questions a cautious reader would have wanted to ask. Three artful photographs accompany the volume, including one of a young José Manuel and Silvia (father and mother) holding young José.

As with the book itself, that image imputes humanity to those remembered in official history as terrorists. Indeed, the beautiful tension of The Surrendered is its interface between the uniquely human and the presumed evil—the popular notion of Senderistas as devilish clones, the one-dimensional caricature that is still proffered by Peru’s mainstream media down to the present day. But this does not mean that Agüero condones his parents’ actions. On the contrary, he critiques them with vigor, to the consternation of his peers, other Senderista children who revere their deceased as heroic martyrs. Because of the pace and complexity of The Surrendered, it is hard to put it down. It is a psychological feast, though admittedly its use in undergraduate history classes might be problematic—it arguably would work best in philosophy courses on guilt or ethics.

One of the encouraging features embedded within this text is Agüero’s own vulnerability and sensitivity. In both prose and interview, there is a touch of refreshing humility—he occasionally acknowledges that he does not have answers. One hopes that literary success will not steal this virtue away. Philosophical messiahs, after all, rise and then often embarrass themselves, including some whom Agüero references (Octavio Paz, who in old age became little more than an apologist for the morally bankrupt PRI, and Elie Wiesel, whom Norman Finkelstein rightly mocked as the High Priest of the Holocaust—who for a twenty-five-thousand-dollar speaker’s fee would come tell you that Auschwitz really sucked). Agüero’s fate? Only time will tell. In the interim, we can look forward to his next historically reflective book.

John W. Sherman
Wright State University


Marc Becker, currently professor of history at Truman State University and a widely respected authority on Ecuador, excels at using underexplored or recently declassified caches of documents to analyze Ecuadorian politics. Becker’s The FBI in Latin America (Duke University Press, 2017) skillfully employed
FBI records to illuminate leftist activism in Ecuador. Similarly, The CIA in Ecuador draws on CIA surveillance documents to explore social movement organizing efforts among the Ecuadorian left. This volume is simultaneously a study of Ecuadorian politics, CIA perceptions of the left in Ecuador, and an extended discussion of how surveillance documents reveal much about the subjects of surveillance as well as the people who created the documents.

Becker begins with a 1949 radio broadcast of The War of the Worlds in Quito. Sadly, the radio station delayed explaining that the invasion was a hoax. Rioting by angry crowds left more than a dozen people dead. Communists did not have anything to do with the broadcast or the riot, but this did not stop the CIA from assuming that “radicals must have been behind the mayhem” (2). The CIA report about the broadcast and the riot illustrate both “the pervasiveness of US surveillance operations as well as the potential possibilities, boundaries, and obstacles to their knowledge and understanding of leftist movements in Latin America” (2). Although many of the CIA documents about the Ecuadorian left were deeply flawed, they represent one of the few bodies of information available. Used carefully, as Becker does, these sources can illuminate much about Ecuador during the long 1950s, or the end of WWII through the Cuban Revolution.

CIA documents, which saw through the world through the lens of the Cold War, often mischaracterized or misunderstood the Ecuadorian left. Some CIA officers feared communists would disrupt society, but the Partido Comunista del Ecuador (PCE) opposed “extraconstitutional alterations in power” (52). The US government’s belief that “Moscow gold” funded the PCE was overblown, but it nevertheless produced extensive surveillance of the Ecuadorian left. Despite the flawed nature of the records and the biases of surveillance officers, they nevertheless yield important insights and serve as a crucial lens with which to examine the Ecuadorian left. The CIA’s monitoring of Communist Party activities, Becker explains, sometimes produced the only records scholars have about the Ecuadorian left during the 1950s. Ironically, the CIA’s obsessive attention to the communists inadvertently created an important record and reminds us that state organizations and actors often preserve traces of the very ideologies, people, and practices they would like to see disappear. Thanks to the CIA’s surveillance, scholars have a detailed summary of what happened at the Fifth PCE Congress in 1952, not to mention other moments during this period. CIA surveillance, Becker concludes, “provides scholars with an opportunity to peek
inside communist party structures to understand how militants organized themselves to advance their political agenda” (183).

“The 1950s were a period of continual transitions for the communist party in Ecuador” (93) and, ultimately, the “intense and continuing organizing efforts in the years after the Second World War laid the groundwork for subsequent militant mobilizations that would not have happened were it not for those earlier, less visible actions” (5). That CIA surveillance documents illuminating these earlier and less visible actions became such an important source for Becker’s narrative is, as stated above, an ironic consequence of the mass of paper generated by extensive surveillance efforts. These records reveal, in extensive although often inaccurate detail, things about both Ecuador and the US. Furthermore, they provide a historian working several generations after their creation with a rich source base to tell the history of the Ecuadorian left during an understudied period. The CIA did not ignore the Western Hemisphere. Ultimately scholars should be thankful they did not, because “CIA surveillance provides insights into the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that the party confronted. Our understanding of the past is richer for the documentary record they left behind” (25).

Once again Marc Becker has taken a trove of documents, read them against the grain, and produced a compelling study of the Ecuadorian left during the 1950s. Anyone interested in the Cold War, Ecuador, and the relationship between the United States and Latin America will find much to appreciate in this volume. In addition, Becker’s discussions of the surveillance documents themselves are also important and should be read by aspiring historians, particularly in graduate seminars. In sum, The CIA in Ecuador deserves a wide readership.

Evan C. Rothera
University of Arkansas—Fort Smith


Drones have been around as toys for many years. When I was a child growing up in Brazil, I had a drone. It was fun to fly it, and I thought of myself as a military helicopter pilot. Never in my wildest dreams did I think of drones as a