

alguna excepción, muestra un rigor y una suficiencia investigativa no exenta de atractivo narrativo: se trata de un volumen que interpela al lector especializado, pero también al aficionado a la historiografía deportiva.

**Pablo Alabarces**

*CONICET-Universidad de Buenos Aires*

VANNI PETTINÁ, *La Guerra Fría en América Latina*. Ciudad de México: El Colegio de México, 2018.

This relatively concise but dense history offers an extraordinary synopsis of the chronology, dynamics, and major events of the Cold War in Latin America between 1946 and 1989. Prof. Pettinà presents a critical reflection about the Cold War that, with masterful prose, takes us through the intricacies of the period, with an emphasis on the impact and effects of the Cold War, a large-scale geopolitical process in the second half of the past century, on the Latin American region. His major argument is that there has been a dialectical and mutual (though asymmetrical) relationship between the geopolitics of the Cold War (as reflected in the international system in general terms) and the regional and domestic economic and political processes that took place in Latin America. Although we should not discard completely the autonomy of political, social, and economic processes in the region, the Cold War did eventually derail the progressive domestic governance processes (in political and economic terms), even though that impact has been very uneven and varied across the different sub-regions and countries in Latin America. In a successful attempt to generalize across diverse processes, problems, and challenges, Pettinà employs what we call in international relations a “second-image reversed” (Gourevitch), wherein the international system (in this case the Cold War dynamics and competition) has affected the domestic politics and societies, rather than the other way around. In addition, and in contrast to the literature that tends to downplay the importance of Latin American processes per se, the author rescues the internalization of the impact of the Cold War through the differing policies adopted by the countries of the region.

The book includes five chapters (the author calls them “partes” in Spanish). The first and probably most original chapter suggests a novel historiographical analysis about new ways of thinking about the Cold War from the perspective of Latin America. There is an inherent importance to emphasizing the Latin American perspective, instead of just referring to Latin America, if we use Peter Smith’s powerful metaphor, as the “talons of the eagle.” The attempt to apportion (rather than to return) to the Latin American countries their centrality

as historical actors capable of developing a political agenda of their own (that is, some degree of autonomy) invites a regional perspective, not just a national one. The framework that Pettinà develops consists in juxtaposing the “external cleavages” (*fractura externa*), in ideological and geopolitical terms, with the “domestic cleavages” (*fractura interna*) that take place within the region, as evidenced in the political, social, and economic struggles involving conservative and progressive/developmentalist approaches. Obviously, as the Cold War evolved, it strengthened the conservative sectors, promoted a protagonist role for the military (through bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes, especially in South America), and escalated the level of violence within several countries of the region, especially in Central America in the 1980s.

Based on that framework, the remaining four chapters of the book take us through the chronology of the Cold War in Latin America, adopting a thematic and analytical prism. Chapter 2 focuses on the years 1946-1954, which were relatively peaceful (or at least less violent), even though they witnessed an erosion in processes of democratization and developmentalism, with an important variation among Costa Rica, Mexico, and Guatemala, regarding the immediate effects of the emerging Cold War. Tragically, the 1954 coup in Guatemala illustrates the pattern of US intervention that would unfold. Chapter 3 centers on the Cuban Revolution as the turning point in the history of the Cold War in the region, due to its reverberations, both in the exaggerated (if not hysterical) response by the United States and the expectation of a “domino effect” of further revolutions in Latin America. Interestingly enough, Pettinà describes and analyses in a superb way (in pages 113-118) how the Cuban Revolution led to a significant political cleavage within the region.

As the Cold War moved into the 1970s, the author analyses in Chapter 4 the decade of state terrorism, as illustrated in the emergence of military bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes in Bolivia (1971), Chile and Uruguay (1973), and Argentina (1976) (Brazil had an early coup d'état in 1964), in addition to Mexico's authoritarian civilian regime under the PRI. Paradoxically, the violence in South America should be contrasted with the “détente” in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Also, at points in the analysis, Pettinà is aware of the lack of coherence between the repressive domestic policies adopted by many of the regimes against their own citizens and a foreign policy that showed some attempts at delinking from the United States (as in the Mexican case).

Finally, Chapter 5 analyses the most violent stage of the Cold War in Latin America, as it escalated into a series of “intermestic” wars (civil wars with US assistance or intervention) in Nicaragua (after the Sandinista Revolution of 1979), El Salvador, and Guatemala. Only with the initiative of some Latin

American countries (Mexico, Colombia, Panama, and Costa Rica), but essentially with the end of the Cold War, did the civil wars in Central America come to an end, leaving Central America in ruins, with nefarious reverberations, as we can see in the political and economic trajectory of the Northern Triangle countries nowadays.

I commend Vanni Pettinà for his successful effort in offering an analytical and engaging interpretation of the Cold War, bringing to the fore many of its major processes and events. It is obvious that all along this superb piece of work, there is an inherent and unresolved tension between the “regional” (referring to Latin America as an homogenous political entity), and the variance one can find between Mexico, Cuba, Costa Rica, Colombia, Brazil, and Chile, just to mention some of the relevant countries referred to. This is a synoptic piece of work and an attempt to make simple a very complicated historical period. Thus, I wish that the conclusions and the epilogue would be longer and more elaborated, perhaps contrasting this very tumultuous period of the Cold War with the previous one, and especially with the post-Cold War years.

**Arie M. Kacowicz**

*Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

MICHAEL J. BUSTAMANTE & JENNIFER L. LAMBE (EDS.), *The Revolution from Within: Cuba, 1959-1980*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019.

Michael J. Bustamante and Jennifer L. Lambe’s edited collection *The Revolution from Within: Cuba, 1959-1980* makes an important and timely contribution to the densely populated field of Cuban Studies, injecting fresh insight by challenging some of the dominant, prevailing tropes that have long characterized the scholarly study of the Cuban Revolution, both on and off the island. In so doing, the book also interrogates what the very act of writing the history of the Revolution might mean, particularly when set against the intensely polarized master narratives emanating from Havana and Miami.

The volume comprises fourteen chapters organized into three parts: “Stakes of the Field,” “Case Studies: The Revolution from Within,” and “Concluding Reflections.” The first opens with a thoughtful essay by Bustamante and Lambe (chapter 1) reflecting on the nature of the historiography of the Revolution and the new directions it might take. The co-editors raise numerous fundamental questions in this respect, notably whether it is ever possible for historical studies of the Revolution to remain neutral given the centrality of history to the revolutionary project. Since 1959, the country’s leaders have staked much of