

number of specialists in the field, and the Ford Foundation expanded funding for graduate training on Latin America and, through the Social Science Research Council, faculty interchanges with Latin American and US universities.

Readers will be particularly interested, as I was, in Delpar's account of the conflicts that emerged in Latin American studies in the 1960s and 1970s with the radicalisation of younger members as the Cold War intensified. This produced serious internal tensions in the field over such questions as the probity of government and foundation funding of Latin American studies, which some saw as antithetical to the essence of impartiality of the academic enterprise. An example was Project Camelot in 1964–65 at American University, underwritten by the US Army's Special Operations Research Office to employ researchers to undertake the study of Latin American countries with the expressed aim of finding the potential for, and ways to curb, revolt and revolution in the region. To many young scholars as well as their Latin American counterparts this 'smacked of US academic imperialism and interventionism in the internal affairs' of Latin America (p. 168). Delpar goes on to recount the rise of dependency theory and the founding of NACLA (1966) and *Latin American Perspectives* (1974), as the profession shifted to the left. This leads her also to recount the politicisation of the Latin American Studies Association and its policy of making declarations critical of US policies towards the region, a policy that continues to roil the profession even today. On these issues and throughout the book Delpar stands scrupulously above the fray, endeavouring to be 'objective' and non-partial, perhaps to a fault.

What one comes away with from this excellent survey of the ups and downs of Latin American studies in the United States is the inevitable coincidence of US domestic concerns and interests in the region with the rise and fall of dollars flowing into the production of area specialists and knowledge creation. To revive the enterprise during down periods, one often hears the refrain among practitioners that what is bad for Latin America (revolutions, civil war, natural disasters etc.) is good for the profession. Lamentably, this sad truism governs the general health of Latin American studies, now once more being subject to an upsurge and reshaping by the forces of globalisation and the aforementioned dollar flows (see, for example, LASA President Eric Hershberg's 'President's Report' in the *Forum* (autumn 2008), pp. 1–2).

George Washington University

PETER F. KLAREN

J. Lat. Amer. Stud. 41 (2009). doi:10.1017/S0022216X09990204

Thomas O'Brien, *Making the Americas: The United States and Latin America from the Age of Revolutions to the Era of Globalization* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2007), pp. 390, £15.95, pb.

This splendid new survey incorporates and distils more than a decade of a new generation of scholarship that understands the relations between the United States and Latin America as a two-way street, sensitive to cultural, social and economic dynamics, and not limited to the activities of state actors. The book achieves the difficult goal of bringing together many strands of new research (including the author's own work on US corporations) into a satisfactory and coherent whole. The narrative of the book pays due attention to treaties, doctrines, and corollaries to doctrines, but its main innovation comes from showing with telling examples how

the activities of non-state actors such as US foundations, corporations, business-people, missionaries, labour unions, academics, tourists and journalists, as well as the cultural impact of the press, film and television, have mattered in inter-American relations.

The basic argument is that all these actors and official Washington types (not always different individuals given the revolving door from official positions to corporations and foundations) were shaped by shared experiences and values that gave them a sense of mission. They had a general feeling of responsibility to save Latin America from its failure to adopt faithful copies of US institutions and values voluntarily. The book is particularly successful in showing how social, economic and cultural dynamics internal to the United States have routinely updated and re-invigorated its desire to improve the people down south. Historical change transformed how the United States' perceived superiority to Latin America would be articulated. The book shows how racist views used to rationalise campaigns against Native Americans and the continuation of slavery in the South also justified expansionist adventures in Latin America like the war with Mexico and the shenanigans of filibusters in the 1850s. With rapid economic growth after the Civil War, the mission was to civilise Latin peoples in need of better habits, including consumption and production habits. By the end of the century the US civilising mission took a distinct imperialistic tone with the Spanish–American War and subsequent occupation of Cuba. Thereafter the missionary zeal went into high gear; US activities in the region included not only the expansion of markets and the strategic re-positioning advocated by Mahan, but also using the invasions of Caribbean countries 'to dislodge the remnants of European influence, promote U.S. business interests, and launch campaigns of civilization focused on rationalized government procedures, improved education and public health, and the general promotion of market forces' (p. 94).

With the Great Depression and the Second World War, a United States that had discovered the virtues of government intervention to promote economic recovery at home redefined once again its civilising mission. Leaving behind the attitude of racial superiority, the mission became the promotion of development. The job of uplifting Latin America was paired with the desire to fight communism. Racial superiority was replaced by social science. Latin Americans were no longer inferior because of their darker skin; they were simply behind in the path to development, and could use some help. They were traditional but capable of being modernised. Modernising Latin Americans was to be an enlightened way to keep the communist conspiracy at bay. Thus, the author proves that condescension has been a durable and malleable guiding force. Using this perspective it is not difficult to extend the argument and discover a civilising agenda behind the relentless preaching of the Washington Consensus gospel of the 1990s.

The inclusion of businesspeople and corporations in a foreign relations survey is hardly novel, but this book moves beyond dependency-theory approaches that concentrate on telling the story of the exploitation of peripheral Latins by the United Fruit Company or Anaconda Copper. O'Brien includes fascinating discussions on the more complex influence exercised by business concerns. In Mexico, for example, Sears Roebuck introduced US-style consumerism with advertising campaigns, store displays and an expansion in the practice of consumer credit. In Venezuela, Creole Petroleum sought to modernise the community; it provided educational and medical services to its workers and gave them loans to encourage

home ownership, with a vision ‘based on U.S. postwar suburbs and stressing the American belief in “democratic” capitalism’ (p. 196). Private foundations were as important as businesspeople and corporations in advancing the US agenda. The book includes insightful discussions on the Rockefeller Foundation’s health and Green Revolution programmes, and on the Ford Foundation’s promotion of modernisation theory and its scholarship programs to train young Latin Americans at the powerhouses of neoliberal economics, such as the University of Chicago. After reading these sections the reader is left in no doubt about the importance of considering the impact of foundations on Latin America. The book is equally successful in showing how Protestant missionaries and labour unions helped to shape inter-American relations.

A significant theme that runs through the book is the analysis of Latin American responses to the missionary zeal coming from the north. O’Brien makes a great effort to show how Latin Americans were not willing to roll over and accept the imposition of institutions, cultural influences, business projects or military invasions. The rejection, resistance, partial embrace, refashioning, reinterpretations, selective adoption, and combinations and iterations of the above are an important part of the story.

Even though recent years have witnessed the publication of a number of good surveys on US–Latin American relations, this work stands out as unique thanks to its distinct early-twenty-first-century sensibility. To end on a pedagogical note: the book works extremely well when used to guide class discussions. Not surprisingly, timely topics such as the civilising mission in Iraq spring up naturally. I have assigned this survey to my students and would encourage anyone teaching courses on this topic to do the same.

Fordham University

HÉCTOR LINDO-FUENTES

J. Lat. Amer. Stud. 41 (2009). doi:10.1017/S0022216X09990216

Daniel Lewis, *Iron Horse Imperialism: The Southern Pacific of Mexico, 1880–1951* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2008), pp. xviii + 179, \$18.95, pb.

Iron Horse Imperialism tells the story of a railroad that took almost half a century to be completed, and for this reason held a very complex and changing relationship with various governments belonging to different political regimes, going from the *Porfiriato* to the Revolution and the post-revolutionary state. Even though some research has been done on the Southern Pacific of Mexico (SPM), the novelty of this book is twofold: first, that it deals with a longer period, covering the particularly troublesome decades of the 1910s and 1920s; and second, that it makes use of archival sources that had not been explored so far, particularly the corporate records of the company, kept at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California.

The SPM was born as the Sonora Railroad, built between 1880 and 1882 from the US frontier in Nogales to the Pacific port of Guaymas. The idea of extending the line to the south, in order to connect in Guadalajara with the rest of the Mexican railroad system, arose in the late 1890s, but started to materialise only in 1905. Construction works continued until 1912 from both sides of the line, but were suspended due to the revolutionary turmoil before the most technically challenging section of 160 kilometres crossing the Sierra Madre Occidental could be laid. It took 11 years and a new agreement with the government for the works to be reassumed,