
BOOKS

MEXICO OF TODAY.

Mexico and the United States. By Frederick Starr. Published by the Bible House, 443 S. Dearborn St., Chicago. 1914. Price, \$3.50.

Professor Starr, the well-known anthropologist of the University of Chicago, whose frequent journeys of investigation into Mexico during the past twenty years have made him an intimate observer and friend of both Indians and Spaniards, has just presented to the public a timely book in a readable form. Without pretense of treating the subject after the stately manner of historians, the author has nevertheless succeeded in giving a condensed and graphic description of the Mexico that is now looking into the mouths of American cannon. Dismissing with a few words the glamour that Bancroft spread over Aztec civilization, and the romance that Lew Wallace wove into the land of the Montezumas, Professor Starr sets forth the prosaic facts of modern research; and upon these he constructs his history of the past hundred years.

That the author endorses John Kenneth Turner's "Barbarous Mexico" will give the reader an idea of his point of view. But he is particular to state that Mr. Turner's title is unfortunate in that it conveys the idea that it refers to the people of Mexico, whereas in reality it is applied to the methods of the government, and particularly to the Diaz government. Professor Starr thinks the Mexican government all that Turner said it was, and more; but for the people themselves he has a sympathetic appreciation that will appeal to those who look upon Mexico as something other than a land to be despoiled by a stronger race. He explains why we are hated by the Mexicans. "They realize that we are different; they consider us most disagreeable. We assume and try to demonstrate that we are superior. Our attitude toward them is always critical and instructive." These social antagonisms, added to the economic friction that comes from our beginning where the despoiling Spaniard left off, serve to explain some of the recent happenings south of the Rio Grande.

Professor Starr, always a strong anti-imperialist, sympathizes heartily with the non-intervention principle of the Administration at Washington, but frankly decries the non-recognition of Huerta as a diplomatic mistake in method of carrying out the peace policy. Let them absolutely alone, he says, to battle out their own way to an equilibrium as Argentina and Chile have done, and Nicaragua and the others will do.

Altogether, Professor Starr's book is one from which the busy man can get a picture of the real conditions in Mexico, without devoting prolonged study to the question.

S. C.

A UNIVERSITY ADDRESS.

On Politics and History. By Viscount Morley. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York, 1914. Price, \$1.00 net.

In the turmoil of the hottest battle of the foremost war between democracy and plutocracy in the world today, when the British Tories have "forged Ulster into a fire-arm" in their desperate stand against the land program of the Liberal Ministry, when Great Britain and all the world breathlessly watches Parliament—at this moment there has been published in England an unimpassioned, philosophical, calm little book written by one of the three most prominent Liberals in the House of Lords.

John Morley's biographies are a part of the world's literature. This generation knows itself and its heredity far better because of Morley's masterly interpretation of the character and career and influence of Edmund Burke and Richard Cobden, of Rousseau and Gladstone and Cromwell.

But this latest book of Lord Morley's is not a biography. "Politics and History" is an essay, "a version, and recast" of an address made by the author in 1912 as Chancellor of the University of Manchester. The audience and the occasion explain the unrestraint of its erudition. With the stuff of its thought we are all concerned—the great social motives and queries of mankind and suggestions for their interpretation and solution:

What is public opinion like? How shall we appreciate representative government in the cross-lights of its advocates and forerunners and foes?

Representative government exists today in a hundred different forms, depending on a hundred differences in social state and history, and nobody claims for public opinion in all or any of them either sanctity or infallibility. But to make a mock of it, is merely to quarrel with human life. We all know the shortcomings in political opinion and character—the fatal contentment with simple answers to complex questions; the readiness, as Hobbes put it, to turn against reason, if reason is against you; violent over-estimate of petty things; vehement agitation one day, reaction as vehement the other way the next; money freely laid on a flashing favorite this week, deep curses on what has proved the wrong horse the week after; haste; moral cowardice; futility. But if anybody supposes that these mischiefs are peculiar to parliaments or democracy, he must be strangely ill-read in the annals of military despotism, absolute personal power, centralized bureaucracy, exalted ceremonial courts.

Does mankind actually progress? John Stuart Mill expressed an "audacious doubt." How shall we use history?

History's direct lessons are few, its specific morals rare. To say this is not to disparage the grand inspiration that present may draw from past, or the priceless value of old examples of lofty public deeds and magnanimous men. . . . To working statesmen parallels may easily be a snare, and lu-