preferred the ideal and the appearance of non-intervention, it has seldom refrained from intervention when a vital national interest was thought to be at stake. The non-intervention principle, of course, has suffered numerous blows since 1900. The practices sanctioned early in the century by the Roosevelt Corollary constitute one major negation, while the necessities imposed by the international rivalries of the past two decades suggest that the old doctrine ought to be explicitly abandoned. This, indeed, is the crux of Miss Graber's message: "Clarification of American policy is all the more prudent at this time because the reasons which made it politic to sustain the myth of adherence to a rule of absolute non-intervention have long since passed. Instead, there is an imperative need to abolish duplicity between American words and deeds . . . so that American political leaders can act forcefully, without an unwarranted guilt complex." The point is both timely and well made.

Eastern Michigan University DONALD F. DRUMMOND

Franklin D. Roosevelt's World Order. By Willard Range. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1959. xiv + 219 pp. Notes and index. $4.50.)

Here is another addition to the Roosevelt literature, a range of books that now has large proportions. The present volume examines Franklin D. Roosevelt as a thinker on world affairs. Its first three chapters look at Roosevelt's opinions on the breakdown of world order in the twentieth century and his understanding of what that breakdown meant for the United States. There follow topical chapters on the kind of world order that Roosevelt wished to see replace the order already broken, with consideration of such subjects as the good neighbor ideal, disarmament, abolition of imperialism, world-wide democracy and freedom, a global new deal, and collective security. Roosevelt, Professor Range shows, believed in these things. The author, a member of the political science department of the University of Georgia, has read widely in the Roosevelt literature and examined the files at the Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park. At the end of the book there are 852 citations (for 203 pages of text). The volume is well written, in clear and careful if humorless prose. It closes, one should add, with a disgracefully amateurish index.

This book is a perplexing task for a reviewer. It certainly does what it sets out to do: it ably describes Roosevelt's hopes for a world order. Although the writing is well done, there are defects which stand out. A major problem lies in the subject — in which, of course, the author could have done nothing to help himself, once he had chosen it. Roosevelt's ideas on world order were much of the time commonplace and banal, and frequently they were

trivial comments thrown off in rapidly dictated letters or in ill-considered remarks to visitors and reporters. There is now a plethora of this material in books and archives. Much of it has little or no meaning. Such is not the stuff out of which the historian of ideas can construct a coherent body of thought. Professor Range had his difficulties with this material. Another problem of the book is its organization, topical rather than chronological. To organize by topics is difficult if admirable, and in the present case the topics — such as democracy, or the good neighbor — often proved so broad and formless that the author hardly knew what to put into them.

One wonders, in conclusion, what Roosevelt would have thought of this full-dress scholarly study of his view of world order. Would that gay cynic have thrust up his cigarette holder and grinned?

Indiana University ROBERT H. FERRELL

Are We Good Neighbors? Three Decades of Inter-American Relations, 1930-1960. By Donald Marquand Dozer. (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1959. xii + 456 pp. Table, notes, bibliography, and index. $8.00.)

The relations of the United States with Latin America have received timely and self-interested examination at least three times during the twentieth century, 1898-1905, 1928-1934, and now, 1955-1960. Various Latin American processes of change — nationalism, Indianism, labor, industrialization, restless intellectuals, and radical peasantry — have silently or loudly been carried to the surface of history, but it has been chiefly at certain times in the century that the United States, and for that matter, the Communist and Western European worlds have seen, thought about, and tried to correlate their own self-interest with emergent Latin America.

One reason for this is that too few trained Latin Americanists handle the issues and consequences of inter-American relations. Journalists, travelers, politicians all go to Latin America and see what they wish to see. It takes a trained Latin Americanist, in the case of Professor Dozer combined with State Department experience, to integrate documentation, invaluable newspaper sources and editorials, and his own judgment into a much needed and well worth-while synthesis of the different channels inter-American relations have followed and must follow. The activity of government has enlarged from the political to include the cultural, trade-union, social, and even private citizen approach to the values and ways of South America. This is the great rediscovery of the contemporary phase of inter-American relations, 1928-1934 and 1955-1960. This enlarged government policy must continue to exist alongside the valuable work of public and private banking, investment, strategy, and defense. We surely should have learned, as Dozer