

*Discursos y escritos.* By LUIS M. DRAGO. (Buenos Aires: Editorial El Ateneo, 1938. 3 vols. Pp. 430, 438, 272.)

Few Latin-American public men play a more significant rôle in the history of diplomacy than Luis Drago. Drago was born in 1859. He began his active career while still a youth on that great newspaper, *La Nación*, at the age of only sixteen. Contemporaneously he pursued his studies, and received the degree of doctor in jurisprudence in 1882. In the same year he was elected to the legislature of Buenos Aires. After only a year in this post he became Secretary of the Chamber of Appeals on one of the courts of the Province, and made his way upward in the public service, serving as attorney-general of La Plata. He went back temporarily into private life in 1893, but in 1902 he was elected to the National Congress, and in August assumed the post of minister of foreign affairs, which he held for less than a year. In 1906 he returned to Congress, and in 1907 he was one of the Argentine delegates to the second Hague conference. In 1909 he was appointed as one of the arbiters in the fisheries controversy between the United States and Great Britain, which had just been sent to the Hague. Three years later he was again elected to Congress, and was offered the honor of a special mission to the United States on the occasion of the centennial of Argentine independence, but was obliged to decline on account of his health. He played an important rôle in the debates which took place on the question of an unlimited leave of absence for President Sáenz Peña, and in the discussion with regard to the sale of two Argentine cruisers as a part of a policy of reducing armaments in 1914. In 1916 he retired to private life. Offered the embassy to Great Britain in the course of the next year, and a place on the commission of jurists which drew up the statute for the World Court in 1920, he felt compelled to refuse both honors. By this time he had only a year to live. He died on June 9, 1921.

The volumes here under review are prefaced by a biographical essay by his son. This essay is written with much detachment, and is remarkably free from any kind of filial extravagance. One finds oneself wishing that it gave us a little more insight into what must have been an extremely interesting and significant personality.

It is difficult, indeed, from these speeches and writings to reconstruct very satisfactorily the man with whom they deal. The number of private letters is small; the collection consists for the most part of public speeches, commentaries on private and public law, a certain amount of diplomatic correspondence, and a highly interesting collection of materials with regard to the Drago doctrine, the second Hague conference, and the fisheries arbitration. But one gets, nevertheless,

some insight into personality from a perusal of these materials. It is interesting to find Dr. Drago, for example, interesting himself in Macaulay's essay on history, and in Carlyle's essay on Doctor Francia. It is interesting to discover him writing as a young man a thesis on Marital Authority, and identifying himself with the idea of civil emancipation of married women, though reform in this matter was only accomplished some years after his death. It is interesting to see him opposing lotteries, and to observe in much of his correspondence a strong sense of personal dignity, and of regard for the dignity of his nation. One would like to know more about the circumstances of his resignation from his post as foreign minister. Here the reasons given seem trivial, and his son's explanation hardly flattering to the minister's sense of proportion. Finally, one certainly gets the impression of a personality strongly individualistic, wide in its interests, and of very substantial learning.

The part of these volumes which is likely to be of most value to readers in the United States is naturally that concerned with the enunciation of the Drago Doctrine. It is impossible to read Dr. Drago's correspondence on this matter without perceiving that he was a friend of American coöperation, and a convinced believer in the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. In his own view, indeed, he sought to give them an extension, in his famous note of December 29, 1902. But he regarded the principle which bears his name as a principle which was peculiarly applicable to the republics of the New World, and he did not wish to see it fused in any more general formula. Still more, he was not at all gratified at the proposal put forward by the American delegation at the second Hague conference of 1907, which proposed to forbid the use of force in the collection of contract debts unless arbitration had been offered and refused. To the Argentine jurist, such a proposal was equivalent to a recognition of the validity of the use of force in some circumstances, and to that use he was firmly opposed. He took, however, no intransigent or obstructionist view at the Hague, but was the leader in suggesting reservations to the American proposition. In this, he was opposed by the representative of Brazil.

It is interesting to observe that in the fisheries arbitration Dr. Drago, in a separate and dissenting opinion on the question of the extent of the bays referred to the treaty of 1818 (which was the basis of the judgment), took occasion to point out that as an historical matter certain bays, among which he mentioned Chesapeake Bay, and the bay of La Plata, were under national jurisdiction, despite their large size. In general, he was rather critical of the decision of the arbitral tribunal on this matter.

Drago was a friend of compulsory arbitration, a firm defender of legal processes, and a protagonist of international understanding. He combined a just solicitude for the interests of his country, with a very substantial measure of international idealism. He is an interesting figure in that happy age—which every thoughtful man hopes to see restored—when questions of international right and justice could be discussed in an atmosphere of reasonable discussion. He would have detested the age of violence in which we live today. And it seems not unlikely that he would look to the United States, in concert with his own country, to take its stand in behalf of those standards of legality and peace which he sought consistently to uphold.

DEXTER PERKINS.

University of Rochester.

*Our Rising Empire, 1763-1803.* By ARTHUR BURR DARLING. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1940. Pp. v, 595. \$5.00.)

This volume might well serve as a supplemental text to a course in the diplomatic history of the United States. Its title, however, seems to the reviewer somewhat misleading. "Empire" and "imperial" are terms that will apply to the United States in a limited sense only, especially for the period covered, nor does the purchase of Louisiana seem a good point at which to end the volume. The Monroe Doctrine, in his opinion, more fittingly closes the diplomatic era that began with the Peace of Paris of 1763. It is to be hoped that the author will give us a companion volume, covering the remaining twenty years.

This volume, per se, performs an important function. It synthesizes the host of monographic writings and documentary collections that crown a half century of productive research. In footnote and appendix the author gives generous acknowledgment to fellow workers but likewise reveals personal familiarity with the sources used by them and skillfull selection based on classroom experience. He has not confined his attention to capitals and courts but has shown clearly and in ample detail the bearing of frontier happenings on final treaties. It is largely because of this inclusion of frontier influences, that the reviewer questions the relevancy of his title. Certainly the builders of the American Union and above all the men operating in the western forests would be the very first to repudiate any suggestion of "imperialism" in connection with their efforts. On the other hand their express contribution should in some way receive recognition in the title.