

purpose is to exalt Castilla as the paradigm of Peruvian nationality. Along with its sister organization, the *Centro de Estudio Histórico-Militares*, the *Instituto* has done much to bring nineteenth-century Peru into a new perspective. Both organizations are under the direction of the prominent military historian, retired General Felipe de la Barra.

The volume consists of two parts. The first, subtitled "El Estadista," contains lectures given at the military academy in 1945 in commemoration of the centennial of Castilla's first assumption of power; Mariano Felipe Paz Soldán's pioneer biography of the Grand Marshal (1879); and essays by Jorge Basadre, General Carlos Miñano, the late Víctor Andrés Belaúnde, and others. These contributions, which include articles on naval policy and the 1858-1860 campaign against Ecuador, are of uneven quality but taken together convey a picture of Castilla as a noble patriot laboring to bring order and progress to his country after two decades of strife. Possibly the writers have overemphasized his role in establishing the rule of law.

The second part of the book, "El Soldado," is a revised edition of Felipe de la Barra's *Castilla conductor militar*, which appeared in 1962, and provides an adequate general survey of the hero's military career. Beginning as a royalist cadet, Castilla was captured by the patriots at Chacabuco, served as a patriot lieutenant colonel at Ayacucho, led the Restoration against Santa Cruz' confederation, and participated both in the war of 1841 against Bolivia and in subsequent civil conflicts. Chronologies and maps are included.

Although this book is certainly factually useful, it appears to lack depth, analysis, and synthesis. A more penetrating biography of Castilla is needed.

Naval War College

DAVID H. ZOOK, JR.

Relaciones diplomáticas entre Chile y los Estados Unidos de América, 1829-1841. By CARLOS MERY SQUELLA. Santiago, 1965. Editorial Andrés Bello. Notes. Appendices. Bibliography. Pp. 152. Paper. \$3.20.

Making considerable but by no means exhaustive use of archival material, Carlos Mery Squella of the Catholic University of Chile has written a brief summary of early Chilean-United States relations. Frequently he stresses the lack of preparation of United States representatives to Chile and also concedes the inadequate background of Chilean diplomats serving in the United States. He leaves the im-

pression, though, that he regards the inadequacies of Chileans as quite natural, while those of United States diplomats are judged to be inexcusable and an affront to the southern republic. In general, Mery's work is diplomatic history on the most superficial level, for he has made little attempt to explain the attitudes and background conditions that influenced Chilean-United States relations. A cursory introduction by historian-polemicist Jaime Eyzaguirre adds nothing of value to the meager work.

Mery deals in some detail with the treaty of peace, amity, commerce, and navigation signed in 1832 by the United States and Chile. The United States wanted the treaty to contain a conventional most-favored-nation clause, while Chile desired the right to grant sister Latin American republics concessions which would not have to be extended to the United States. The Chilean point of view prevailed, and subsequent attempts of the United States to prevent diplomats of Santiago from granting more favorable terms to Peru than those extended the United States resulted in discord and friction. Mery contends that the willingness of Andrés Santa Cruz, leader of the Peru-Bolivia Confederation (1835-1839), to subscribe to the United States position on tariff matters was in part responsible for Washington's favorable attitude toward the Confederation in its struggle with Chile.

In effect, the main purpose of the Mery book is to justify Chile's war against the Confederation while at the same time censuring various United States diplomats for their sympathy with the Santa Cruz cause. He pictures Yankee representatives as motivated solely by selfish economic considerations, whereas high-minded Chileans who grasped the true needs and destiny of the southern continent showed selfless statesmanship and international wisdom. Mery has totally ignored the research of Robert N. Burr and others in writing a chauvinistic history of Chile's crusade against the nefarious Santa Cruz Confederation and its United States sympathizers.

Not long ago in a Lima newspaper the Chilean historian, Guillermo Feliú Cruz, praised Félix Denigri Luna's unique qualifications to write a balanced history of the Peru-Bolivia Confederation and its diplomatic relations. He expressed the hope that this Peruvian historian would soon dedicate himself to that task. The inadequacies of the present book make one all the more anxious for the speedy fulfillment of Feliú's hope.

University of Notre Dame

FREDRICK B. PIKE