



PROJECT MUSE®

Left in Transformation: Uruguayan Exiles and the Latin
American Human Rights Networks, 1967-1984 (review)

Margaret Power

The Americas, Volume 63, Number 4, April 2007, pp. 687-689 (Review)

Published by Cambridge University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/tam.2007.0085>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/214855>

the República Restaurada (1867-1876), rather than in the late liberal mobilization against Díaz. Free speech, fair justice and electoral transparency had deep roots as opposition themes. The book follows these threads through the historiography, managing to establish the basic narrative while keeping a critical eye on multiple interpretive schools. The 1920s emerge as a moment of great political fluidity, with continuing military rebellions, a complex system of regional and sectoral parties, and an active Congress that besieged the Sonorenses with many ideological, personal and local agendas. Servín rightly suggest that the period could provide a better historical analogy for our present than the heroic opposition against Díaz. Beyond moments of contingent alliance like the understudied candidacy of Vasconcelos, the opposition often saw public opinion as a more sensible path to achieve change. That was the choice by the end of Lázaro Cárdenas's presidency: to defend the alleged victory of Juan Andrew Almazán or to build an ideological counterbalance against official radicalism. The second approach was clearly more productive for Catholics and business interests, as reflected in the subsequent years of the PAN's "loyal opposition" and its eventual triumph.

Between the 1950s and 1980s the PRI's electoral hegemony has not inspired much historical research. This book points to several avenues to fill that gap; one involves looking at the terrains of municipal elections and armed resistance as often intersecting paths of political competition that never quite fit in the *pax priísta*. Leftist (and, we might add, conservative) activism in the 1960s forced the regime to transfer opposition from the streets to the polls. A narrow focus on human rights abuse under Gustavo Díaz Ordaz and Luis Echeverría, we might add, neglects the long-term consequences of that decision.

Servín's book provides an excellent tool to navigate contemporary changes with a historical compass. Although the extensive bibliography might be less valuable for undergraduate students in the United States the text itself could be extremely useful through an English version, and will be a valuable resource for researchers and teachers.

Columbia University
New York, New York

PABLO PICCATO

Left in Transformation: Uruguayan Exiles and the Latin American Human Rights Networks, 1967-1984. By Vania Markarian. New York: Routledge, 2005. Pp. xi, 263. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$85.00 cloth.

Vania Markarian argues that much of the literature on human rights ignores the politics of the individuals and organizations that made up this movement, just as it tends to overlook the role that individual exiles played in defining the politics of the human rights work. To correct this weakness, Markarian has written an absorbing study of the Uruguayan Left from the 1960s to the 1980s, focusing on its connections

to, interpretations of, and use of the language and networks of the human rights movements. Her book simultaneously offers the reader a cogent picture of recent Uruguayan history, an in-depth appraisal of the changing politics and experiences of the Uruguayan Left, and a clear description of the connections and contradictions between and among different Uruguayan leftists and the human rights movement.

Markarian's examination of a variety of writings by and interviews with members of the Uruguayan Left reveals that the relationship between the Left and the human rights movement was highly complex and evolving. The experience of dictatorship and the torture and repression that the military inflicted on thousands of Uruguayans, combined with the Left's recognition and internalization of its own political and military defeat and subsequent exile, had a profound impact on the Left's vision of itself and the importance it accorded to individual and personal liberty. Steeped in the Marxist tradition that prioritized the collective and an ethos of self-sacrifice, most of the Uruguayan Left had associated individual liberty with individualism and a bourgeois value system. Faced with the military's widespread use of torture and its attempt to destroy the individual, the Left initially responded with a politics of heroism based, in large part, on a masculine definition of resistance. However, as Markarian clearly shows, the exaltation of the heroic individual resisting barbaric torture for the good of the collective gradually gave way to a recognition of the need to denounce human rights violations and further the cause of individual rights. The weakness of the Left, contacts with the transnational human rights movement, and the changing politics of the Left on a global level engendered the transformation of the Uruguayan Left, which emerged from the period of dictatorship with an enhanced appreciation of human rights and deeper ties to the international human rights movement.

Markarian makes a point of focusing on the individual Uruguayan exiles who led the movement for human rights and restoration of democracy. This focus is both a strength and weakness of her study. Certainly, the work of individuals was instrumental in redefining the Uruguayan Left's politics and practice on the issue of human rights. And it is true that often the role played by these individuals is lost in more general discussions of organizations and institutions. At the same time, I would have liked a clearer sense of how the exile communities related to the work around human rights, what networks they built with each other and with other organizations, and what political work they engaged in on a local level. One other drawback is that Markarian's emphasis on the individual leader resulted in a discussion of what men did, since apparently the public face of the Uruguayan Left in exile and inside Uruguay was male. I wonder what women exiles did and thought, and how they contributed to the changing politics and human rights movement during this period.

My concerns should not overshadow the enormous strengths of this book. It provides an incisive description of recent Uruguayan history, a penetrating analysis of the changes that the Uruguayan Left underwent, and a provocative discussion of the

transnational human rights movement. Markarian writes a fascinating study of how the Uruguayan Left and the human rights movement worked together, drawing on specific and well-researched examples. For example, she shows, in just the right amount of detail, why members of the Uruguayan Left were able to mount such a successful human rights campaign in the U.S. Congress and why they worked so well with transnational human rights organizations like Amnesty International. Her study provides new insight into the various responses the Uruguayan Left had to the dictatorship, most especially its embrace of a new understanding of human rights and individual liberty.

Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois

MARGARET POWER

POLITICAL ECONOMY/GLOBALIZATION

The Creation of the British Atlantic World. Edited by Elizabeth Mancke and Carole Shammas. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. Pp. vi, 400. Notes. Index. \$52.00 cloth.

Few historians have been more influential than Jack P. Greene in defining the field of Atlantic history during the past few decades. This book—written for the most part by Greene’s former students—is both a tribute to and recognition of Greene’s ambiguous legacy. The collection begins with a quotation from his 1996 essay “Beyond Power,” in which Greene championed Atlantic history as a corrective to “the history of nation-states, a mainstay and the last vestige of the paradigm of power.” Despite this statement, much of the work of Greene and his students has underscored the importance of political power, whether local or imperial, in the creation of the Atlantic world. The essays in this collection offer diverse perspectives on the British Atlantic, but in the end they raise doubts about whether it is possible, or even advisable, for Atlantic historians to move “beyond power.”

This collection sets itself apart from others by directly confronting the similarities and differences between Atlantic and imperial histories. On one hand, critics contend that Atlantic history is little more than imperial or colonial history under a different name, especially when it often uses imperial labels—the British or Spanish Atlantic, for example—to define its bounds. But as Carole Shammas notes in an illuminating Introduction, Atlantic historians tend to avoid “examining the place of imperial politics in the shape of the transatlantic experience” (p. 5), focusing more on the ability of diverse populations on the peripheries to shape their own experiences. This volume combines traditional political history with the more fashionable study of subaltern or minority groups, and as in any collection of essays, the results range from exemplary to unexciting.

Several of the essays follow recent trends in colonial and Atlantic history by stressing the permeability of national boundaries. April Lee Hatfield’s selection