

man can follow the Soviet party line for thirty years and still consider himself an independent Marxist, not a Communist.

University of Illinois

ROBERT E. SCOTT

México y el arbitraje internacional. El Fondo Píadoso de las Californias. La Isla de la Pasión. El Chamizal. By ANTONIO GÓMEZ ROBLEDÓ. México, 1965. Editorial Porrúa. Map. Appendices. Pp. xii, 407. Paper.

Ambassador Antonio Gómez Robledo deals with three international arbitration cases which are seldom mentioned in history texts in the United States but rarely omitted from Mexican historical works. This is by no means a definitive diplomatic history, an interpretive foreign policy study, or a profound legal treatise, but it demonstrates sound knowledge in all three areas.

Gómez Robledo first examines the Pious Fund case in which the Catholic Church of California endeavored to extract from the government of Mexico funds which were originally vested in the Church of New Spain. Despite the fact that after two arbitrations the ultimate award favored the United States, the author presents a strong case for Mexico.

In dealing with the recently settled Chamizal conflict, he takes the United States to task for failure to abide by the arbitral decision of 1911. Forcefully stating the position of an aggrieved Mexican, he terms this the most passionate case in the diplomatic history of Mexico. His treatment of the Chamizal conflict is the most perceptive of the three, although incomplete as the period since 1911 is neglected. A more thorough study of United States—Mexican diplomacy in this era would have revealed numerous complexities which the author chose to omit. Nevertheless, his examination of both the Pious Fund and Chamizal cases indicates a definite lack of foresight on the part of those who negotiated the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

Gómez Robledo's account of both the Chamizal question and the Island of Passion controversy (commonly called the Clipperton Island case) illustrates that a primary objective of Mexican diplomacy has been the conservation of her national territory. As a tribute to the art of diplomacy the book often mitigates the author's nationalistic bias. Above all the need for international law to be uniform and generally accepted is paramount in his mind.

After cutting apart almost every flimsy page, the reader found a useful although abbreviated selection of documents. Additional maps

of the Chamizal region and of the Clipperton Island area as well as a bibliography would have been helpful.

University of Akron

SHELDON B. LISS

Dividing the Waters. A Century of Controversy between the United States and Mexico. By NORRIS HUNDLEY, JR. Berkeley, 1966. University of California Press. Illustrations. Maps. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xii, 266. \$6.95.

Of all the important disputes between Mexico and the United States none has been as confused, as complicated, or as little understood as the division of the waters from the Rio Grande, the Colorado, and the Tijuana rivers. The ambitious task of unraveling this tangled story has been well done in Norris Hundley's *Dividing the Waters*. While concentrating primarily on the period from 1906 to 1944, Hundley analyzes this colossal water fight from its beginnings in the last decades of the nineteenth century through the recent salinity dispute in the Mexicali Valley. Although designed as a study from both sides of the border, the author's Mexican section is severely limited by Mexico's regrettable decision to close the relevant archives. This is not to say that Mexico is neglected, however, since Hundley does a fine job with the admittedly inadequate public materials.

Dividing the Waters is focused of course on the treaty of 1944, which more or less settled the international water controversy. The author must be thanked at the outset for not losing us in the arcana of international legal theory on water disputes. Instead a minimum of theory provides a background for the analysis of treaty negotiations.

Much of the difficulty in understanding how the 1944 treaty came about is due to the large variety of groups interested in the river water. Each of these, from local farmers to federal governments, had its own special problem to be solved or interest to be protected. One of Hundley's major virtues, in addition to thorough research, is his ability to organize and present the conflicting goals of myriad pressure groups. Each tried to impose its pet solution on the rest, and but for Hundley's clarity we would become lost in the clamor. Unfortunately, however, there is one voice not heard. In the discussions and maneuvers of all these groups one wonders where the American business and agricultural interests were. What position, for example, did American companies operating on both sides of the border take toward the treaty negotiations?

Hundley's talent for dissipating fog is particularly welcome in