
MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS AND THE POLITICS OF DEPENDENCE: Copper in Chile

by Theodore H. Moran
Princeton, 1974, 286 pp.
\$14 cloth, \$4.95 paper

L of C 74-2973
ISBN 0-691-04204-7
ISBN 0-691-00359-9 pbk

AMERICAN CORPORATIONS AND PERUVIAN POLITICS

by Charles T. Goodsell
Harvard, 1974, 272 pp. \$14

L of C 73-85888
ISBN 0-674-02280-7

Are multinational corporations always as powerful in Latin America as their critics allege? Not according to Moran's study. Before 1945, Chile had little control over U.S.-owned copper companies. Initially, the Chileans needed the capital and modern technology that the multinationals could provide. Once the investment was made, however, and the Chileans began to acquire expertise and confidence, the relationship between the partners changed, and the Chileans were able to obtain ever larger benefits from the companies. Increased bargaining power, combined with growing resentment of exploitation by foreigners, ultimately led to the Allende government's nationalization of the copper companies (1971).

Goodsell's analysis centers on the 12 biggest U.S. companies (mining, oil drilling and refining, manufacturing, retailing, agriculture, communications) operating in Peru. He provides many specifics about the multinationals and, like Moran, concludes that in Peru, as in Chile, the American companies have become considerably less powerful over time. Unlike Moran, who offers a close look at the companies, the Chilean political system, and the interaction between them, Goodsell focuses almost exclusively on the companies. In so doing, he fails to convey a sense of what Peruvian politics is all about. This shortcoming weakens the impact of his otherwise useful book.

—Susan Kaufman Purcell

THE END OF SERFDOM: Nobility and Bureaucracy in Russia, 1855-1861

by Daniel Field
Harvard, 1976
472 pp. \$17.50

L of C 75-23191
ISBN 0-674-25240-3

In the United States, the end of slavery came only with a devastating civil war. In Russia, the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 produced no such violence. Why the difference? Field, a Syracuse historian, shows us how Russia's shrewd imperial bureaucrats and acquiescent nobles bargained to avoid disaster, negotiating realistic terms for ending an inertial social system that had endured for centuries. He demonstrates in great detail the "naive monarchism" (faith in the benevolent will of the Tsar) that prevented most of the nobles from opposing Alexander