MARIÁTEGUI:
Marxismo, Comunismo, and Other Bibliographic Notes

Harry E. Vanden
University of South Florida

Currently, Western Europe is experiencing a novel type of Marxism. The Communist movement is no longer viewed by most observers as a cohesive monolith waiting for directions from the East, and communism in Italy, France, and Spain has shown an increasing level of autonomy and national resourcefulness. Indeed, the "Eurocommunism" of Santiago Carrillo (head of the Spanish Communist party) is frequently attacked by his Soviet comrades in Party Congress and press alike. In that this new European communism pays a great deal of attention to specific national conditions, the importance of autonomy, and flexible strategies to win support, it is not always understood by orthodox Communists or ardent anti-Marxists. The latter group is convinced that all Communists are the same and will show their true color once in power, while the former is greatly concerned that their once revolutionary parties will evolve into revisionist Social Democratic groupings far afield from Lenin's prototypical Bolshevik party. Neither, then, is happy with this innovative approach to Western European Marxist-Leninist praxis.

Innovators—Marxist or not—are often less than popular, and dynamic thinkers and revolutionaries are no exception. Even Mao Tse-tung and his Chinese comrades had considerable difficulty with their own Central Committee and the Communist International when they were first formulating many of the practices that eventually helped to bring them to power. Likewise, the history of the Italian Communist party shows similar strains between the Italians and Moscow-based decision makers.

Europe and Asia, however, hold no monopoly on dynamic Marxist thinkers. Indeed, Latin America produced an innovative Marxist *pensador* who was busy creating his own "Indo-American Socialism" some fifty years before Carrillo published *Eurocomunismo y estado*. José Carlos Mariátegui (1894–1930) realized not only the importance of Marxism for the development of America, but, unlike many other socialist and nonsocialist *pensadores*, the necessity of developing it within the Latin American (and not European) reality. He did not, however, share Haya de la Torre's belief that Marxism would be entirely transformed in a new temporal historic space.[1]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0023879100032283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

APRISTA VIEWS

Although the Apristas have often attempted to claim Mariátegui as one of their own, they had, by 1930, generally been highly critical of his (Marxist) thought. This criticism was spearheaded by APRA's (Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana) two leading intellectuals, Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre and the noted Aprista literatus, Luís Alberto Sánchez. Originally, however, there was no conflict between Mariátegui and the Apristas. When APRA was developing in Peru it was, as the name itself suggests, meant as a broad-based alliance that could house a multiplicity of groupings. In fact, Mariátegui had affiliated himself with this movement in the early 1920s as a tactical measure that would allow him to proceed with his self-imposed tasks of political education and propagandization. Thus, he participated vigorously in the Universidad Popular González Prada and assumed the editorship of the APRA-linked workers' publication, *Claridad*.

As it evolved, however, APRA began to take a slightly different tack. Although at first friendly with the new movement in Soviet Russia (Haya de la Torre had traveled there and met with many of the outstanding Soviet leaders), an estrangement began to occur, and the Apristas began to show less sympathy for the position embodied by the Communist International. One obvious point of conflict was that APRA was to be an alliance of many classes, while, of course, the International was to be based on the struggle of one class—the proletariat. In fact, as of 1927, Haya had begun to disassociate himself from what he thought was the bureaucratic determinism of the "official revolutionaries," and called for the construction of a Latin American "Kuomintang."[2]

This attitude on the part of Haya de la Torre would naturally make the continuation of Mariátegui's alliance with him difficult. Nor was the Communist International any longer favorably disposed toward APRA. In a communication sent to Mariátegui with Julio Portocarrero (after he had attended the V Congress of the International Red Sindicates, Moscow, 1927) the C.I. suggested, in response to questions posed, that the Peruvian comrades form their *own* class-oriented party and that they no longer cooperate with the APRA alliance.[3]

At about this time, Haya and the Mexican cell of APRA circulated their "Plan de México," in which they called for the transformation of APRA into a (Peruvian) "Partido Nacionalista Libertador" with Haya as "Jefe supremo" (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:290–93). Mariátegui, in a letter to the Mexican cell dated 16 April 1928, argued that he could not agree with the formation of the party or the *criollo* politics it was employing, but that he was *not* averse to the continuation of APRA as an alliance, as it originally had been (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:296–98).

To this sincere position statement, Haya de la Torre replied rudely that Mariátegui must have written the letter under the influence of a tropical fever, and that, more fundamentally, he was "full of Europeanism" and should put himself "in the [Peruvian] reality" (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:298–302). These remarks seem to have set the tenor for APRA criticism of Mariátegui. Indeed, these were precisely the terms that Luís Alberto Sánchez employed in his polemic with Mariátegui in *Mundial*.[4] This line of criticism was later incorporated

into other works by these men and became an essential part of the APRA—Communist/Socialist polemic which continues into the present day.

Such views are also found in the work of a younger APRA intellectual, Eugenio Chang-Rodríguez. Writing in the mid-1950s, Chang-Rodríguez represented Mariátegui as an early disciple of Haya who, in the last few years of his life, fell under the influence of agents of the Communist International (especially Eudocio Ravines). Thus, Mariátegui's Peruvian genius had been tarnished if not spoiled by contamination from European Communist ideas. Likewise, according to this view, Mariátegui's break with APRA resulted because the Communist International had decreed the necessity of disassociating with APRA, and thus the transformation to a nationalist party was only a pretext for the break (Chang-Rodríguez 1957, p. 148).

Recently, the growth of the radical Marxist left and the Haya-led APRA's partial return to power have rekindled critical interest in Haya's thought (Portocarrero 1977) and the differences between Mariátegui and Luís Alberto Sánchez and Haya (Aquezolo Castro 1976 and Germaná 1977).

FIRST VIEWS FROM THE LEFT

One of the most intriguing episodes in the trajectory of the reactions to Mariátegui's thought and work concerns the perceptions of several Communist critics and the Communist International itself. As early as 1923, Mariátegui had proclaimed his sympathy for Lenin and the Third International (Mariátegui, 1959g). Reading through *Defensa del marxismo*, it becomes obvious that it is Leninist Marxism that Mariátegui is avowing while criticizing the revisionist Marxism of the Social Democrats and their Second International. Indeed, we would argue that he was orienting his group toward a Peruvian Marxism-Leninism that would not include Haya de la Torre or APRA. The first point of the accord reached at the first party meeting at "Playa de la Herradura" (September 1928) states that the initial cell of the party would be affiliated to the Third International (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:397). It would seem natural that Mariátegui's Socialist party would be affiliated with the new International. Indeed, other Socialist parties in Latin America had already achieved such affiliation (Colombia, Ecuador). When Mariátegui sent Portocarrero to Moscow in 1927, he requested him to discuss the situation of the "Peruvian proletariat" with the International. The above cited communication from the Latin Secretary of the International was the response. In this communication, it was suggested that the "workers of Peru ought to form their own Communist Party" (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:396). Thus, Mariátegui seemed to have the support of the International for the formation of his classist party. He also had access to several documents published by the International, especially *Le programme de l'Internationale Communiste* (published in Paris in 1924 by Librairie de l'Humanité), which formed a part of his personal library (Vanden 1975b). This document, and perhaps many of the others to which he had access, pertained to an early period in the International when it was more directly under Lenin's influence and when Zinoviev was still in charge of the International. In the Second Congress of the Comintern, on the basis of Lenin's

remarks, a resolution was approved that spoke of the need to unite fractionalized forces. Indeed, the so-called second phase of the International (1921–28) called for a united front and emphasized going out to the masses to incorporate all those with any potential for revolutionary action that had any prospect of succeeding.[5] Mariátegui preferred prolonged action that would capture the majority of the working class. He had witnessed first hand what had happened to the Italian left as it fractionalized itself before the growing forces of fascism. He had, as he often commented, seen fascism grow. He was, no doubt, aware of Gramsci's unheeded cry for a united front of "democratic forces" and of Togliatti's argument for a "united front" among the Italian labor unions. These factors plus the repressive Leguía dictatorship and the nascent condition of the Peruvian industrial proletariat and labor organization, helped strengthen his resolve to opt for a *frente único* in Peru. Likewise, his study of the concrete national conditions had encouraged him to found a broad-based Socialist party that would, in fact, reach out to embrace the masses. It would, however, be directed by a small "secret [and illegal] cell of the seven," which would be in close contact with the International (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:397).

Such actions were consistent with the International's directives during this period, as well as with Mariátegui's assessment of the tactical necessities at hand. Indeed, many of Mariátegui's actions—but not the socialist name he gave his party—could find justification in Lenin's twenty-one conditions that had to be met before a party could adhere to the International.

By the beginning of 1929, Mariátegui was also corresponding with Eudocio Ravines, who, along with Armando Bazán and others, had broken away from the APRA cell in Paris, following Mariátegui's break with APRA and the formation of the Socialist party in Peru. By this time, Ravines had entered into direct contact with the International and later visited the Soviet Union. He came to be one of the foremost Communist leaders in Latin America, although he eventually renounced the doctrine.[6] In a letter to Nicanor A. de la Fuente, dated 20 June 1929, Mariátegui recommended that de la Fuente "enter into immediate correspondence" with Ravines (at the Paris address of the "International de los Trabajadores de la Enseñanza"), and added that he was "the most serious and ideologically prepared of our compañeros outside the country" (Mariátegui Family Archive). In a later letter (9 September 1929), Mariátegui makes mention of sending a copy of "the thesis of Ravines and campañeros," and gives instructions for the organization of a "collection" to pay for Ravines' imminent return to Peru (Mariátegui Family Archive).

During this time, it seems certain that Mariátegui also had some contact with the International, for the Peruvian group was invited to send delegations to the May 1929 meeting of the "Confederación Sindical Latinoamericano" (Montevideo), and the June 1929 "Primera Conferencia Comunista Latinoamericano" (First Latin American Communist Conference, Buenos Aires).

Mariátegui was hard at work interpreting revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in light of the specific concrete conditions in which Peru found itself at this historic juncture. This, combined with his exposure to the historic conditions in which Italian Communism was developing, his particular ideological

and intellectual formation, and the influence of the Communist International's second "united front" stage contributed to the following tactical formulations: the formation of a "united front" labor movement; the organization of a legal Socialist party that could embrace a broad spectrum of the masses, including peasants, Indians, agricultural workers, and even certain lower middle class groupings such as artisans, and intellectuals; and the formation of a "secret" (illegal) cell of the seven within the party, which would be composed of "conscious elements" who would be affiliated to the International and direct the party. The argument, then, was that the uniqueness of the conditions in Peru necessitated (as had been the case in Russia) certain tactical (if not strategic) modifications of Marx's theory and Lenin's praxis to make the Socialist movement viable in this new context.

Even though this was—in reference to the name and composition of the party—at variance with certain aspects of Lenin's twenty-one conditions, it might have received a more sympathetic reception during the initial phases of the International's united front period. This subject seems to have been broached in the communication from the C.I. that Portocarrero brought from Moscow in 1927. Indeed, the first point refers to "the situation of the working class and peasants in Peru and their ties with the international proletariat." The answer was as follows: "The working class and peasant masses in Peru have conditions which are *identical* to those of the working masses and peasants in the major part of the other Latin American countries . . . [they] are equally a part of the vast revolutionary front of the semi-colonial and colonial peoples (Jules Humbert-Droz in Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:393).

Mariátegui was, as he suggested in his letter to the APRA cell in Paris (Martínez de la Torre 1947, 2:296), quite capable of doing his own thinking. Thus, although the intransigence of Haya and other APRA leaders made the break with APRA necessary, he continued to believe that a broad-based labor movement and a legal Socialist party were necessary. The Socialist party would have to embrace a large segment of the masses and heighten their class consciousness through political education and propaganda.

In the meantime, conditions outside of Peru had convinced Stalin (who was by now beginning to consolidate his hold on the Soviet Union) and other Soviet leaders to opt for a new (International) tactic of "class against class." Thus, from 1928 until the declaration of the "Common Front" (against fascism), the C.I. passed into its so called Third Period in which all nonproletariat elements were to be excluded from participation in the proletariat's classist struggle and were, in fact, seen as enemies of the working class. The fact that Mariátegui criticized APRA as the Kuomintang of Latin America and suggested that bourgeois elements had no place in the classist struggle against imperialism was completely consistent with this new turn in tactics.[7] His ideas about a Socialist party and the incorporation of the peasant and Indian masses were, however, another matter.[8]

In his opening remarks to the first meeting of Latin American Communist Parties, Vittorio Codovilla, an Italian-born Socialist who migrated to Buenos Aires and became the head of the Latin American Bureau of the Communist

International, attacked the Peruvians for their passivity in reference to the Peru-Chile border dispute over Tacna and Arica. This, it turned out, was but a premonition of things to come. As the discussion continued throughout the conference, the Peruvians—represented by Hugo Pesce and Julio Portocarrero—were attacked for not implementing a policy of "national autonomy." This referred to what appears to have been a (Stalinist?) reinterpretation of Lenin's writings on the nationalities questions, that the Peruvian comrades should work for the foundation of autonomous republics for the Quechua and Aymara "nationalities" (South American Secretariat 1929, p. 30). Apart from any violence this may have done to a realistic interpretation of conditions in Peru, it was directly opposed to Mariátegui's strategy of gradually incorporating the indigenous masses into the country-wide Socialist movement through political education, propagandization—and a creative fusion of modern socialism with their traditional communal past.

Portocarrero attempted to make the Peruvian position clearer by presenting Mariátegui's thesis, "Punto de vista anti-imperialista" (Mariátegui 1969a). Following this, he presented what he termed the particularities of the political movement in Peru. He then briefly recounted the anarcho-syndicalist origins of working class organization in Peru and Peru's relatively low level of industrialization and political consciousness among her workers when compared to other Latin American countries like Argentina and Chile. He also suggested that the present environment in Peru—especially the high levels of of illiteracy among even the small industrial proletariat—made class organization difficult. Mention is also made of other unique conditions in Peru—some of which were a function of her geography. Portocarrero continued: "From this, we deduce *that the directives of the South American Secretariat* [of the International] have to be different, because the conditions of each region are different." And a few paragraphs later:

> Taking into consideration our economic situation and our political level, we believed it propitious to create a socialist party that embraces the great mass of the artisans, poor peasants, agriculture workers, proletariat, and some honest intellectuals. To constitute this party we have considered that: first, it is necessary to develop on a proletarian base. When we discuss this point, we arrive at the conclusion that if we are capable of maintaining control, we will make the socialist party a revolutionary party; if we are incapable of exercising this control, we will at least have caused the proletariat to take a step ahead in its evolution and political education. (South American Secretariat 1929, p. 144)
>
> We constructed the socialist party as a tactic, as a way of linking up with the masses . . . you have classified us as reformist without studying the question in the depth which it deserves. . . . If our [Communist] group can control the party and direct its actions, is not this a good means of linking up with the masses? (South American Secretariat 1929, pp. 155–56)
>
> The Socialist Party is based on our group, which is entirely in harmony with the ideology of the Communist International. We

> are and declare ourselves to be above all Communists. . . . I emphasize, Comrades, the socialist party is only a tactic. . . . We know that we are taking a risk with its formation, but it is a long process which already has its own history. These are causes which ought to be taken into consideration to formulate the political line about our tactic of forming a socialist party. (South American Secretariat 1929, p. 136)

Codovilla and the representatives of the International were, however, loath to consider the "causes" or special conditions that Portocarrero, as the spokesman for the Peruvian group, had so carefully presented. Although some of the delegates showed some sympathy for the Peruvian position, Codovilla and the International representatives were adamant in their criticism of the formation of a Socialist party in Peru. Nor were they more favorably disposed to Mariátegui's theses on the races in Latin America. All opinions, it seemed, needed to be precisely focused from the vantage point of the International's new directives and current stage, not from an appreciation of the immediate conditions in which a group must work.

The Bulgarian, Stephanov (using the name "Luis"), said that he thought the Peruvian's plans were "dangerous" and that it would be necessary to create an illegal Communist party if such could not be done legally. The delegate for the Communist Youth International suggested that "The error of the comrades from Peru is that of not understanding that the creation of a true Communist Party, ideologically monolithic, is the necessary condition for all serious revolutionary work. The creation of this party is the only guarantee of working in the bosom of the masses. . . . Create, despite all difficulties, an illegal Communist Party that will not adapt itself, but which will resist the reaction" (South American Secretariat 1929, pp. 162–63). The Russian example had, it seemed, universal validity.

Mariátegui's position was that of a Marxist-Leninist who wished to affiliate his group with the Communist International, but who also wished to preserve some measure of local autonomy—especially when it came to formulating the tactical decisions that would lead to the success or failure of the revolutionary Marxist movement he had worked so hard to create and nurture. He wished to apply creatively those aspects of Marxism-Leninism that would strengthen his movement, while reserving others for a more propitious time. He would also make a few creative adaptations of the doctrine (such as the incorporation of the peasants into the revolutionary class and skipping a stage of history) on the basis of the concrete conditions that he and his small group of followers encountered.

On the other hand, Codovilla, Humbert-Droz, and the International's other representatives were anxious to make sure that the Latin American delegates followed the new tactics of the Third Period. They also wanted to make sure that the Russian conception of the road to revolution was accepted by each delegate—no matter how great the divergence between the historic conditions in their country and those of Russia in 1917. Lamentably, this attitude on the part of the International (and indeed the Soviet Union) was to continue through

the next two decades, and accordingly would hamper the development of strong indigenous Communist movements in Latin America.

The issue of whether to change the name of the party from Socialist to Communist was not resolved during Mariátegui's lifetime. The rebuff he received in Argentina, Codovilla'a attitude, and the fact that the Argentinean had been in contact with a Cuzco Communist cell that had already been formed with his assistance weighed heavily on the Peruvian and may have contributed to his decision to relocate in Argentina (perhaps so he could confront Codovilla first hand). A few days after Mariátegui died in April of 1930, an extensive communication from the International arrived. It instructed the Lima group to change the name of the party to Communist. The central committee—which had only recently acquiesced to Mariátegui's wish to affiliate officially with the International—voted overwhelmingly to accept this directive. The only dissenter was Mariátegui's loyal friend and protégé, Ricardo Martínez de la Torre (1947, 2:508). Eudocio Ravines, who became the new General Secretariat of the party, led the transformed party into the dark illegality of the 1930s.

However, it seems as though the Communist International had, for some time, been against the formation of the type of party Mariátegui envisioned. Referring to *International Press Correspondence* (published as *World News and Views* in English), we find the following quote from the then Latin Secretary of the International (Jules Humbert-Droz): "We must also combat the idea of the formation of a kind of Labour and Farmer Party under the idea of the leadership of a small Communist group." This quote is taken from a co-report to the VI Congress of the Communist International, and is dated 16 August 1928 (Humbert-Droz 1928). Thus, we see the International was well informed about Mariátegui's efforts and had already reacted negatively almost a year before the conference in Buenos Aires. This attitude would seem similar to that displayed with respect to the Chinese Communist party, and indeed all too closely aligned with the policy of "Building Socialism in One Country."

Under Ravines' direction, the party more closely adhered to the directives that emanated from the Moscow-based International. Mariátegui's unique ideological positions and tactics found little sympathy in orthodox Communist circles throughout the thirties and into the forties (although his person was usually venerated, at least in Latin America).

One of the most severe ideological criticisms of Mariátegui came from the Soviet historian, V. Miroshevsky. In an article entitled "El Populismo en el Peru, papel de José Carlos Mariátegui en la historia del pensamiento social Latinoamericano," the Russian argued that "some substantial traces of Russian populism have manifested themselves in diverse petite bourgeois revolutionary movements in a series of backward countries" and that "these ideas found their most adequate expression in the theoretical works of José Carlos Mariátegui" (Miroshevsky 1942, p. 41). These criticisms, which must have been based on distorted perceptions of Mariátegui and a less than profound reading of the *7 Ensayos*, make specific mention of a worker-peasant party to which the industrial proletariat was only to be an appendage (p. 46). It is further noted that the International classified this as a dangerous step. So much for Mariátegui's idea of

incorporating the peasants and Indians into the party. This inversion, coincidentally, more precisely refers to the position adopted by the Chinese Communists. As to the Peruvian's views of Incan Communism—these were "based on altered facts and fantasies" (p. 52).

Mariátegui's idea of moving directly into a Socialist stage of history is also noted, although Miroshevsky is loath to even credit the Peruvian with the original application of the Leninist idea (p. 55). Stalin's position that Latin America must pass through a series of predetermined stages (thus, no stage can be skipped) to arrive at the Socialist stage of history also seems to be reflected in the article (p. 56). The following quote from the Program of the Communist International is offered to show the fallacy of Mariátegui's view: "The passage to the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible only through a series of preparatory stages; only as the result of the transformation of the Democratic-Bourgeois Revolution into a Socialist revolution. And—in the majority of the cases—Socialist construction is only possible when directly aided by a country where the dictatorship of the proletariat exists" (Program of the Communist International, cited in Miroshevsky, p. 56).

Thus, the Soviet historian—whom we believe was closely aligned with the Soviet views that dominated the International up until the time it was dissolved—was attacking precisely those of Mariátegui's ideological and tactical positions that were original. These included: a broad-based Socialist party that would embrace the peasants and Indians as well as the classical proletariat and would gradually prepare them for their revolutionary task in history; the veneration of the communal society of the Inca Empire and the possibility of fusing modern socialism and technology with its communal remnants in the Sierra; and the possibility of skipping at least a substantial part of the capitalist stage of history in Peru so as to directly implant socialism. Miroshevsky ended his article by suggesting that "his [Mariátegui's] points of view had nothing in common with proletarian socialism. His ideas were utopian dreams of a petite bourgeois intellectual in a backward peasant country."

Views from Peruvian Communists were, however, quite different by this time. In 1943, the then Secretary General of the Communist Party of Peru, Jorge del Prado, published an article in *Dialéctica*, in which he argued that Mariátegui was, in fact, a Marxist-Leninist, and that, apart from his ideological work, he had been actively involved in organizing the Peruvian proletariat—especially the workers—for some years before his death (Prado 1943). Three years later, del Prado published an expanded version of his article in the form of a small book, *Mariátegui y su obra* (Prado 1946). He argued that Mariátegui was a Marxist-Leninist and, by implication, a Communist. He further lauded the fact that Mariátegui worked toward organizing the Indian population, and the fact that he began with painstaking Marxist (political) education and labor organizing. Del Prado was much more sympathetic to Mariátegui's work than had been Ravines (who by this time had been expelled from the party), and even considered himself one of Mariátegui's followers. As to Mariátegui's major written work, he suggested: "We say—without fear of erring—that Mariátegui's *7 Ensayos* constitutes the first serious creative Marxist-Leninist research effort in our

continent. . . . As an initial work it could not be perfect" (p. 28). There is, then, at least a tacit support for the originality of Mariátegui's interpretations. It is perhaps significant that Mariátegui's work began to receive a more favorable treatment in Communist circles just as the Communist International (and the implication of Moscow-directed action) was coming to an end. Jorge del Prado seems to have been instrumental in restoring Mariátegui's place in Communist circles, and seems to have been one of those to reinitiate the veneration of Mariátegui that is now so widespread among the Peruvian left.

A more pointed defense of Mariátegui and his thought (and a well-directed attack on Miroshevsky) came in 1946 from the Peruvian Communist M. Arroyo Posadas, a friend of Mariátegui who was party to the illegal organizational activity which the Peruvian carried out. His article—"A próposito del artículo 'El populismo en el Peru' de V. Miroshevsky"—published in *Dialéctica* (Arroyo Posadas 1946), argued that the Russian, through his interpretation of Mariátegui's work, had been incorrect in classifying Mariátegui as a populist. Specifically, Arroyo Posadas argued that Mariátegui had creatively applied Marxist-Leninist doctrine (with some inevitable errors) and had been engaged in political work to bring about the implantation of this doctrine since 1923. Indeed, "the Marxist party was then reduced to small circles and groups of revolutionaries who were directed by José Carlos Mariátegui" (p. 9). Masterfully employing a series of quotes from Mariátegui and Lenin, Arroyo Posadas clearly distinguished Mariátegui's thought from that of Russian populism, and clearly established fundamental parallels between Mariátegui's penchant for founding his revolutionary praxis on a thorough comprehension of the specific historical conditions at hand and Lenin's thought as reflected in his writings: "'Precisely because Marxism is not a dead dogma, not a finished, prepared, immutable doctrine, but a guide for action' [*Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism*, V.I. Lenin] is why José Carlos Mariátegui—even with the gaps and errors in his own activity and in the bold consistence he showed in his application of these principles to his daily labors—is considered as a genuine Peruvian representative of Revolutionary thought in Latin America" (p. 21).

Citing from Mariátegui's correspondence with him, from his lectures on "Historia de la Crisis Mundial" (Mariátegui 1959g), from *Amauta*, and from "Principios Programáticos del Partido Socialista" (Mariátegui 1969a, pp. 159–64), and from other letters and writings, he definitely establishes Mariátegui's place as a revolutionary Marxist who worked for the foundation of a Marxist-Leninist party in Peru. In so doing, he not only discredits Miroshevsky's article but begins the vindication of Mariátegui, his thought, and his attempts to adapt Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions at hand.[9] Thus, at least some Peruvian Communists were beginning to argue for a full appreciation of the nature and magnitude of Mariátegui's thought and revolutionary action.

Although appearing somewhat later than the above points of view, mention should also be made of the monograph by the Colombian Communist, Francisco Posada. A fairly well-reasoned work that makes use of a wide variety of source material, it is handicapped by the overly orthodox (Soviet) Marxism of the author. He argues that Mariátegui was the "first Peruvian Marxist," that as

such, his formulations were indefinite in some respects, and that they did not reflect the "theoretical specificity of Marxist philosophy" (Posada 1968a). He even berates Mariátegui for not having a "detailed basic Marxist formation" and notes that he was not university educated. According to the Colombian, Mariátegui's concrete analyses—especially those which deal with art and literature—are "brilliant and rich in suggestions. . . . However, his general theoretical plan, which corresponds to his philosophical formation, is feeble" (p. 12).

We see, then, that as late as the mid-nineteen sixties, the views from the Communist left still labored under much of the criticism to which Mariátegui's thought and ideas for national praxis had initially been subjected. Although he regained much of his stature nationally, there were still at least a few international critics who were unwilling to ignore what they considered to be his Marxist deficiencies. Indeed, it is difficult to appreciate the creative nature of the Peruvian's Marxism, if it is judged from a rigid, orthodox perspective, as was the case with Posada. Likewise, although a Latin American himself, Posada focused on Mariátegui's thought from an academic European perspective—and thus he found many deficiencies in this area. Latin American and, more generally, Third World thought is invariably influenced by European thinkers, but it develops quite differently in different national contexts. This was the case with Mao's Marxism-Leninism, Cuban Communism, and Amílcar Cabral's African Marxism. Thus, it must be evaluated in the context in which it developed (or at least in a similar context) in order to grasp its full import. This is very much the case with Mariátegui's thought—and indeed his praxis as well. In order to understand it as fully as possible (or to judge it fairly), it must be considered in the Peruvian context in which it occurred.

COMMUNIST VIEWS REEVALUATED

Mariátegui's increasing prominence in Peruvian national circles, and indeed within the leftist subculture, suggests that a reexamination of the Soviet position would, of necessity, be in order. This is precisely what has occurred. The changing views on Mariátegui within Peru, the availability of material in the USSR, the advent of the Cuban road to communism, and the denunciation of the "cult of the personality" in the Soviet Union have all contributed to a reexamination of earlier criticisms of Mariátegui and his work.

A translation of an article by two Soviet researchers, S. Simionov and Anatoly Shulgovski (1960) appeared in the Lima publication *Hora del Hombre*. The article begins by discounting any Aprista claims to Mariátegui and continues as follows: "Unfortunately, Soviet historical publications have not always correctly judged Mariátegui's works and activities. On studying his ideological legacy, some Soviet researchers centered their attention on isolated formulae which were contradictory or taken out of context, and which did not deal with the author's fundamental formulations, starting points and final conclusions. From this, an erroneous judgment of Mariátegui's conceptions and role in the revolutionary movement of national liberation in Peru emerged" (p. 66).

The authors suggest that they are making specific references to the article

by Miroshevsky and the concomitant thesis that Mariátegui was a populist. Note is made of certain of Mariátegui's organizational insufficiencies, because of his Sorelian contact with anarcho-syndicalism, but the authors laud the above-mentioned articles by Prado and Arrollo Posadas for reestablishing the "authentic" picture of Mariátegui as a "vanguardist fighter for the interest of the Peruvian proletariat" (p. 66).

The severe criticism of Mariátegui's "liberal" opinions about the Indian problem is acknowledged, but is followed by a statement about the "peculiarities" of the liberation movement in the Peru of his time and how such opinions were a refutation of the economic and social regime which then existed. Indeed, the undeveloped nature of the Peruvian proletariat in the 1920s (one of the concrete conditions that caused Mariátegui to incorporate the Indian peasant masses into his conception of a revolutionary movement and, thus, to argue for a Socialist rather than a Communist party) is specifically acknowledged.

Referring to *Defensa del Marxismo*, the Soviet scholars suggest that "although Mariátegui's theses are far from impeccable in this work, his fundamental orientation concurs with Marxist-Leninist doctrine" (p. 72). Indeed, "he knew Lenin's doctrine on Imperialism very well, and adopted it as the basis of his [research on the subject]" (p. 77). Furthermore, Mariátegui's formulation of a worker-peasant party is accepted since (we are told) this does not mean a party of two classes in that "peasants," in this case, means agricultural workers. In this context, it is further argued that: "The original formulation of the role of the indigenous masses in the historical process is Mariátegui's valuable contribution to the development of Marxist-Leninist theories in the concrete conditions of Peru" (p. 80). And finally, Mariátegui is lauded as an outstanding popularizer of Marxism in South America. Needless to say, this is quite a contrast to the views expressed by Miroshevsky, which seemed to reflect Soviet thinking through the 1940s. It also marked the evolution of Soviet thinking to a stage where it could accept national liberation struggles which were not necessarily patterned on an exact Soviet-Leninist model. A Russian edition of the *7 Ensayos* was published in 1963, and in 1966, the Latin American Institute of the Soviet Academy of Science published a compendium of essays by Soviet, East European, and Latin American writers: *José Carlos Mariátegui, Strenuous Fighter for the Triumph of Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Latin America* (Kononof et al. 1966). Although this latter work has not yet been translated from the Russian, the table of contents suggests that it is in line with the above Soviet view. Articles by Jorge del Prado, A. Dessau, and A. Shulgovski are included in its almost four hundred pages. Soviet views of Mariátegui are also discussed in John Kromkowski's dissertation (1972).

In a recent international conference on Mariátegui (Segundo Seminario Internacional José Carlos Mariátegui, Lima, 17–20 June 1974) the Soviet participant, A. Shulgovski, presented a paper in which he stated that in his country, interest in Mariátegui's ideas and work is still growing, that the Peruvian is studied in Soviet universities where he is the subject of theses and diplomas, and that future Soviet works will pay considerable attention to Mariátegui (Shulgovski 1974). In this paper, Shulgovski, who is the head of the research depart-

ment of the Latin American Institute of the Soviet Academy of Science, underlined the international nature of the Socialist revolution to which Mariátegui was committed. His views were completely consistent with those expressed in the 1960 article which he coauthored, and would, we believe, be an accurate reflection of current Soviet thinking.

The Cuban delegation to the same 1974 international conference also presented a paper in which they argued that Mariátegui had the following merits: "That of having creatively applied Marxism-Leninism to the Peruvian reality; that of analyzing the structural deformation and feudal impediments which retarded the growth of his country; and that of recognizing and defending the fundamental role of the working class in the revolutionary process" (Cuban Delegation 1974, p. 6). They also credited his recognition of the reality of a young proletariat (and, thus, the necessity of alliance with other sectors of the population) and the profundity of his analysis about the role of the indigenous masses in the revolution (p. 6). Further, they drew strong parallels between Mariátegui and the founder of Cuban communism (and interestingly, a contributor to *Amauta*), Julio Antonio Mella. A recent article in *Casa de las Americas* attests to the ongoing Cuban interest in Mariátegui (Orrillo 1977) and announces a full-length work in progress—*Mariátegui y la revolución Cubana*.

Thus, the Communist position in general and the Soviet and Cuban positions in particular have evolved considerably from earlier times. Currently, virtually every leftist group in Peru, including the pro-Chinese Bandera Roja, accepts Mariátegui as the founder of Peruvian Marxism and left-wing intellectual thought. Indeed, he, along with Cesar Vallejo, is now the cultural hero of the Peruvian left.

As suggested by the more recent Soviet and Cuban scholarship, Communist writers are finally beginning to appreciate the flexible type of Marxism-Leninism that Mariátegui espoused and endeavored to implement. Indeed, several European writers who reside in Marxist regimes have displayed a most sympathetic interest in the Peruvian Amauta (see Dessau 1971 and Kossok 1967; a Hungarian edition of the *7 Ensayos* is also being prepared). Nor has an Italian writer with party ties missed the unique nature of Mariátegui's Marxist-Leninist political thought or proletarian aesthetics (Melis et al. 1971). Indeed, there has been increasing Italian interest in Mariátegui and his writings in recent years. The *7 Ensayos* has been translated (1972b) as have two separate editions of *Cartas de Italia* (1970f and 1973b). Einaudi (Turin) will soon publish a work on Mariátegui by a North American author, Jesús Chavarría.

However, not all European writers have viewed Mariátegui's Marxism so sympathetically. Robert Paris (1971, 1970), who wrote the prefaces for the French and Italian editions of the *7 Ensayos*, believes that Mariátegui was overly influenced by George Sorel and never developed a comprehensive understanding of Marxism because he was not exposed to all the essential Marxist-Leninist sources. A recent work (Vanden 1975b) would, however, seem to shed some doubt on this assertion by documenting Mariátegui's exposure to classical Marxist sources.

PERU

Stimulated by the publication of the *Obras Completas de José Carlos Mariátegui* (twenty volumes) and the recent reprints of *Amauta* and *Labor*,[10] Peruvian scholarship on Mariátegui has burgeoned in recent years. This began in the early sixties and included such works as Guillermo Rouillon's comprehensive *Biobibliografía de José Carlos Mariátegui* (1963) which, along with a brief chronology of Mariátegui's life, contains 3,462 entries of publications by and about Mariátegui from 1914 to 1960. This has become an invaluable reference tool for any Mariátegui scholar. Rouillon, who has dedicated himself to the study of Mariátegui for some years, brought out the first volume of his long promised biography in 1975 (*La creación heroica de José Carlos Mariátegui*). As the only comprehensive biography about Mariátegui, this volume brings a wealth of information about his life. The assiduous reader might, however, object to Rouillon's often imprecise recreations of verbatum conversations fifty-five years after they took place, or his amateurish attempts at psychobiography (Mariátegui's entire adolescence is defined as a search for his father). Abundant material about Mariátegui's relationship with Manuel González Prada and his early involvement with a Socialist organizing committee and other leftist groups is, however, of great interest. If the projected second volume achieves the detailed account that the first attempts, it should shed considerable light on Mariátegui's long neglected organizational activity. Likewise, it should enable a much more complete understanding of the exact nature of the Peruvian's Marxism.

Slightly before the first Rouillon work appeared, Antonio San Cristóbal-Sebastián published a short work on aspects of Mariátegui's thought (*Economía educación y marxismo en Mariátegui*, 1960). Here, he not only takes note of the original nature of Mariátegui's Marxism, but further suggests that a systematic body of thought begins to emerge from Mariátegui's diverse literary production if his writings are grouped together by topic. A few years later, in 1964, the Peruvian journalist Genero Carnero Checa published a useful work that focused on Mariátegui as a journalist—*La acción escrita: José Carlos Mariátegui, periodista*. Although his work carried no new revelations, it helped to add to the growing interest in Mariátegui, and provided a competent treatment of aspects of Mariátegui's life and some of his literary work.

One of the best—albeit shortest—treatments of Mariátegui's thought appears in a general volume by the late Augusto Salazar Bondy. In his *Historia de las ideas en el Perú contemporáneo* (1965), he argued that Mariátegui's principal task had been "the application of Marxist methodology to a comprehension of Peruvian history and society" (pp. 312–13). Indeed, his "open" Marxism, which was influenced by Sorel, Gramsci, Bergsonian vitalism, and pragmatism, allowed him to "apply his Marxist conceptions to Peruvian reality without deforming it" (p. 333). Unlike Robert Paris and his protégé, Meseguer, he also acknowledges Mariátegui's "assiduous reading of classical Marxist thinkers" (p. 311).

Ironically, the major recent Peruvian work on Mariátegui was written by a former Spanish Jesuit, Diego Meseguer. Originally a doctoral thesis at the University of Paris, *José Carlos Mariátegui y su pensamiento revolucionario* (1974) is a

competent, though not well organized work, which may well be the most extensive published examination of Mariátegui's thought to date. He, like Paris, is convinced that "Mariátegui was interested in Marixism which was filtered through Sorel, Gramsci, Clarté [H. Barbusse], the Russian leaders, and even non-Marxist authors like A. Tilgher, P. Gobetti, and B. Croce" (p. 141). This supposition (which is strangely similar to that of earlier orthodox Marxist-Leninists) thus led Meseguer to conclude that Mariátegui was espousing an impure Marxism that was not Marxist-Leninist in nature and did not benefit from direct access to texts by Marx, Engels, or Lenin. We find this to be somewhat questionable, especially in light of the publication of two other works in Peru. The first, *Lenin y Mariátegui*, by Emlio Choy et al. (1970), would seem to document amply the strong Leninist influence in Mariátegui's written work and political activity. The second, *Mariátegui: influencias en su formación ideológica* (Vanden 1975b), details the ample access Mariátegui had to Italian, French, and Spanish editions of the Marxist classics, including *Capital, State and Revolution* and *Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism*. Mariátegui's familiarity with basic Marxist works and, indeed, revolutionary praxis in Europe (Italy, in particular) thus poses the possibility that he was very much aware of the uniqueness of many of his formulations and was fully conscious of the way he wanted to interpret Marxism in the Peruvian—Latin American context. Indeed, one might argue that he was knowingly opting for a distinctly Peruvian-Indo American Marxism and for a Peruvian road to revolution. Although this possibility has not yet been well explored in the literature, there are other works that focus on Mariátegui in Marxist-Leninist terms (Prado et al. 1972 and Lévano 1977).

Five other shorter works also demonstrate the growing interest in Mariátegui and his thought: *En defensa del llegado de Mariátegui* (Saturino Paredes Macedo 1970), *Asalto en Washington Izquierda* (César Miró 1974), *Mariátegui: destino polémico* (Hernando Aguirre Gamio 1975), *Introducción á Mariátegui* (Ricardo Luna Vegas 1975), and *5 Razones para aceptar a Mariátegui* (Marco Arteaga Calderón 1976). Aguirre Gamio's book, which is a collection of previously published articles in the popular press, is the most helpful of the five, but hardly seems to be a major work.

NORTH AMERICAN SCHOLARSHIP

North American scholarship is still in the process of coming to terms with Mariátegui and the nature and magnitude of his work. To date, there has only been one full-length book published about the Peruvian in the U.S., and this, as we shall soon see, is of questionable quality. The *7 Ensayos* was not translated until 1971 and then appeared with a good, but relatively short (twenty-three pages), general introduction by the noted Peruvian historian, Jorge Basadre (Mariátegui 1971a). There had, however, been some reference to Mariátegui in general works that deal with Latin American thought. Special mention should be made of the pioneering work by William Rex Crawford, *A Century of Latin American Thought* (1944), and his coherent—though lamentably brief—discussion of Mariátegui's work. We should also note the two excellent works by

Harold Eugene Davis: *Latin American Social Thought* (1963) and *Latin American Thought* (1972), both of which make ample mention of Mariátegui. In the latter work, Davis suggests that, "It is one of the surprising anomalies of conservative Peru that it should have produced the 'dean' of Latin American Communism and author of *Seven Essays in Interpretation of Peruvian Reality*, one of the greatest Latin American books of the Twentieth Century" (p. 189).

In a similar vein, *Latin American Political Thought and Ideology* (Martz and Jorrín 1970) also includes a brief but competent discussion of aspects of Mariátegui's thought, and Martin Stabb gives an intriguing examination of Mariátegui in his *In Quest of Identity* (1967). One also finds briefer discussions of Mariátegui's literary production in works on the Latin American essay, or Latin American literature and culture (see, inter alia, Arciniegas 1968). There are also a few relevant U.S. publications that treat Latin American Marxism and communism. Outstanding among these is the volume edited by Aguilar (1968), which contains a substantial selection of Mariátegui. Other works invariably make reference to Mariátegui and his problems with the International as manifest in the discussions at the Buenos Aires meeting in 1929 (Alexander 1957 and Poppino 1964). There have also been a small number of articles that treat Mariátegui directly—specifically, a short remembrance (1956) and bibliographic piece (1961) by Robert G. Mead, and articles by Baines (1970) and Vanden (1976 and 1978). Garrels (1976) and Vanden (1975a) have also published articles in Spanish, Daniel Reedy (1969) has penned a chapter on Mariátegui in a book on Latin American artists and writers, and Jeffrey Klaiber devotes a chapter to Mariátegui in his *Religion and Revolution in Peru, 1824–1976* (1977).

John Baines's *Revolution in Peru: Mariátegui and the Myth* (1972) represents the first full-length work resulting from the new wave of North American Mariátegui research. Although the text is barely one hundred and fifty pages in length, the author lamentably not only attempts an understanding of the man and his writings, but an analysis of "the meaning of revolution in the Peruvian political context" (p. 2) and a political analysis of the military revolution under Velasco. Clumsily applying modernization theory gleaned from Lerner's *The Passing of Traditional Society*, he argues that Mariátegui was "a transitional figure in the process of social change; the man between the worlds of tradition and modernity" (p. 5). One is never convinced that Baines has marshalled sufficient data to ground his argument in this or other areas. Indeed, one might conclude that the author is unsuccessful in all three areas. He provides neither a useful picture of the man's life (he uses the 1895 birth date even though the 1894 date has been generally accepted for some ten years), literary work, and thought, nor an adequate explanation of "the meaning of revolution in the Peruvian context." Nor does one find a competent analysis of the present regime. The number of inexactitudes and the imprecision of the focus make a detailed discussion tedious and, one imagines, unnecessary. A small sample taken from the concluding chapter of the work should suffice: "The Communists repeatedly have attempted to link Mariátegui to their cause; even though available evidence refutes this connection. . . . Had he lived longer, it is likely that he would have allied with Haya de la Torre in opposing Communist penetration in Peru in the 1930s" (p. 140).

Apart from the obvious factual errors, this passage also suggests the extent to which Baines' unexamined anticommunism hampered him in his task. As one reviewer suggested, "It is another of far too many examples of incompetent U.S. doctoral dissertations being hastily rushed into print" (Segal 1973). A second reviewer further argued that, "Had Mr. Baines been given the political assignment of pillorying Mariátegui, he could not have done a better job" (Chavarría 1975; p. 168). Thus, we are left with a treatment of Mariátegui which is at best inadequate.

Fortunately, a revised version of Jesús Chavarría's excellent doctoral dissertation, "José Carlos Mariátegui, Revolutionary Nationalist: The Origin and Crisis of Modern Peruvian Nationalism, 1870–1930" (1967) will soon be published by the University of New Mexico Press. Unless the quality is substantially inferior to that of the original dissertation, this should be one of the best works on Mariátegui to date. Interestingly, an Italian translation (Einaudi, Turin), of an earlier version of this work will probably be published before the English edition. Nor have John Kromkowski's (1972), Elizabeth Garrell's (1974), or Harry Vanden's (1975) dissertations yet been published in English. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of Mariátegui's life, writings, thought, or praxis (practical political activity) might be difficult if one were limited to English language sources which were published as of early 1978.

OTHER LATIN AMERICAN VIEWS

Latin Americans generally (Arciniegas 1957)[11] and Latin American Marxists in particular (Carrión 1930 and Marinello 1937) have always shown considerable interest in Mariátegui. Beginning in the 1960s, the region witnessed increasing interest in the Peruvian and the nature of his Marxism (Posada 1968a, b and Moretic 1970). Indeed, a recent work by the well-known Ecuadorian writer Benjamín Carrión (1976) probably comes closest to understanding not only the genius of Mariátegui's writing—"que José Carlos Mariátegui es el creador de una formula para el ensayo latinoamericano, lo cual se realiza plenamente en la obra mayor del Amauta: *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*" (p. 54)—but the specific, undogmatic nature of his creative Marxism-Leninism: "La arada y sembradura de Mariátegui, se basó fundamentalmente en su posición afirmativa, resuelta, sin vacilaciones, dentro de la línea socialista—marxista, pero socialismo nuestro, sin imitaciones ni arrebañamientos" (p. 57).

CONCLUSION

Thus, we come to realize that Mariátegui's Marxism (and his literary and political thought as well) was—as Lenin admonished—to be created within the specific historical context and the "concrete national conditions" which he encountered in Peru and Latin America at that time. He, like Gramsci (whose Marxism he had been exposed to while still in Italy in the early 1920s) thought that Marxism should be dynamic, flexible, and nondeterministic.

As such, then, the communism that Mariátegui espoused was very similar

to much of the more dynamic Third World Marxism developed by Mao in China, Castro and Guevara in Cuba, Amílcar Cabral in Guinea Bissau, or which is currently being developed in Mozambique. Likewise, the theoretical and practical flexibility that Mariátegui valued so highly is remarkably similar to that now being championed by Santiago Carrillo and his Italian and French counterparts. Indeed, as the Peruvian said, "No queremos, ciertamente, que el socialismo sea en América calco y copia. Debe ser creación heroica. Tenemos que dar vida, con nuestra propria realidad, en nuestro proprio lenguaje, al socialismo indoamericano. He aquí una misión digna de una generación nueva" (1969a, p. 249). And one further imagines that the Peruvian would have applauded Carrillo when the latter suggested that: "Las soluciones que propugnamos no valen sin duda para todo el mundo; valen para el nuestro y otros paises en grado semejante [de desarrollo]. . . . La previsión genial de Lenin sobre la diversidad de vías al socialismo se ha confirmado plenamente. . . . El marxismo se funda en el analisis concreto de la realidad concreta. O es eso, o es pura *ideología*, en el sentido peyorativo del termino, que prescinde de la realidad y se convierte en algo que ya no es Marxismo" (1977, pp. 24–25).

Mariátegui, we would argue, had captured the dynamic, humanistic spirit of Marxism and well understood the importance of flexible theoretical and tactical interpretations. He was nurtured by a Marxism that had not yet been forced into a deterministic mold. Consequently, his nationalism and indigenism were a function of his dynamic, revolutionary international socialism. Yet, his Marxism was specific, concrete, and grew out of national conditions. The Apristas could not conceive of an international socialist who was a nationalist; the dogmatic Marxists could not imagine an autonomous nationalist who could develop his thought and praxis within the parameters of international Marxism. Both, it would seem, were proven wrong by subsequent events in a variety of countries. Mariátegui, in the interim, has indeed been vindicated and his work is now meriting increased attention, not only from scholars around the world, but from those who realize that successful socialist revolutions can only occur when revolutionary praxis springs from the concrete application of Marxism to specific national conditions.[12]

NOTES

1. See Robert J. Alexander (ed.), *Aprismo, The Ideas and Doctrines of Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre* (Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1973), and Kantor (1954), especially his writings on "historic time space."
2. Haya de la Torre, *El Estudiante* (Havana, 1 July 1927) cited in Martínez de la Torre (1947, 2:277).
3. "Message from the Latin American Secretariat of the Communist International," cited in Martínez de la Torre (1947, 2:393–96).
4. See *Mundial* (Lima, February–March 1927); Mariátegui (1969a, pp. 214–28); and a recent reprint of the entire polemic (Aquézolo Castro [ed.] 1976).
5. See Jane Degras, "United Front Tactics in the Comintern, 1921–1928," in *International Communism*, ed. David Footman (Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960), pp. 9–22.
6. See Eudocio Ravines, *The Yenan Way* (New York: Scribners, 1951).

7. See "Punto de vista anti-imperialista," in Mariátegui (1969a, pp. 79–95).
8. Mariátegui's "united front" labor strategy never seems to have been challenged by the International. This is, no doubt, due to the fact that even in the third period, the Communist International supported a similar strategy for the labor movement.
9. In this respent see Lenin, *Report . . . on the National and Colonial Questions*, Mao Tse-tung, *On Practice*, and Amílcar Cabral, *Return to the Source*.
10. Reacting to the way many of Mariátegui's writings had been ignored, Biblioteca "Amauta" was reformed in the 1950s with assistance from Mariátegui's immediate family. They soon began to collect and republish Mariátegui's works in inexpensive paperback editions. By 1969, Biblioteca Amauta had published virtually all of his post-1923 writings with the notable exception of a major manuscript on "Politics and Ideology," which seems to have been lost when it was sent to César Falcón for publication in Spain (see *Ideología y política*, which is an approximation of the work in this volume, p. 17). The "ediciones populares" of Mariátegui's collected works number twenty volumes and include related brief biographic notes (Bazán and Weise), collected interviews, and other related material. Two other series of secondary works about Mariátegui (Presencia y Proyección de la Obra de Mariátegui) and the *7 Ensayos* (Presencia y Proyección de los *7 Ensayos*) now number several volumes each. In 1974, the publishing house reprinted all the numbers of his short-lived (late 1928 to early 1929) labor newspaper, *Labor*; and in 1976, they published a beautifully executed reprint (with Index) of the entire collection of Mariátegui's famous magazine, *Amauta* (1926–32). They will soon publish a collection of his letters, most of which are now found in the Mariátegui Family Archive.
11. See also, Paris et al. (1973).
12. See, in this light, R. Sandri (1972).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography focuses on the period from 1960 to 1977. The period up to 1960 is well covered in Guillermo Rouillon's *Bio-Bibliografía* (1963). See also Robert G. Mead's "Bibliografía crítica" (1961).

OBRAS COMPLETAS DE JOSÉ CARLOS MARIÁTEGUI

These editions do not contain Mariátegui's pre-1923 "edad de piedra" writings, although their publication is forthcoming. Dates for the first edition of the popular editions of the *Obras completas* (*O.C.*) are given below; most of these volumes have been reissued several times. The *O.C.* are listed here in order by volume number (in parentheses) and, except where noted, were published in Lima by Biblioteca Amauta.

MARIÁTEGUI, JOSÉ CARLOS

1959a *La escena contemporanea*. (1) First edition, Biblioteca "Amauta," 1925.
1957 *7 Ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. (2) First edition, Biblioteca "Amauta," 1928. Other editions published before 1957.
1959b *El alma matinal*. (3)
1959c *La novela y la vida, siegfried y el profesor canela. Ensayos syntéticos, reportajes y encuestras*. (4) Three critical opinions of *La novela y la vida* are also included.
1959d *Defensa del marxismo*. (5)
1959e *El artista y la época*. (6)
1959f *Signos y obras*. (7)
1959g *Historia de la crisis mundial, conferencias (Años 1923 y 1924)*. (8)

NIETO, LUÍS ET AL.

1959h *Poemas a Mariátegui*. (9) With a prologue by Pablo Neruda.

WEISSE, MARÍA [ET AL.]

1959i *José Carlos Mariátegui; etapas de su vida y los ensayos de Benjamín Carrión, Jesualdo Sosa, Baldomero Sanin Cano, Merdardo Vitier, Jorge Falcón,* [y] *Rubén Sardón*. (10)

MARIÁTEGUI, JOSÉ CARLOS

1972a *Peruanicemos al Peru*. (11)
1960a *Temas de nuestra América*. (12)
1969a *Ideologia y politica*. (13)
1970a *Temas de educación*. (14)
1969b *Cartas de Italia*. (15)
1970b *Figuras y aspectos de la vida mundial I (1923–1925)*. (16)
1970c *Figuras y aspectos de la vida mundial II (1926–1928)*. (17)
1970d *Figuras y aspectos de la vida mundial III (1929–1930)*. (18)

TAURO, ALBERTO

1960b *Amauta y su influencia*. (19) A brief description of *Amauta* and *Labor*, with a select annotated index.

BAZÁN, ARMANDO [ET AL.]

1969c *Mariátegui y su tiempo*. (20) Also contains essays by Manuel Moreno Sánchez, Eugenio Orrego Vicuña, Juan Marinello, Waldo Frank, Luís Felipe Alarco, Enrique Espinoza, and Robert G. Mead, Jr.

REPRINTS OF MARIÁTEGUI'S NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE

Labor

1974 Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, S.A. All ten numbers of Mariátegui's labor newspaper, 10 November 1928 to 7 September 1929, with index.

Amauta

1974–1976 Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, S.A. Beautifully executed reprints of all 32 numbers of Mariátegui's famous magazine, 1926–32, with a comprehensive index by Violeta de Guerra-García.

OTHER EDITIONS OF MARIÁTEGUI'S WORKS

1937 *José Carlos Mariátegui*, [con] notas de Manuel Moreno Sánchez. México: Universidad Nacional. An anthology not listed in Rouillon's *Bio-Bibliografía*.
1955a *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. Prologue by Guillermo Rouillon, Santiago, Chile: Editorial Universitaria, S.A.
1955b *Paginas literarias de José Carlos Mariátegui*. Edited and with a prologue by Edmundo Cornejo U. Lima: n.p. Contains selections from pre-1923, "edad de piedra" writings.
1960c *El problema de la tierra y otros ensayos*. [Havana?]: Editora popular de Cuba y del Caribe.
1963a [*7 Ensayos* in Russian.] Moscow.
1963b *7 Ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. Havana: Casa de las Americas.
1965 *Los Amautas*. Lima: Librería Juan Mejia Baca Editorial.
1966 *Antología de José Carlos Mariátegui*. Edited with a prologue by Benjamín Carrión. Colección Pensamiento de América. Second Series, Vol 2. México: B. Costa AMIC, Editor.
1968 *Sept essais d'interprétation de la réalité péruvienne*. Translated by Roland Mignot, with a preface by Robert Paris. Paris: François Maspero.
[1969] *7 Ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. México: Ediciones Solidaridad.
1969d *Crítica literaria*. Preliminary essay by Antonio Melis. Buenos Aires: Editorial Jorge Alvarez.
1970e *El proletariado y su organización*. México: Editorial Grijalbo, S.A.
1970f *Lettere dall'Italia e altri saggi*. Translated and with an introduction by Gaetano Foresta. Palermo: Editori Stamadori Assocati.
1971a *Seven Interpretive Essays on Peruvian Reality*. Translated by Marjory Urquidi. Austin: University of Texas Press. Also issued in paperback.

1971b *Ensayos escogidos*. Edited with a prologue by Augusto Salazar Bondy. Lima: Editorial Universo.
1972b *Sette saggi sulla realta peruviana e altri scritti politici*. Introductory essay by Robert Paris. Turin: Giulio Einaudi.
1973a *Acerca del caracter de la sociedad peruana*. Lima: Editorial Popular. 32 pp.
1973b *Lettere dall'Italia e altri scritti*. Edited by Ignazio Delgu. Rome: Editori Riuniti.
1973c *José Carlos Mariátegui en sus textos*. Lima: PEISA.
1975a *Sete ensaios de interpretação de realidade peruana*. Translated by Salvador Obiol de Freitas and Caetano Lagrasta; with an Introduction by Florestan Fernandes. São Paulo: Editora Alfa-Omega.
1975b *Fascismo sudamericano, Los intelectuales y la revolución y otros articulos ineditos (1922–24)*. Edited by the Centro de Trabajo Intelectual Mariátegui. Lima: Editorial Pedagógica "Asencios." Claims to contain several essays not published in 50 years.
1976 *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana*. Primera edición española. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.

MARIÁTEGUI, JOSÉ CARLOS, JULIO ANTONIO MELLA, ERNESTO "CHÉ" GUEVARA, CARLOS ROMERO AND RUY MAURO MARINI.
1972c *El marxismo en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Centro Editor de América Latina.

SECONDARY WORKS

ABADIE-AICARDI, RAÚL FEDERICO
1962 "La idea de la integración nacional peruana en José Carlos Mariátegui." Montevideo: Centro de Estudios Historicos. 29 pp.

AGUILAR, LUÍS, ED.
1968 *Marxism in Latin America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

AGUIRRE GAMIO, HERNANDO
1975 *Mariátegui: destino polémico*. Lima: Instituto Nacional de Cultura.

ALEXANDER, ROBERT J.
1957 *Communism in Latin America*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press. Often factually inaccurate.

ANGELES CABALLERO, CÉSAR A.
1962 *El paisaje en Mariátegui, Vallejo y Cieza Leon*. Ica, Peru: Instituto de Literatura Universidad San Luís Gonzaga de Ica.

AQUÉZOLO CASTRO, MANUEL, ED.
1976 *La polémica del indigenismo*. Lima: Mosca Azul. The original indigenist polemic between Mariátegui and Luís Alberto Sánchez. This is the first time both sides have been gathered together under one cover.

ARCINIEGAS, GERMÁN
1957 "González Prada, Mariátegui, Haya de la Torre, tres momentos en una sola vida." *Cuadernos Americanos* 93:3:203–11.
1968 *Latin America: A Cultural History*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

ARROYO POSADAS, M.
1946 "A propósito del artículo 'El populismo en el Peru,' de V. Miroshevsky." *Dialéctica* (Havana) 6:17:9–34.

ARTEAGA CALDERÓN, MARCO
1976 *5 Razones para aceptar a Mariátegui*. Lima: Empresa Editora Amauta, S.A.

BAINES, JOHN M.
1968 "José Carlos Mariátegui and the Development of the Ideology of Revolution in Peru." Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Wisconsin.
1970 "José Mariátegui [sic] and the Ideology of Revolution in Peru." *Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal* 7:2:109–16.
1972 *Revolution in Peru: Mariátegui and the Myth*. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

BASADRE, JORGE
1975 *La vida y la historia*. Lima: Fondo del Libro, Banco Industrial del Peru.
1976 "José Carlos Mariátegui y el Marxismo." *La Prensa* (Lima), 31 Oct., p. 21.

BAZÁN, ARMANDO
[1939] *Biografía de José Carlos Mariátegui*. Santiago, Chile: Zig-Zag. Not complete; short and selective with some impressionistic material; reprinted in volume 20 of the *Obras Completas*.

BOURRICAUD, FRANÇOIS
1969 "Mariátegui presentado en edición francesa." *Aportes* (Paris) 13 (July):133–35.

CAMPOS, JUAN
1975 "Un testimonio inesperado. Yo lleve a Mariátegui a trabajar a La Prensa." *La Jornada*, Labor supplement of *La Prensa* (Lima) 4 Feb., pp. 8–9.

CAMPOS, MARIO
1974 "Mariátegui inedito." *Estampa*, Sunday magazine of *El Expreso* (Lima) 9 March, pp. 6–7.

CARNERO CHECA, GENARO
1964 *La acción escrita, José Carlos Mariátegui, periodista*. Lima: n.p. Rights reserved by the author.

CARRILLO, SANTIAGO
1977 *"Eurocomunism" y estado*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.

CARRIÓN, BENJAMÍN
1930 *Mapa de América*. Madrid: Sociedad General Español de Librería.
1976 *José Carlos Mariátegui, el precursor, el anticipador, el suscitador*. Sep Setentas 238. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública.

CASTILLO, LUÍS ALBERTO
1976 "Hace 50 años apareció *Amauta*." *El Comercio* (Lima) 1 Oct., p. 2.

CHANG-RODRÍGUEZ, EUGENIO
1957 *La literatura política de González Prada, Mariátegui y Haya de la Torre*. México: Colección Studium 18.

CHAVARRÍA, JESÚS
1967 "José Carlos Mariátegui, Revolutionary Nationalist: The Origin and Crisis of Modern Peruvian Nationalism, 1870–1930." Ph.D. dissertation, U.C.L.A.
1975 Review of Baines' book. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 7:1:165–68.

CHOY, EMILIO ET AL.
1970 *Lenin y Mariátegui*. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.

COMISIÓN POLÍTICA DEL PARTIDO COMUNISTA PERUANA
[1968] *Acerca de la historia del partido comunista peruano y su lucha interna*. [Lima]: "Ediciones Bandera Roja."

CONGRESO CONSTITUYENTE DE LA CONFEDERACIÓN SINDICAL LATINO AMERICANO
1929 *Bajo la bandera de la C.S.L.A.* Montevideo: Imprenta la Linotipo.

CRAWFORD, WILLIAM REX
1944 *A Century of Latin American Thought*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Second edition, 1967.

[CUBAN DELEGATION]
1974 "José Carlos Mariátegui y la revolución anti-imperialista y socialista en América Latina." Paper presented by the Cuban delegation to the II Seminario Internacional José Carlos Mariátegui, Lima, 17–20 June.

CUNEO, DARDO
1966 "Nota sobre José Carlos Mariátegui." *Cuadernos Americanos* 148:5:163–70.

DÁVILA, CARLOS
1970 "The Fusion of Socialism and Indigenismo in José Carlos Mariátegui." M.A. thesis, University of Florida, Gainesville.

DAVIS, HAROLD EUGENE
1963 *Latin American Social Thought*. Washington, D.C.: The University Press of Washington.
1972 *Latin American Thought*. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press.

DESSAU, ADALBERT
1965 "José Carlos Mariátegui als Literaturkritiker." *Beiträge zur Romanischen Philogie* (Berlin, G.D.R.), no. 1, pp. 62–94.
1971 "Literatura y sociedad en las obras de José Carlos Mariátegui." In *Mariátegui: tres estudios*, Melis et al., pp. 51–109. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta. This is an expanded version of Dessau's 1965 article.

DÍAZ, FILIBERTO
1970 "Mariátegui y los *Siete Ensayos*, un estudio y comentarios." *Cuadernos Americanos* 170:3:152–66.

DÍAZ ROZZOTTO, JAIME
1966 "José Carlos Mariátegui y las posibilidades del desarrollo no capitalista de la comunidad indigena peruana." *Cuadernos Americanos* 25:3:173–205.

ESPINOZA, ENRIQUE [SAMUEL GLUSBERG]
1932 "José Carlos Mariátegui á través de su correspondencia." In *Trinchera*, pp. 40–69. Buenos Aires: Biblioteca Argentina de Buenas Ediciones Literarias (BABEL).

ESPINOZA R., GUSTAVO AND CARLOS MALPICA S.S.
1970 *El problema de la tierra*: Presencia y proyección de los 7 Ensayos. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.

FLORES RAMOS, JORGE
1966 *Mariátegui y Vallejo: poemas*. Lima: Compañía de Impresiones y Publicidad.

GARRELS, ELIZABETH
1974 "The Young Mariátegui and His World (1894–1919)." Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.
1976 "Mariátegui, la edad de piedra y el nacionalismo literario." *Escritura: Teoría y Crítica Literaria* (Caracas) 1:1:115–28.

GERMANÁ, CÉSAR
1977 "La polémica Haya-Mariátegui." *Análisis* (abril–dic.) 2/3.

GUERRA M., LUÍS FELIPE AND ANTONIO SAN CRISTÓBAL
1964 *González Prada, José Carlos Mariátegui*. Lima: Biblioteca Hombres del Peru.

HUANAY, JULIÁN
1956 *Mariátegui y los sindicatos*. Lima: Imprenta Minerva.

HUMBERT-DROZ, JULES
1928 "Questions of the Latin American Countries, Co-Report of Comrade Humbert-Droz." *International Press Correspondence* 8:72:1290–1304. Also listed in English as *World News and Views*.

KANTOR, HARRY
1954 *The Ideology and Program of the Aprista Movement*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

KLAIBER, JEFFERY L.
1977 *Religion and Revolution in Peru, 1824–1976*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

KONONOF, B.G. ET AL.
1966 *José Carlos Mariátegui, Strenuous Fighter for the Triumph of Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Latin America*. Moscow: Editorial Science. In Russian.

KOSSOK, MANFRED
1967 *José Carlos Mariátegui y el desarrollo del pensamiento Marxista en el Perú*. Lima: Ediciones Ensayos.
1971 "José Carlos Mariátegui y su aporte al desarrollo de las ideas Marxistas en el Perú." In *Mariátegui: tres estudios*, Melis et al., pp. 111–47. A brief piece based on the 1967 monograph.

KROMKOWSKI, JOHN A.
1972 "The Emergence and Ongoing Presence of José Carlos Mariátegui in Peru and the Soviet Union." Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Notre Dame.

LÉVANO, CÉSAR, ED.
1977 *Mariátegui: la revolución de octubre, escritos 1917/1930*. Lima: Siglo XX.

LUNA VEGAS, RICARDO
1975 *Introducción a Mariátegui*. Lima: Editorial Causachun.
MARINELLO, JUAN
1937 *Literatura hispanoamericana*. México: Ediciones de la Universidad Nacional de México.
MARTÍNEZ DE LA TORRE, RICARDO
1947 *Apuntes para una interpretación marxista de historia social del Perú*. Four vols., 2d ed. Lima: Empresa Editora Peruana. An essential work for understanding Mariátegui or indeed the Peruvian left. It is now being reprinted by the "Estudiantes de sociología de la Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos."
MARTZ, JOHN D. AND MIGUEL JORRÍN
1970 *Latin American Political Thought*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
[MARXISMO . . .]
1975 *El marxismo, Mariátegui y el movimiento feminino*. Lima: Editorial Pedagogica "Asencios."
MEAD, ROBERT G.
1956 "Recordación de Mariátegui." *La Nueva Democracia* (New York) 37:4:62–63.
1961 "Bibliografía crítica de José Carlos Mariátegui." *Hispanica Moderna* (New York) 27:2:138–42.
MELIS, ANTONIO
1968 "Mariátegui: primer marxista de América." *Casa de las Americas* 8:48:16–31. Translated from the original article in Italian which appeared in *Critica Marxista* (Rome) 5, no. 2 (Mar.–Apr. 1967).
1973 "Estética, crítica literaria y política cultural en la obra de José Carlos Mariátegui, apuntes." *Textual* (Lima) 6 (June):66–69.
1976 "El debate sobre Mariátegui: resultados y problemas." *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latino Americano* (Lima) 2:4:123–32. A review essay.
MELIS, ANTONIO, ADALBERT DESSAU AND MANFRED KOSSOK
1971 *Mariátegui: tres estudios*. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta. Translations of the original articles by Melis, Dessau, and Kossok.
MESEGUER ILLÁN, DIEGO
1972 "José Carlos Mariátegui y el realismo literario Marxista." *Textual* (Lima) 5–6 (Dec.):9–11.
1974 *José Carlos Mariátegui y su pensamiento revolucionario*. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
MIRÓ, CESAR
1974 *Asalto en Washington Izquierda*. Lima: Librería Editorial "Minerva."
MIROSHEVSKY, V.
1942 "El 'populismo' en el Perú, papel de Mariátegui en la historia del pensamiento social Latino-Americano." *Dialéctica* (Havana) 1:1:41–59.
MORETIC, YERKO
1970 *José Carlos Mariátegui, su vida e ideario, su concepción del realismo*. Santiago, Chile: Ediciones de la Universidad Técnica del Estado.
NUÑEZ, ESTUARDO
1964 "José Carlos Mariátegui y su experiencia italiana." *Cuadernos Americanos* 137:6:179–97.
ORRILLO, WINSTON
1977 "Primeras huellas de Mariátegui en Cuba." *Casa de las Americas* 16:100:178–81.
PARADES MACEDO, SATURINO
1970 *En defensa del llegado de Mariátegui*. Lima: Ediciones Bandera Roja. 16 pp.
PARIS, ROBERT
1966a "José Carlos Mariátegui: une bibliografie; quelques problemes." *Annales* (Paris) 21:1:194–200.
1966b "José Carlos Mariátegui et le modele du 'communism' inca." *Annales* (Paris) 21:5:1065–73.

1967 "Mariátegui e Gobetti." *Quaderno 12* (Turin, Centro Studi Piero Gobetti), March pp. 3–13.
1970 "El marxismo de Mariátegui." *Aportes* (Paris), no. 17 (July):7–30.
1971 "Mariátegui: un Sorelismo ambiguo." *Aportes* (Paris), no. 22 (Oct.):178–84.
1972 "Para una lectura de los *Siete ensayos*." *Textual* (Lima) 5–6 (Dec.):2–7.

PARIS, ROBERT ET AL.
1973 *El marxismo latinoamericano de Mariátegui*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones de Crísis. Contains, inter alia, several critical Aprista views.

PESCE, HUGO
[1972] *El factor religioso*. Presencia y proyección de los 7 Ensayos. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.

POPPINO, ROLLIE E.
1964 *International Communism in Latin America*. N.Y.: The Free Press.

PORTOCARRERO, FELIPE
1977 "El pensamiento político de Haya de la Torre." *Análisis* 1(Jan.–Mar.):37–48.

POSADA, FRANCISCO
1968a *Los origenes del pensamiento marxista en Latinoamérica*. Cuadro 6, Casa de las Americas. Havana: Casa de las Americas.
1968b *Los origenes del pensamiento marxista en Latinoamérica; política y cultura de José Carlos Mariátegui*. Colección cuadernos ciencia nueva. Madrid: Ediciones ciencia nueva, S.A.
1972 "Estética y Marxismo en José Carlos Mariátegui." *Textual* (Lima) 5–6(Dec.):24–31.

PRADO, JORGE DEL
1943 "Mariátegui, marxista-leninista." *Dialéctica* (Havana) 2:3:33–56.
1946 *Mariátegui y su obra*. Lima: "Nuevo Horizonte."

PRADO, JORGE DEL ET AL.
1972 *Vigencia de José Carlos Mariátegui*. Lima: Campodonico Ediciones, S.A.

REEDY, DANIEL R.
1969 "The Cohesive Influence of José Carlos Mariátegui on Peruvian Art and Politics." In *Artists and Writers in the Evolution of Latin America*, edited by Edward D. Terry. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

ROEL P., VIRGILIO
1971 *Esquema de la evolución económica*. Presencia y proyección de los 7 Ensayos. Lima: Bibloteca Amauta.

ROMERO, EMILIO AND CÉSAR LÉVANO
1969 *Regionalismo y centralismo*. Presencia y proyección de los 7 Ensayos. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.

ROUILLON, GUILLERMO
1963 *Bio-bibliografía de José Carlos Mariátegui*. Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
1975 *La creación heroica de José Carlos Mariátegui. Vol. I: La edad de piedra (1894–1919)*. Lima: Editorial Arica, S.A.

SALAZAR BONDY, AGUSTO
1965 *Historia de las ideas en el Perú contemporaneo*. Two vols. Lima: Francisco Moncloa Editores, S.A.
1967 *La filosofía en el Perú*. 2d ed. Lima: Editorial Universo, S.A.
1972 "Actualidad de Mariátegui." *Textual* (Lima) 5–6(Dec.):19–22.

SÁNCHEZ, LUÍS ALBERTO
1974 *Panorama de la literatura del Perú*. Lima: Editorial Milla Batres.

SAN CRISTÓBAL-SEBASTIÁN, ANTONIO
1960 *Economía, educación y marxismo en Mariátegui*. Lima: Ediciones Studium.

SANDRI, R.
1972 "Mariátegui: The National Road and Internationalism in the Third World." *Critica Marxista* (Rome) 10:6:91–110. In Italian.

SEGAL, ARON
1973 "An Extraordinary Man." *The Times of the Americas*, 7 Mar.
SELVA, MAURICIO DE LA
1967 "Algo más sobre Mariátegui," *Cuadernos Americanos* 150:1:174–86.
SHULGOVSKI, ANATOLY
1974 "Problemas de la unidad del proceso revolucionario mundial en las obras de José Carlos Mariátegui." Paper presented at the II Seminario Internacional José Carlos Mariátegui, Lima, 17–20 June.
SIMIONOV, S. AND A.SHULGOVSKI
1960 "El papel de José Carlos Mariátegui en la formación del Partido Comunista del Peru." *Hora del Hombre* (Lima) 1:1:65–82.
SOUTH AMERICAN SECRETARIAT OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
1929 *El movimiento revolucionario Latinoamericano*. Versiones de la primera conferencia Comunista Latinoamericano, Buenos Aires. Buenos Aires: La Correspondencia Sudamericana.
STABB, MARTIN
1967 *In Quest of Identity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
TARAZONA ESPINOZA, MANUEL
1973 "El Mariátegui desconocido." *La Prensa* (Lima), 15 July, pp. 10–11.
VALCARCEL, LUÍS E., AUGOSTO SALAZAR BONDY, AND AUGOSTO TAMAYO VARGAS
1976 *El problema del indio; El proceso de la instrucción pública; y El proceso de la literatura*. Presencia y proyección de los 7 Ensayos. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.
VALLEJO, CÉSAR
1961 *Los heraldos negros*. Introduction by José Carlos Mariátegui. Lima: Editora Perú Nuevo.
VANDEN, HARRY E.
1975 "José Carlos Mariátegui: Revolutionary Political Thought and Praxis in a Developing Nation." Ph.D. dissertation, New School for Social Research.
1975a "Influencias en Mariátegui." *La Jornada*, Labor supplement of *La Prensa*. (Lima) 1:14:11–13.
1975b *Mariátegui: influencias en su formación ideológica*. Lima: Biblioteca Amauta.
1976 "Socialism, Land and the Indian in the *7 Ensayos*." *INTI, Revista de Literatura Hispanica* (U. of Conn.), no. 4 (Autumn):71–75.
1977 "Marx and the Peasantry in Latin America: Mobilization or Marginalization?" Paper presented at the 1977 Southeastern Council on Latin American Studies meeting, Tuskegee, Alabama.
1978 "The Peasants as a Revolutionary Class: An Early Latin American View." *Journal of Inter-American Studies and World Affairs* 20:2:191–209.
VILLAVERDE ALCALA-GALIANO, LUIS
1971 "El Sorelismo de Mariátegui." *Aportes* (Paris), no. 22(Oct.) 168–177.