

INTERESTS, INFLUENCE, AND INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Elizabeth G. Ferris
Lafayette College

- TO PROMOTE PEACE: U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE MID-1980S.* Edited by DENNIS L. BARK. (Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institute Press, 1984. Pp. 328. \$19.95.)
- U.S.-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS: ISSUES AND CONCERNS.* Edited by MICHAEL R. CZINKOTA. (New York: Praeger, 1983. Pp. 297. \$35.95.)
- LATIN AMERICA AND THE U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST: A BASIS FOR U.S. FOREIGN POLICY.* By MARGARET DALY HAYES. (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1984. Pp. 295. \$23.50 cloth, \$11.95 paper.)
- U.S. POLICY FOR CENTRAL AMERICA: A BRIEFING.* By EDWARD GONZALEZ, BRIAN MICHAEL JENKINS, DAVID RONFELDT, and CAESAR SERESERES. (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1984. Pp. 33.)
- THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO: PATTERNS OF INFLUENCE.* By GEORGE W. GRAYSON. (New York: Praeger, 1984. Pp. 215. \$27.95.)
- GEOPOLITICS, SECURITY, AND U.S. STRATEGY IN THE CARIBBEAN BASIN.* By DAVID RONFELDT. (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1983. Pp. 93. \$7.50.)
- MEXICAN-U.S. RELATIONS: CONFLICT AND CONVERGENCE.* Edited by CARLOS VASQUEZ and MANUEL GARCIA. (Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center and Latin American Studies Center, University of California at Los Angeles, 1984. Pp. 504. \$35.00 cloth, \$25.00 paper.)
- THE CRISIS IN LATIN AMERICA: STRATEGIC, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL DIMENSIONS.* Edited by HOWARD J. WIARDA. (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1984. Pp. 32. \$2.95 paper.)
- HUMAN RIGHTS AND U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY: THEORETICAL APPROACHES AND SOME PERSPECTIVES ON LATIN AMERICA.* Edited by HOWARD J. WIARDA. (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1982. Pp. 96. \$4.25.)
- IN SEARCH OF POLICY: THE UNITED STATES AND LATIN AMERICA.* By HOWARD J. WIARDA. (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1984. Pp. 147. \$17.95 cloth, \$7.95 paper.)

These ten studies reflect disquieting trends in the field of inter-American relations. Excepting the edited volume by Carlos Vázquez and Manuel García y Griego, which raises exciting theoretical questions, and the study by George Grayson, which displays considerable sophistication in analyzing U.S.–Mexican relations, the remaining books provide to varying degrees the intellectual underpinnings of the Reagan administration's policies toward Latin America.

A close relationship has always existed between the way North Americans have studied inter-American relations and U.S. policies toward the region. In the 1960s, while scholars were positing the links between economic development and democracy, the U.S. government was implementing the Alliance for Progress. The human rights policies of the late 1970s were paralleled by burgeoning scholarship on human rights issues. The emergence of an important dependency paradigm among U.S. scholars was accompanied by at least symbolic efforts by the Carter administration to be more sensitive to Latin American and Third World concerns.

Most of the books reviewed here serve another purpose—the academic rationalization of the Reagan administration's view of Latin America. The six works published by the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), the Rand Corporation, and the Hoover Institute all provide the ideological justification for U.S. interventionist policies in Central America. The works savagely attack the Carter administration's human rights policies, although the authors are careful to underscore their personal commitment to human rights. Strategic concerns have moved overtly to the fore, and with few exceptions, economic and strategic issues are placed in separate intellectual compartments and analyzed in isolation from one another. Unlike the dependency theorists who used analyses of economic relations to explain the nature of Latin American politics and U.S.–Latin American relations, many of these authors use cultural factors to explain the nature of Latin American authoritarian political systems. The policy implications of such a shift are clear: if a nation's political reality is determined by its historical and cultural traditions, then nothing can be done to change unjust social or economic structures. Unfortunately, it appears that the politically conservative analysts have acquired a monopoly on analyzing cultural factors while progressive scholars have concentrated on economic determinants.

The remaining three books represent other currents in the field of inter-American relations. Grayson's *The United States and Mexico* characterizes a shift by North American analysts away from studying dependence to studying influence. In some sense, this shift represents a healthy trend because the political manifestations of unequal power relationships merit further study. But it is disturbing in its emphasis on discrete contemporary actions with relatively little attention paid to the

historical and structural contexts that give meaning to specific diplomatic interactions. Moreover, a shift in focus from dependence to influence changes the subject of the study from one concerned primarily with Latin America to one concerned almost exclusively with the United States. While studies of dependence analyze the effects of policies, studies of influence consider the ways in which policies are formulated.

This shift in emphasis has been accompanied by an increasing concentration on exploring U.S. interests in Latin America, particularly in Central America. Indeed, the dominant theme of the AEI-Rand-Hoover publications is defining and promoting U.S. interests in the region. With the exception of the Vásquez and García y Griego volume, these works are primarily devoted either to explaining the nature of U.S. interests in the region or to assessing how these interests might be better achieved. While U.S. national interests and policies toward Latin America are important and legitimate research topics, the fact that these subjects are apparently dominating the field of inter-American relations is disturbing. In the Reagan era, even overt ethnocentrism seems academically acceptable, with the result being that Latin America is viewed as important because of what it means to the United States. In most of these books, one looks in vain for assessments of the impact of the burgeoning Latin American debt on U.S.–Latin American relations or for sophisticated analyses of the relationships between Latin American domestic power constellations and changes in the nature of the relationship between Latin America and the United States.

The individual works reviewed here illustrate these general trends. The group includes two books edited and one book authored by Howard J. Wiarda, all published by the American Enterprise Institute. In the introduction to *Human Rights and U.S. Human Rights Policy: Theoretical Approaches and Some Perspectives on Latin America*, Wiarda notes that “the authors included here are all fervent believers in human rights” (p. 2). Yet the contributors criticize Jimmy Carter’s lack of cultural sensitivity, dispute Jacobo Timerman’s account of Argentine anti-Semitism, and assert the impossibility of applying universal human rights criteria. The subject of human rights policy is explored almost exclusively in terms of U.S. national interest and frequently in terms of the East-West conflict. In justifying the Reagan administration’s close relations with Argentina in the aftermath of the Jacobo Timerman book, Mark Falcoff states, “If the sole purpose of foreign policy was to make us feel good about ourselves, we could gladly concede the Soviets their Argentine prize” (p. 78). Given the nature of the military government in Argentina at the time, to assume that Argentina would become a “Soviet prize” seems an unwarranted conclusion, to say the least.

The essays in this collection clearly support the Reagan adminis-

tration's downgrading human rights issues in U.S. foreign policy in the region in favor of global priorities. As Michael Schifter states, "What we are doing, at worst, is subordinating certain perfectly legitimate short-range human rights concerns to our effort to protect the free world against the most compelling serious long-term threat to the cause of human rights [the USSR]" (p. 58). Two articles by Jeane Kirkpatrick, including the now classic "Dictatorship and Double Standards," are found in the volume and serve to legitimize further the Reagan administration's policies. In defending current U.S. human rights policy, she observes: "We think that by trying less we can produce more. Time, of course, will tell" (p. 93). While none of these works attempt to assess systematically the results of the two administrations, there are some indications that the Reagan approach to human rights has been less than completely successful. In spite of presumed quiet diplomacy, the Chilean regime has become more repressive in the past year; also, Alfonsín's glowing tribute to Jimmy Carter in 1984 suggests that the views of these authors are not shared by Latin American politicians or dissidents.

The seven essays in *Human Rights and U.S. Human Rights Policy* clearly provide the kind of academic rationale that the Reagan administration finds useful in developing its policies. While some valid points are raised (human rights policies are, in fact, interventionist), the articles contain serious shortcomings, which stem at least partially from the authors' lack of knowledge about Latin America.

The second book edited by Wiarda, *The Crisis in Latin America: Strategic, Economic, and Political Dimensions*, includes essays by Mark Falcoff, Joseph Grunwald, and Wiarda. The Wiarda essay is useful in assessing the declining leverage of the United States in Latin America, the systemic nature of the current crisis in U.S.–Latin American relations, and the frequently appalling level of ignorance in the United States that constrains attempts to understand Latin America. Wiarda deplores this ignorance in light of what he sees as the growing U.S. dependence on Latin America. While he favors a more "restrained" U.S. policy in Central America, he argues that the United States cannot afford to do nothing or to be merely a "moral force" in the region. "We have not only values," he remarks, "but also interests in the area—increasingly important ones" (p. 28).

This theme of U.S. interests—and potential threats to these interests—is picked up by Mark Falcoff, who directs his attention to the influence of outside nations in Central America (he does not consider the United States to be an "outside nation"). He notes, for example, that while North Americans do not understand the security implications of Central America, the USSR and Cuba have shown that they not only understand but are taking advantage of the current situation. Fal-

coff also criticizes the actions of the European Social Democrats as well as Mexico's involvement in Central America, seeing in such intervention a challenge to U.S. interests. Joseph Grunwald's article concludes that the depth of the region's economic crisis seems unrelated to the particular economic system in place, noting that both Cuba and Chile have been hard hit. He attributes the crisis instead to domestic and international structural factors. His article seems the most sophisticated in analyzing what many Latin Americans see as the major economic issues in inter-American relations.

Wiarda's third book, *In Search of Policy: The United States and Latin America*, consists of seven of his previously published papers. Although occasionally repetitive, Wiarda's writing contains some elemental truths about Latin America, as in his discussions of the U.S. public's abysmal lack of understanding of Latin America and the importance of cultural factors in understanding Latin America. Wiarda is well known for his observations on the authoritarian nature of Latin American politics; in this volume, he uses these cultural factors to explain the nature of U.S.–Latin American relations. He repeatedly returns to the theme of human rights as an example of the political impact of the profound cultural differences between the United States and Latin America. For example, he states: "There are of course universal criteria of human rights, but there are also culturally distinct nuances of meaning. . . . We need to know, therefore, how and when and with what implications, El Salvador violates *its own* criteria for human rights as well as when it violates our own or universal standards" (p. 50, emphasis in the original). Unfortunately, he gives little indication of which Salvadoran voices we should listen to in determining whether or not Salvadoran human rights criteria are being violated. One would expect different responses from the governmental authorities who tolerate high levels of violence (or, as often charged, contribute to it) as opposed to the victims of that violence.

To Promote Peace: U.S. Foreign Policy in the Mid-1980s, edited by Dennis L. Bark, is a collection of seventeen essays written by former or current Hoover Associates. The book jacket notes that all the contributors share the premise that an adequate credible defense is the best guarantee of peace. Although the book contains a variety of interesting essays (for example, Edward Teller's "Energy and Peace"), two are particularly relevant for the study of inter-American relations. Melvyn Krauss's essay on development aid decries using foreign aid and creating welfare states in the Third World, and it bitterly attacks international financial institutions for insulating Third World governments from the results of their ill-conceived policies. He argues that economic growth and the free enterprise system represent the best hope for Third World nations. Not only will the Third World benefit from the free

enterprise system, but the entire world stands to gain: "Just as free trade ensures that the benefits of economic growth in the North spread to the South, free trade also ensures that rapid growth in the South spreads to the North" (p. 2). Again one encounters the rationale on which the Reagan administration bases its economic policies toward Latin America: free trade, economic growth, and a vigorous private sector represent the best hope for Latin America's future development.

The essay by Robert Wesson seems a bit out of place in this volume. Like Wiarda, Wesson looks to Latin American cultural traditions in discussing Latin American–U.S. relations. But unlike Wiarda, he maintains that the Western Hemisphere forms a cultural community, with elements of a shared political tradition. Wesson also perceives some of the structural factors affecting inter-American relations, arguing, for example, that the ultimate basis for movement toward democracy is a reduction in inequality. He is particularly critical of U.S. policy toward Cuba, which he characterizes as notably unsuccessful in the past and unlikely to succeed in the future. Wesson argues that the United States should seek to reincorporate Cuba into hemispheric affairs.

David Ronfeldt's *Geopolitics, Security, and U.S. Strategy in the Caribbean Basin* was written for the U.S. Air Force before the invasion of Grenada. Ronfeldt proposes a reformulation of U.S. policy in the region according to four principles: first, the Caribbean Basin should be made secure for U.S. presence; second, hostile foreign powers should be prevented from acquiring military bases; third, foreign struggles for power should be excluded from the region; and fourth, few U.S. resources should be dedicated to protecting U.S. interests and assets in the Caribbean. He supports this call for a policy reformulation in terms of what he calls the "strategic imperative": "the ability of the U.S. to act as a world power in a global balance of power system is greatly enhanced by the exclusion of that system and its related threats and struggles from the Basin" (p. 8). Thus Ronfeldt maintains that the question of the security of the Caribbean Basin must be disentangled from the global East-West conflict, arguing against militarization of the basin. He proposes instead that U.S. primacy should be upheld through a system of "collective hegemony"; specifically, Venezuela, Mexico, and Colombia should act in concert with the United States in promoting regional stability. Although Ronfeldt maintains that such a policy would be anti-imperialist, he clearly envisions the United States as playing a dominant role in such a system: "The United States would be constrained from behaving like a hegemonic power, yet it could derive benefits as though hegemony existed" (p. 42). While the United States would have to overcome Latin American nationalism in order for collective hegemony to function, a regional security system would promote U.S. inter-

ests. At the same time, however, Ronfeldt talks of strengthening U.S. presence in the region. Given the nature of past and present U.S. actions in Central America, Ronfeldt's credibility becomes strained at times, as when he asserts that "the United States is the only power that can foster a strong democratic political center in the Basin and shield it from right-wing assassins" (p. 67). Although couched in collective and regional terms, some of Ronfeldt's ideas—such as his almost casual mention of the need to think about "de-Sovietizing Cuba"—are quite disturbing (p. 45). Not only do such phrases indicate the real thrust behind the rhetoric of regional solutions and collective security, but they provide a telling glimpse of the way such strategists view the region.

The Rand study, *U.S. Policy for Central America: A Briefing*, by Edward González et al. is a revised version of an October 1984 briefing presented to the Kissinger Commission on Central America. In it the authors assess U.S. strategic interests in the Caribbean Basin. Their focus is also strategic: the United States must prevent threats from arising in Central America that would force the diversion of U.S. resources from other areas of the world. Moreover, the authors insist that the "United States has a *moral obligation* to protect and support those moderate forces that share this moderate commitment to human rights and other democratic values" (p. v, emphasis added). They view the Soviet Union as increasing its presence in Central America and take as a given the creation of a Nicaraguan-USSR axis in the region. After developing alternative scenarios for political events in the region (such as the installation of Soviet MIGs in Nicaragua or a guerrilla victory in El Salvador), they assess various alternatives for U.S. policy toward Nicaragua: accommodating with the Sandinistas, putting nonmilitary pressure on the Sandinistas (including financially supporting anti-Sandinista forces), intervening directly with military forces, or preventing the introduction of Soviet weapons systems in Nicaragua. Although U.S. military intervention is described as "the surest way of eliminating Nicaragua as a potential threat" (p. viii), the authors note that it would entail both high political costs and military problems (they estimate that one hundred thousand U.S. combat troops, including virtually the entire U.S. strategic reserves, would be required) (p. 23). Consequently, they recommend that the United States maintain pressure on the Sandinista regime by means including financial support for the "anti-Sandinista elements" and that it take steps "including, if necessary, selective military actions" to ensure that Nicaragua does not continue to acquire Soviet weapons systems and does not allow a Soviet-Cuban military buildup within its borders (p. 26). In Central America generally, the authors advocate engaging Latin American nationalism by various means, which include supporting the "time-honored principle of non-

intervention," strengthening moderate democratic forces, fostering socioeconomic development, and building "constructive" military relations (p. 30).

The six works by Wiarda and his contributors, Bark, Ronfeldt, and González et al. provide a telling glimpse into the mentality underlying the Reagan administration's policies toward Central America. The González briefing's apparently straightforward assertion that the United States should abide by the "time-honored principle of non-intervention," which appears a mere two pages after the call for selective military actions against Nicaragua to prevent a Soviet-Cuban buildup there, boggles the mind. Similarly, Ronfeldt's call for a system of "collective hegemony" that recognizes Latin American nationalism seems embarrassingly ignorant of Latin American history. This apparent lack of understanding of Latin America's historical experience sets the "strategists" who are not area specialists apart from even the conservative Latin Americanist writers. Thus both Wesson and Wiarda are sensitive to efforts to increase U.S. hegemony in Latin America. While the policy implications of stressing cultural factors seem at least to lend tacit support to repressive Latin American regimes, the policy implications of the "strategists" such as Ronfeldt and the González team are much more interventionist. Focusing on U.S. national interests leads—perhaps inevitably—to the conclusion that U.S. strategic imperatives in the region outweigh any efforts to promote autonomous independent political regimes. Not only are foreign powers to be kept out of the region, but governments that do not toe the Washington line are to be "discouraged."

For readers seeking a glimpse of the occasionally bizarre intellectual foundation on which U.S. policy toward Latin America is based, these six books provide an excellent overview. With the possible exception of Wiarda (who elsewhere has developed interesting ideas on the formation of authoritarian political systems in Latin America), the studies are virtually devoid of theory. They are less concerned with understanding why certain policies develop the way they do than with interpreting current events with the ever-present goal of formulating policy alternatives. The only theoretical underpinnings seem to stem from Hans Morgenthau's classic dictum that all states act to increase their own power.

The four remaining works by Michael Czinkota, Margaret Daly Hayes, George Grayson, and Carlos Vásquez and Manuel García y Griego represent somewhat complementary trends in the literature on inter-American relations. While they have little in common, they reflect some of the same tendencies of the six works noted above, particularly the trend toward analyzing U.S.–Latin American relations in terms of U.S. interests, U.S. influence, and policy prescriptions.

U.S.–Latin American Relations: Issues and Concerns, edited by Michael Czinkota, differs from the others in its economic approach, specificity, and lack of overt policy implications. The collection of fifteen essays (approximately half by Latin Americans) is drawn primarily from papers presented at a conference on exporting sponsored by Georgetown University in Rio de Janeiro. The contributions are divided into three sections: first, macroissues in Latin American trade policy, including essays on import-export patterns of manufactured goods for four Latin American nations and on the implications of international trade law for Latin American tax practices; second, the corporate issues in U.S.–Latin American trade, including articles on small and medium-sized companies in Mexico, perceptions of U.S. international executives, and a model for export negotiations; and third, new forms of trade development, including articles on tourism, Brazilian trading companies, and free trade zones along the Mexican border. As is the case with many edited volumes, the essays are of uneven quality. All of the articles were written from the viewpoint of either individual companies or governments trying to use a particular company. The larger political implications associated with developing tourism and with free trade zones are not discussed by any of the authors. While many of the articles offer concrete suggestions based on the experiences of Latin American firms, the volume is less useful in discussing the broader political consequences of trade in the inter-American system. This narrower focus on the workings of private companies in conducting U.S.–Latin American trade may be an attempt to avoid the political pitfalls of a more comprehensive approach.

Margaret Daly Hayes's *Latin America and the U.S. National Interest: A Basis for U.S. Foreign Policy* was initially written for the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. The tone is set on the first page: "The critical questions to be answered in reviewing U.S. political, economic, and security interests are not whether the United States has interests in the hemisphere, but rather, how to promote those interests more effectively" (p. 1). This study basically describes U.S. interests in Latin America, with specific chapters on the Caribbean Basin, Mexico (by Bruce Bagley), and Brazil. Hayes sees the most serious threats to U.S. interests existing in the Caribbean, and she observes that "the presence in Cuba of a hostile Marxist-Leninist government poses the most serious political problem for the United States in the hemisphere, one that has troubled U.S. administrations for more than twenty years" (p. 81). While she does not discuss "de-Sovietizing Cuba," she advocates a policy of "studied neglect" toward Cuba. Although Hayes notes that successful U.S. policy in the region depends on the degree to which U.S. interests coincide with the interests of Latin American countries, *Latin America and the U.S. National Interest* is clearly written from a U.S.

perspective. In fact, she asserts that “anti-Americanism in the region poses a major test of U.S. tolerance for political experimentation” (p. 225). The book’s strongest points are its concise descriptions of Latin American debt problems and specific developments in Brazilian–U.S. and Mexican–U.S. relations. The statistical data (such as the tables showing U.S. dependence on Latin American raw materials and arms markets) are clearly presented and useful. A minor irritation is the lack of Spanish accent marks.

George Grayson’s *The United States and Mexico: Patterns of Influence* is part of the Praeger series on influence in international relations edited by Alvin Rubinstein. Grayson defines *influence* as both a process and a product. Influence is considered to be a derivative of power: power is “general, latent, continuing, and relative” while influence is “situational, manifest, and short-lived” (p. 2). Influence stems from the inequality of power between two states, but its exercise depends on the issue involved, its salience, and the degree of national willingness to absorb the cost. Following a brief history of U.S.–Mexican relations, Grayson discusses the Echeverría years in terms of Mexico’s vulnerability to the United States. He cites the 1975 Jewish tourism boycott, questions raised about the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), and several other cases to substantiate Mexico’s vulnerability to U.S. influence. Separate chapters analyze oil and gas policy under López Portillo, Mexican foreign policy toward the Caribbean Basin and Cuba, Mexican membership in GATT, immigration, and the 1982 economic crisis. Throughout the book, Grayson displays a thorough understanding of Mexican–U.S. relations. His chapter on oil and gas policy provides an excellent analysis of a complex and dynamic component of U.S.–Mexican relations. His discussion of immigration policy is up-to-date, tracing the development of the Simpson-Mazzoli package through the fall of 1983. The 1982 economic crisis (which he partially blames on de la Madrid) again illustrates Mexico’s weakness vis-à-vis the United States. Grayson reports that some individuals in the U.S. government favored driving Mexico “to its knees” (p. 187), but the supportiveness of the U.S. response in fact demonstrates its sensitivity to Mexico and the importance that it attaches to U.S.–Mexican relations.

Grayson adeptly portrays Mexico’s suspicions and defensive attitude toward the United States, attributing many of the difficulties in relations between the United States and Mexico to Mexico’s lack of understanding of the U.S. political process. He sees the relationship between the U.S. and Mexico as a symbiotic one, arguing that Mexico’s oil power has reduced U.S. efforts to manipulate Mexico. He foresees that as Mexico expands its influence with other nations, it will strengthen its bargaining capabilities vis-à-vis the United States.

This view of the relationship between Mexico and the United

States as one of interdependence is hotly contested by some of the contributors to the edited volume by Carlos Vásquez and Manuel García y Griego. *Mexican–U.S. Relations: Conflict and Convergence*, copublished by the UCLA Chicano Studies Center and the Latin American Studies Center, includes sixteen essays, twelve of which were previously published between 1977 and 1982. The contributors represent some of the principal scholars and practitioners working in the field of U.S.–Mexican relations. The editors' introductory essay provides an excellent overview of both the volume and the principal issues in U.S.–Mexican relations. Reflecting perhaps their concern with Chicano politics, the editors distinguish between intersocietal and intergovernmental relations, although most of the essays emphasize the latter component. They also note that while some of the authors in this volume emphasize the constraints of U.S. or Mexican policy, others emphasize the policy choices available to the governments. A focus on constraints, they astutely point out, is based on a different set of assumptions than a focus emphasizing national choices. These themes of constraints and choices and of the impact of Mexican oil provide some continuity for divergent essays on specific issues, including general U.S.–Mexican relations, energy issues, other trade issues, immigration, and the participation of Chicanos in U.S.–Mexican relations. Space precludes adequately discussing the many issues and the profound theoretical debates raised in this provocative volume. One example of the fundamental disagreements between some of the contributors is found in the section on general U.S.–Mexican relations. David Ronfeldt and Caesar Sereseres view the Mexican–U.S. relationship as an interdependent one in which the two countries are so closely linked that the United States cannot hurt Mexico without hurting itself. Both Mario Ojeda and Carlos Rico question this characterization of the Mexican–U.S. relationship, emphasizing that despite the rhetoric of "mutual dependence," Mexico needs the United States much more than the United States needs Mexico.

In analyzing energy issues, Lorenzo Meyer presents a historical study comparing Mexico's oil policy before nationalization of the industry with its situation after 1979. The historical experience suggests that analysts of the contemporary situation should consider certain historical issues, such as how the oil benefits are distributed. Jorge Castañeda, former Mexican foreign minister, argues that oil can actually extricate the country from the conjunctural economic crisis but that it will do so according to the interests of the country's dominant class, the Mexican bourgeoisie.

Jorge Bustamante and James Cockroft discuss the issue of immigration and conclude that Mexican labor migration to the United States represents an unequal exchange in which Mexico subsidizes the U.S.

economy. They note that the sectors of the population that emigrate to the United States are not the poorest sectors and that U.S. capital migrates to Mexico. In exploring the characteristics of the Mexican immigrants and some of the political difficulties they create for U.S.–Mexican relations, Bustamante and Cockcroft observe that this massive migration occurs in the absence of an articulated policy regarding emigration. In contrast to the Bustamante-Cockcroft study, Clark Reynolds analyzes the labor market projections for the two countries, concluding that the two countries are interdependent in terms of labor supply. In fact, U.S. investment in Mexico may have a significant positive impact on the employment of low-skilled labor. The article by Cornelius traces current antiforeign and anti-Mexican sentiments in the United States, noting that these attitudes are likely to grow and harden in the future. At best, he concludes, these attitudes will set limits on U.S. migration policy. At worst, they may force the choice of a punitive, discriminatory policy (p. 372). This article leads into the final section of the book, which looks at the role of Chicanos in relations between the U.S. and Mexico. The authors, Rodolfo A. de la Garza, Juan Gómez-Quiñones, and Carlos H. Zazueta, describe and explain the relations between Chicanos, the Mexican government, and the U.S. government, raising many interesting questions in the process. While all three articles express a preference for more dialogue, none are very optimistic about the possibilities for a stable, mutually productive relationship.

Mexican–U.S. Relations: Conflict and Convergence is by far the best of the books reviewed here because it includes a diversity of views, devotes some attention to the principal theoretical issues, and demonstrates a basic awareness that a Latin American perspective is vital to any discussion of U.S.–Latin American relations. As long as U.S. commentators ignore Latin American historical experiences in this hemisphere and concentrate exclusively on U.S. interests and influence in the region, understanding of inter-American relations will be limited. Unfortunately, such inadequate understanding will undoubtedly reinforce the interventionist trends in U.S. policies toward Latin America.