to Latin American Civilizations." *Radical History Review*, no. 61 (Winter):125–38.
- BLANKSTEN, GEORGE I.**
 1971 "Latin American Studies: Radicalism on the Half Shell." *Journal of Developing Areas* 5 (Apr.):330–36.
- BOSI, ECLEA**
 1979 *Memória e sociedade: Lembranças de velhos*. São Paulo: Queros.
- BUARQUE DE HOLLANDA, SERGIO, ED.**
 1960–1981 *História geral da civilização brasileira*. 10 vols. São Paulo: DIFEL.
- BUHLE, PAUL, ED.**
 1990 *History and the New Left: Madison, Wisconsin, 1950–1979*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University Press.
- CARDOSO, FERNANDO HENRIQUE, AND ENZO FALETTO**
 1979 *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, translated by Marjory Mattingly Urquidí. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- CASTANEDA, JORGE**
 1993 *Utopia Unarmed: The Latin American Left after the Cold War*. New York: Knopf.
- CHILCOTE, RONALD, AND JOEL C. EDELSTEIN, EDs.**
 1974 *Latin America: The Struggle with Dependency and Beyond*. New York: John Wiley.
- CLINE, HOWARD F.**
 1953 *The United States and Mexico*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
 1966 "The Latin American Studies Association: A Summary Survey with Appendix." *LARR* 2, no. 1:57–79.
- CLINE, HOWARD F., ED.**
 1966 *Historians of Latin America in the United States, 1965: Bibliographies of 680 Specialists*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Latin American Research Review

- 1967 *Latin American History: Essays on Its Study and Teaching, 1898–1965*. Vols. 1–2. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- COLLIER, RUTH BERINS, AND DAVID COLLIER**
1991 *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- CONRAD, ROBERT EDGAR**
1972 *The Destruction of Brazilian Slavery, 1850–1888*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
1994 *Children of God's Fire: A Documentary History of Black Slavery in Brazil*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- COOPER, FREDERICK, ALLEN F. ISAACMAN, FLORENCIA E. MALLON, WILLIAM ROSEBERRY, AND STEVE STERN**
1993 *Confronting Historical Paradigms*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- CORTES CONDE, ROBERTO, AND SHANE HUNT, EDS.**
1985 *The Latin American Economies: Growth and the Export Sector, 1880–1930*. New York: Holmes and Meier.
- COSIO VILLEGAS, DANIEL, ED.**
1955–1974 *Historia moderna de México*. 9 vols. Mexico City: Hermes.
1967 “History and the Social Sciences in Latin America.” In *Social Science in Latin America*, edited by Manuel Diégues Júnior, 121–40. New York: Columbia University Press.
- CRISCENTI, JOSEPH T.**
1971 “Argentina: The National Period.” In *Latin American Scholarship since World War II*, edited by Roberto Esquenazi-Mayo and Michael C. Meyer, 103–13. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- DEAN, WARREN**
1995 *With Broadax and Firebrand: The Destruction of the Brazilian Atlantic Forest*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- DEGLER, CARL**
1971 *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States*. New York: Macmillan.
- DELLA CAVA, RALPH**
1970 *Miracle at Joazeiro*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- FARRISS, NANCY M.**
1984 *Maya Society under Colonial Rule: The Collective Enterprise of Survival*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- FLORES GALINDO, ALBERTO**
1984 *Aristocracia y plebe: Estructura de clases y sociedad colonial*. Lima: Mosca Azul.
- FOX, MELVIN J.**
1967 “Universities in Latin American Studies.” In *Latin American History: Essays on Its Study and Teaching, 1898–1965*, edited by Howard F. Cline, 2:803–8. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- GIBSON, CHARLES**
1964 *The Aztecs under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519–1810*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- GONZALEZ, LUIS**
1974 *San José de Gracia: Mexican Village in Transition*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- GRAHAM, SANDRA LAUDERDALE**
1988 *House and Street: The Domestic World of Servants and Masters in Nineteenth-Century Rio de Janeiro*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- GUY, DONNA J.**
1991 *Sex and Danger in Buenos Aires: Prostitution, Family, and Nation in Argentina*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- HAHNER, JUNE E.**
1990 *Emancipating the Female Sex: The Struggle for Women's Rights in Brazil, 1850–1940*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

STUDYING THE HISTORY OF LATIN AMERICA

HANKE, LEWIS

- 1935 *The First Social Experiments in America: A Study in the Development of Spanish Indian Policy in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 1949 *The Spanish Struggle for Justice in the Conquest of America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

IGGERS, GEORG G., AND HAROLD T. PARKER, EDS.

- 1979 *International Handbook of World Studies: Contemporary Research and Theory*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

JOHNSON, JOHN J.

- 1958 *Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- 1964 *The Military and Society in Latin America*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- 1980 *Latin America in Caricature*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

JOSEPH, GILBERT M., AND DANIEL NUGENT, EDS.

- 1994 *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

KARASCH, MARY C.

- 1987 *Slave Life in Rio de Janeiro, 1808–1850*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

KATZ, BARRY M.

- 1989 *Foreign Intelligence: Research and Analysis in the Office of Strategic Services, 1942–1945*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

KATZ, FREDERICH, ED.

- 1988 *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

KNIGHT, ALAN

- 1992 "Latin America, History, and Historiography: Interview with Alan Knight." Interview by Bill Schwartz. *History Workshop Journal*, no. 34:159–76.

LEVINE, ROBERT M.

- 1978 *Pernambuco in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- 1992 *Vale of Tears: Revisiting the Canudos Massacre in Northeastern Brazil, 1893–1897*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

LOCKHART, JAMES

- 1968 *Spanish Peru, 1532–1560*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- 1991 *Nahuas and Spaniards: Postconquest Central Mexican History and Philology*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- 1993 *The Nahuas after the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth through Eighteenth Centuries*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

LOVE, JOSEPH L.

- 1980 *São Paulo in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

MALLON, FLORENCIA E.

- 1983 *The Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860–1940*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- 1994 "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History." *American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (Dec.):1491–515.
- 1995 *Peasant and Nation: The Making of Postcolonial Mexico and Peru*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

MANRIQUE, NELSON

- 1988 *Yawar Mayu: Sociedades terratenientes serranas, 1879–1910*. Lima: DESCO.

MORSE, RICHARD M., AND JORGE E. HARDOY, EDS.

- 1992 *Rethinking the Latin American City*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

NACLA

- 1994 "Rural Latin America: Wrestling with the Global Economy." *NACLA Report on the Americas* 17, no. 3 (Nov.–Dec. 1994):15–41.

OLLMANN, BERTELL, AND EDWARD VERNOFF, EDS.

- 1982 *The Left Academy: Marxist Scholarship on American Campuses*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

PACKENHAM, ROBERT

1973 *Liberal America and the Third World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

PIKE, FREDRICK B.

1963 *Chile and the United States, 1880–1926: The Emergence of Chile's Social Crisis and the Challenge to United States Diplomacy*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

1967 *The Modern History of Peru*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

1977 *The United States and the Andean Republics: Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

1986 *The Politics of the Miraculous in Peru: Haya de la Torre and the Spiritualist Tradition*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

1992 *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

1995 *FDR's Good Neighbor Policy: Sixty Years of Generally Gentle Chaos*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

POPPINO, ROLLIE E.

1964 *International Communism in Latin America: A History of the Movement, 1917–1963*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press of Glencoe.

POTASH, ROBERT A.

1969 *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1928–1945: Yrigoyen to Perón*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

1980 *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1945–1962: Perón to Frondizi*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

1996 *The Army and Politics in Argentina, 1962–1973: From Frondizi's Fall to the Peronist Restoration*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

PRESCOTT, WILLIAM H.

1838 *History of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, the Catholic*. 3 vols. Boston, Mass.: American Stationers.

1847 *History of the Conquest of Peru*. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brother.

1868 *History of the Conquest of Mexico*. 3 vols. Philadelphia, Pa.: Lippincott; 1st ed. 1843.

REIS, JOÃO JOSE

1993 *Slave Rebellion in Brazil: The Muslim Uprising of 1835 in Bahia*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

REVEL, JEAN-FRANÇOIS

1979 "The Trouble with Latin America." *Commentary* 67, no. 2 (Feb.):47–50.

ROSTOW, W. W.

1960 *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROUT, LESLIE B., JR.

1978 *The African Experience in Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROWE, WILLIAM, AND VIVIAN SCHELLING

1991 *Memory and Modernity: Popular Culture in Latin America*. New York: Verso.

SCHMITT, KARL M.

1965 *Communism in Mexico: A Study in Political Frustration*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

SCHWARTZ, STUART B.

1992 *Slaves, Peasants, and Rebels: Reconsidering Brazilian Slavery*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

SCOTT, REBECCA J.

1985 *Slave Emancipation in Cuba: The Transition to Free Labor, 1860–1899*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

SEED, PATRICIA

1995 *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

STERN, STEVEN J.

1982 *Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

STERN, STEVEN J., ED.

1987 *Resistance, Rebellion, and Consciousness in the Andean Peasant World, 18th to 20th Centuries*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

TANNENBAUM, FRANK

1946 *Slave and Citizen*. New York: Knopf.

TAYLOR, WILLIAM B.

1985 "Between Global Process and Local Knowledge: An Inquiry into Early Latin American Social History, 1500–1900." In *Reliving the Past: The Worlds of Social History*, edited by Olivier Zunz, 115–90. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

TELLO DIAZ, CARLOS

1993 *El exilio: Un retrato de familia*. Mexico City: Cal y Arena.

U.S. LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

1966 *National Directory of Latin Americanists: Bibliographies of 1,884 Specialists in the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Hispanic Foundation Bibliographical Series no. 10. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

WEINSTEIN, BARBARA

1995 "The Model Worker of the Paulista Industrialists: The 'Operário Padrão' Campaign, 1964–1985." *Radical History Review*, no. 61 (Winter):92–123.

WILLIAMS, WILLIAM A.

1962 *The United States, Cuba, and Castro*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

1972 *The Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. New York: Delta.

WINN, PETER

1986 *Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

WIRTH, JOHN D.

1977 *Minas Gerais in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

WOLPIN, MILES D.

1971 "Latin American Studies: For a Radical Approach." *Journal of Developing Areas* 5 (Apr. 1971):321–29.

WOMACK, JOHN, JR.

1969 *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*. New York: Knopf.

WOOD, GORDON S.

1994 "The Losable Past." A review of *Telling the Truth about History*, edited by Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, in *The New Republic*, 7 Nov. 1994, pp. 46–49.