


F

1235

.P796



SIGILLVM · VNIVERSITATIS · CALIFORNENSIS
EUREKA
MDCCCLXVIII

EX LIBRIS

BANCROFT LIBRARY

Mexican Literature on the Recent Revolution

By
HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY

*Reprinted from The Hispanic American Historical Review,
Vol. II, No. 2, May, 1919*



BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

MEXICAN LITERATURE ON THE RECENT REVOLUTION

Political events in Mexico during the past decade have called forth an unusual literature both as to quantity and character. That part of it written in English has become fairly familiar to the American reading public. The works which have appeared in foreign languages have, unfortunately, not been so readily available. In Mexico itself there has been great activity among the writers, historical and otherwise, who have their own interpretations of events to present to their own public. Much of the writing turned out has been by way of propaganda for one side or other of the combatant forces. Some of it has been of a dispassionate character; particularly so was that which appeared just before the débâcle which drove Don Porfirio Díaz into exile. As this revolutionary literature was written for home consumption, and has appeared in no English translations or reviews, it is pertinent to glance over it hastily, with the hope of ascertaining what is the mind of the Mexican people, or, more properly speaking, of that part of it which unseated the old régime, placed in its stead a government by the long-despised proletariat, and endeavored to remake the world which had been wellnigh taken from it by the policy of the Científicos. Of necessity, most of the books which have come out have been sympathetic with the new order of things, or at least out of sympathy with the old. Hence this paper will in a peculiar sense be as representative of the revolutionary ideal as the literature it represents. The writer of the present article holds no brief for the authors whose works he studies, but musters them as impartially as may be. The opinions expressed are here presented rather in the form of abstracts than in the form of set reviews. The reader will, then, understand that he is reading as much of the actual statements of Mexican writers as it is feasible to give.

When, in 1909, the Porfirian régime was on its last legs, and all the world was speculating what was to be the outcome of the expected disappearance of Díaz from the political arena, Mexico itself was far from unconscious of the proximate dilemma. About that time ap-

F1235
P796

3717

peared two books which voiced the national uneasiness, under similar titles and from opposite sides of the political aggroupment. The first of these, in point of importance at least, was that by Andrés Molina Enríquez, *Los Grandes Problemas Nacionales* (Mexico, 1909). In the opinion of the present writer there are not half a dozen greater books on Mexico in existence. When one has named Alexander von Humboldt and Madame Calderón de la Barca, the residue of Mexican literature falls to a level from which Molina's book stands out in distinct relief.

The author, who is, or was at last accbunts, engaged in advisory work on the agricultural problems of Mexico, handles his problems (and these are so closely allied in character as to constitute a single one) by first laying the necessary background in Part I, wherein the questions of territorial setting, early historical influences, and contemporary factors are introductory to the main discussion. The character of the problem is prefaced in the fourth of the introductory chapters, entitled "The influence of the *Leyes de Reforma* on property". This influence, Molina says, was not as beneficent as it might have been, because the *Reforma* neglected to establish the status of individual property and made the further mistake of including in the process of disamortization the estates of civil and native communities, which it was impolitic to molest. Hence, the *Leyes* were far from effecting the transformation which they began. They did an imperfect work, putting into circulation all church property, a part of the municipal property, and part of the Indian communal property. But the *Reforma* did create a new class interest among the *mestizos*, to whom the author looks for the social and political salvation of Mexico in the establishment of a true nationality.

In his fifth introductory chapter, Molina gives one of the keenest characterizations of Porfirio Díaz that has ever appeared from any pen: "The secret of the Paz Porfiriana" declares in brief, that Díaz was a political liberal who was able to dominate that group through the policy of "the patriot saving the country"—[a pose not unknown in the United States]. The essence of his administration was a reversion to government of the viceregal form, the construction of a coercive organization, with obligatory, truly military, coöperation from the dependent members of it. The fundamental secret was the concentration of power. Díaz governed with respect for constitutional *form*, but with complete power over the (ostensible) election of governors, the national legislature, and the judiciary, with, of course, a

subservient cabinet. In addition, he had the power of dominion over the various racial elements by the use of personal friendship, which conceded and demanded sacrifices. All his officers were joined to him on the personal basis where patriotism and duty were not understood. Yet Díaz was clever enough not to ask his entourage to cross the social lines in maintaining this political friendship.

Having thus disposed of his background, Molina proceeds to discuss, in Part II., the "Problems of prime importance", these being those of property, land credits, irrigation, colonization, and politics, each being discussed in a chapter in the order named.

Chapter I. is really a study of the problem of titulation and transfer of property. The question is highly complicated in Mexico, as compared with the United States for instance, by the fact that Mexico is populated by people with all grades of conscious attitude toward property save the highest one, namely that of land credits with fiduciary titles. The most advanced form of territorial right in Mexico is that of *propiedad efectiva*, and the most advanced social elements are in the same stage. The social groups, which have varying types of possessorship, are: the landed creoles, the new creoles (those who are post-*Reforma*), some *mestizos*, the native farmers with titled property, groups in communal possession with individual ownership, those in possession as a group, those with communal but indefinite occupation of land, movable sedentaries, and nomads.

The chief problem studied by the author is that of subdivision of the great estates in individual holdings. The economic inutility of these large holdings is due to a number of facts peculiar to the land problem in Mexico. There, great individual holdings, in spite of the laws, always constitute real amortization. All the great *haciendas* of the central valley lie in the plains, while the rustic population is perched upon the hills where there is no vegetation other than that arising from cultivation. The *haciendas* are of the huge size to which the American imagination has been accommodated by many English works on Mexico. What is worse, they remain half tilled and in the same hands for centuries. The owners prefer ruin rather than subdivision of their estates, which they hold together in the spirit of domination. Within their holdings they exercise the absolute dominion of feudal lords. They enrich themselves by the toil of the unhappy laborer; they gradually take possession of the communal lands of the *comunidades*, and later brazenly claim proprietorship. This has brought about deep-seated hatred and endless litigation between towns and *hacendados*.

The ownership of an *hacienda* is not a business; the investment of capital in great tracts of land is not profitable. The owners seek a fixed income from their estates, endeavoring to make income and expenses actually meet. If the ratio can be maintained the *hacendado* is content; if not, he strives, not to increase production, but to assure it, seeking not volume of returns but regularity. Hence he sows only wellknown seeds, under irrigation, rather than venture new crops. For this reason production from the *haciendas* is less than from the *rancherías*. The truly typical agriculturist of Mexico is the *ranchero*, not the *hacendado*. The latter establishes his fixed income, turns his estate over to an administrator, and travels in Europe or dallies at his club. He might increase production by developing irrigation if he would take from his income to finance the work, or he might improve his product otherwise by similar investment, but he will not; he can, then, make his *hacienda go* only by arranging credits, thus exposing himself to loss if his foresight is bad.

Desire for fixed income has led the *hacendados* in the cereal zone (the populous central plateau) to cultivate the *maquey*, which causes a wider dissemination of the *pulque* habit and reduces the area devoted to raising foodstuffs. Entire *haciendas* are given up to this crop, which costs little to put in, suffers little from pests, and yields a large income. Even so, if there is weakness of production it is compensated for by extension, while expenses and liabilities are reduced. Reduction of area cultivated is, paradoxically, accompanied by extension of area held, as of a forest or an irrigable tract taken by force of persecution from a neighboring *ranchito* rather than by intensification of cultivation or adaptation of crops on the original area. Again, if for lack of any natural resource, an estate is mortgaged, it is rarely freed of the incumbrance.

Reduction of expenses is effected by refusal to introduce standard machinery, by grinding wages, or by evasion of taxes, which has become notorious. The disproportion in taxes paid by large and small holdings is one of the greatest evils of the land problem. Peonage for the purpose of holding labor on the *haciendas* has become an acute social menace. Restriction caused by spread of the *haciendas* often leaves native villages without roads whereby to communicate with each other. Large estates often make no contributions to the upkeep of such public roads as do exist, using their own roads by preference.

Amortization of property, which is most aggravated in the great cereal belt, can be remedied by obliging owners to let lands on long

leases. A prime difficulty is lack of a thrifty middle class to constitute a successful tenantry. Voluntary definite subdivision, were it possible, would meet the same difficulty, and lands subdivided would be absorbed by Americans and creoles.

In handling this problem, four considerations must be borne in mind: reduction of great holdings should be restricted to the cereal zone; it should be accomplished by first equalizing all property under taxation; laws compelling subdivision should be state laws and not federal, as they are of local and special application. It is also to be remembered that violation of private property is relative and not absolute, and may have a more important social than individual significance. "In other words, any restriction of private property which aids the formation of our nationality, at the same time not smothering private property, must be constitutional and legitimate. Last, this reform must move slowly, and under a system of laws whereby the *hacendado* will be compelled to subdivide".

Small holdings in Mexico also constitute a problem. They have been created by absorption from the town councils, the religious corporations, and the native communal towns under the Circular of October 9, 1856. These holdings must be enlarged, and the *mestizos* have already begun to do this by absorbing land from the Indians, but these holdings, transferred without title, are liable at any time to be declared *terrenos baldios* (government lands) and so subject to redistribution by the government.

These small properties are at present considered as having been transferred by adjudication, and are subject to a small *censo* or annual "rent." It should be declared that the transfer concedes full ownership, requiring no future redemptions, and that no more communal *rancherías* shall be divided, for this has kept on in spite of Article 27 of the Constitution (of 1857).

In his discussion of communal properties, the author points out that in Spanish times all native holdings were treated on an equality which gave the Indians opportunity to defend their property rights against the Spaniards. Towns already existing had their rights tacitly acknowledged or covered by *mercedes*. Always the natives were thought of as a totality, never as individuals. This condition persisted until, under the laws of disamortization (which considered property in all Indian towns as of uniform status) many Indians were dispossessed fraudulently. Some of them sold their lands for ridiculously small sums and were left in misery. As a result, whenever there is sub-

division of the lands of a native town there is always an uprising. To remedy this, the author would recognize by law the various grades of communal ownership, granting titles to each tract according to its status, and gradually raising the conception of property to that of individual titled holdings. "All this classification and formation of individual possession would be very difficult; it should be made, not on general principles, but by precise enumeration of the communities to be considered in each state. The process would take long compared to a human life, but a short time as compared to the life of a nation".

The chapter on the forestry problem shades into the general thesis of means to social betterment in the following words: "We need the [creation of a bourgeoisie by depriving the clergy and great landlords of their great estates] and it will be done by the specific means which we indicate *or by a revolution which must come sooner or later*. . . . Pauperism is the leprosy which is killing us, and if we do not wish that Mexico should have an end like that of Poland it is essential that it should cease to be an Ireland" (p. 124).

In his chapter on the problem of the population, Molina touches the quick of the social dilemma which confronts Mexico. He faces the question from three points of view successively, they being, first, that of geographical distribution, second, that of the composition of the social structure, and, third, that of the sociological or collective unity. Following them in the order named, we learn that the wheat zone of the central plateau, where the crop requires abundant rains, is the fundamental zone for population and agricultural production. From it the currents of population send the excess to the various points of the Republic. From Mexico to Vera Cruz go frequent groups of *enganchados* (laborers under contract). Yucatan has a commerce in men from the central zone which is as great as the old commerce in negroes. The inhabitants of the center abound in all the mining regions. The sparsity of population in the several regions is then discussed, and it is shown that there is not likely to be movement from the outside toward the center because of the superior supply there already. Outside of the cereal zone the establishment of any new enterprise will always be contingent upon the labor supply, which is scarce.

There is a constant flux and reflux of the population due to unequal food production. This movement should be left unhampered. It is interfered with where labor is under restriction of real or implied contract, as in the case of the *enganchados* or the *peones acasillados*.

Remedies needed are prohibition in labor contracts of hereditary transmission of debt, prohibition of labor contracts of more than a month's duration, of any advance payment of wages, of corporation stores (*tiendas de raya*) or any other discount on wages whatsoever; second, there should be prohibition of the *enganche*; third, the laws should give laborers equal civic status throughout the entire Republic.

From the viewpoint of its social construction Molina's study of the population is even more interesting. When the Spaniards came, the natives, just beginning to form an integral group, came into disastrous conflict with the higher social type; this created a peculiar social construction which lasted three centuries. Independence, fruit of the attrition of the centuries, was at the expense of the superimposed Spaniards, and left the creole and *mestizo* elements superimposed upon the native population. Then immigration brought a new creole group, to which were added the North Americans, who retain their solidarity and isolation. Hence there is stratification, even caste, mitigated somewhat by republican *forms* of government. The strata occur in the following order: North Americans, then Europeans (both of whom the author admires and hopes to see incorporated into the nation) who are especially protected by Mexican law; then the new creoles, the landed creoles, and the creole clergy; below are the *mestizos*, dividing into the directing or old revolutionary group, the professional people, and employees of the government; in the descending congeries come the army, the upper workingmen, the small individual proprietor group, and the *rancheros*. The author gives an interesting history and description of each of these groups. Below them yet come the natives, divided into lower clergy, soldiers, lower workmen, communal proprietors, and day-laborers. This stratification, which seems incredible at least as a social consciousness, gives five laboring classes which support the economic weight of twelve privileged ones. Still there is lacking a pure middle class, which must be produced by subdivision of the large estates and other measures. The burden of the unproductive classes has encouraged the emigration of laborers, adding further inequality.

Other dire consequences of this aggroupment are the narrowing of national riches in a few hands, the conservation of large properties to the prejudice of unskilled labor, the oppression of the *mestizo* agricultural group. From the total of these sequent conditions comes low purchasing power, which reacts unhappily upon the available market for national manufactures; hence the economic crisis is chronic and progressive.

The economic remedy proposed by the creoles, European immigration, is *puro un absurdo*, being indeed only a manifestation of the influence of consanguinity. Foreigners could not sustain life in competition with the Mexican standard, hence their colonies would be doomed to failure. Only the tropical variety of agriculture is highly profitable, and it everywhere depends, as witness the Yucatan henequin industry, upon native labor. The native and *mestizo* elements, the one capable of the greatest endurance and the other showing the greatest relative strength, excel in respect to their incomparable adaptability to their habitat, especially in their power to sustain life on corn and to live in the open. They will, then, dominate the country, the *mestizos* will absorb the creoles and foreigners, and, in the inevitable conflict with the North Americans, will emerge victorious because of the qualities named above. The latter race, even now obliged to depend upon imported labor, will not be able to conquer the Mexicans economically at least. The native population will in time be increased by the artificial extension of the agricultural zone northward. This can be assisted by breaking up the stratification of society, giving each group greater freedom. Within fifty years the population will have grown to fifty millions. Then, the present "Manifest Destiny" of American absorption will have disappeared.

In his final chapter, on the political problem, the author reaches some interesting conclusions. Three essential circumstances characterize Mexico's interior policy: first, from the ethnic struggle the *mestizos* have emerged triumphant; second, the struggle has compelled the country to adopt the dictatorial government as the only stable one; third, the dictator must have a special training and character. With its *mestizo* basis, the country does not need immigration. It does need to develop an *alma nacional*, having, unfortunately, only the scanty materials of common language and religion to work on, and even these are lacking as between the various tribes of indigenes. In politics the creole, clinging to control by his ethnic group, will always be a menace; but the *mestizos* show the only real group solidarity, being united by origin, language, religion, physical type, and aspiration. The creoles will not submit without a fight, and, in a pinch, may appeal to the United States for intervention as their last hope of domination.

Foreign relations also make the danger of intervention grave. Hence the power of the creoles must be broken without at the same time injuring the foreigners, who all work upon Mexico through the agency

of the United States. In a word, the *mestizos* must supplant the creoles in their close relations with foreign interests. This interesting experiment the author proposes to attempt by effecting a foreign loan for the purpose of developing *mestizo* agricultural activities.

Foreign relations are, of course, affected by proximity to the United States. As to the Monroe Doctrine Mexicans must, as did Díaz, conform, but with insistence upon its operation through international action. With respect to Japan, Mexico must stand with the United States on the problem of Japanese aggression. In general, Mexico's relative weakness as compared with the United States requires a delicate policy of excessive acquiescence, a difficult attitude due to the many private interests involved. Mexicans are obliged to suffer indignities both national and individual from North Americans, which they must learn to eliminate. The question is whether the United States will permit the development of Mexico until it shall arrive at a political, moral, and social strength in which the aggressiveness of America will no longer be suffered. The national spirit of justice of the United States was expressed on March 23, 1871, by Mr. Sumner, who said that a nation should not do anything that it did not want done to itself. Whenever America has intervened it has been with the purpose of doing good, hence that country will not oppose Mexican development, will not, in likelihood, disturb an internal movement, even revolutionary, within Mexico. This may be better assured by uniting the American and the *mestizo* interests; thus United States capitalists would have no cause for complaint and the government no cause for intervention. Can it be that Sr. Molina had in 1909 such prescience of coming events?

The book by Esteban Maqueo Castellanos, *Algunos Problemas Nacionales* (Mexico, 1909) takes up discussion of "The Yankee Peril" and "Problems of the Political Future." The author is now a political exile in the United States; he says that he wrote "with a sense of obligation to Porfirio Díaz for the grandeur which he brought to Mexico" (Prelude).

In the first essay, writing ten years ago, Maqueo Castellanos felt that while the imperialism of the United States is destined to be the Moloch of Hispanic Americans, the real danger lies more among them than with North Americans. This is, of course, by way of saying that if the southern nations conduct themselves according to the standards of right political life they will have opportunity to develop nationality and sovereignty; but if they do not, the result will be

quite otherwise. The author derived a great deal of comfort from discussion of the internal problems which he expected would prevent the United States from advancing along the path of trailing glory toward universal hegemony of the continent. Many of these problems were in the minds of every one in 1909, and now make interesting reminiscent reading. There was to come a war for domination of the Pacific or against Japan, or against Mexico. In these or any of them the United States would not be warmly united; sectional interests would prevent. In war with Mexico, strong support would come from the border states, which would find in extension to the south an opportunity to constitute for themselves a new republic, with elements *sui generis* braver and more energetic than those of the northern republic. The most hopeful sign was the lack of solidarity which characterizes the United States, due to widely diverse types of immigrants. The negro question also presents its menace of caste war. And yet, with this wideness of the mark, Maqueo Castellanos showed more appreciation of our potential problems than do most Americans of Mexico's difficulties.

I must, even at cost of too much space, include his characterization of the Americans in Mexico (before the orders to leave the country were issued by the American government): There are, says the author, annually invested in Mexico by Americans about fifty million dollars; the American population increases annually by about three or four thousand. Some six to eight hundred millions of American money are invested in the country; the American colony may be as high as sixty thousand. This immigration is dangerous, because it represents a rapid absorption which may fuse Mexican nationality with American through disappearance of economic and political autonomy. But the reality is far from the appearance, for thirty per cent of this American money becomes nationalized, as does English and Canadian capital. But there is a kind of American investment which is here as a loan, and is not stable; it might, under a difficult situation, work harm to Mexican interests.

The American population which comes to make itself permanent is one-third composed of sane and judicious elements, well-educated men of enterprise, who have a proper conception of equity and justice, and are adaptable to environment. They know Mexico well, appreciate its institutions, follow its development, and analyze its history as a forerunner of the future. The American colony . . . grows affectionate toward the country, likes to be here, and furnishes a most estimable contingent.

This type of American proceeds ordinarily from the center or north of the United States, and is not a possible enemy but a good friend. It forms an important and intellectual part of the American group. It finds here the same liberties as at home. It considers our laws good enough. It never speaks of war, annexation, or imperialism with reference to Mexico. It forms, in a word, the most interesting part of the American colony for our country.

The second one-third is formed of that group of Americans who come to Mexico looking for work, to struggle for a future, for a better economic situation than they enjoyed in the States. They are modest in means and education, good Yankees, strong enough for rude tasks, or, sometimes, persons who are anxious to dress in style. These people have no proper judgment of the environment into which they come; they know our institutions very little, study us not at all, and have no propensity to become amalgamated with us. They neither hate us nor like us. For them a Mexican is always an intellectual, social, and political inferior. They come especially from the northwest and the southwest of the United States. They may be an enemy to us; they will not be our defenders. Imperialism is a good thing for them, and if intervention comes they will be glad to see the frontier line carried down to the Suchiate. This group, which grows more like ourselves in time, is yet happy to follow the first group of Americans, considering them the distinguished ones and having a sort of snobbish desire to be associated with them.

The other one-third is our irreconcilable enemy. It is composed for the greater part of people driven from the United States by labor competition which they have not been able to meet. They have fled their country in order not to be restrained by law when they do not wish to obey the foreman of the shop nor observe the standards of the employees of the railroads. In their own country they are hostile to order; here, any authority exercised over them they consider an affront and make complaints to the consuls and ambassadors which those officials fortunately know how to estimate. A standing percentage of these immigrants have accounts with justice to settle in their own country. Many are fortune hunters. They will never dominate a situation, however difficult, though they are so undesirable.

The real danger is not from America, but from Mexico. If Mexico has a right to national life because its people know how to preserve internal peace, foment progress, increase riches, and work quietly for their own evolution, they will have nothing to fear from the Americans,

who, though strong to the point of arrogance, swelled with their triumphs, proud, haughty, potent, are, in spite of all, a brother people which knows and weighs justice and has respect for other American peoples. In union with the United States the Mexicans will move toward accomplishment of the prophecy of the immortal Frenchman who said that the future of humanity is in America.

If on the contrary we renew our revolutionary past tomorrow, if we forget in our political vertigo the road along which peoples move to enjoy the respect and consideration of others . . . if we prefer violence to prudence in interior and exterior political life, then it will not be the Yankee peril that shall wipe our country off the catalogue of the life of nations, but it will be ourselves—the Mexicans—unworthy of the right of possessing nationality.

Whether or not the foregoing works were inspired by the famous Creelman interview with General Díaz in 1908 or not it may not be possible to decide. It is true, nevertheless, that that interview is considered by many students of Mexico as the proximate point of departure of the existing social unrest in that country. Certainly the event was followed by a resurgent political activity which boded well for the nation during its earliest days, before the lines had been so sharply and bitterly drawn between the opposing schools of thought. It will be remembered that the essential points of the Creelman interview were in the statement of Díaz that he intended to decline to be a candidate to succeed himself in 1910, that he considered the Mexican people now capable of exercising the franchise, and hence that he felt willing to permit the organization of political parties and the nomination of candidates for the presidency not sponsored by himself. The direct statement was made that election by the government was not to be demanded. Señor Don Querido Moheno, then a member of the Científico group, and afterward in charge of the portfolio of Foreign Relations in the cabinet of General Huerta, was one of those, and there were many, who took the Díaz pronouncement at its face value; his book *¿Hacia dónde vamos?* (Mexico, 1908) was a pioneer among the Mexican political writings of that period which undertook the dissemination of information calculated to educate the people of Mexico in political responsibility. Querido's book is a sort of citizens' manual or guide to electoral intelligence, intended to assist the country past the political crisis of the proximate disappearance of Díaz from the scene. The need was, during the remainder of the dictator's incumbency, known then to be nearing its natural end, to provide and train

truly political parties and an adequate public opinion. Moheno's attitude may be called that of a conservative, even a moderate, at the time of his writing. "We are not ignorant", he writes, "of the resistance which will naturally oppose attempted reforms, and we hold this opposition justifiable wherever the present fundamental institutions have sprung from an historical evolution. But in Mexico, where Federalism, universal suffrage, and restriction of the jury are the product of rigid, abstract reasoning . . . where institutions do not interpret the spirit of the race, but have been imposed thoughtlessly or viciously, and our organs have not become a part of us, it is important that no new institutions should be established arbitrarily, but that those should be adopted which are best suited to our social structure".

In another place, the author says that the successor of Díaz is bound to fail if he adopts the Díaz methods. Francisco Bulnes is credited with the statement of "an historical law" to the effect that when an excellent personal government is followed by another excellent government also personal, the result is abominable. The successor of Díaz must seek for his basis of action and his strength a free and active public opinion. This is yet non-existent, and it is the duty of Mexicans to create it.

Moheno's book is of course largely occupied by the political questions regnant at the time of his writing, such as the proposed revival of the vice-presidency for the purpose of grooming a successor to Díaz [a dilemma which any dictatorial government encounters at the end of the natural term of the usurper, and which Mexico has not yet successfully met, wherein the state is subjected to the imminent risk, almost the certainty, of anarchy upon each occasion when it becomes necessary to transmit political power].

Concerning the suffrage, the author says plainly that it does not work; it was and is a farce which deceives no one. To the children of Mexico, now grown, election day used to mean a day upon which they might not go out of doors, for sad experience had taught the women that election day was a day of imprisonment, shooting, beating, and all kinds of brutality; particularly did the authorities commit affronts which left the town in a spirit of rancor. Even at the date of the writing of this book election was still under the complete control of the authorities, who tabulated the returns before the event. Hence elections are characterized by an unanimity impossible in the United States, where election signifies the free expression of choice by a majority.

Discussing the Constitution of 1857, Moheno says that Hispanic Americans, lacking real political traditions, are by that token the more inclined to try novelties; so, whenever a reform is projected the most recent advance is adopted for the purpose of arriving once and for all at the highest grade of perfection, intervening steps of the evolution of political ideas being entirely omitted. No doubt the author would be emphatic in saying that some such ideal has guided the adoption by his political opponents of the present Constitution.

Passing to an interesting discussion of plans for education in citizenship, the author enters an instructive study of electoral law and practice in Mexico, showing how the constitution and the law have been mutilated. True salvation for the existing situation will come by creating government by public opinion upon the basis of proper national institutions. That is to say, Mexico is a backward nation and her institutions must not be based upon foreign forms merely because these have been successful elsewhere. True democracy is to be achieved through education. Díaz won his success by destroying liberty of the press, of the courts, the sovereignty of the states, the independence of the branches of the government, and all constitutional checks—"all the apparatus of golden illusion which furnished the dream of democracy".

The right of suffrage must be limited before election can be essentially valuable. The illiterate must be disfranchised. To do this will be to create a state within a state, leaving acquisition of franchise to the process of education, so that no group shall be permanently eliminated. Asking, finally, whether Mexico has the proper materials for an attempt at democracy, Moheno concludes in the affirmative.

One would like to spread upon the records something of a complete notice of that delicious intransigent Juan Pedro Didapp, a Mexican of Oriental extraction, of the stuff of which our oriental fatalists and cosmopolites are made. Throughout his early career he busied himself with dealing resounding whacks upon all phases of the Díaz régime. One of the earliest of his works was *Explotadores Políticos de Mexico: Bulnes y el Partido Científico ante el Derecho Ageno* (Mexico, 1904). This is a philippic against the Científicos, more particularly Francisco Bulnes, whom he calls the medium through which they exploit their ideas; this is the viewpoint from which the problems are attacked, including those of a long and vigorous chapter on the Mexican railways.

Space forbids mention of all save one other of this writer's works. His last one was *Los Estados Unidos y nuestros Conflictos Internos*

(Mexico, 1913). Here again the author continues his uncompromising attitude toward the Científicos. On his main theme, he notes that three times has the attention of the United States been fixed upon Mexico, at Independence, at the French Intervention, and during the recent revolution. During each epoch the same element, called Clerical under Spain, Conservative under the Empire, and Científico under Díaz, has sown hatred for the blonde people of the north. Their enemies, who do not, nevertheless, join the liberals, are atheistic and anti-American. The United States has a serious interest in the Mexican serio-comedy, for foreigners hold that country responsible for it. The United States is the custodian of the rights of man upon this hemisphere, hence the Monroe Doctrine is logical. The United States understands its position perfectly; we Mexicans, a weak nation and race, are in a period of political tutelage. We have no international honor; we think that he who owes and does not pay does well.

The Americans would prefer that the Hispanic countries remain free, for thus they become most useful; but the United States will not remain quiet if European influence becomes prominent in Mexico.

The United States was frankly glad to get rid of Díaz; the revolt against him, avers the author, was planned in the American Department of State! The United States has always had secret agents in Mexico since Díaz began. . . . Not without dignity, our international problems for thirty-five years were handled first in the United States embassy at Mexico. The diplomatic representatives of Mexico abroad were less valuable than those at home. The war which broke out in 1910 was begun and sustained by American capitalists, with the full consent of Secretary Knox and President Taft. The American press and people all sympathized with Madero, and Mexican diplomacy was unable to forestall any of this.

Didapp played no favorites, and was as severe upon Madero and Zapata as upon Díaz; it is not unlikely that his attitude was due to his adhesion to the ultra-Socialistic faction. He was not liked any better by the *huertistas* than by the earlier governing groups. In 1913 he was held in jail at El Paso for violation of the neutrality laws, in company with Pascual Orozco and J. Córdova. It has been said that after his release he made his way into Mexico, where, like Enrique Gutiérrez de Lara, he was killed.

The American public was, a few years ago, made familiar with social and agricultural labor conditions by a book written by John Kenneth Turner, *Barbarous Mexico*, which was hotly discussed in both

republics. It portrayed an almost unbelievable situation among the submerged laborers. It is not the purpose of this article to go into the literature in English on Mexico; rather will it be pertinent to show what has been said by Mexicans on the questions of labor conditions. In 1906 an Agricultural Congress was held in the Diocese of Tulancingo, and some of its proceedings were printed in the *Boletín de la Secretaría de Fomento, Numero especial de Propaganda*, July, 1906. In particular, a discourse was delivered by Señor Trinidad Sánchez Santos which merits some attention as showing why a Mexican peón would as lief join an incipient rebellion as stay at "home" and work. The speaker said:

The national problem of Mexico is due to two extreme situations. On the border is the alluring civilization . . . the supreme strength, of the United States. In the center three fourths of our population, the agricultural population, is in moral, economic, and physiological misery . . . In the center is . . . a silent barbarity lying over an imprisoned spirit which asks nothing of light; a surrendered right which asks nothing of happiness, a weakened constitution which asks nothing but a drink of alcohol; a pile of rags which asks nothing of wealth . . . a home without rights, an unhappy wife, a nominal sense of country, slavery—at the price of one or two hundred pesos; a race which smiles negatively at civilization, at legitimate pleasure, at the high destiny of man, with the same smile with which a death's head seems to smile at life . . . The only solution . . . is to increase and ennoble production . . . by civilizing the laborer and enriching the land. Make him a true Christian and citizen; educate him, elevate him, remunerate him.

Some revelations have been made as to the family life of the day laborer of whom we are speaking. Actually, such a family does not exist . . . hence the great mass of the people does not constitute a society, but . . . a horde. This rural proletariat, fleeing from legal marriage, gives itself up to debauchery characterized by desertion. . . . The man deserts the woman soon, and moves to another estate to seduce another. . . . The mother, abandoned . . . has no other recourse but iniquitous exploitation of her starving little ones, to ruin with brutalizing work those living wrecks . . . which bear all the miseries of alcoholism. . . . If she accepts another lover . . . he treats the children of the former with terrible cruelty. . . . Is this family life? Is this . . . the "strength of the country?"

. . . The regional school proposed [for rural education] will remain empty as long as the father earns twenty-five *centavos*, as long as these same twenty-five *centavos* are controlled by the *tienda de raya*, as long as the *tienda* is controlled by the owner, the merchant, and by the public treasury; as long as the father is not able to support his children and obliges them . . . to support themselves . . . I do not see how the child can go to school before or during or after fourteen hours of work in the sun, or without eating. . . . If the family does not exist among the *jornaleros* the first thing that we must do is to create it in order that from it may develop the home and out of the home the school.

The Congress considered measures to combat alcoholism, to provide recreation, instruction, written labor contracts, and other benefits for the rural population. Debauchery and infant mortality (the latter said to reach 75 per cent) were partially met by proposals to facilitate marriage, vaccination, and other sanitary and social measures. With our present information one can only surmise what may have been the results of this and other congresses during the intervening thirteen years.

In 1912-13-14, Antenor Salas issued in Mexico a series of pamphlets under the title *El Problema Agrario en la Republica Mexicana*. The essential demands made in this series of pamphlets are for the passage of laws providing for equal taxation of small and large holdings; for subdivision of great estates to provide lands for small colonists; for actual military enlistments of young men to serve as soldier-colonists under rigid discipline. He argues that the State must put itself on the side of the proletariat pictured above by Sánchez Santos. He justifies the expropriation of large estates upon the ground of the larger social right as against the individual—the right of eminent social domain, if we may coin a pseudo-legal term. In furtherance of this aim the governing classes must make laws by which they will remove themselves from power to exploit the humble classes. He proposes legislation along the lines of the American and English homestead laws for the purpose.

Zeferino Domínguez, in *The Trouble in Mexico and its only Solution* (San Antonio, 1914), attacks these problems by describing what he has done in a practical way for rural Mexicans. He has had interesting and valuable experiences with the proletariat in the State of Texas where he has done much to better the condition of the rural poor.

Three works of more than ordinary interest are by an author said to have been imprisoned during the Díaz régime, liberated by Madero, and now, or at latest account, employed as a fiscal expert by the Constitutionalist government. This is Antonio Manero, author of *El Antiguo Régimen y la Revolución* (Mexico, 1911), *Cartas Políticas* (Mexico, 1913), and *¿Qué es la Revolución?* (Mexico, 1915). Of these, the first is the most important, whatever one's sympathies may be with the various opinions offered. In it the author presents three chapters which are, curiously enough, with the same identical titles as those of Pablo Macedo's well-known *Tres Monografías*, namely: "Evolución mercantil", "Comunicaciones y obras públicas", and "La hacienda pública". In them Manero ignores the colonial epoch, treated

understandingly by Macedo. The remaining fourteen chapters are largely historical, with a dispassionate interpretation. It may be summed up in the assertion (p. 410) that "the only true democratic party in Mexico was the Científico party of 1892. . . . The path which the Madero revolution marked out is not the path of democracy but the path of demagogy, which always leads to the yoke, either of conquest or of dictatorship".

In the *Cartas políticas*, Manero discourses on a variety of topics; in the main, in his attitude on property and poverty he follows Molina Enríquez closely. The sixth and last *Carta* is a criticism of Francisco I. Madero's *La Sucesión Presidencial en 1910* (Mexico, 1910), which raised the battle-cry upon which Madero whirled Mexico into the vortex of revolution that nearly ruined it forever. Here Manero argues against Madero's thesis that the ills of Mexico are due to militarism, for the Díaz régime was autocratic, but civil rather than military. The situation of the country is due rather to bad legislation and to the disparity between the political and the social constitutions.

In *¿Qué es la Revolución?* Manero again deals with property as did Molina Enríquez. Other subjects discussed are justice, banking conditions, legislation, and public education, their condition being adjudged causes of the revolution.

Rafael Martínez, Carlos M. Samper, and José P. Lomelín were joint authors of *La Revolución y sus Hombres* (Mexico, 1912). It is an appreciation of the Madero movement, rather philosophical but not sufficiently discriminating to be of much value. A number of revolutionary *planes* and *pronunciamientos* add value to the appendices.

Fortunato Hernández, author of *Las Razas Indígenas de Sonora y la Guerra del Yaqui* (Mexico, 1902), *Un Pueblo, un Siglo, y un Hombre*, (Mexico, 1909), and *Mas allá del Desastre* (Mexico, 1913) was a *felicista*. In *Mas allá del Desastre* he opens the fray with a high-strung appeal to Mexicans to beware lest, while they fight each other, intervention swoop down upon them. Madero he characterizes as "an unhappy degenerate with maniacal extravagances". His propaganda was not however, so much to blame for the revolution as [and here the author touches the quick of the sore as few Mexican writers do] were the selfish educated Mexicans who have been indifferent to the illiterate class, neglecting ten millions who cannot read, till they have become the tools of the demagogues. The danger of an uprising is real, and if we would conjure it we must give land, bread, justice, and education to ten millions. Our patriotism must make teachers of us unless we want to see the Yankees come, to teach English to our Indians.

Hernández's third essay in this book, "El pulpo blanco"—the white octopus, has an introduction by Manuel Ugarte of Argentina the well-known anti North Americanist and author of *El Porvenir de la América Latina*. Hernández admires the book by F. Carrera Justis, *Orientaciones Necesarias—Cuba y Panama*, (Habana, 1911), which ascribes to the United States the origin of three revolutions and three protectorates, those of Panama, Cuba, and—Mexico next. The revolution beginning in 1910 was, says Hernández, developed and fomented in the United States, provided with American munitions and money, and assisted by an illusory American neutrality and stupid Mexican diplomats. This author is one of the few who speak well of the government of Victoriano Huerta, calling that unhappy man a courageous, sagacious, and patriotic soldier, all of which is doubtless true without adding much to his luster as executive of the nation.

Ramón Guzmán, who wrote *El Internacionalismo de Mr. Wilson en Mexico* (New Orleans, 1915), did so in the generous spirit of one who is not a Mexican but desires to set our president right in his idealistic attitude toward the Carranza government. The author shows to his own satisfaction that everything done by President Wilson for Mexico was wrong. This is also the burden of the paper by Manuel Calero y Sierra, former Científico now residing in New York, which is a categorical condemnation of *The Mexican Policy of President Woodrow Wilson as it appears to a Mexican* (New York, 1916).

From the opposite political angle, comes José Rodríguez del Castillo with his *Historia de la Revolución de México. Primera Etapa, la Caída del General Díaz* (Mexico, 1915). The author shows how Díaz, failing to lend an ear to prophecy, let Limantour become his *alter ego* in government, how the centenary of Mexican independence was a demonstration on the part of aristocratic Mexico, while no one gave a thought to the aspirations, hardly to the existence, of the common people; how the dictatorship began and grew; how the Científico party acquired a strangle-hold on business and on the president, and other phases of the pre-revolutionary period. In Book II., Rodríguez shows, in "The rottenness of the dictatorship", the political machine at work as only a Mexican conversant with political life could, or being a member of the "opposition", would.

First he pays his compliments to the Congress of the Union, saying that every session save that of 1877 was servile. To be elected to the body required only the vote of Díaz. Members who proved restless were eliminated or met civil death. The senate was always full of

"lame ducks"—septuagenarians who called themselves "boys" and carefully registered the will of the Executive.

The Chamber of Deputies had a peculiar organization. First came the members of the "royal family", a dozen of whom the author names. Then the sons of old war companions of the chief, also named. Then the sons-in-law, who had married daughters of government officials. Then came the *niños finos* who through family influence followed in the wake of Doña Carmelita (the Señora de Díaz). Of course such a body could be only reactionary and subservient; parliamentary opposition after 1884 was unknown. The author details a number of the farcical activities of the Congress.

Concerning the Supreme Court, a yarn was once brought to Díaz that Iñigo Noriega had said that it only did the president's bidding. The old warrior answered bitterly: "The evil is not in the fact that he says this, but in that it is the truth" (p. 99). The court was always the subject of attack. Justo Sierra made in 1892 his famous statement, "The people are hungering and thirsting for justice" (p. 100). The process of *amparo* lost power as a personal guarantee. The personnel of the court steadily declined. No jurisprudence was built up because there were no consistent decisions, no uniformity, no interest or responsibility felt by the members, whose decisions were made in advance for them.

The cabinet officers, with notable exceptions such as Romero Rubio, Baranda, and Limantour, were subservient and incompetent. Mexico was as a consequence always subordinated to the White House. Worse still was the preferential treatment of the Yankees in everything. Concessions were showered upon them with largesse.

After indicating a dozen or more of the state governors who showed the worst characteristics of the Díaz policies, with more evident weaknesses, Rodríguez passes to the lesser luminaries, the notorious *jefes políticos* who have, since the Carranza party came into power, been eliminated in name. In chapter 5, "The lowest tyrants," he says:

A *jefe político* in the time of Porfirio had the political and administrative direction of the district, the care and direction of the *ayuntamientos*, the command of the forces of safety and police, the immediate care of all public municipal utilities, the prisons, public charities, collection of taxes, the execution of all the material works in the district, power over electoral frauds in all stages, the control of the judicial authorities . . . the pursuit of all bandits, taking the census, gathering statistics, meteorological observations, the preservation of bridges, roads, and highways of the district, the whole local machinery in fact, and the organization and control of festivals to receive the governor whenever he came. . . .

The governors named their *jefes políticos*, made them personally responsible for all that passed in their districts, conceding them extraordinary faculties, the transaction of business being facilitated by the telephone. The *jefe politico* was the dispenser of favors to the *hacendados*, who were under the obligation to praise him to the governor. This was reciprocity. The *jefe* had the use of horses from one place, carriages from another, corn, milk, pulque, wood, etc., from other ranches, with chickens, eggs, and rabbits from everywhere. . . . Through the *jefe* went the voluntary contributions of the *hacendados* to the central government, being considerably diminished in transit.

In his turn the *jefe* reciprocated. If the pet son of the *hacienda* had violated a poor Indian girl, if the administrator shot a *mediero*, or if *peones* were lacking, all was taken care of by the *jefe politico*. The pet son might do whatever he pleased, the *peón* was to blame for the blow that struck him down, or the *mediero* who was shot was a fraud. *Peones* who did not want to work must be off to some *hacienda* for two *reales* a day or else into the army. . . . Whole towns were sometimes taken in the levy and poor families left orphaned and in misery because of disobedience to the *jefe*.

Carlos Trejo Lerdo de Tejada, in *La Revolución y el Nacionalismo* (Havana, 1916) seeks to draw from the revolution lessons which will help develop the national spirit. The author is nephew of Miguel Lerdo de Tejada, and grandson of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada, and held office under both the Díaz and the Madero régimes. He finds, as do several other writers mentioned in this article, a cause of social disturbance in the lack of harmony between the form of society and the written constitution. Few of these writers point out clearly just what they would do to remedy this discrepancy, aside from education. Party government, says Trejo, has not been successful; each party calls its opponents traitors, showing lack of tolerance and respect for the rights of others. Popular election has been affected by formidable clerical influence, which usually decides elections by exerting itself over the Indians, whose submissive psychology is the product of centuries of despotism.

Independence has not changed the real social and political structure of New Spain. Since independence there have been seventy-two governments, nearly all of them *de facto*, and fifty-five of them purely military. Only twelve had legal origin. During ninety-four years Mexico had one hundred revolutions, only three of which have been national in scope and beneficent in character, the Hidalgo-Iturbide, the Tejada-Juárez, and the Madero-Carranza revolutions. *Felicismo*, *reyismo*, and *huertismo* were only movements for personal ambition sustained by legions of mercenaries and imbeciles.

The *Paz Porfiriana* was a parenthesis in revolutionary life which allowed a small advance, but material and not spiritual in character. It changed Mexico's liberal character, won during the *Reforma*, to that of a conservative oligarchy. Mexican politics rotates about two serious errors, first, the belief that personal leaders are the cause of national inequilibrium and that the elimination of persons will bring triumph; second, the inability to see that the *Reforma* had more than a politico-religious aspect. [It would have prevented the great estates which Díaz permitted.] The agrarian question, crux of the *Reforma* and of the present revolution, can be settled regardless of forms of government.

Trejo's program for rehabilitation includes thirteen points, which he hopes to see worked out by the revolution. The first six are directed toward improvement of economic life on the land, on the railroads, and in industry; they concern the labor aspects of the situation. The courts must be purified in order that these changes may come. State socialism will bring about expropriation of land either in proprietorship or usufruct. The proletariat must have its rights to property cared for. Banks must assist small capital, and participation in the wealth of the country must be given to the largest number. Education must reach the lowest citizens, and reach them quickly in order to develop the national spirit which will arrest the active forces of dissolution.

The author finds the arduous domestic problem complicated by the sinister influence of the United States, whose foreign policy he finds based on four postulates, they being: The demand for political and commercial hegemony, the Monroe Doctrine, a tendency to strengthen and solidify the interests of American countries, and, lastly, the "Wilson Doctrine," this latter being the principle that the United States will not, on moral grounds, recognize governments *de facto* or of revolutionary origin. However, he sees that revolution has been the only means for political renovation in Hispanic America, so he doubts whether this policy can be maintained.

Manuel Gamio, the distinguished archaeologist, whom Mr. Means mentioned in his "Andean Society"¹ as "the founder of race appreciation in Mexico," wrote *Forjando Patria* (which might be translated *Forging a fatherland*) published in Mexico, 1916. The work has for its main thesis the uplift of the masses as the basis of national wellbeing.

¹ See HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, I, no. 4, November 1918.

The unity of the book is marred by the introduction of numerous inappropriate chapters; Señor Gamio is not, as Mr. Means thinks, the "founder" of this attitude of uplift of the lower strata of society in Mexico. The main thesis of this book has been noticed appreciatively by Frederick Starr in *The American Journal of Sociology* for September, 1918.

Andrés González Blanco, said to be a Spaniard, is author of *Un Déspota y un Libertador* (Madrid, 1916). The volume is part of the projected "*Biblioteca Constitucionalista*," which is to consist of some twenty volumes. The *déspota* was of course Don Porfirio, and the *libertador*, Carranza. It has been said that this and other books have been subsidized; it should be remembered that in Mexico there is no regular book business as understood in the United States, and it is furthermore to be assumed that a "*Biblioteca Constitucionalista*" will contain opinions favorable to the party of that name. If these opinions are paid for the work is not necessarily stultified by the fact, but will, of course, not have the weight of independent opinion.

In his *México y Estados Unidos* (Mexico, 1917), Miguel Rebolledo says with reference to the Monroe Doctrine that, in exchange for a protection dictated by the supreme interest of the United States, Hispanic Americans have had to endure an extremely humiliating tutelage. Intervention has had the character of a more or less dissembled protectorate. In the hands of Wilson, the Doctrine can be Mexico's shield; under the Roosevelts and Polks it is a constant threat. Looking about for some other nation to which to turn for an alliance whereby to neutralize the influence of the Octopus, the writer examines each of the great powers in turn, but only to decide that none of them would interest itself; Mexico must "stand alone in her weakness and her right to a free life, face to face with the great power of the North American people" (p. 77).

The author believes that after the European War, when the proletariat has to immigrate to America for relief from its suffering, there will be a union of the poorer classes across international lines. Then the North American proletariat will be Mexico's friend. The American Federation of Labor . . . last year invited Hispanic American workers to make note of American and European capitalists who were acquiring concessions disposed of by Hispanic Americans without attention to popular rights. The Federation asserted that if the capitalists of America were uniting to protect their interests the wage earners must do the same. Mexico, says the author, must accept the

invitation of the Federation as well as any other opportunities of approach to the Americans through pacific associations and literary or intellectual connections.

Rebolledo notes in his appendix that the United States will not tolerate any stabs in the back while engaged in the European War; in this crisis he advises alliance with the Allies and the United States without declaration of war on Germany. "Let us not permit our temporal assistance, imposed by the necessity of the moment, to undergo vassalage, and let us make these people see that our aid is to be conditional, having for its object the conservation of our sovereignty and our absolute, inviolable independence" (p. 162).

One might continue the survey of this literature almost indefinitely, so great is its quantity; the effort would not, however, yield great variety in type beyond those already shown.² In the works noticed cer-

² Among the works of interest concerning revolutionary conditions in Mexico which cannot be included in this survey, may be mentioned the following items not included in this article nor in the list given in the November, 1918, number of this REVIEW.

Aragón, Alfredo: *El desarme del ejército federal por la revolución de 1913*. Paris, Soc. an. des imprimeries Wellhoff et Roche, 1915. Pp. 93.

Brinsmade, Robert Bruce: *El latifundismo mexicano, su origen y su remedio*. Obra que contiene proyectos prácticos para libertar a México o a cualquiera otra nación del azote del monopolio privado. Traducida del inglés por Ignacio Flores Iñiguez. Mexico, Imp. Sría de Fomento, 1916. Pp. 250.

Bustamante, Luis F.: *De el Ebano a Torreón* (colección de reportazgos de guerra). Monterrey, N. L., Tip. El Constitucional, 1915. Pp. 129.

— — — *Perfiles y bocetos revolucionarios*. Mexico, Tip. "El Constitucional," 1917. Pp. 183.

Carranza, Venustiano: *Manifest destiny; excerpts of speeches delivered by General Venustiano Carranza*. N. p., 1916. Pp. 6.

[Chocano, José Santos]: *El conflicto del día* (a propósito de la mediación A. B. C. sud-americano). [El Paso, Texas, Franklin Printing Co., 1914.] Pp. 8.

— — — *Por la raza y por la humanidad; Santos Chocano habla sobre México*. . . . *Las palabras de un muerto*. El Dr. Belisario Domínguez ante la Cámara de Senadores. Puebla, Tip. "Vida Nueva," 1914. Pp. 43.

Colina, F. de la: *Madero y el Gral Díaz*. Mexico, Guerra y Vázquez, 1913. Pp. 159.

Doblado, Manuel: *Mexico para los Mexicanos*. El presidente Huerta y su gobierno. Mexico, A. Enríquez, 1913. Pp. 172.

Fernández Güell, Rogelio: *Episodios de la revolución mexicana*. San José, C. R., Impr. Trejos Hermanos, 1914. Pp. 259.

González, Antonio P.: *La revolución y sus héroes; crónica de los sucesos ocurridos en México desde octubre de 1910 a mayo de 1911*. Mexico, Ortega y Compañía, 1911. Pp. 255.

tain characteristics may be called common. Foremost stands the idea that the United States is regrettably near, obtrusively benevolent, suspiciously capable of the utter absorption of Mexico, but on the whole likely to prove rather decent if the Mexicans can establish order and behave themselves together in political life. They admit that the responsibility is their own. As to internal affairs there is practical unanimity in tracing the difficulty to the condition of the proletariat. The remedies suggested are based upon an attitude which would subordi-

- González Blanco, Andrés: De Porfirio Díaz a Carranza. Conferencias dadas en el Ateneo de Madrid en los meses de marzo y abril de 1916. Madrid, Impr. Heléncia, 1916. Pp. 283.
- González Blanco, Edmundo: Carranza y la revolución de México. Valencia, Promoteo, Soc. Ed., 1914. Pp. 231.
- Gutiérrez de Lara, Lázaro: El pueblo mexicano y sus luchas por la libertad. Los Angeles, n. d. Pp. 399.
- López, Alfonso E.: La revolución de Carranza y Maytorena. El interinato del Gral. Huerta. Mexico, Impr. 1^a Humboldt, núm. 5, 1913. Primera parte.
- Márquez Sterling, Manuel: Los últimos días del presidente Madero (Mi gestión diplomática en México). Habana, Impr. "El Siglo XX," 1917. Pp. 686.
- Martínez, Rafael: La revolución y sus hombres (apuntes para la historia contemporánea). Mexico, Talleres tip. de "El Tiempo", 1912. Pp. 123.
- Martínez Rojas, Jesús: El asesinato oficial del senador Dr. Belisario Domínguez. La disolución de las cámaras federales y el Gral. Victoriano Huerta. Mexico, Impr. de A. Carranza e Hijos, 1914. Pp. 177.
- Melgarejo, Antonio D.: Los crímenes del Zapatismo. (Apuntes de un guerrillero). Mexico, F. P. Rojas y Comp., 1913. Pp. 168.
- Mellado, Guillermo: Tres etapas políticas de Don Venustiano. Campañas del cuerpo de ejército de Oriente. Mexico, n. d. Pp. 359.
- Moheno, Manrique: Partidos políticos. Estudio sobre su viabilidad y naturaleza de sus funciones en la República Mexicana. Mexico, Tip. I. Lara, 1910? Pp. 157.
- Palavicini, Félix F.: Los diputados, lo que se ve y lo que no se ve de la Cámara. Mexico, Tip. "El Faro", 1913. Pp. 590.
- Palabras y acciones. Mexico, 1917. Pp. 277.
- Peust, Otto: Mexico y el problema obrero rural. Mexico, Impr. de la Sría de Fomento, 1911. Pp. 136.
- Ponce de León, Gregorio: El interinato presidencial de 1911, obra escrita . . . sobre la tarea que realizó el señor licenciado Don Francisco León de la Barra como presidente interino de la República. Mexico, Impr. de la Sría de Fomento, 1912. Pp. 290.
- Prida, Ramón: From despotism to anarchy.—Facts and commentaries about the Mexican revolutions at the beginning of the twentieth century. El Paso, Printing Co., 1914. Pp. 263. (Abridged from the Spanish edition.)

nate legally the rights of property to those of persons, to those of the social group rather than to those of the individual owner. The revolutionary literature does, in fact, foreshadow the Constitution of 1917 with remarkable accuracy. As literature, what it lacks in art it makes up for in directness of expression, in clearness of appreciation of the problems involved, in frankness of self-accusation, and in definiteness of program. It voices the cry of an anguished nation which seeks to rise from its unhappy plight to a condition of material prosperity based on the welfare of the masses whose political voice has now been heard for the first time in four hundred years.

HERBERT INGRAM PRIESTLEY.



