

for northern South America, and the geography of Brazil more than doubled; those on government and international relations and sociology nearly doubled.

The new editor, Henry E. Adams, has not only preserved the *Handbook's* excellence, but is striving to improve its services by expanding the coverage of journal articles and making possible the inclusion of last minute materials. The contributing editors, the mainstay of the *Handbook*, remain basically the same. A few are missing: John Augelli in geography, Richard Adams, Robert Howard, Sidney Mintz, and Charles Wagley in anthropology, and David Felix in economics. New ones have come forward: Ripley Bullen, Henry Selby, Lambros Comitas, and John Murra in anthropology, Marion Gilim, William Glade, and Aldo Ferrer in economics.

The present volume must be considered supplementary for most historians, who will have to content themselves with Volume 28 while looking forward to Volume 30, both of which emphasize current historical writing. Most comments by a reviewer of the *Handbook* tend to seem superfluous. It might be more appropriate on this occasion to express the profession's appreciation to all the contributors who, with dedication but no other compensation, join forces with Editor Adams and his staff in an effort to save Latin Americanists from floundering helplessly in their own productivity.

Fairleigh Dickinson University

ROBERT A. NAYLOR

*A Bibliography of United States-Latin American Relations Since 1810.*

Compiled and edited by DAVID F. TRASK, MICHAEL C. MEYER, and ROGER R. TRASK. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1968. University of Nebraska Press. Index. Pp. xxxi, 441. \$14.95.

One indication that a field of historical research has developed to something like maturity and a position of scholarly respect is the appearance of comprehensive bibliographies listing publications in that field. Latin American history in general boasts many such bibliographies, to say nothing of that sempiternal serial, the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*. From time to time U. S. diplomatic history has also enjoyed the attentions of bibliographers. Until recently the study of U.S.-Latin American relations or of hemispheric affairs in general has fallen between the two larger fields. Within the last two years, however, we have received two major bibliographies devoted to inter-American relations, each one running to about eleven thousand entries. One of them, compiled by Daniel Cosío Villegas, ap-

peared under the auspices of the Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores of Mexico (*Cuestiones Internacionales de México*, reviewed in *HAHR*, February 1967, p. 77). The other, at present under review, was sponsored by a group of American universities and colleges.

The three American editors have laid out their ungainly subject in a systematic manner calculated to be of the greatest use to the greatest number of researchers. They begin with a section on Guides and Aids and another devoted to basic secondary works on Latin America, U. S. diplomatic history, and U. S.-Latin American relations. Then follow ten sections dealing with chronological divisions, including one on The New Pan Americanism Since 1889, and a section on Pan Hispanism, Yankeeophobia, and Aprismo. The last twelve sections cover works on the relations between the United States and individual Latin American nations or groups of nations. While some may regret the lack of a separate section or two dealing with economic relations, it is fairly easy to survey writings on this topic with the aid of numerous subheadings in each section. The work ends with a comprehensive author index.

Brief comparison with Cosío Villegas' *Cuestiones internacionales* suggests that although the two works overlap considerably, each has areas of special emphasis. Trask, Meyer, and Trask have listed many American dissertations and European publications which do not appear in the Mexican bibliography. Cosío has included more government publications, commission reports, and the like, especially Mexican official documents. Comparison is difficult in this general category, however, for the American editors do not list entries for the Pan American Union or the United Nations in the author index, as does Cosío. (His listings, however, are apt to be self-defeating, since they are usually followed by dozens of item numbers.) In most (but not all) cases Cosío has listed more writings of individual Mexican historians and publicists. This is less apt to be true of other Latin American writers. For example, Trask, Meyer, and Trask list more entries for both Eduardo Frei Montalva and Arturo Frondizi than Cosío, and in citations of Fidel Castro's writings the American bibliography outdoes the Mexican by ten to zero.

But such comparisons are invidious. These bibliographies represent enormous and well-directed labor which will simplify and improve all future study in the field. The knowledgeable researcher will need to consult both of them, and they both belong in any university or archival library.

Indiana University

DAVID M. PLETCHER