
BOOKS IN REVIEW

EDITORS' NOTE

Constraints of time have made it impossible to commission a significant number of review essays in this issue. Several are presently being prepared for the next and forthcoming numbers of LARR. We present those which follow as indications of the form such review essays might take. In the future, the Editors will not themselves be reviewing books in this space, and readers are assured that there will be no effort to turn this section into a house organ.

LATIN AMERICA'S EXILE POLITICS

THE DEMOCRATIC LEFT IN EXILE; The Anti-dictatorial Struggle in the Caribbean, 1945-1959. By CHARLES D. AMERINGER. (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, 1974. Pp. 352. \$19.95)

CUBANS IN EXILE; Disaffection and the Revolution. By RICHARD R. FAGEN, RICHARD A. BRODY and THOMAS J. O'LEARY. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1968. Pp. 161. \$5.95.)

THE POLITICS OF EXILE; Paraguay's Febrerista Party. By PAUL H. LEWIS. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1968. Pp. 209. \$6.00.)

THE ASSIMILATION OF CUBAN EXILES; The Role of Community and Class. By ELEANOR MEYER ROGG. (New York: Aberdeen Press, 1974. Pp. 241. \$10.00.)

Exile, replete with personal anguish, psychological trauma, and economic hardship, is a recurrent phenomenon in western history. Recent episodes provide stark testimony to the enduring agonies produced by domestic turmoil. The impact of political upheaval upon the lives of a people becomes profoundly searing for large numbers of citizens, both activists and non-participants. Perhaps the most prominent cases in the twentieth century have been the exoduses from Stalinist Russia, fascist Italy and Germany, Spain, and the dislocations in the Middle East. Latin America has scarcely been immune. Revolutionary Cuba has provided an illustration of direct relevance to many of us in the United States. The tragedy of post-Allende Chile has contributed further to international awareness of the exile phenomenon. Less heralded examples, provoked by somewhat different ideological and political circumstances, include the forcible expulsion of ele-

ments of the Democratic Left in the Caribbean and that of the *febreristas* in Paraguay. There is no reason to expect that similar occurrences will not reappear in future years, in one form or another. The expulsion of individuals from their native lands and the proscribing of political parties and organizations from legal activity will undoubtedly continue to weave an important strand into the fabric of Latin American politics. Scholars must address themselves to the study and investigation of Latin America's exile politics. Research strategies, data collection, and methodologies of investigation should be confronted and assessed.

The literature is disarmingly if discouragingly slender, even if one includes works dealing with non-Latin American cases. As Paul Lewis remarks in the introduction to *The Politics of Exile*, systematic studies can be encompassed virtually in a single footnote. The shelf of works concerning Latin America is even skimpier. The four works under review here are among the few to be published in the last decade, and reflect a variety of approaches to the subject. Uncommon obstacles to research are also clearly outlined. The efforts of an historian, a sociologist, and of four political scientists appear in these studies. Two fundamental areas of emphasis can be identified: One deals with the organizational and ideological travails of exiled political parties, while the other concentrates upon the motivation of individual refugees and the problems of assimilation into new and often alien cultures. The Ameringer and Lewis studies fit into the former category. They analyze, respectively, the experiences of the Democratic Left in its conflict with Caribbean dictatorship from 1945 to 1959, and the three decades of febrerista exile from Paraguay. Ameringer's avowedly historical interpretation and Lewis' more organizationally oriented analysis represent essentially traditional scholarship. In contrast, the flavor of political sociology is evident with Rogg, as well as the collaborative effort of Fagen, Brody and O'Leary. The sampling of a specific universe, the construction and application of interview schedules, and statistical handling of mass data are among their relevant techniques. Before assessing the various research procedures and methodologies, however, the content and substance of each work must be reviewed.

The fifteen years beginning at the conclusion of World War II in the cockpit of the Caribbean were especially disruptive, even for that historically volatile region. At a time when party organizations emerged which were collectively labelled the Democratic Left, the struggle for political power with a host of assorted dictators was deadly serious. Acción Democrática (AD) of Venezuela, the Partido Revolucionario Cubano (PRC), the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano (PRD), and Costa Rica's Partido Liberación Nacional (PLN) were the most prominent. Less powerfully organized but perhaps more extreme in tactics were their counterparts in Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Honduras. Among the authoritarians to oppose the Democratic Left during this period were Venezuela's Marcos Pérez Jiménez, Tiburcio Carías of Honduras, Anastasio Somoza and his sons in Nicaragua, and the prototypical figure of Generalissimo Rafael Leónidas Trujillo. Carlos Castillo Armas appeared in Guatemala somewhat later, while Ameringer's inclusion of Rafael Angel Calderón Guardia is a judgment which many students of Costa Rican politics would contest. Be that as it may, the reader is led with painstaking care through the labyrinthine maze of Caribbean politics, including a judicious and informative treatment of the sometimes mythic but well publicized Caribbean Legion.

The greatest attention understandably is devoted to Acción Democrática, the best organized and most doctrinally self-conscious of these organizations. Founded in 1941 after an early experience which originated in the student activism of the famous "Generation of '28," the AD underwent a heady moment of government power during the 1945-48 *trienio*, only to be followed by a full decade of proscription. Ameringer's account turns up little that is new, but is accurate in its systematic narrative of that difficult period. It is the case of the *adecos* which provides the single best source for Ameringer's broader generalizing about political exile. Somewhat less detailed attention is devoted to Cuba's PRC. The author is perhaps chary of the *auténticos*, given the complexity and controversy of Cuban politics in the wake of the 26th of July movement and the enduring influence of Fidel Castro. The unreliability of many Cuban published sources, as well as both practical and political obstacles in interviewing former participants, doubtless contributed further. Ameringer recognizes the substantial loss of PRC popularity and viability as a result of the corruption of its two administrations.

He seems similarly cautious and reserved in examining Guatemala's Partido Revolucionario (PR), as well as the Arbenz government which was ultimately toppled in 1954 with powerful backing from the Central Intelligence Agency. To be sure, the informal but meaningful entente of the late 1940s, dominated by Rómulo Betancourt of Venezuela and Costa Rica's José Figueres, was itself increasingly ambiguous in its relationship to the Guatemalans. Relatively frequent communication and exchange of views during the presidency of Juan José Arévalo in Guatemala (1945-51) diminished following the election of Jacobo Arbenz and the growing influence of Marxist forces within his administration. Yet another set of circumstances emerges from Costa Rica, where the dictatorial-democratic dichotomy so heavily used by Ameringer is less convincing. Without denying the involvement of Figueres in the early years of the Democratic Left, his position within the framework of Costa Rican politics scarcely justifies a discussion paralleling the Venezuelan, Dominican, and even Cuban instances. Notwithstanding these and similar problems, Ameringer does provide an informed and well organized chronicle of the tortuous events of the late 1940s, including the abortive Cayo Confites episode of 1947, international involvement in Costa Rica's 1948 civil war, and the 1949 Luperón invasion of the Dominican Republic.

The Democratic Left in Exile does not draw upon social science theory, but raises interesting questions about the significance of political exile as related to organizational structure and doctrinal commitment. Here again the Venezuelan situation occupies a leading position, and Ameringer properly devotes attention to the multiple tactics and strategy of Acción Democrática. From 1948 to 1953 the party placed heavy emphasis on its underground movement. The viciously relentless persecution by the regime, especially after the 1950 assassination of Pérez Jiménez' leading rival for power, took a heavy toll of the younger *adeco* leadership. The opening of the Guasina concentration camp, street murders, unbridled torture of political prisoners, and the increasing efficiency of the dictatorship's feared Seguridad Nacional (SN) all sapped the strength of the clandestine movement. At the same time, international pressures were brought to bear against governments permitting the residence of such leaders as Betancourt and his senior colleagues. From 1953 to 1956 the exile effort was devoted increasingly to insuring the party's sheer survival, while biding its time in anticipation of an ultimate return. When this was finally realized in 1958, the generational and doctrinal

stresses engendered by the decade of proscription had fertilized the seeds of disension and factionalism which plagued Acción Democrática in future years.

In an area characterized by swift changes in mood and a rapid transformation of political forces, the discussion of 1945-59 sounds curiously dated. Although relatively few years have passed, the era has acquired a quality of mustiness, as if taken down from the shelf of a museum display. This is not to say that what grew into the Democratic Left has disappeared from the scene. In early 1974 the PLN regained power with the election of Daniel Oduber. More importantly, the AD in 1973 returned after five years in opposition to win an overwhelming electoral victory. The March 1974 inauguration of Carlos Andrés Pérez has been followed by a revived populism which, nourished by petroleum income, has been assuming an increasingly prominent position in Latin American diplomatic circles. Nonetheless, as Ameringer observes, the Cuban Revolution introduced a new era in hemispheric affairs, altering drastically the context within which ideological forces contended for political power. His study of exiles, then, focuses on organizational entities, their interrelationship throughout the region, and their collective political activities.

Paul Lewis provides a sharper delineation of exile politics with his concentration on Paraguay's febreristas. As a political scientist, he frames his book within the theoretical parameters of the literature on party organization. We are told at the outset in no uncertain terms that *The Politics of Exile* is a study of party organization and not an analysis of individual political exiles. "The chief assumption here is that exile parties do not constitute a genre of political organization different from other parties; they are simply required to operate under abnormal conditions" (p. xiii). Those elements and characteristics of scholarly research on political parties are therefore presented throughout his book: Organization, discipline, leadership, factionalism, and ideology. Having made clear his orientation at the outset, Lewis proceeds with a detailed dissection of the febreristas from their 1936 inception. His case differs from that of Ameringer in its single-country context and the uninterruptedly overwhelming length of exile. For the febreristas, the explosive capture of power introduced a brief three years of power after which the movement was driven abroad. Had a similar fate befallen Acción Democrática, its leadership would have remained scattered and aging in such foreign outposts as San José and Mexico City, dreaming with wistful bitterness of the 1945-48 glory years.

In studying a political party under the abnormal conditions of exile, then, the author gives close attention to structural and ideological factors. With the former, we are reminded that organizational skills are severely taxed by the penalties proscription imposes. Following the initial expulsion and dispersion, a regrouping is required in order to undertake clandestine activities. Communications must be established between the underground at home and the exiled leadership, a task Lewis regards as little short of monumental. Unlike some of the Caribbean parties and movements, serious febrerista resistance efforts proved somewhat intermittent and sporadic over time. To be sure, there was concerted activity in the first years of exile, culminating in 1947's armed rebellion. After briefly assuming the guise of civil war, dominant government forces prevailed. The better part of two decades were to pass before the regime of General Alfredo Stroessner extended political amnesty to the febreristas in August 1964. Although many senior figures returned home, among them the longtime party leader Gen-

eral Rafael Franco, full political participation was effectively denied. In the next ten years, periodic gestures by the regime toward an alleged "liberalization" alternated with longer periods of repression. For all practical purposes, the movement remained one of refugees, the majority of the leaders residing in Buenos Aires.

The necessity of maintaining organizational viability and morale amid the pronounced annoyances of refugee life created strong pressures on internal cohesion. Lewis recounts four discrete cases of serious factionalism within the febrerista organization. With senior leaders effectively obligated to regain power for the party or risk being discredited, the impatience of a younger generation damaged structural purity and weakened internal discipline. Ideological cleavages also came to the fore, increasingly couched upon philosophical or theoretical divergences which, under the circumstances, were the epitome of futility. Personal pettiness often surfaced to fuel the fires of factionalism. In the end, Lewis regards the quality and effectiveness of leadership as the crucial variable. Citing Roberto Michels' "iron law of oligarchy" as applicable to the febreristas, he contends that incumbent leaders, prevented in exile from supplying material rewards for party loyalty, inevitably suffer an erosion of power and influence. "One of the ironies of exile seems to be that, as the party dwindles in size, the struggles for leadership become more intense . . . often rationalized by violent quibbles over petty ideological points" (p. 191). Owing perhaps to his disciplinary training and a familiarity with the literature of comparative politics on party organization, Lewis provides an interpretation more acute than Ameringer's in its systematization of the structural and ideological variables. For both scholars, however, exile politics is primarily circumscribed by the activities of organizational elites.

The contrasting emphasis upon mass attitudes and socio-cultural adjustments to refugee life is writ large in the two studies of Cuban exiles. With *Cubans in Exile*, Fagen, Brody, and O'Leary pose questions of individual motivation in attempting to learn why their respondents left Cuba. Working through the Cuban Refugee Emergency Center in Miami, they questioned those who reached Miami in the first four years after the fall of Fulgencio Batista. Their sample was therefore drawn from Cubans who arrived in the United States prior to the discontinuation of regularly scheduled air flights from Havana to Miami during the October 1962 missile crisis. A second exodus, transported by special flights beginning in late 1965, was therefore excluded from the study. The three collaborators argue briefly but persuasively that those leaving in the post-1964 wave possessed a different psychological and attitudinal outlook, constituting as they did a group which was the product of the political and social transformation realized during the early years of the Castro government. Having thereby identified and defined their subjects, the authors are able to examine the refugees' backgrounds, their reasons for leaving, and their attitudes toward the Revolution before and after departure. There is no denying the painfulness of readjustment to a new style of life and to uneasy self-perceptions, but the study does not concern itself with the refugees' life in the United States. Unlike the Rogg inquiry, the consequences of exile lie beyond the scope of this investigation.

Given the opportunity to examine conditions under which internal dissatisfaction becomes sufficient to cause a significant exodus, the authors also ask if it is only the political activist who flees. They counterpose data against the

commonplace assumption that it is primarily the highly politicized who voluntarily opt for exile. It becomes apparent that the 1959-62 migration, coming out of what became a revolutionary situation, was composed essentially of those who preferred self-imposed exile. The data clearly contradict the assumption that this group of refugees arrived at the decision because of ideological commitment. Rather, the most common pattern was an individual reaction to varied personal experiences. The Cuban Revolution had been pervasive almost from the outset, reaching the vast majority of citizens. As the authors demonstrate in chapter 6, "The Decision to Leave," those who left concluded that conditions were intolerable. The definition of this quality fell into seven categories: Fear of imprisonment, actual incarceration, harassment (the disruption of daily life), the failure to integrate into the Revolution, a loss of job or possessions, a diffuse objection to government activities, and opposition to what some viewed as communist regime orientation. Grouping these categories under yet broader rubrics of pragmatic and ideological experience, the investigators conclude that the first were relatively more decisive in respondents' final decision to leave.

Drawing the work to a close, they argue that four major issues had been raised: (a) The meaning of disaffection and flight; (b) the significance of continued residence in Cuba and participation in the Revolution; (c) the legitimacy of the Castro regime; and (d) the implication of the exodus for the future of the regime. We are reminded of the differences between the subjects of the Ameringer and Lewis tomes and those of the Cuban study. That is, traditional Caribbean dictatorships have been confronted by exiles who are customarily politicized and who represent an active opposition. "On the other hand, refugees from Castroism come from a much larger pool of potential exiles: all those affected negatively by the frenetic activity of the regime. In the main, such persons are politicized, if at all, *by the process of change itself*; they do not necessarily belong to the rather narrow prerevolutionary political stratum [of Cuba]" (p. 100). Thus the pervasiveness of the Revolution, while far from the only explanatory factor, becomes important. Clearly, the possibility of migrating without the application of immigration quotas by the United States cannot be ignored. Along with the rejection of the new way of life which sprang forth in Cuba from January 1959, traditional attachments became strained and often warped. As a relevant footnote to the atypical attributes of the Cuban case, the authors point out Fidel Castro's willingness to export his opponents and critics rather than indiscriminately applying those repressive measures characteristic of many Caribbean regimes. If this mass of citizens were not susceptible to assimilation within the new order, better to permit departure rather than risk greater injury to the realization of revolutionary objectives.

For Eleanor Meyer Rogg, it is precisely the issue of assimilation that demands investigation. In effect, she moves chronologically a step beyond the stage of exile life examined by Fagen, Brody, and O'Leary, studying the experiences of refugees in the process of personal adjustment to a new environment and culture. The locus for *The Assimilation of Cuban Exiles* is West New York, New Jersey, a community in which exiles from Cuba constitute from one-fourth to one-third of the population. The major intellectual issue revolves about the impact of a strong ethnic community upon refugee acculturation. Drawing on relevant sociological literature, she demonstrates a somewhat stronger theoretical bent than that of the other works under review. As a direct practical objective, Rogg seeks out the factors pertinent to the process of adjustment. Moreover, careful attention is devoted

to socio-economic background in order to grasp the dimension of class. In the same fashion, she probes into occupational as well as socio-psychological adjustment. Through the collection of demographic data and the intensive interviewing of 250 families, Rogg devoted four years to the project. Her findings are rich with insight, and can only be highlighted briefly in this space.

Two major hypotheses had been posed at the outset. First, the formation of a strong concentrated community, by perpetuating features of the native culture, was presumed to influence favorably the adjustment of first-generation Cubans. Furthermore, it was postulated that refugees of middle class backgrounds could become acculturated more easily and swiftly than immigrants from poorer classes. The data largely confirm both hypotheses. The role of the community in assimilation is shown to be important, and the learning of North American ways was being achieved at a steady but measured pace, therefore permitting the survival of individual personality and family tradition. Despite occupational dissonance, acculturation progressed for a large majority. Ethnic solidarity remained strong, but new attachments and loyalties grew. Although most respondents retained a desire to return home, 87.7 percent believed that if their families were still in the United States fifty years hence, they would be exactly the same as those outside the Cuban experience. This anticipated equality was viewed in a positive light. Concerning class background, Professor Rogg determined that refugees with middle class origins encountered initial difficulty in adjusting to the lower-level occupations in which some 80 percent found themselves. However, there was optimism about their ultimate occupational future. At the same time, those from the lower end of the socio-economic scale in Cuba, while relatively more content with the immediate material satisfactions of new employment, showed themselves less readily susceptible to assimilation than those from the middle strata.

The vitality and variation of scholarly research is vividly portrayed in these four works. Research procedures, the nature and availability of data, obstacles to intellectual inquiry, and methodological techniques range over a broad spectrum. While individual criticisms can and will be proffered, it is generally true that in each study the investigator(s) adopts methods most appropriate to his idiosyncratic approach to exile politics. In some ways the most imposing task was that facing Lewis in his Paraguay work. When his research was initiated, the febreristas had been out of power for a quarter century, and the diaspora had left its remaining leaders both physically and psychologically isolated from the vortex of political activity. Substantial sleuthing was necessary to identify and to locate those former leaders still living who could provide the most useful information. The lacuna of materials by both Paraguayan and foreign authors added to the problems, as did the predictable lack of sympathy by representatives of the country's governing elite. Lewis himself puts it well in a model of understatement:

The existing literature on this subject is scanty, and what is available is often highly impressionistic and polemical. It is difficult to obtain empirical data. Often records are either lost or were not kept, and the personal recollections of the participants are inclined to be colored by partisan emotions. This lack of 'hard' data tends to leave the researcher with the problem of picking his way through a bewildering labyrinth of contradictory information, based primarily on polemical literature and interviews of varying reliability. . . .

Research into exile politics is an experience that tends to make one appreciative of the conditional, tenuous nature of 'facts.' Men engaged in highly partisan politics seem to see what they wanted to see in the first place, and to remember things in a way most convenient to justify their position. . . . We are dealing with epistemological and psychological variables whose study lies beyond the scope of this work. The possible effects that exile may have upon people's perceptions of their environment are beyond our competence to discuss at anything but a superficial level. Such problems tend to show, however, why research in this area has been neglected (pp. xii-xiii).

There is some reason to suspect that, despite the best of intentions, he was not fully immune to the temptation of mild favoritism. Although the very absence of extensive scholarship makes it difficult for non-Paraguayans to render a judgment, there is an occasional phrase which hints at a less than fully critical use of oral and written febrerista sources. One can say with greater confidence that the treatment of the two López regimes in the nineteenth century is, at the least, less unsympathetic than customary interpretations. And on another intellectual plane, Lewis' efforts at broad conceptualization and generalization are unexceptional. He does not make extensive use of theoretical work extant on political parties and organizations. References in both the introductory and concluding passages to the work of Samuel Eldersveld are scarcely appropriate. The author seems almost to concede the point in his final pages, noting Eldersveld's overly broad generalizations derived from a study of parties in Wayne County, Michigan. Yet this does not fully pardon him, for there is undue reliance on that far from universal work in attempting to lend theoretical significance to the findings of his case study. Since Lewis emphasizes that his is a study of party organization as situated in an abnormal setting, there is a burden of proof which he does not meet. Notwithstanding such flaws, however, the fact remains that he chose to tread where other scholars had been timorous; honestly recognized and grappled with research problems of imposing magnitude; and brought forth a commendable case study on the febreristas. If the reader learns more about the party and Paraguayan political history than he does about the dynamics of political exile, this does not deny that *The Politics of Exile* deserves its place among works on this understudied topic.

The research problems facing Fagen, Brody, and O'Leary are of a different character. The cooperation of officials at the Cuban Refugee Center was central to the project; there seems little indication that this was difficult to secure. Success in interviewing Cuban exiles in Miami was a much more uncertain question, however, and there was good reason for initial anxiety by the authors. In time, 53 percent of the original 401 members of the sample received questionnaires, and evidently met the task seriously. This, in conjunction with the demographic data available through the Center, provides a rich lode of data. The restraint and scholarly judgment with which the data were analyzed deserve high marks. The authors promise to eschew speculation and let the data speak themselves, a pledge which is commendably honored. Moreover, they are judicious in posing unresolved questions which survive presentation of the data. There is little effort to generalize extensively about political exiles, but *Cubans in Exile* provides a highly competent case study which is replete with suggestions for broader inquiry by future researchers. Let it be noted that the co-authors follow a practice which is not yet observed as fully by social scientists as it should be: To wit, they reproduce the invitation to respondents and the questionnaire itself, in both Spanish and En-

lish. Tables reporting their findings are interspersed throughout the text and are clearly presented; attitudinal Guttman scales are reproduced in the Appendix. Similar remarks can be made with reference to Rogg. Her basic intellectual concerns are clearly articulated, as are the theoretical elements she wished to examine. The reader is informed about the construction of the research design, its field implementation, and its results. Indices present the bases for measures of cultural assimilation and for both U.S. and Cuban SES. The final appendix also provides the interview schedule in each language.

With *The Democratic Left in Exile*, less systematic methods are employed. Charles Ameringer draws heavily upon printed sources, supplemented by personal interviews. Certainly the breadth of his study makes both forms of inquiry potentially intimidating in magnitude, and he deserves credit for a major effort at the collection of large chunks of material. In dealing at length with more than a half-dozen political systems over a period of years, he accepts substantial problems of source material. The ultimate synthesizing and presentation of these materials, as noted earlier, reveals great industry, personal patience, and a judicious intellect. Furthermore, it is no mean task to unravel such intricacies as the legendary Caribbean Legion or the succession of abortive invasions by political adventurers. This is not to ignore the difficulties in securing information about the several dictatorships which play a part in his narrative. Without intending to quibble, however, it is still possible to question Ameringer's heavy reliance on *The New York Times*, *Hispanic American Report*, and the newspapers of Caracas, Havana, Managua, and San José. He also runs the risk of possible bias, much as did Lewis, through heavy use of partisan sources. For Venezuela he draws repeatedly on the writings of Betancourt and other AD leaders, along with assorted exile publications. His Costa Rican citations are slanted toward José Figueres and the PLN, as for example Figueres' cousin and long-time supporter Arturo Castro Esquivel. Admittedly, there is less material available for Costa Rican than for Venezuelan politics. Lastly, the interviews with political participants are far too limited and selective to contribute fully to his study. His choice of subjects is neither comprehensive nor completely representative of the activists about whom he writes. Granted the undeniable financial and human demands which extensive interviewing would have required, the fact remains that this aspect of his research only partially fleshes out Ameringer's book.

Taken together, these four volumes provide incontrovertible evidence that Latin America's exile politics is deserving of systematic and continuing study. Of equal importance is the fact that problems of research, while undeniable, are shown to be less than insuperable. Each work offers proof that a dedicated and serious scholar can meet and cope with the obstacles. The scope of these studies include the examination of exiled party organizations, of clandestine and refugee activity, and of problems of leadership and discipline, ideology and program. At the micro level they also focus upon individual experience: Motivation, attitudes, and cultural relationships. What more need be said to encourage future research on the politics of exile?

JOHN D. MARTZ
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill