

Total number of subscribers for week ending June 19 429,010
Number of new subscribers for week ending June 19 12,823
Number of copies sold for week ending June 19 8,663
Gain for week 4,743
Total Number of Subs for Week Ending June 25 433,773
Total Edition Printed Last Week 485,000

Established Aug. 31, 1895 FIFTY CENTS A YEAR Six Months 25 Cents Clubs of Four or More (40 Weeks) 25 Cents
This is Number 762
Entered at Girard, Kansas, postoffice as second-class mail matter
FRED D. WARREN
Girard, Kansas, U. S. A., July 9, 1910

This paper bears a Yellow Label on which your name is printed. On the same and following your name is a number. If it's 763 your subscription expires with the next issue and YOU SHOULD RENEW AT ONCE.
THE APPEAL EDITORIAL STAFF
J. A. WAYLAND
EUGENE V. DEBS
FRED D. WARREN
CHARLES LINCOLN PHIFER

NO DECISION.

It is now two months to a day since I argued my case before the United States court of appeals at St. Paul. That august tribunal has not yet handed down its decision. It would seem that in two months' time three distinguished jurists could determine the simple question: Is the mailing of a reward for the capture of a man under indictment for murder by the editor of a Socialist paper in exactly the same manner followed by sheriffs, private agencies, anti-horse thief associations, bankers and private individuals every day in the year in the United States, a violation of the federal law. There are no technical points involved in the controversy as these were all waived aside; that there might be no confusing thimble rigging to obscure the issue involved. It has been suggested that perhaps the judges are waiting until after election before handing down their decision. Perhaps so—your guess is as good as the Appeal's on the cause of the delay.

The Fleeing Judge Talks Back.

Judge Phillips, of the federal court of Missouri, not only has resigned under fire, but he has also joined the "Let Us Alone" club, and replied to the Appeal's charges about the Tampico fishing trip.

His reply is a confession. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 26 has a page feature about the judge and the Appeal's criticism of him. He is reported to have said:

They have charged that the railroad-rate cases were discussed on that trip between railroad attorneys and the judges, and they said that a shot was fired during the discussion of these court matters on the private car. As a matter of fact the excursion was a purely social and private affair, innocent of any bearing on court business or politics, and the shot that was fired into the car roof was from a gun which was discharged by accident while one of the party was cleaning it. Yet because a game warden saw a head sticking out of a basket, he started to fire, and the shot which was fired into the car roof was from a gun which was discharged by accident while one of the party was cleaning it. Yet because a game warden saw a head sticking out of a basket, he started to fire, and the shot which was fired into the car roof was from a gun which was discharged by accident while one of the party was cleaning it.

Notice that the judge refers to "that trip," and to "a shot that was fired," and "the game warden who saw a head sticking out of a basket," thus admitting the truth of these features which the Appeal mentioned. But the judge lies with the same felicity with which he receives bribes. The Appeal did not charge, as he said, that the railroad rate cases were discussed on that trip between the railroad attorneys and the judges. What it did say was that Judge Phillips and his associates, Pollock and McPherson, accepted a private car and trip to Tampico, Mexico, while a railroad case was pending in the federal court, and that, on their return, the case was decided in favor of the railroads and against the people of Missouri. It was unnecessary that there should be any discussion of the matter in the car. The acceptance of the transportation was a bribe, and the ruling of the court in the matter was proof that the judges accepted the bribe.

All the Appeal said is true. But even if those slighted—the violation of the game law, the drunkenness and debauchery on the trip, and the firing of a gun by a drink-crazed member of the judicial junket—were set aside, the one essential fact remains that three federal judges accepted the hospitality of a railroad company while a railroad case was pending in a federal court, and that, on their return, the case was decided in favor of the railroads whose debts the judges had, against the people of Missouri. That is the damning fact, and Phillips cannot dare not deny it.

But this is not all the lie that Judge Phillips tells. He told a staff correspondent of the Post-Dispatch:

Eugene V. Debs, speaking at a safe distance from the staid dome of a Kansas City federal building, has been one of the most persistent of my detractors.

As a matter of fact Eugene V. Debs, instead of speaking from a safe distance, was careful to speak in Kansas City, home of the judge, where he made the charges and sent a complimentary ticket with a special invitation to Judge

REPUBLICANS' ATTENTION!

Jeff Davis, democratic senator from Arkansas, over his signature, charges the republican party with responsibility for the existence of the white slave traffic, the organized business in the bodies of women and girls for prostitution. Senator Davis' letter is published in this issue.

Another national legislator claims that Theodore Roosevelt personally suppressed public information upon the subject of the organized traffic in living bodies of the daughters, sisters, wives and sweethearts of republicans as well as democrats.

On December 24, 1909, President Taft, chosen to carry out "my policies," commuted the sentence of Auguste Roussett, a convicted New York white slave.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., the republican foreman of a New York grand jury to investigate the white slave traffic, reports a complete whitewash.

What does this mean? Is it true that your party is the nominal head of the most shameful, the most brutal, the most degrading business in history? The daughters of your political opponents do not suffer alone. Republican homes, too, are invaded for living playthings for the master class. The profit system, in its destruction of womanly chastity, knows no party lines. Your home is not immune. Your daughter may go on the altar tomorrow.

SENATOR DAVIS SAYS THAT YOU AS A REPUBLICAN, VOTED FOR THIS CONDITION. He lays the blame squarely at YOUR door, as a republican voter.

WRITE HIM FOR HIS PROOF!

The Appeal is in receipt of information to the effect that all the talk about Roosevelt not meeting the pope while in Rome is a lie; that he did meet and hold a conference with him. What politics do you suppose, behind all the rot about the meeting having been called off?

WHILE poor criminals go to jail, the rich criminals go to Europe.

The capitalist is a great comedian. He never passes a labor law without a joker attached.

The owners of the machine are wealthy. Why are not the people owners of the machine?

PLUTES do not fear that Socialism will break up the home, but say that, lest it break up their graft.

If the public schools were concentrated into larger units, with suitable buildings where the facilities could be economically employed, to provide at least the midday meal, where the children could not only be given a sumptuous meal, but where they could be taught agreeable table and house manners, the schools would be much more benefit than they are now, and would be so attractive that there would be no need of truancy laws and officers, and it would be a long step toward breaking the petty divisions of wealth and sects, and blend the whole into a more harmonious democracy. This seems to be the goal the Socialists of Milwaukee are striving for, at the earliest date, and it will be the most far-reaching influence that their victory will have on that city's population and the nation. When that day comes, there will be no other schools to divide the people into warring factions. The economic law of self-interest is stronger than any other pull, and when the public schools really fulfill their mission they will put a barrier against any attempt to hold people in mental bondage for the profit that some make out of it. The public schools are the most revolutionary institutions that this country holds. The boys and girls now at school are going to make as great innovations and improvements in government as they are in industry. The future belongs to the Socialists, and more largely because of the public schools than any other one factor.

People have got to be shocked to wake them up out of old absurd routine. Use paralyzes us to almost every injustice, when people are shocked, they begin to think and inquire.—Harriet Beecher Stowe.

It is an old saying that should be remembered today: "Beware when the Greeks come bearing gifts." There is at present a marked tendency among capitalist papers to praise "Socialist tendencies." It is not all sincere, but may mean an effort to save the face of the exploiters, to yield a little for the purpose of saving the system whereby the rich live at the expense of the poor. Worse than that, it may be a means of forwarding a proposition to sell the railroads to the people at inflated prices and in doing that make the government responsible for dividends—for the loot they seek. We must keep our eyes squarely on the goal—on the overthrow of the system of exploitation. Inasmuch as the people were swindled out of the railroads, which they paid for and rightfully own today, we must not consent to paying a dollar for them. In justice, they belong to the people now. They should be confiscated. The so-called owners ought to be content to merely escape the penitentiary.

T. P. GORE, the blind senator from Oklahoma, announces that an effort was made to bribe him in the interest of land speculators who want to get hold of vast tracts of Indian land in Oklahoma. He says he was practically offered \$50,000 to induce him to withdraw his opposition to the measure. There is nothing surprising in the statement that bribery was attempted in a matter of this kind, because that has been worked from the days of the Credit-Mobilier to the present. The surprising thing is that a senator should both refuse a bribe and expose the corruption. Senator Gore is not half so blind as scores of other senators.

Nor only did the Appeal secure the Turner articles when they were suppressed by the American, but it has also been liberal enough to turn loose an article when the advertisement of the Appeal's publication caused a syndicate to ask Turner for the story. He asked the Appeal for permission to write the feature, and it was granted him. As a result, the story has gone to hundreds of thousands it would not have reached otherwise. The Appeal is not seeking monopoly but results. You know now how it came that part of Barbarous Mexico has got into the United Press.

THOMAS F. RYAN, the New York promoter, is reported as having said that in the future the reign of money will be divided among seven American "princes," whom he names as J. Pierpont Morgan, Jr., Henry F. Davidson, Otto H. Kahn, Mortimer L. Schiff, John R. Dennis, George F. Baker, Jr., and James Stillman Jr. All are direct descendants of the present financiers of importance. The wealth they get will be inherited. You don't believe in inherited power, do you? You think all in America have equal chance, don't you? Sensible people know better.

Even the staid capitalist paper, the Saturday Evening Post, seems to awaken to the situation in part. It recently printed an editorial entitled, "Afraid of a Word," in which it declared that relative to the trusts "all political parties, except the Socialists, are at sea, in the same boat" and "it is only by being 'whichever' in dealing with monopolistic combinations, and if the socialistic way is the successful way why doesn't somebody propose to follow it further? Is it because we are frightened at a word?"

THE Roosevelt edition is provoking wide comment in the press. There was a telegram sent out from Girard about it, alluding to the censored part, to "abuse of the ex-president," and to the calling of Roosevelt the "political Dr. Cook."

THE Alaskan telegraph systems are owned by the United States government and as a consequence the rates are only one-fourth those charged in the states, and a still further reduction is being planned. This is what it means to have the government serve the people, service at cost.

Who will do the dirty work under Socialism? Well, they are now financing in New York an "automatic maid," a machine which will wash dishes. When people find human life less cheap, they will invent machines to do the dirty work. That it can be done is proven by this invention.

THE present king of England is to all intents and purposes a bigamist. His first wife, by whom he had several children, and who, according to Life, is now living in seclusion in Canada, was set aside because she was only "folks," and he married a scion of royalty in order that he might be king. The children by his first wife are not permitted to call him father. This shocking immorality is either endorsed or excused by the church dignitaries who rant about Socialist free love and Socialism breaking up the home. Shame on such hypocrisy!

JUDGE VAN VALKENBURG, who has succeeded Judge Phillips on the federal bench of Missouri, while district attorney, before his appointment as judge, laughed at the absurdity of the Warren prosecution declaring that no judge would consider it seriously. Of this there can be no doubt, as it comes from first hand. That was the opinion of Van as a man and lawyer. Now, since he has become a federal judge, of course, his viewpoint may change. The presence of "interests" looming over the horizon, and instructions from those higher up, sometimes have great influence in changing real men into mere federal judges.

WHEN the news reached the tobacco raisers of Honduras, that the government had granted a monopoly of the tobacco business to a government official, who had sold it to the American Tobacco trust, the raisers went wild with anger and burned their bales in the public places of San Pedro and other towns. Here in America, where we have such wise citizenship, we do not grant public monopolies, but permit men to attain it, and we jail the tobacco farmers if they object to be skinned. But we are wise, and the poor illiterate, ignorant Spaniards are not in it! About the easiest sucker in the world is the American two-legged voting machine. He has been trained by the old party machines until he is a lulu with a big L. Socialists want to have each producer receive the full social value of their labor, but the laborers prefer to vote to be skinned by the trusts. So mote it be.

Don't stand for the present system of robbery. Sit down on it.

THE corruption escaping at present indicates that capitalism has come to a head and been punctured.

MEMBERS of the Anti-Socialist Society are entitled to write after their names the initials, A. S. S. How appropriate!

CAPITALISM seems inclined to apply for an injunction prohibiting the coming of Socialism, but the working class just laughs.

WITH collective ownership and operation of the railroads traveling at one cent a mile first-class could be realized without cutting the wages of a single necessary railroad employee, and many of them are surely entitled to and would get a raise. It is only by the stupidity of the masses that they are worked into voting for the old parties that favor the rich as against the workers. If the masses knew what power they had in their ballot they wouldn't be begging for laws before every legislative body—they would be enacting their own laws. Only the Socialists are such fools as to want the laws in the interest of the great majority who are working people, and whose labor sustains the whole fabric of civilization. In monarchies the laws are made by and for the nobility and the rich; in America the laws are made by and for the people of wealth. Those who own the property of any nation have always and will always control that nation. And it is right that they should. So if the many who are poor desire to control the laws they must first make all the industrial properties the common heritage of the race—then the race owning the property can and will control it. Property is and always has been the real king.

WITH Roosevelt the man the Appeal is not concerned. It is with Roosevelt the politician who aspires to be third time president of the United States—who secretly expects to be more than a monarch in fact, a president in name!

No, Socialism was never tried in China or anywhere else. It was exploitation that was tried, the twin-brother of capitalism. The emperor owned all and ruled the people absolutely much as the "benevolent" plutes rule America today.

FRANCE holds a public monopoly in making of matches. Last year it made \$5,700,000 profit which went into the public treasury. Here we are so wise that we permit the Gould family to make about \$12,000,000 a year profit on the match industry. It is so much better to have millionaires than to have it go into the public treasury! Are we not the wisest garabos that ever tried to run society? See it, you galoot!

INSTEAD of trying to suppress the white slave traffic by ending the profit system, the grand jury of which John D. Rockefeller, Jr., was foreman, recommended the censorship of the picture show. The reason is plain. The picture show is the theater of the people and is interfering with the profits of the theater trust. Besides, it has actually taught things against the system under which the white slave traffic flourishes.

THAT practical serfdom exists among sailors on ocean vessels is certain. The matter has been brought to the attention of congress and the Pan American press reports, "an order secretly given to the horse committee on merchant marine and fisheries to call off further committee meetings for consideration of the measure for protection of sailors." Of course, you choose to be mastered by the plutes who own your jobs, and so have no right to expect any other treatment.

THE Cosmopolitan is printing what purports to be personal recollections of Porfirio Diaz. It is probably a work of fiction. But even it shows that Diaz has been incestuous. He says: "The fourth child of my parents was a girl named Manuela, who died in 1856 in her twenty-eighth year, leaving a daughter, Delina, born in 1843, who was my first wife. This means that he married his niece and is surely a good recommendation for the great moralists who land him in the skies. The result of this incest is told by Diaz, or the biographer who writes in his name: "There were eight children by this marriage, of whom only two survive."

IN every city the public is complaining about the extortion of the express rates. Hundreds of thousands have been expended by the public and government in the past investigating and lawing about the express extortions. And the same game is being supported by the votes of the men who complain, they not having the sense or something to see that if the public owned and operated the express business that there would be rapid decrease in express rates, because every congressman and senator would vie with each other in giving better and cheaper service to the people from whom they get their election. It seems that voters are very foolish to keep on permitting men in office who oppose the collective ownership of transportation, while at the same time that same public is ever in hot water because of the extortion and bribery and crime by the men who privately own the express business. Most people cannot make comparisons. They have never been taught to reason at all. Socialists know what to do and how to do it, but there are not enough of them yet to make the change.

Congress "appropriated" \$102,000,000 of the people's money during the session just closed. Most of it was graft. Private interests pushed every appropriation that was passed. Not a measure that I heard of was in the interest of the masses. Can you name one?

SOME people think what others tell them or what they read, and others don't think at all. What do you think?

Mastering Europe.

Senator William A. Clark, of Montana, on returning from a recent trip to Europe.

"Socialism is mastering Europe," he said. "The government of France is practically socialistic now. No one can foretell the future of Socialism. Socialism shows itself very strongly in the budget. It is spreading all over England as well as the continent."

Barbarous Mexico==Slave Colony of the United States

BY JOHN KENNETH TURNER.

BARBAROUS MEXICO—a slave colony of the United States. To the appended article there can be no more appropriate title than this.

Today Mexico is virtually a slave colony of this country. Tomorrow the appellation will be even more completely true, if the evidence of the present is to be taken for predicting the future.

After freeing his black slaves Uncle Sam, at the end of half a century, has become a slaver again. Uncle Sam—or that hideous caricature of him which is administering our affairs at Washington—has gone to slave-driving in a foreign country.

No, I shall not charge this to Uncle Sam, the genial, liberty-loving old fellow-citizen of our childhood. I would rather say that Uncle Sam is dead and that another is masquerading in his place—a counterfeit Uncle Sam who has so far deceived the people into believing that he is the real one. It is that person whom I charge with becoming a slaver.

I am not calling names without reason. I am not shooting wildly in the dark. I base my assertions upon the most definite and provable grounds. I charge, first, that the United States is largely responsible for the rise of the system of slavery in Mexico; second, that the United States is responsible for the determining force in the continuation of that system of slavery; third, that the United States is responsible, knowingly for these things.

When I say the United States, I do not mean a few minor and irresponsible American citizens. Nor do I mean the American nation—which, in my humble judgment, is unjustly charged with the crimes of many persons over whom under conditions as they exist, it has no control. I use the term in its most literal and exact sense. I mean the organized power which officially represents this country at home and abroad. I mean the powers that be in this country. I mean the federal government and the interests that control the federal government. I mean President Taft, Attorney General Wickersham, the congress of the United States, J. Pierpont Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, M. Guggenheim Sons, the Southern Pacific railroad and its allies—and the vast ramifications of interests connected with all of these, immediately and remotely.

It is a general custom with American magazines and newspapers never to attribute anything but the highest motives to the chief executive. The purposes of underlings are questioned, but of the chief, never. And when the latter is necessarily involved in the criticism—as in the Ballinger case, for instance—nothing worse than ignorance is imputed. This is all bosh—bosh born of cowardice. I charge President Taft—once granting that he possesses a higher intelligence than an idiot—with knowing that slavery exists in Mexico and with knowingly stretching his powers to the utmost to maintain it.

Mexico Already American Property.

Socialists are wont to declare that chattel slavery was abolished in the United States because it ceased to be profitable. Without commenting on the truth or fallacy of this assertion, I declare that there are plenty of Americans who are prepared to prove that slavery is profitable in Mexico. Because it is profitable, the United States has had a hand in the creation of Mexican slavery, and in order to continue to reap the profits of Mexican slavery, the United States has provided for the continuation of that institution. To accomplish this end it has gone to the extent of reducing Mexico to a political dependency. Mexico has been annexed to the United States in everything except in name.

Do not imagine from this that Mexico is about to come under the American flag. Quite the contrary. Continuing as none the less an American colony, she will retain her own governmental machine and her own flag. This is simply because slavery can be maintained with greater safety under the Mexican flag than under the American flag. As long as Mexico can be controlled she will not be annexed, for once she is annexed the protest of the American people will become so great that the slavery must of necessity either be abolished or veiled under less brutal and downright forms. The United States will continue to control Mexico. The moment she finds it impossible to control her in other ways she will control her with an army.

Diaz is president of Mexico because he can be controlled, and for the same reason he will continue as president until his death. Diaz is the most absolute and irresponsible despot on the face of the earth, but for all that he is a political dependent. His personal power he holds by indulgence of the United States, which will maintain him as long as he lives, even to the extent of putting an army at his disposal. If for one month the American power in Mexico were held in absolute abeyance—which is inconceivable—Diaz would be overthrown and the props would be knocked from under the system of Mexican slavery.

My statements here may seem at first blush astounding, unbelievable, but they cannot be refuted. Doubtless the subsidized writers will say that they are ridiculous. In order to prove them it only remains to point out the extent of the American partnership with Diaz and the functions which that unholy alliance has developed for the mutual protection of its components.

The very defense of Mexican slavery and Mexican despotism which we find in the United States a sufficient presumption of guilt upon which to base an indictment. What publication or in-

dividual in the United States was ever known to defend the system of political oppression in Russia? What publication or individual in the United States was ever known to excuse the Slave atrocities of the Congo Free State? How many Americans are in the habit of signing paucans of praise to Czar Nicholas or the late King Leopold?

Americans of whatever class not only do not dare to do these things, but they don't care to do them. But what a difference when it comes to Mexico! Here slavery is sacred. Here autocracy is debied.

It will not do to deny the honesty of the comparison between Mexico and Russia or the Congo. For every worshiper of Diaz knows that he is an autocrat and a slave-driver and enough of them admit it to leave no ground for doubt that they know it.

What, then, is the reason for this strange diversion of attitude? Why do so many prostrate themselves before the czar of Mexico and none prostrate themselves before the czar of Russia? Why is America flooded with books hailing the Mexican autocrat as the greatest man of the age while it is impossible to buy a single book, regularly published and circulated, that seriously criticizes him?

The inference is inevitable that it is because Diaz is the Golden Calf in but another form, that Americans are profiting by Mexican slavery and are exerting themselves to maintain it.

But there are easily provable facts that carry us far beyond any mere inference, however logical it may be.

What is the most universal reply that has been made to my criticisms of Mexico and Mexico's ruler? That there are \$900,000,000 of American capital invested in Mexico.

To the powers that be in the United States the nine hundred million dollars of American capital form a conclusive argument against any criticism of President Diaz. They are an overwhelming defense of Mexican slavery.

"Hush! Hush!" the word goes about. "Why, we have nine hundred million dollars grinding out profits down there!" And the American publishers obediently hush.

The \$900,000,000 of American capital in Mexico not only fully explains the American defense of the Mexican government, but it is also the best possible proof of the assertions which I made at the outset of this article—that Mexico is a political dependent of this country; in other words, that it is already an American colony in everything except in name.

Wherever capital flows capital controls the government. Socialists cannot claim exclusive ownership of this doctrine. It is recognized everywhere and by all men who have as much as half an eye for the lessons that the world is writing. The last decade or two has proved it in every country where large aggregations of capital have gathered.

No wonder there is a growing anti-American sentiment in Mexico. The Mexican people are naturally exceedingly patriotic. They have gone through tremendous trials to throw off the foreign yoke in past generations and they are unwilling to bend beneath the foreign yoke today. They want the opportunity of working out their own national destiny as a separate people. They look upon the United States as a great colossus which is about to seize them and bend them to its will.

Americans Behind Tyranny of Diaz.

And they are right. American capital in Mexico will not be denied. The partnership of Diaz and American capital has wrecked Mexico as a national entity. The United States government, as long as it represents American capital—and the most rampant hypocrite will hardly deny that it does that today—will have a deciding voice in Mexican affairs. From the viewpoint of patriotic Mexicans the outlook is melancholy indeed.

Let us cast our eyes over Mexico and see what that \$900,000,000 of American capital is doing there.

The Morgan-Guggenheim copper merger is in absolute control of the copper output of Mexico.

A Guggenheim Sons own all the large smelters in Mexico, as well as vast mining properties. They occupy the same powerful position in the mining industry generally in Mexico as they occupy in the United States.

The Standard Oil company, under the name of the Waters-Pierce, with many subsidiary corporations, controls a vastly major portion of the crude oil flow of Mexico. It controls a still greater portion of the wholesale and retail trade in oil—nearly per cent of it, so its managers claim. At the present writing there is an oil war in Mexico caused by an attempt of the only other oil distributing concern in the country—controlled by the Waters-Pierce—to force the Standard at a favorable price. The situation predicts an early victory for the Standard, after which its monopoly will be complete.

Agents of the American Sugar trust have just secured from the federal and state governments concessions for the production of sugar beet and beet sugar so favorable as to insure it a complete monopoly of the Mexican sugar business within the next ten years.

The Wells Fargo Express company, of which John D. Rockefeller, Jr., holds the controlling interest, and which controls ten per cent of the world's production of raw rubber, is in possession of a majority of the rubber producing properties of Mexico.

The Wells Fargo Express company, the property of the Southern Pacific railroad through its partnership with the Mexican government, holds an ab-

Barbarous Mexico==Slave Colony of the United States

BY JOHN KENNETH TURNER.

BARBAROUS MEXICO—a slave colony of the United States. To the appended article there can be no more appropriate title than this.

Today Mexico is virtually a slave colony of this country. Tomorrow the appellation will be even more completely true, if the evidence of the present is to be taken for predicting the future.

After freeing his black slaves Uncle Sam, at the end of half a century, has become a slaver again. Uncle Sam—or that hideous caricature of him which is administering our affairs at Washington—has gone to slave-driving in a foreign country.

No, I shall not charge this to Uncle Sam, the genial, liberty-loving old fellow-citizen of our childhood. I would rather say that Uncle Sam is dead and that another is masquerading in his place—a counterfeit Uncle Sam who has so far deceived the people into believing that he is the real one. It is that person whom I charge with becoming a slaver.

I am not calling names without reason. I am not shooting wildly in the dark. I base my assertions upon the most definite and provable grounds. I charge, first, that the United States is largely responsible for the rise of the system of slavery in Mexico; second, that the United States is responsible for the determining force in the continuation of that system of slavery; third, that the United States is responsible, knowingly for these things.

When I say the United States, I do not mean a few minor and irresponsible American citizens. Nor do I mean the American nation—which, in my humble judgment, is unjustly charged with the crimes of many persons over whom under conditions as they exist, it has no control. I use the term in its most literal and exact sense. I mean the organized power which officially represents this country at home and abroad. I mean the powers that be in this country. I mean the federal government and the interests that control the federal government. I mean President Taft, Attorney General Wickersham, the congress of the United States, J. Pierpont Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, M. Guggenheim Sons, the Southern Pacific railroad and its allies—and the vast ramifications of interests connected with all of these, immediately and remotely.

It is a general custom with American magazines and newspapers never to attribute anything but the highest motives to the chief executive. The purposes of underlings are questioned, but of the chief, never. And when the latter is necessarily involved in the criticism—as in the Ballinger case, for instance—nothing worse than ignorance is imputed. This is all bosh—bosh born of cowardice. I charge President Taft—once granting that he possesses a higher intelligence than an idiot—with knowing that slavery exists in Mexico and with knowingly stretching his powers to the utmost to maintain it.

Mexico Already American Property.

Socialists are wont to declare that chattel slavery was abolished in the United States because it ceased to be profitable. Without commenting on the truth or fallacy of this assertion, I declare that there are plenty of Americans who are prepared to prove that slavery is profitable in Mexico. Because it is profitable, the United States has had a hand in the creation of Mexican slavery, and in order to continue to reap the profits of Mexican slavery, the United States has provided for the continuation of that institution. To accomplish this end it has gone to the extent of reducing Mexico to a political dependency. Mexico has been annexed to the United States in everything except in name.

Do not imagine from this that Mexico is about to come under the American flag. Quite the contrary. Continuing as none the less an American colony, she will retain her own governmental machine and her own flag. This is simply because slavery can be maintained with greater safety under the Mexican flag than under the American flag. As long as Mexico can be controlled she will not be annexed, for once she is annexed the protest of the American people will become so great that the slavery must of necessity either be abolished or veiled under less brutal and downright forms. The United States will continue to control Mexico. The moment she finds it impossible to control her in other ways she will control her with an army.

Diaz is president of Mexico because he can be controlled, and for the same reason he will continue as president until his death. Diaz is the most absolute and irresponsible despot on the face of the earth, but for all that he is a political dependent. His personal power he holds by indulgence of the United States, which will maintain him as long as he lives, even to the extent of putting an army at his disposal. If for one month the American power in Mexico were held in absolute abeyance—which is inconceivable—Diaz would be overthrown and the props would be knocked from under the system of Mexican slavery.

My statements here may seem at first blush astounding, unbelievable, but they cannot be refuted. Doubtless the subsidized writers will say that they are ridiculous. In order to prove them it only remains to point out the extent of the American partnership with Diaz and the functions which that unholy alliance has developed for the mutual protection of its components.

The very defense of Mexican slavery and Mexican despotism which we find in the United States a sufficient presumption of guilt upon which to base an indictment. What publication or in-

dividual in the United States was ever known to defend the system of political oppression in Russia? What publication or individual in the United States was ever known to excuse the Slave atrocities of the Congo Free State? How many Americans are in the habit of signing paucans of praise to Czar Nicholas or the late King Leopold?

Americans of whatever class not only do not dare to do these things, but they don't care to do them. But what a difference when it comes to Mexico! Here slavery is sacred. Here autocracy is debied.

It will not do to deny the honesty of the comparison between Mexico and Russia or the Congo. For every worshiper of Diaz knows that he is an autocrat and a slave-driver and enough of them admit it to leave no ground for doubt that they know it.

What, then, is the reason for this strange diversion of attitude? Why do so many prostrate themselves before the czar of Mexico and none prostrate themselves before the czar of Russia? Why is America flooded with books hailing the Mexican autocrat as the greatest man of the age while it is impossible to buy a single book, regularly published and circulated, that seriously criticizes him?

The inference is inevitable that it is because Diaz is the Golden Calf in but another form, that Americans are profiting by Mexican slavery and are exerting themselves to maintain it.

But there are easily provable facts that carry us far beyond any mere inference, however logical it may be.

What is the most universal reply that has been made to my criticisms of Mexico and Mexico's ruler? That there are \$900,000,000 of American capital invested in Mexico.

To the powers that be in the United States the nine hundred million dollars of American capital form a conclusive argument against any criticism of President Diaz. They are an overwhelming defense of Mexican slavery.

"Hush! Hush!" the word goes about. "Why, we have nine hundred million dollars grinding out profits down there!" And the American publishers obediently hush.

The \$900,000,000 of American capital in Mexico not only fully explains the American defense of the Mexican government, but it is also the best possible proof of the assertions which I made at the outset of this article—that Mexico is a political dependent of this country; in other words, that it is already an American colony in everything except in name.

Wherever capital flows capital controls the government. Socialists cannot claim exclusive ownership of this doctrine. It is recognized everywhere and by all men who have as much as half an eye for the lessons that the world is writing. The last decade or two has proved it in every country where large aggregations of capital have gathered.

No wonder there is a growing anti-American sentiment in Mexico. The Mexican people are naturally exceedingly patriotic. They have gone through tremendous trials to throw off the foreign yoke in past generations and they are unwilling to bend beneath the foreign yoke today. They want the opportunity of working out their own national destiny as a separate people. They look upon the United States as a great colossus which is about to seize them and bend them to its will.

Americans Behind Tyranny of Diaz.

And they are right. American capital in Mexico will not be denied. The partnership of Diaz and American capital has wrecked Mexico as a national entity. The United States government, as long as it represents American capital—and the most rampant hypocrite will hardly deny that it does that today—will have a deciding voice in Mexican affairs. From the viewpoint of patriotic Mexicans the outlook is melancholy indeed.

Let us cast our eyes over Mexico and see what that \$900,000,000 of American capital is doing there.

The Morgan-Guggenheim copper merger is in absolute control of the copper output of Mexico.

A Guggenheim Sons own all the large smelters in Mexico, as well as vast mining properties. They occupy the same powerful position in the mining industry generally in Mexico as they occupy in the United States.

The Standard Oil company, under the name of the Waters-Pierce, with many subsidiary corporations, controls a vastly major portion of the crude oil flow of Mexico. It controls a still greater portion of the wholesale and retail trade in oil—nearly per cent of it, so its managers claim. At the present writing there is an oil war in Mexico caused by an attempt of the only other oil distributing concern in the country—controlled by the Waters-Pierce—to force the Standard at a favorable price. The situation predicts an early victory for the Standard, after which its monopoly will be complete.

Agents of the American Sugar trust have just secured from the federal and state governments concessions for the production of sugar beet and beet sugar so favorable as to insure it a complete monopoly of the Mexican sugar business within the next ten years.

The Wells Fargo Express company, of which John D. Rockefeller, Jr., holds the controlling interest, and which controls ten per cent of the world's production of raw rubber, is in possession of a majority of the rubber producing properties of Mexico.

The Wells Fargo Express company, the property of the Southern Pacific railroad through its partnership with the Mexican government, holds an ab-

Barbarous Mexico==Slave Colony of the United States

BY JOHN KENNETH TURNER.

BARBAROUS MEXICO—a slave colony of the United States. To the appended article there can be no more appropriate title than this.

Today Mexico is virtually a slave colony of this country. Tomorrow the appellation will be even more completely true, if the evidence of the present is to be taken for predicting the future.

After freeing his black slaves Uncle Sam, at the end of half a century, has become a slaver again. Uncle Sam—or that hideous caricature of him which is administering our affairs at Washington—has gone to slave-driving in a foreign country.

No, I shall not charge this to Uncle Sam, the genial, liberty-loving old fellow-citizen of our childhood. I would rather say that Uncle Sam is dead and that another is masquerading in his place—a counterfeit Uncle Sam who has so far deceived the people into believing that he is the real one. It is that person whom I charge with becoming a slaver.

I am not calling names without reason. I am not shooting wildly in the dark. I base my assertions upon the most definite and provable grounds. I charge, first, that the United States is largely responsible for the rise of the system of slavery in Mexico; second, that the United States is responsible for the determining force in the continuation of that system of slavery; third, that the United States is responsible, knowingly for these things.

When I say the United States, I do not mean a few minor and irresponsible American citizens. Nor do I mean the American nation—which, in my humble judgment, is unjustly charged with the crimes of many persons over whom under conditions as they exist, it has no control. I use the term in its most literal and exact sense. I mean the organized power which officially represents this country at home and abroad. I mean the powers that be in this country. I mean the federal government and the interests that control the federal government. I mean President Taft, Attorney General Wickersham, the congress of the United States, J. Pierpont Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, M. Guggenheim Sons, the Southern Pacific railroad and its allies—and the vast ramifications of interests connected with all of these, immediately and remotely.

It is a general custom with American magazines and newspapers never to attribute anything but the highest motives to the chief executive. The purposes of underlings are questioned, but of the chief, never. And when the latter is necessarily involved in the criticism—as in the Ballinger case, for instance—nothing worse than ignorance is imputed. This is all bosh—bosh born of cowardice. I charge President Taft—once granting that he possesses a higher intelligence than an idiot—with knowing that slavery exists in Mexico and with knowingly stretching his powers to the utmost to maintain it.

Mexico Already American Property.

Socialists are wont to declare that chattel slavery was abolished in the United States because it ceased to be profitable. Without commenting on the truth or fallacy of this assertion, I declare that there are plenty of Americans who are prepared to prove that slavery is profitable in Mexico. Because it is profitable, the United States has had a hand in the creation of Mexican slavery, and in order to continue to reap the profits of Mexican slavery, the United States has provided for the continuation of that institution. To accomplish this end it has gone to the extent of reducing Mexico to a political dependency. Mexico has been annexed to the United States in everything except in name.

Do not imagine from this that Mexico is about to come under the American flag. Quite the contrary. Continuing as none the less an American colony, she will retain her own governmental machine and her own flag. This is simply because slavery can be maintained with greater safety under the Mexican flag than under the American flag. As long as Mexico can be controlled she will not be annexed, for once she is annexed the protest of the American people will become so great that the slavery must of necessity either be abolished or veiled under less brutal and downright forms. The United States will continue to control Mexico. The moment she finds it impossible to control her in other ways she will control her with an army.

Diaz is president of Mexico because he can be controlled, and for the same reason he will continue as president until his death. Diaz is the most absolute and irresponsible despot on the face of the earth, but for all that he is a political dependent. His personal power he holds by indulgence of the United States, which will maintain him as long as he lives, even to the extent of putting an army at his disposal. If for one month the American power in Mexico were held in absolute abeyance—which is inconceivable—Diaz would be overthrown and the props would be knocked from under the system of Mexican slavery.

My statements here may seem at first blush astounding, unbelievable, but they cannot be refuted. Doubtless the subsidized writers will say that they are ridiculous. In order to prove them it only remains to point out the extent of the American partnership with Diaz and the functions which that unholy alliance has developed for the mutual protection of its components.

The very defense of Mexican slavery and Mexican despotism which we find in the United States a sufficient presumption of guilt upon which to base an indictment. What publication or in-

dividual in the United States was ever known to defend the system of political oppression in Russia? What publication or individual in the United States was ever known to excuse the Slave atrocities of the Congo Free State? How many Americans are in the habit of signing paucans of praise to Czar Nicholas or the late King Leopold?

Americans of whatever class not only do not dare to do these things, but they don't care to do them. But what a difference when it comes to Mexico! Here slavery is sacred. Here autocracy is debied.

It will not do to deny the honesty of the comparison between Mexico and Russia or the Congo. For every worshiper of Diaz knows that he is an autocrat and a slave-driver and enough of them admit it to leave no ground for doubt that they know it.

What, then, is the reason for this strange diversion of attitude? Why do so many prostrate themselves before the czar of Mexico and none prostrate themselves before the czar of Russia? Why is America flooded with books hailing the Mexican autocrat as the greatest man of the age while it is impossible to buy a single book, regularly published and circulated, that seriously criticizes him?

The inference is inevitable that it is because Diaz is the Golden Calf in but another form, that Americans are profiting by Mexican slavery and are exerting themselves to maintain it.

But there are easily provable facts that carry us far beyond any mere inference, however logical it may be.

What is the most universal reply that has been made to my criticisms of Mexico and Mexico's ruler? That there are \$900,000,000 of American capital invested in Mexico.

To the powers that be in the United States the nine hundred million dollars of American capital form a conclusive argument against any criticism of President Diaz. They are an overwhelming defense of Mexican slavery.

"Hush! Hush!" the word goes about. "Why, we have nine hundred million dollars grinding out profits down there!" And the American publishers obediently hush.

The \$900,000,000 of American capital in Mexico not only fully explains the American defense of the Mexican government, but it is also the best possible proof of the assertions which I made at the outset of this article—that Mexico is a political dependent of this country; in other words, that it is already an American colony in everything except in name.

Wherever capital flows capital controls the government. Socialists cannot claim exclusive ownership of this doctrine. It is recognized everywhere and by all men who have as much as half an eye for the lessons that the world is writing. The last decade or two has proved it in every country where large aggregations of capital have gathered.

No wonder there is a growing anti-American sentiment in Mexico. The Mexican people are naturally exceedingly patriotic. They have gone through tremendous trials to throw off the foreign yoke in past generations and they are unwilling to bend beneath the foreign yoke today. They want the opportunity of working out their own national destiny as a separate people. They look upon the United States as a great colossus which is about to seize them and bend them to its will.

Americans Behind Tyranny of Diaz.

And they are right. American capital in Mexico will not be denied. The partnership of Diaz and American capital has wrecked Mexico as a national entity. The United States government, as long as it represents American capital—and the most rampant hypocrite will hardly deny that it does that today—will have a deciding voice in Mexican affairs. From the viewpoint of patriotic Mexicans the outlook is melancholy indeed.

Let us cast our eyes over Mexico and see what that \$900,000,000 of American capital is doing there.

The Morgan-Guggenheim copper merger is in absolute control of the copper output of Mexico.

A Guggenheim Sons own all the large smelters in Mexico, as well as vast mining properties. They occupy the same powerful position in the mining industry generally in Mexico as they occupy in the United States.

The Standard Oil company, under the name of the Waters-Pierce, with many subsidiary corporations, controls a vastly major portion of the crude oil flow of Mexico. It controls a still greater portion of the wholesale and retail trade in oil—nearly per cent of it, so its managers claim. At the present writing there is an oil war in Mexico caused by an attempt of the only other oil distributing concern in the country—controlled by the Waters-Pierce—to force the Standard at a favorable price. The situation predicts an early victory for the Standard, after which its monopoly will be complete.

Agents of the American Sugar trust have just secured from the federal and state governments concessions for the production of sugar beet and beet sugar so favorable as to insure it a complete monopoly of the Mexican sugar business within the next ten years.

The Wells Fargo Express company, of which John D. Rockefeller, Jr., holds the controlling interest, and which controls ten per cent of the world's production of raw rubber, is in possession of a majority of the rubber producing properties of Mexico.

The Wells Fargo Express company, the property of the Southern Pacific railroad through its partnership with the Mexican government, holds an ab-

Barbarous Mexico==Slave Colony of the United States

BY JOHN KENNETH TURNER.

BARBAROUS MEXICO—a slave colony of the United States. To the appended article there can be no more appropriate title than this.

absolute monopoly of the express carrying business of Mexico.

E. N. Brown, president of the National Railways of Mexico and a satellite of H. Clay Pierce and the late E. H. Harriman, is a member of the board of directors of the Banco Nacional, which is by far the largest financial institution in Mexico, a concern that has over fifty branches, in which all the chief members of the Diaz financial camarilla are interested and through which all financial deals of the Mexican government are transacted.

Finally, the Southern Pacific railroad and allied Harriman heirs, despite the much vaunted government railway merger, owns outright or controls by virtue of near-ownership, three-fourths of the main line railway mileage of Mexico, which enables it today to impose as absolute a monopoly in restraint of trade as exists in the case of any railway combination in the United States.

So you see how it is in Mexico. The Americanization of Mexico of which Wall Street boasts, has been accomplished and accomplished with a vengeance.

It were hardly worth while to pause at this juncture and discuss the question why Mexicans did not get in on the ground floor and control these industries. It is not, as numerous writers would have you believe, because Americans are the only intelligent people in the world and because God made Mexicans a stupid people and intended that they should be governed by their superiors. One very good reason why Diaz delivered his country into the hands of Americans was that Americans had more money to pay for special privileges. And Americans had more money because, while all Mexicans were becoming impoverished by the war for the overthrow of the former Maximilian, thousands of Americans were making fortunes by means of grafting army contracts involved in our Civil war.

I have said that Americans were profiting off the slavery of Mexico. They are not only profiting off it indirectly in a great many ways, but they are also profiting off it directly.

Americans Behind Yaqui Extirmination.

Take the Yaqui atrocities, for example. Vice President Corral, who was then in control of the government of the state of Sonora, stirred up a Yaqui war because he saw an opportunity to get the Yaqui lands and sell them at a good price to American capitalists. The Yaqui country is rich in both mining and agricultural possibilities. American capitalists bought the lands while the Yaquis were still on them, then stimulated the war of extermination and finally instigated the scheme to deport them into slavery in Yucatan.

But American capital did not stop even there. It followed the Yaqui women and children away from their homes. It saw families dismembered, women forced into wifehood with Chinamen, men beaten to death. It saw these things, encouraged them and covered them up from the eyes of the world, because of its interest in the price of steel hemp, because it feared that with the passing of slave labor the price of steel hemp would rise.

The American Cordage trust, a ramification of Standard Oil, controls half the Hemp export of Yucatan. The Standard Oil press declares there is no slavery in Mexico. Governor Fred N. Warner of Michigan, for example, recently denied my expose of slavery in Yucatan. Governor Warner is interested in contracts involving the purchase of a million dollars worth of steel hemp from the slave kings of Yucatan.

But Americans not only profit directly by the slavery. They work the slaves themselves—buy them, drive them, lock them up at night, beat them, kill them, exactly as do other employers of labor in Mexico. And they admit that they do these things. In my possession are scores of letters, of printed interviews with, and signed articles by American planters, who admit that they employ labor which is essentially slave labor. Did I have the space I would print some of them here, but I have not the space. I intend to print Turner—Mexico—Fifth Article.

In his articles now running in the Cosmopolitan Magazine, Othman Stevens, writing especially to discredit my expose, admits the forced labor and the whip—which means slave labor—but he attempts to defend it. Needless to add, the nine hundred million dollars of American capital is the defense. In fact, all over the tropical section of Mexico, on the plantations of rubber, sugar-cane, tropical fruits—everywhere—you will find Americans buying, beating, imprisoning, killing, slaves.

Americans Hold and Entrap Slaves.

Let me quote you just one interview I had with an American planter in Mexico. He has quit the business now and is ranching in Texas. Moreover, I have a feeling of personal friendship toward him. Therefore, I hesitate to give his name. This man for five years ran a large plantation near Santa Lucia.

"When we needed a lot of *enganchados* (snared workers)," he told me, "all we had to do was to wire to one of the numerous *enganchadores* (snarers) in Mexico, saying: 'We want so many men and so many women on such and such a day.' Sometimes we'd call for three or four hundred, but the *enganchadores* would never fail to deliver the full number on the dot. We paid fifty pesos apiece for them, rejecting those that didn't look good to us, and that was all there was to it. We always kept them as long as they lasted."

"It's healthier down there than it is right here in the city of Mexico," he told me. "If you have the means to take care of yourself there you can keep as well as you can anywhere on earth."

Less than five minutes after making this statement he told me:

"Yes, I remember a lot of three hundred *enganchados* we received one spring. In less than three months we buried more than half of them."

This is one of the stories that the American Magazine suppressed. Here is another:

class cars. Riding in a third class car between Tierra Blanca and Vera Cruz one night, I spied an American negro sitting by the corner.

"I wonder if they ever caught him down here?" I said to myself. "I'll find out."

Tom West, a free-born Kentucky negro of twenty-five, hesitated to admit that he had ever been a slave. But he confessed gradually.

"Ah was workin' in a brick yahd in Kaintucky at two dollahs a day," was the way Tom put it, "when another cullahd man come along an' tolle me he knowed where Ah cud get three seventy-five a day. Ah said 'Ah'm with ye.' So he hands me one o' them book prospectuses an' the next day he tulk me to the office o' the company an' they said the same thing—three seventy-five American money, or seven an' a half Mex! So Ah come with eighty othead cullahd folks by way o' Tampa, Florida, and Vera Cruz, down here to a coffee and rubbah plantation at LaJunta, near Santa Lucia, Oaxaca.

"Seven and a half a day! Huh! Seven an' a half! That's just what they paid me when they let be go—afiah two years! Ah run away twice, but they ketched me and bring me back. Did they beat me? Naw they beat lots o' othead, but they nevah beat me. Aw yeh, they batted me a few times with a stick, but Ah wouldn't 'a let 'em beat me; no snh, no me."

The plantation that caught Tom West, Kentuckian, was an American plantation. Some months after talking with Tom I happened to hold a conversation with a man who identified himself as Tom's master after I had told him Tom's story.

"Those niggers," this American told me, "were an experiment that didn't turn out very well. They must have been ours, for I don't know of anybody else down that way that had them at the time of which you speak. The seven and a half a day? Oh, the agents told 'em anything to get them. That was none of our business. We simply bought and paid for them and then made them work out their purchase price before we gave them any money. We kept them under lock and key at night and had to guard them with guns in the daytime. When they tried to make a break we'd tie 'em up and give 'em a good dressing down with a club. The authorities? We chummed with the authorities. They were our friends."

Reminds you of before the war, doesn't it? Well, what are you going to do about America's slave colony?

Americans Use Mexican Peons.

The partnership of American capital with President Diaz not only puts at its disposal a system of slave labor, but also permits it to utilize the system of peonage and to beat the class of wage-laborers down to the lowest point of subsistence. Where slavery does not exist in Mexico you find peonage, a mild form of slavery, or you find cheap wage-labor. The average mine worker in Mexico is paid less for one week's work than the average miner in our western states receives in one day although the cost of the common necessities of life are higher in Mexico; corn and beans are usually higher in Mexico than in the United States, and the common Mexican lives on corn and beans.

A proportionate disparity exists in many other industries. Diaz's *rurales* shot Colonel Greene's copper miners into submission and threats of imprisonment put an end to the great strike on an American-Mexican railroad.

American capitalists boast of the fact that their Diaz "does not permit any foolishness on the part of these labor unions." In such facts as these are found their reason for their hysterical defense of him.

There remains to me barely space enough in which to outline the railroad situation in Mexico, and to tell the hitherto unpublished story of the railway merger.

Today the main lines of Mexican railroads aggregate 12,500 miles. Of this mileage the Southern Pacific company controls and will soon own 8,941 miles, or nearly three-fourths of the total. These lines consist of:

The Southern Pacific in Mexico 950 miles; the Kansas City, Mexico and Orient, 279 miles; the Pan-American, 206 miles; the Mexican, 327 miles; the National Railways of Mexico 7,089 miles.

Of these the Southern Pacific is the only one that is being operated openly on the property of the Harriman heirs. The Orient road is operated under the presidency of A. E. Stillwell, a Harriman ally, whose vice-president, George H. Ross, is a director of the Chicago and Alton road, a Harriman property with which the Orient road has traffic agreements. Construction is still going on on both of these roads and they are drawing from the Diaz government about \$20,000 of subsidy for every mile built, or nearly enough to build the road.

The Pan-American railroad was recently acquired by David H. Thompson, who is the nominal president. Thompson was the United States ambassador to Mexico, where he seems to have represented the Harriman interests first and the other American interests afterwards. After securing the road, he resigned the ambassadorship. Thompson is an old satellite of Harriman and was acting for Harriman in securing the road. Harriman men are associated with him as directors of the road. The special purpose of Thompson's securing the road was to incorporate it as a part of Harriman's plan to make an all-rail route from the Arizona border to Central America.

The only control exercised by the Harriman interests over the Mexican road, as far as the writer knows, is that involved in the pooling of interests, in both freight and passenger traffic, of the Mexican road and the National Railways of Mexico which the Harriman interests control.

Merging of Mexican Railways.

It now remains to tell the story of the Harriman control of the National Railways of Mexico. It is the inside story of the Mexican merger—a story which I obtained from unimpeachable sources while working as a reporter of the Mexican Daily Herald in the Spring of 1909.

Briefly, the story is this: The consolidation under nominal government control of the two principal railroad systems in Mexico, the Mexican Central and the Mexican National, was brought about, not, as is officially

given out, to provide against the absorption of the Mexican highways by foreign capitalists, but to provide for that very thing. It was a deal between E. H. Harriman, on the one hand, and the government financial camarilla, on the other, the victim in the case being Mexico. It was a sort of deferred sale of the Mexican railroads to Harriman, the members of the camarilla getting as their share of the loot millions and millions of dollars through the juggling of securities and stock in effecting the merger. On the whole, it constitutes perhaps the most colossal single piece of national plundering carried out by the organized wreckers of the Mexican nation.

In this deal with Harriman, Limantour, minister of finance, was the chief manipulator, and Pablo Macedo, brother of Miguel Macedo, sub-secretary of the department of the interior, was first lieutenant. As a reward for their part in the deal, Limantour and Macedo are said to have divided \$9,000,000 gold profits between them and Limantour was made president and Macedo vice president of the board of directors of the merged roads, which positions they still hold. The other members of the board of directors of the merged roads are Guillermo de Landay Escandon, governor of the Federal District of Mexico, Samuel Morse Felton, former president of the Mexican Central, who was Harriman's special emissary in Mexico to work on Diaz to secure his consent to the deal, E. N. Brown, former vice president and general manager of the Mexican National lines, and Gabriel Mancera. Each of these four men is said to have made a personal fortune for himself out of the transaction.

The National Railways of Mexico, as they are officially known, have in addition to a general board of directors, a New York board of directors. Note the Harriman timber to be found among these names: William H. Nichols, Ernest Thalmann, James N. Wallace, James Speyer, Bradley W. Palmer, H. Clay Pierce, Clay Arthur Pierce, Henry S. Priest, Eban Richards and H. C. P. Channan.

Whether the Mexican railroad deal was conceived in the brain of Limantour or of Harriman is not known, but Limantour seems to have attempted to pull off the merger originally without the aid of Harriman. Some four years ago Limantour and Don Pablo Martinez del Rio, owner of the Mexican Herald and manager of the Banco Nacional, went into the market and bought heavily of Mexican Central and Mexican National stock, after which they broached the merger scheme to Diaz.

Diaz turned the proposition down point-blank, and Limantour and del Rio both lost heavily, del Rio's losses so bearing down upon him that he died soon afterwards.

It was at this point that Limantour is supposed to have turned to Harriman, who immediately fell in with the scheme and carried it to an exceedingly successful termination for himself.

Harriman owned a lot of Mexican Central stock, but fifty-one per cent of this property was in the personal possession of H. Clay Pierce. When the first rumblings of the 1907 panic were heard Pierce was persuaded to hypothecate his entire holdings to Harriman.

After getting control of from eighty to eighty-five per cent of the Mexican Central property Harriman sent Samuel Morse Felton, one of the ablest railroad manipulators in the United States, to talk Diaz over to the scheme. Where Limantour had failed Felton succeeded and the world was informed that the Mexican government had accomplished a great financial feat by securing the ownership and control of its railroad lines.

It was announced that the government had actually secured fifty-one per cent of the stock of the company, which is denied but which is not material. Also the government was put in nominal control of the situation.

Americans in Control.

But—in the deal Harriman succeeded in placing such heavy obligations upon the new company that his heirs will be able to foreclose with very little loss.

Note some of these obligations. The Mexican Central and Mexican National systems are both cheaply built roads; their rolling stock is of very low grade. Their entire joint mileage at the time of the merger was 5,400 miles, and yet under the merger they were capitalized at \$615,000,000, gold or \$112,000,000. Oceans of water there.

The Mexican Central was thirty years old, yet had never paid a penny. The Mexican National was over twenty-five years old, yet it had paid less than 3 per cent. Yet in the over-capitalized merger we find that the company binds itself to pay four and one-half per cent on \$225,000,000 worth of bonds and four per cent on \$160,000,000 worth of bonds or \$186,525,000 interest a year and pay it semi-annually!

Out of the merger Harriman got three things—cash consideration, special concessions and subsidies for his west coast road, and merged stocks and bonds. Harriman dictated the contract as to the payment of interest on those bonds and his successors will compel payment or foreclosure. As long as Diaz remains in power, as long as the Mexican government is "good," the deficiency can be paid out of the Mexican treasury. But the moment there is trouble the government will be unable to pay and the railroad will become American in name as well as in fact.

Trouble! That word is an exceedingly significant one here. Trouble will come when Mexico attempts to kick over the traces of American "influence." A Mexican revolution will mean trouble, for every revolution Mexico has had has been a repudiation of all or a part of the debt of the government for a time. Mexico is in a corner and that is exactly where the United States wants her. The final step in the complete Americanization of Mexico's railroads will be held as a club over the Mexican people to prevent them from overturning a government that is favorable to American capital.

But, mark you, the railroad club will be only one of many. In case of a serious Mexican revolution the United States will intervene on the plea of protecting American capital. American intervention will destroy the last hope of Mexico for an independent national existence. Mexican patriots know this. Revolution means intervention; inter-

vention means annihilation; therefore revolution means annihilation. The threat of an American army today keeps Mexico from revolution against the autocracy of Diaz.

American Seizure Coming.

Do I guess when I prophesy that the United States will intervene? Hardly for the United States government has already less itself most strenuously to stamping out the first evidences of revolution against its friend Diaz. Diaz is a good friend of Wall Street and the puppets of Wall Street.

Attorney General Wickersham is a heavy stockholder in the National Railways of Mexico. Henry W. Taft, brother of the president, is general counsel of the National Railways of Mexico. Right well has Diaz subsidized his friends in Wall Street and Washington. And the thanks of Wall Street and Washington have been expressed in much more substantial terms than words.

What do I mean when I say this? I mean, for one thing, that President Taft and Attorney General Wickersham have already placed the United States government in the service of Diaz to aid in stamping out incipient revolution against him—a revolution with which, for justifiable grounds, our revolution of 1776, cannot for an instant be thought of in comparison.

Three times during the past two years the United States government has rushed an army to the Mexican border in order to crush a movement of Liberals which had risen against the autocrat. Constantly during the past three years the American government—through its secret service and its department of justice—has maintained in the border states a reign of terror in which it has lent itself unreservedly to the extermination of political refugees of Mexico who have sought safety from the long arm of Diaz upon the soil of this "land of the free and the home of the brave."

In a future article I shall tell in detail the story of America's persecution of the enemies of Diaz upon American soil.

DIAZ REELECTED.

Diaz has again been "elected" president of Mexico! But he would not have been elected except for the work of the soldiery.

When election day came his opponent, Madero, was in prison, charged with "insult to the government and to the president" in daring to make the race; the candidate for vice president in opposition to Diaz's choice was in Europe, where he had been banished; and the whole land was under military rule. The people had been deprived of firearms, hundreds were in prison for no crime except talking about the election of another president than Diaz, and other hundreds had been killed and wounded in an effort to stop the revolt against the tyrant.

The so-called election of Diaz does not mean that he received a majority of votes of the legalized voters of Mexico; it means that a majority were so intimidated they did not vote at all. The melancholy part of this picture is the fact that all his time Uncle Sam was aiding Diaz to perpetuate this fraud on humanity. United States troops and secret service men were on the border, and every aid possible was rendered Diaz, on his personal appeal to the Washington authorities. But why should it not be so, seeing that Diaz is merely a puppet in the hands of American capitalists? It was not the election of Diaz, it was the forcing of the American trust agent on the Mexicans at the point of the bayonet.

Elections in New Orleans.

Just before elections you will always notice that concealed weapons are discovered in the houses of suspected "revolutionists" and that the papers make a tremendous fuss about the imminence of revolution. This is a bald hoax, but it seems to be dangerous. When Diaz really thinks there is danger of an uprising, very little is said about it. The fellow who has nursed the dangerous flame of sedition in his bosom is arrested and shot without any parade or any newspaper publicity. But wherever there is a district of a province that might break the unanimity of the customary reelection of the president, if it were left to itself, there will certainly be found concealed weapons and all the apparatus of war a short time before election, and every newspaper in the world will get the news. On this general alarm, Diaz declares military rule in that particular place, and the votes are cast and counted under the eyes of the soldiers. This is always discouraging to the opposition, and greatly assists the harmonious unanimity of the regular reelection.

Another neat device is to arrest the opposing candidate, if there happens to be one. Francisco Madero was rash enough to intimate that he would put his name up against that of Diaz. Madero was arrested on the charge of harboring a runaway revolutionist. This charge must have been a flimsy one, for the government abandoned it and charged the would-be candidate with reviling the government. This charge is well founded, for when Madero was arrested, he remarked that he would not get any justice in the courts as long as Diaz ruled. He is safe in jail now.

Words Will Not Suffice.

From National Prohibitionist, Chicago.

It will take something more than words on the part of politicians to contend with Socialism. Whether the theory of the Socialist be right or wrong, Socialism in this land is a protest against wrongs that are very real, and as such it has a power and vitality with which only real truth can cope. The politicians who hold power at Washington and Albany and Springfield and Harrisburg and our other state capitals and misrule our great cities, by their prostitution of power, by their absolute disregard of public welfare, by creating Socialists, are paving the way for a revolution which, wisely or unwisely, will accomplish changes, be they for the better or the worse. If our present institutions are to be preserved, new principles in their administration, new methods in their conduct must be adopted, and that speedily. A political system built on fraud can never resist a revolution that, though perhaps, lacking in wisdom, is honest and founded on a real human need.

Jim Hill's "Knute"

Knute Nelson is one of the United States senators from Minnesota. He is the personal representative of and belongs bodily to "Jim" Hill, the railroad magnate and pirate. Nelson is chairman of the Ballinger whitewash committee and the very fact of his being chairman of that committee is sufficient evidence of his character and standing. Nelson was known to be "safe" when he was made chairman of that committee and from the day it opened its session he did all in his power to shield Ballinger, the tool of Guggenheim and Morgan, and discredit and destroy his accusers.

A few days ago the representatives of the various labor unions seeking to influence legislation favorable to labor at Washington called on "Jim" Hill's Knute, the alleged representative of Minnesota in the senate, in regard to a pending measure regarding workmen's compensation. Nelson at once flew into a rage, denounced those demanding labor legislation as demagogues and rushed from the room in fury.

This is "Jim" Hill's Knute, notorious as a henchman of Aldrich and as a lackey of the trusts and corporations.

There was one time in the career of "Jim" Hill's Knute, however, when his bluff failed to work. That was in 1894, when he was governor of Minnesota and the A. R. U under Debs had "Jim" Hill's Great Northern tied up from St. Paul to Puget Sound.

"Jim" Hill ordered his governor to summon Debs to appear in his office. Debs came. "Jim" Hill's Knute promptly exploded with fury. That's his game. Debs quite as promptly said his bluff. Waiting until "Jim" Hill's Knute got through Debs calmly said:

"Now, governor, listen to me. You can't bluff me. I can see clear through you and your game. You wear Jim Hill's collar. I don't. You are acting under his orders. I am here to fight him. I absolutely refuse to take the strikers' back to work. I take orders from neither you nor Jim Hill, your master. You may tell Hill for me that in spite of you and the soldiers you threaten to send out his road will stay tied up until he settles fairly and squarely with the strikers. Moreover, I propose to place you and your attitude squarely before the workmen of Minnesota and when you are next a candidate they will put you where you properly belong."

Debs said some other things that were to the point, but the governor interrupted him and begged of him with tears in his eyes not to misunderstand him, to which Debs answered: "No, governor, that is not your trouble, the trouble is that I do understand you. If I did not understand you you could bluff me out of your office and compel me under threat to force the strikers back to work; had you known how clearly I understand you I am sure you would not have summoned me to your office."

By this time the governor's roaring voice was reduced to whisper filled with emotion and the assurance was given again and again by the governor, "Jim" Hill's Knute, that his heart was full of sympathy for the poor working people and that they had not a better friend on earth.

Debs turned his back and walked from the office.

The bluff of "Jim" Hill's Knute did not work that day and the Appeal ventures the assertion that Knute, the tool of the plute, has never forgotten that interview.

Osacar's Unwisdom.

From Los Angeles Herald.

We fear that our own Oscar Lawler, who contributed a carefully prepared invective to President Taft's waste basket, is hopelessly "in bad" politically. If he is being championed by Representative Dalzell, the chairman of the house committee appointed to investigate the allegations of Mexican persecution of refugees in America he is hopelessly done for. Dalzell is Joe Cannon's alter ego. For a decade he has sneezed whenever Cannon took snuff. He has been for years the chief henchman for the house tyrant.

If Oscar has hitched up to that bunch we can't send him to the senate, as somebody over our shoulder suggested. We might have found excuses for his course in the Glavis case, but if he has been plotting the constitution by persecuting political refugees, and is now being shielded by Dalzell, as seems to be the case from the way in which the "investigation" is being conducted by that worthy, even our powerful voice is too feeble to be of avail to save him from the wreck.

At the hearing of the committee yesterday John Murray, of Los Angeles, testified that as secretary of the Political Refugees' Defense league he was in San Antonio last year during Taft's meeting with Diaz, and was arrested on a charge of violating the neutrality laws, thrown into jail and kept there forty-eight hours; then released without trial by order of the United States district attorney. He also related many instances of Mexican refugees arrested and kept in jail for weeks, often for months, on all kinds of trumped-up charges and finally released. John Kenneth Turner, author of "Barbarous Mexico," produced evidence that detectives had been seen tampering with mail in the Los Angeles postoffice.

Thereupon Chairman Dalzell of the committee announced that the hearing would be concluded today, which is taken to mean that Lawler will not be asked to explain his acts as United States district attorney at Los Angeles. Is Dalzell using some of the whitewash left over from the Ballinger investigation?

Substantially Correct.

From Tacoma (Neb.) Lyle.

It is not within the province of The Lyre to say whether or not the Appeal's socialistic remonstrances and deductions are fundamentally correct, but it is within its province to say that the great tidal wave of Socialism is advancing, not receding, and the greatest stroke that can be made to advance the cause of Socialism would be to subsidize the Appeal and then throw its editor into jail. It is perplexing the wise heads in Washington—probably too much truth, or if not truth, it makes them anxious.

Warren's Defiance.

A handsome printed book, large type, Warren on the cover, containing the full text of Warren's great speeches before the federal courts, and edited by St. Paul. Five dollars a hundred; and St. Paul, express prepaid; single copies 10c. Order from the Appeal.

OKLAHOMA'S RAILROAD.

As an indication of the revolt of the small traders and farmers against the EFFECTS of the present system, the dispatches tell us that a move is on in Oklahoma to initiate a law for the state to build a railroad from the northeast to the southwest corner of the state, and lease it to some railroad that will operate it. It is such lack of knowing what to do that enables the skinkers to exploit their victims. To build and operate such a road at cost would greatly benefit the property owners by raising the prices and the rents, but it would not benefit the working class but little if any. But it would soon put the kibosh on the class of roads that the present extortionate rates make necessary for profitable operation. If the state leases the road to other roads, it will be operated to the detriment of the public, as has been proven by the Illinois Central, the Cincinnati Southern, the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis and other roads built by the public and leased to a lot of grafters. It does not cost as much to build railroads as is claimed. A state railroad, operated in the interest of the people, could operate at one-third present tariffs, and the other roads would have to come to these rates or the people and business would move from one section of the country to another to get the advantage of the rates, as was done in Iowa and Minnesota many years ago. A new road was built some twenty miles away, paralleling the first road that extorted from the people; the new road made lower rates; owners of property on the old road abandoned their holdings and moved over to the new road because they could better afford to throw their property away than to pay the difference in the rates. One publicly owned road across Oklahoma would reduce the rates one-half or more on all the roads. It would then be profitable enough. But they will get the present rates so long as they can, of course. I had something to do with building and financing fifteen miles of interurban electric road from Girard to the coal mines east of it two years ago. We built this road and equipped it for \$15,000 a mile. It has now under other management an interest bearing debt of \$45,000 a mile, besides the stock. If the public had sense enough to build and own it, it would be getting the use of the property for one-third the investment it now has to pay on. But to build a road and lease it to some profit mongers would not help the condition one bit. The public prints keep the people ignorant on the economics of railroads, and that is why the railroads fought the provisions of the railroad bill that proposed to investigate the real cost and value of the transportation properties of the nation. A system of electric passenger and freight lines could be built in Oklahoma that would pay an interest on the capital and give the public better service than they are now getting for one-third what they now pay. And all roads will be run by electricity in the next decade. It is better and cheaper. Will Oklahoma rise to the occasion? If she does, she will double her population in the next ten years.

Oscar's Unwisdom.

From Los Angeles Herald.

We fear that our own Oscar Lawler, who contributed a carefully prepared invective to President Taft's waste basket, is hopelessly "in bad" politically. If he is being championed by Representative Dalzell, the chairman of the house committee appointed to investigate the allegations of Mexican persecution of refugees in America he is hopelessly done for. Dalzell is Joe Cannon's alter ego. For a decade he has sneezed whenever Cannon took snuff. He has been for years the chief henchman for the house tyrant.

If Oscar has hitched up to that bunch we can't send him to the senate, as somebody over our shoulder suggested. We might have found excuses for his course in the Glavis case, but if he has been plotting the constitution by persecuting political refugees, and is now being shielded by Dalzell, as seems to be the case from the way in which the "investigation" is being conducted by that worthy, even our powerful voice is too feeble to be of avail to save him from the wreck.

At the hearing of the committee yesterday John Murray, of Los Angeles, testified that as secretary of the Political Refugees' Defense league he was in San Antonio last year during Taft's meeting with Diaz, and was arrested on a charge of violating the neutrality laws, thrown into jail and kept there forty-eight hours; then released without trial by order of the United States district attorney. He also related many instances of Mexican refugees arrested and kept in jail for weeks, often for months, on all kinds of trumped-up charges and finally released. John Kenneth Turner, author of "Barbarous Mexico," produced evidence that detectives had been seen tampering with mail in the Los Angeles postoffice.

Thereupon Chairman Dalzell of the committee announced that the hearing would be concluded today, which is taken to mean that Lawler will not be asked to explain his acts as United States district attorney at Los Angeles. Is Dalzell using some of the whitewash left over from the Ballinger investigation?

Substantially Correct.

From Tacoma (Neb.) Lyle.

It is not within the province of The Lyre to say whether or not the Appeal's socialistic remonstrances and deductions are fundamentally correct, but it is within its province to say that the great tidal wave of Socialism is advancing, not receding, and the greatest stroke that can be made to advance the cause of Socialism would be to subsidize the Appeal and then throw its editor into jail. It is perplexing the wise heads in Washington—probably too much truth, or if not truth, it makes them anxious.

Warren's Defiance.

A handsome printed book, large type, Warren on the cover, containing the full text of Warren's great speeches before the federal courts, and edited by St. Paul. Five dollars a hundred; and St. Paul, express prepaid; single copies 10c. Order from the Appeal.

The Ubiquitous Question

BY C. L. PHIPER

Is kidnaping legal? The question will not down. Since Warren asked it in respect to the Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone cases, it has passed through many vicissitudes, only to come back each time with renewed power, and in plainer terms. Is kidnaping legal?

The latest appearance of the question was at Pensacola, Fla., where United States Commissioner Marsh decided that kidnaping was not legal. This is another knot in the question. The supreme court of the United States decided it was legal in the Moyer case, with Justice McKenna dissenting; then they prosecuted Warren for three years for merely suggesting kidnaping of a capitalist; and now it is decided that kidnaping is contrary to law.

The matter came before Judge Marsh over the arrest of Felix Corbin, indicted in Georgia for assault, with intent to commit murder. Corbin fled to Florida and application was made for requisition, which was granted by the governor of Florida. But a petition for a writ of *habeas corpus* was applied for in the first judicial circuit court of Florida on the ground that the requisition papers were faulty, and the court issued the papers, delivering them to the sheriff of the county, named Collins. These papers were conveniently lost, and Corbin was rearrested and taken by Collins in an automobile to Alabama, where a train was boarded and Corbin was escorted as a prisoner to Georgia. Judge Marsh, after reviewing the case, decided that Corbin was in effect kidnaped, contrary to law; and not only so, but that the concerted action on the part of several people in making connections for the taking away of the prisoner proved conspiracy as well. He, therefore, held the sheriff and his assistant to await the action of the grand jury.

In rendering his opinion, Judge Marsh makes it plain that a law of the United States had been violated, as well as state law of Florida. The matter will, therefore, in all probability, come before the federal courts for final decision, if it does not go to the supreme court of the United States itself. The decision is far reaching in nature, and already proceedings are being begun in Mississippi, where a case greatly resembling the Florida case is under consideration.

If the decision of Judge Marsh is found to be in accordance with law, then the executives of law become themselves subject to law, a thing which was entirely ignored in the Colorado case and which is the very crux of Warren's contention. If Judge Marsh's position is correct, then the governors of Colorado and Idaho, at the time of the Haywood kidnaping, were both kidnapers and conspirators, and subject, even at this day, to criminal prosecution, with a possible penitentiary sentence to follow. It would have been impossible to bring out the main contention in the Warren case in stronger relief than has just been done in the Florida decision.

The Warren prosecution was clearly for the purpose of covering the criminal trial of men supposed to uphold the law. It took three years to clear away the verbal rubbish that concealed the true issue,

