

Even with regard to his central concern, however, Niebuhr's book remains distant from key events and processes. Historians agree that it was President Salamanca's "jingoism," to use Niebuhr's term, that led to the Chaco War. But Niebuhr does not disentangle the toxic brew of political calculations and overconfident patriotism that led the president, and many Bolivians, to start a war with Paraguay, nor does he unearth new findings about, say, the logistics of the war. Information about the size and readiness of the Bolivian military, for example, is scattered throughout the text. If war builds or destroys states, then a history of political transformation in Bolivia requires documenting and analyzing the bureaucratic procedures and decisions that led to the nation's defeat. All too often, Niebuhr substitutes paragraphs about war-making in Europe or the United States for detailed analysis of the multiple failures of the Bolivian state.

Niebuhr seems to suggest that the 1952 Revolution was inevitable after the Chaco War. As authors from Herbert Klein (1969) and James Malloy (1971) to James Kohl (2021) have emphasized, Bolivia's defeat did turn its citizens against its political establishment. Support for Salamanca's Genuine Republic Party and other parties of the pre-war period disintegrated as urban male voters cast ballots for the populist and left-wing parties that would also gain control of the street. Military officers, veterans of the war, overthrew governments in 1936, 1937 and 1939. An uprising in 1946 ended with President Gualberto Villarroel, a Chaco War veteran, hanging from a lamp post in the square in front of the presidential palace. But to imply that the 1952 Revolution was unavoidable requires the analysis of these and subsequent events to show how rural and urban rebellions exploited the opportunities of a weak and delegitimized state to liquate the old order in 1952.

University of North Carolina Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina
Fabrice_Lehoucq@uncg.edu

FABRICE LEHOUCQ

MULTILATERALISM IN THE AMERICAS

The Southern Cone and the Origins of Pan America, 1888–1933. By Mark J. Petersen. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2022. Pp. 344. \$65.00 cloth; \$51.99 e-book. doi:10.1017/tam.2022.130

The matter of American multilateralism (as in the Americas' multilateralism) has been the subject of only a handful of deep, well-researched books, despite the fact that notions of a unity of values or purposes have existed and played a role in the history of the continent almost since the wars for independence from European powers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Therefore, Mark Petersen's book is a much welcomed contribution to a field that should receive more attention from scholars of international relations and the international history of the Americas.

Petersen's work focuses on the views and policies of the governments of Argentina and Chile toward the Pan-American initiatives proposed and carried out first by the United States at the end of the nineteenth century, and continuing with more interest and a more solid endorsement from Latin American countries in the first decades of the twentieth century. Petersen's narrative is straightforward: Argentina and Chile first suspected the motives of the United States in its efforts toward the constitution of Pan-American institutions, but evolved into acceptance of the reality and even the desirability of these institutions. They understood that their own national interests in the regional context could be advanced through them, much like their own perception of US foreign policy interpreted the original effort toward Pan-Americanism from US administrations in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

The process through which the change in the mindset of Argentines and Chileans unfolded constitutes the bulk of Petersen's narrative. Based on archival sources and a deep knowledge of the relevant bibliography in English and Spanish, Petersen describes in detail how statesmen and diplomats came to value the institutional opportunities offered by Pan-Americanism, or at least tried to make the best of their existence, even if many of them as individuals were skeptical of the purpose or practicality of the Pan-American framework. Petersen correctly identifies and explains links between domestic processes and the outlook on Pan-Americanism of Argentine and Chilean officials, although his emphasis on the diplomatic character of the problem makes clear to readers, appropriately in my view, that these were matters of foreign policy, a realm that at least in Argentina and Chile has a tradition of independence from other state duties and endeavors. Still, the adoption and embrace of the concept of Pan-Americanism among women seeking expansion of their civil and political rights and by other activist groups (for example, architects) aptly demonstrates the power that adhered to the concept, beyond the confines of institutional diplomacy.

As its title announces, the book focuses on the views and policies toward Pan-American institutions in Argentina and Chile, and to the extent that such concentration is its core aim, it must be commended as an excellent work of scholarship. This concentration, however, does open a few additional avenues of reflection that the author could have taken. One that seems germane to Petersen's description of the process, from the perception of Pan-Americanism as a ploy of US imperialism to a more ample endorsement from initially reluctant actors, is the way in which modern nation-states interact in regional settings assumed as geographically cohesive in some way. Pan-Americanism made (and makes) sense for Americans, both US and Latin, because both groups believed, at some level, that belonging to the same continent and having political systems based on similar principles—whatever the specific and contingent results these systems might produce—warranted the establishment of institutional frameworks that included them all.

Furthermore, Pan-Americanism was not a defensive endeavor, as had been the case with most international alliances and coalitions up to that point. In this sense,

Pan-Americanism was one of the first instances, if not the first, of modern multilateralism, with all its promise and all its inherent weaknesses. Although Petersen comments on this issue throughout the book, one wonders if he might have given it more prominence in the argument.

In any case, these questions fall beyond the scope of the author's intent, so pointing them out is more a way to suggest future scholarship on a topic that deserves it than to make specific criticism of a book that stands as a good example of scholarship on inter-American relations and diplomacy.

Instituto de Historia
Universidad San Sebastián
Santiago, Chile
sebadagohurtado@gmail.com

SEBASTIÁN HURTADO-TORRES

LATIN AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL HISTORY

The United States and Venezuela during the First World War: Cordial Relations of Suspicious Cooperation. By H. Micheal Tarver. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2021. Pp. 255. \$105.00 cloth; \$45.00 e-book.
 doi:10.1017/tam.2022.131

Latin America's experience of the First World War has been the subject of several books and articles in the last few years. These works have been part of both a flurry of scholarship during the Great War's centenary and a proliferation of new research on Latin American international history in the 1910s to 1930s. Some countries in the region, however, have remained at the margins of recent publications. For that reason, H. Micheal Tarver's new book is a welcome addition, as it shines a spotlight on one such case: Venezuela. Tarver focuses his attention on how the war affected Venezuela's bilateral relationship with the United States, presenting the war years as a transformative period.

In telling this story, Tarver sets himself to a fairly straight-forward task. Instead of getting "bogged down in theory and multilayered analysis," he aims simply to "present the story as events unfolded" (ix). He mostly follows through on this premise; the only theories he engages, mainly in the introduction and conclusion, have to do with *caudillismo* and types of presidential character. The story that unfolds over five chapters—including two pre-war contextual chapters, two more substantial wartime chapters, and a brief conclusion covering the impact of the Spanish Flu on Venezuela—thus emphasizes how the personalities and political agendas of specific individuals in the United States and Venezuela shaped each country's policies toward the war and toward each other.