

Regeneration.

Published every Saturday at
914 Boston St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Telephone: Home A 1360.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
3 months, 60c; 6 months, \$1.10; 1
year, \$2.00; Single copy, 5c;
in bundles, 3c per copy.

No. 108.

Saturday, September 21, 1912.

"Give Thy People A King, That He May Rule Over Them."

Among the blind the one-eyed is king; above the rack of politicians which this country is cursed Roosevelt towers. He towers because he is not afraid; because he bawls out boldly while Socialists, and the semi-Socialists of both the old parties, have been driving at for years but covering up with soothing sophistries. Here is a good example of Roosevelt's style, taken from a recent San Francisco speech, in which he criticized the Democratic candidate for president. After declaring—and with much truth—that the liberty for which Wilson stands is the liberty to work children to death, he said: "What we stand for is to extend government power, and extend as much as possible for the growth of men and women who can better perform the exacting duties of American citizenship. Instead of limiting governmental action, the prime need in our day is to extend the authority to protect the man who needs protection, the weaker man who cannot fight his battles alone."

That, the most accursed doctrine to which a man can lay his tongue, is also magnificent; truly educational because absolutely frank; of inestimable value because it brings us up with a round turn and forces us to think thus hastening the onward march. It states boldly the time-honored position of the Roman Catholic Church; the position of the Czar of all the Russias and of every Asiatic despot; states it in words so simple that the dullest must understand. From Roosevelt's own lips we have it straight that he stands for authority, made stronger and extended; that the sheep need shepherds; that society must consist inevitably of the weak protected by the strong. There is no mistake about it, and also there is no mistake about the fact—tragic beyond the power of language to describe—that millions today rave over the statement. Protection, pushed bravely to its logical conclusion, is the slogan, and the battle cry—"Give thy people a king, that he may rule over them!"

One need not charge unscrupulous ambitions. One need not say Roosevelt is maddened with the scent of power. That would be a guess, and, like all guesses, pitifully weak. We should take our stand on the unshakable ground of unalterable fact. We should appeal, with even more than Roosevelt's courage, to the record, and thrust into the public's nose the reeking truth that rulers can grow strong only as the ruled, from whom they take their strength, grow helpless. We should point not only to the past but to the indubitable present; not only to the bloody revolutions forced on long-suffering humanity by over-weening power, but to history as we see it today, marching before our eyes. If the disinherited Mexican wins back his birthright will it not be because his government is too weak to bar the way? When a union is governed autocratically does it not lose all initiative and become a spineless mass? When we cease to be masters of ourselves and must take orders from above, does not the better part of us go automata, waiting for the undertaker to shovel us into the box? It is impossible to write too strongly.

Roosevelt is a great man—a truly great, big man—because he has done what other politicians for nearly a century past have been afraid to do. He has taken this Republican idol of protection, which its priests wrapped in the mystery of unintelligible schedules, and he has let us see the rags and tinsel, the moth-eaten purple, and the tarnished gilt, of which it is composed. He is a true Republican, and lives up to his creed where others flinch. He says, as says the Pope, that the weak we always must have, and the weak we must protect. He says it as the Southern planter said it of his slaves. He says it as my own people used to say it, in my hearing, of the men and women on their estates among whom they habitually distributed coal and snuff and blankets, since it would be a disgrace to the family if a dependant fell into actual want. He says it like the Czar, to whom millions still bend the knee under the awful delusion that he is really the Little Father of his people, and watches over their welfare with a parental eye. He preaches, with all the fervor of a crusader, this patriarchal doctrine. He stands, grossly unabashed, for the eternal childhood of the race. He does it, as I believe, because, for all his democratic trappings, he is at heart an aristocrat of aristocrats, with the slave-owning blood running riot in his veins. He has all the noble assurance that the serf is incapable of thought; he is proudly confident that the puppet can not understand the strings; he is unafraid of masses, not because he considers them enlightened but because he looks on them as stupid beyond redemption. Doubtless they are

stupid, but Mr. Roosevelt forgets that we are living in an age of universally attempted revolution, and that the foggiest brain can realize that the club from which it aches was wielded by the hand of that dear Government whose authority "the prime need in our day is to extend."

Roosevelt is not a Republican renegade; but true to the stock that sired him. He is loyal, in the very marrow of his bones, to that great dogma of special privilege with which the Republican Party has been poisoning this nation I know not how many years. He, and he alone, would carry its gospel to the stern conclusion from which all others shrink; he, and he alone, has no hesitation in leading authority with power, that the stream may trickle from above to the lower depths in which, according to the creed, the people have to dwell; he does not bat an eyelid in declaring that salvation lies in multiplying officials, and be very sure that he will back up their edicts with every bayonet his "extended" government can command.

Roosevelt claims Debs as his brother, and that is right; but where Debs strides on with seven-leagued boots. The similarity and the contrast are alike pathetic. Debs also would increase the powers of government, giving it an industry here and a function there, but always with a smooth excuse. It would not be the government we know, so painfully. From this old eagle's nest, by some great miracle, a dove will spring. There will be more officials, but of a different breed; taken from the ranks of labor—as are our prison guards and third degree. Anybody they will be better than our profit-driving capitalists, and though government is not what it is cracked up to be, it is the best that can be done. Thus runs the argument of Debs, Berger and their compromising kind.

"Protection" is not a question of wool, steel or sugar schedules, though the politicians try to make it appear such, that they may tangle us up in a net of incomprehensible figures. It is a deep-rooted, wide-spread and utterly pernicious philosophy of life, which has come down to us from the dark despotisms of the past. The doctrine is that improvement must descend from above; that the masses benefit only through the superior few, and that such few—always self-elected—must be endowed with special privileges that they may guard the many from their folly. It is the doctrine that, in the religious domain, the Church of Rome inherited from the Caesars, and that, in the secular domain, has been the pet dogma of every ruling class. Bakunin wrote his "God and the State" expressly to demonstrate that, by an unalterable law of nature, privilege always corrupts, and one may remind Roosevelt, the historian, that Buckle's great indictment of protection, in his justly celebrated "History of Civilization," never has been answered. Therein he takes the reader, step by step, through the rise, decline and fall of the mightiest empires this world has known; pointing ever, with a wealth of evidence that leaves no room for doubt, to the one invariable cause—the robbery of power from the many to load it on the few.

Man should be a worthy animal; he should be capable of governing himself, as do the other animals. He should not have to beg for work; he should not starve amid plenty because no monopolist finds it to his profit to employ him. But this he must submit to so long as he permits monopoly to live, and being thus enslaved he must submit to being governed. If he will not rule himself he must be ruled; if he will not take the rights that enable him to employ himself he must work for the employer, and expect to be treated as the mere money-making instrument he actually is. His remedy is plain, but it is not the remedy of Roosevelt, or of that all-government Socialist system which Roosevelt has appropriated as a weapon ready fashioned to his hand. Indeed it lies directly away from that, the road pointing not to more government but to enlarging the bounds of individual freedom; not to centralising monopoly, and thereby strengthening it a thousandfold, but to rooting it out and cultivating in its stead that "square deal" which was one of the phrases with which Roosevelt captured the thoughtless vote now cheering his despotic program. However, the sheepskin has been cast aside and the grinning fangs of Caesarism are at last in sight. Roosevelt is making us sit up and think. At least, one hopes so.

W.M.C. OWEN.

OPPOSES INTERVENTION.

Resolutions presented by the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, protesting against intervention by the United States in Mexico, have been adopted unanimously by the San Francisco Labor Council.

The resolutions state that the intervention headed by Madero was for the purpose of abolishing peonage and changing the system of land tenure, and that pledges to that effect have been broken, the present leaders are endeavoring to accomplish the original purpose. The case of the Civil War in the United States, which was for practically the same purpose, lasted more than four years and caused the loss of millions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives, is recalled, and the fact that the United States government protested against such intervention by Great Britain was withheld through the efforts of the cotton mill operatives of Lancashire.

Furthermore, the resolutions say, our Civil War abolished chattel slavery and involuntary servitude in the United States. Intervention in this case would be in direct opposition to the settled policy of the country, contrary to human liberty and solely in the interests of a few Americans, who are following their own interests.

Declares Peace In Sight, But Wants New War Loan

Washington, Sept. 10.—The American state department was denounced as a "creature of Wall Street conspirators and financial pirates in Mexico" today by Juan Pedro Didapp, Washington representative of the Mexican revolutionists. He formally protested against the United States rendering aid to the Mexican government in its campaign against the rebels. In a statement today he said:

"The Speyer, Morgan and Harman interests control the Mexican railroads; Henry Clay Pierce and the Standard Oil company possess a monopoly of Mexican oil lands; the big business interests in Mexico are John Hays Hammond and Charles P. Taft. These are the powers which are forcing the state department openly to assist Madero."

"If the state department grants belligerent rights to the revolutionists they will guarantee to protect all American lives and property in the republic and all friction along the border with Mexico will cease."

The past week has been one of continual rumors of heavy impending conflicts in the Northern States, and of great anxiety in Mexico City, without apparently anything of great importance having taken place. The principal event probably was the capture by Salazar of the rich mining camp of El Tigre, situated in Sonora and operated by the El Tigre Mining Company, which is a branch of the Phelps-Dodge syndicate. The stores were looted to the extent of several thousand dollars, but the company's valuable plant was not molested. On the other hand the rebels took gold bullion, valued variously at from \$20,000 to \$60,000. It was reported also that three of the company's leading officials had been held for ransom in the sum of \$100,000, but this proved to be one of the numerous sensational reports that have been flying around. The rebels shortly afterwards evacuated the camp and it is again in the possession of federal troops, who originally put up practically no defense.

Much currency was given on the same day to rumors that Gen. Huerta was about to desert Madero, but this he denied emphatically. There has been also constant talk of filibustering parties being in process of formation on the United States side of the border, and, September 14, E. S. O'Reilly and three newspaper men were arrested at Douglas, Ariz., charged with violation of the neutrality laws.

In a long interview, given out in Los Angeles, September 16, by Senator A. B. Fall of New Mexico, he stated that "conditions have never been in a more critical state than at the present moment. He, with Senators W. J. Smith, of Michigan, Chas. A. Smyth and Wm. E. Borah, are visiting this city as a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and continuing the investigation they began in El Paso.

Col. Pascual Orozco, father of the rebel leader of the same name, was taken prisoner by United States troops, September 15, having crossed the frontier. For several days the rumor persisted that his son also had been captured, but apparently reliable despatches, dated September 18, are to the effect that he is very much at large, being at the head of 1200 well mounted men and advancing on Juarez, where a stiff fight is again expected.

Cinigua, opposite Presidio, Texas, was taken by the Federals, September 15.

Another War Loan.

Independence Day, September 16, brought rioting in Mexico City, but it was suppressed, as might have been expected, for it seems certain that the government has been concentrating all available troops there, anticipating a Zapata attack. Ten men were executed in connection with the plot recently discovered. Madero read his message to Congress, in which he said that \$18,000,000 of the \$20,000,000 loan made in June had been expended, immediately necessary. He recommended compulsory military service, which has aroused a storm of protest, and put himself on record once more as declaring the revolution practically at an end.

On the same date sixty-five American refugees reached Douglas from Nacozari, the fate of which place is still in doubt, the town being threatened by Salazar and Rojas. The Phelps-Dodge syndicate has called in the employees in its various mines to aid in the defense. Fifteen Mormons, the last of the American residents at Colonia Morelos, reached Douglas that day.

Campa was reported, September 18, as having been surprised at Sasabe by 400 federals, but he seems to have made a safe retreat and is said to be heading for Sinaloa. Under that same date the "Los Angeles Evening Herald" played up the following despatch from Mexico City, which we give with some mental reserve, the paper having been guilty of several unfounded but highly sensational reports: "About 5000 rebels under the leadership of Gen. Emilio Zapata have appeared before the gates of this city and are threatening to take it and slaughter every American within its limits."

American they can reach, and then we will join with the Mexican army to fight the common foe from the north."

"The commander of the federal garrison at Cuernavaca reported to the war office today that the rebels are showing unwonted activity in that particular region, and that their general movement seems to be toward the capital."

"Insurrectos from Zapata's main band have been raiding the countryside for a week, taking away with them large quantities of supplies of all kinds. The information has leaked out that he is preparing for an extremely active fall campaign."

"Rebels in Oaxaca and Guerrero have suddenly come to life, according to advices from those states. They are raiding and robbing with unusual freedom, there being practically no opposition in that section from federal forces, Madero having withdrawn most of his troops to the capital in preparation for an assault upon it by Zapata."

AS MEXICO SEES US.

Frederic J. Haskin, one of the best known syndicalist writers in the country, has a long article in the "Trenton Evening Times"—and, we suppose, in other papers—which begins as follows:

"As Americans have well-defined and not over-complimentary views concerning Mexicans, so they have certain views about us that do not show us as through our own eyes. In the first place the Mexicans look upon us as a nation of land-grabbers. They recall that practically one-third of the territory of the United States was secured from Mexico, that we own about a million square miles of land that once was theirs. In other words, they feel that we have taken a million square miles of their territory and have left them only 767,000 miles."

"They feel, too, that much of the best land in their original domain has come to us with the million square miles of territory, and that acre for acre the land we got from them is worth more than the land they have been permitted to retain. They think that the independence of Texas was brought about by Americans who wanted to make it a part of the United States, and that, however it may be viewed, we have proved to be a land-hungry people who have taken advantage of them whenever we could."

"Nor do they find much hope that our land-grabbing tendencies have been entirely obliterated. To their minds our annexation of Hawaii, our retention of the Philippines and Porto Rico, and our quarrel with Colombia all demonstrate that the occasion is the only thing needed and we will make another grab. The Spaniard and his descendant is by nature suspicious; he never fails to assess at full value the usefulness of the past in projecting a forecast of the future. His suspicions more often than not lead him to over-appraise rather than to under-estimate any evil-minded designs that seem to lie in the hearts of nations and individuals."

"There is today all Mexico looks upon the United States as a nation of good impulses which goes wrong the minute there is a chance to grab a bit of territory. And that is why the specter of intervention haunts them. It is why the reports are not to be believed which have it that Orozco wants to force intervention. It is why intervention would be a signal for federals and revolutionists to forget their own differences and unite against the common enemy from the north."

THE PANAMA CANAL.

"The canal shall be free, and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise."

The foregoing is, word for word, the opening clause of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, entered into solemnly with Great Britain and recognized as governing the administration of the Panama Canal. It abrogated the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and conferred valuable rights on United States shipping plying in Canadian waters.

Observe the phrases "entire equality" and "no discrimination," but note especially the words "of all nations," for in them the United States Senate pretends to find the loophole that justifies it in giving our own shipping special privileges. It is now claimed that "all nations" means "nations other than the United States." The gentleman who originated that brilliant suggestion is Lewis Nixon, of malodorous shipping-trust notoriety.

Unfortunately the London "Morning Post" is able to show that in the Senate, when the treaty was under debate, an amendment was proposed which ran: "Providing that the United States should reserve the right, in the operation of the canal, to discriminate in respect of the charges in favor of her own citizens." That amendment was defeated.

The other argument on which the United States falls back is that the treaty was made when Panama was an independent Republic, but that now the canal zone—thanks to the revolution Roosevelt fomented—belongs to us.

Unfortunately, again the treaty specially provided for such a contingency, in the following clause: "It is agreed that no change of territorial sovereignty, or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal, shall affect the general principle of neutralization of the obligation of the high commanding parties under the present treaty." That means, when put into simple language, that the canal was to be run on absolutely neutral principles, no matter what changes in territorial ownership might take place.

How do you feel about it? The "Los Angeles Daily Times," which insists that the canal is ours, to be used or shut up, as we please, unbosoms itself editorially thus: "The 'Times' dislikes to criticize the statesmen of our mother-in-law land, but it cannot be denied that they do sometimes seem to think that everything they see belongs to the British Empire. Like the baby who has not yet learned the limitation of 'I wish,' they reach for both the nearest toy, and the farthest moonbeam, and howl when the moon regards them not."

If that is not a good example of the old sterner maxim—"No case; abuse the other side"—what is?

The people of the United States have not been guilty of this breach of faith, for the people have been no more consulted than if they inhabited the moon. That den of special privileges, the Senate, and its henchman, Taft, are the criminals. But the people have to bear the brunt and carry the handicap of a world-growing conviction that Americans cannot be trusted. In the Latin countries, more particularly, this is becoming a universally-accepted maxim.

Read the quotation from Debs, which we put in a box. For twenty years he has made his living preaching the very thing he went squarely back on in the case of Mexico. He, a revolutionary Socialist! He, an Internationalist! We guess not, except for revenue.

WHAT ROOSEVELT WANTS.

"To the Federal Government he would commit unlimited power, even over small things; business would be regulated and controlled from Washington; the standard of wages would be fixed; inequality in the distribution of profits would be attended to; he would teach the weak; the unfortunate, and the unemployed to look to the Government for relief." ("N. Y. Times.")

"The entrance of Roosevelt with a radical platform, involving practically everything popularly known as 'State Socialism,' is too palpable to permit us to make any mistake about the outlook for the present campaign. There is absolutely no doubt that Theodore's platform will attract thousands, possibly hundreds of thousands, of voters whose ballots would have been cast for the Socialist candidates had Theodore not entered the field in this manner." ("N. Y. Call.")

"He has gone a long way in the direction of State Socialism." (Victor Berger.)

All Things to All Men.

"The next thing in order is for the attorney general to institute a dissolution suit against the new Progressive party as a political trust. It has gone ahead and carried its platform nearly all the issues there are or can possibly be in the next fifty years,—all that, but two. It left out the single tax and the liquor issue. Its platform committee had to struggle hard to keep these out. The single tax was at one time adopted (in a mild form) by a vote of 26 to 5 and was afterward dropped. The liquor plank proposed was also a mild one. It was to the effect that the federal government has no right to issue licenses for sale in dry States. That also was voted down. But the committee adopted, in essence, many of the 'Populist' planks (except free silver), most of the Republican and Democratic planks, the planks demanded by the Federation of Labor, the Woman Suffrage plank, and, according to the Socialists themselves, a fairly complete program of State Socialism. The first draft of the new party's platform would have filled nine pages of this magazine. Most of the argument was afterward eliminated, and the platform was thus cut down one-half. Even then, it is said, other proposed issues, enough to make another platform of equal size, were left out. We can't imagine what they were." ("Current Literature.")

THE CHAMPION'S DIAMONDS.

Testifying at the inquest over the body of his wife, who committed suicide, Jack Johnson, former champion heavyweight, said: "She was apparently happy and a few days ago I ordered a new set of jewels for her. They were to be delivered next Wednesday. I talked with her for a few hours before she shot herself; we talked of the jewels and she was as happy as a child."

He spoke unconsciously the words that constitute the entire indictment of modern civilization wherein the old millions desperately cry aloud for happiness and are given a glittering stone. Every imaginable thing the jaded appetite can think itself into calling for we manufacture until the warehouses burst, but happiness we cannot produce; and our sun looks daily down on such a scene of never-ceasing and degrading scramble as he never saw before. Our recorded murders in this most "civilized" of countries average thirty a day, with the ratio to population increasing yearly. As for our suicides and insanities, the figures are even more appalling.

Such is the civilization we strive to thrust, at the bayonet's point, on Mexico and other countries we have the audacity to label "barbarous," because, forsooth! they are so simple as to think that happiness is not to be found in Jack Johnson's diamonds.

THUS WROTE DEBS.
"If the land can be taken from the rich in this insurrection, (the Mexican Revolution) so can also the mills, factories, mines, railroads, and the machinery of production, and the question is, what would the masses in their present ignorant and unorganized state do with them after having obtained them? It would simply add calamity to their calamities, granting that this impossible feat were capable of achievement." (Extract from article by Eugene V. Debs in the "International Socialist Review" of June, 1911, in which he gave his party the word to boycott the Mexican Revolution.)

HOT ON INTERVENTION.

Washington, Sept. 13.—The United States government is invested with certainty over the Customhouse in Santo Domingo, and the fact that the rebels have already taken possession of the Customhouse establishments at certain points along the boundary line, between the disturbed republic and Hayti, adds to the gravity of the situation, and makes intervention almost imperative.

Washington, Sept. 13.—Fiscal intervention in Cuba may result from pressure being brought to bear by contractors having claims aggregating \$15,000,000 for sewers and paving work done in Havana.

The contractors, who are Americans, are insistent that they should be protected by this government. The view of the fact that the contract was let during Gen. Wood's administration and was continued in force by the island government. (Despatches to "Los Angeles Daily Times.")

LABOR'S TRUE FOES.

"The world," says the "Los Angeles Daily Times"—discussing editorially "The Soul of Man Under Socialism," by Oscar Wilde—holds in potential an abundance of warmth, food and clothing for all, but these happy combinations must be formed by conscious, consistent and constant effort. Production comes only through applied attention, and no scheme can possibly be invented that will spare the individual from his just contribution of thought and action, in continuing the world's sufficiency. Responsibility is unescapable."

Again we remark that the "Times" has a revolutionist on its editorial staff; one who follows the admirable method of making the suggestion and giving his readers the opportunity to do their own thinking. For example, on any reflective mind that reads the foregoing there must jump instantly the thought that the whole trouble with our economic system is that it has created parasites by the million, who, though they toil not neither do they spin, "mistle it through the world in silks and diamonds, recognizing no responsibility save their own degenerate whims. These millions have no wish or skill to make. They are given by law the privilege to take, and every one of them is supported on the worker's back."

HOW DO YOU ALLOW IT?

In "The Syndicalist" (London) for this month Tom Mann has an article in which he deals largely with the ever-crucial question of unemployment. The article is headed with the statement that the unions "must fight to control industry," and he says: "There is no need whatever for unemployed. The men and women thrown out of work by the Capitalists are so thrown out because the Working Class allow the Capitalist class to be the deciding factors." How come it that the capitalists are the deciding factors? How is it that a pitifully small minority, composed of the greater part of people so incapable that they could not make their living anywhere, DO actually dominate the situation?

Obviously because those people are in possession; because they have a legal corner on that without which production cannot take place. It is not a question of ability, and therefore it cannot be solved by making the workers better educated, better drilled, and so forth. It is a question of possession, pure and simple. But the fool and the incompetent in possession of him the land, from which all production must start, and the money, without which no exchanges can be effected; do this, enforcing it with all the power of government, and he will be the deciding factor. It is not a question of "allowing." Not at all; not a bit of it. It is a question of our not being able to help it as long as monopoly is upheld by government and we uphold government.

Tom Mann is talking half-truths. He is persuading a lot of unthinking people that—by organizing, etc.—they can become masters of the situation, allowing the few to remain masters of all that makes the situation what it is. Greater folly could not be taught.

The simple Mexican, who goes straight for the land and takes it, knowing that only thereby can he overthrow his master, is a labor leader from whom many of those who bear the title have much to learn.

"It is characteristic of privilege, and of every privileged position, that they poison the minds and hearts of men. He who is politically or economically privileged has his mind and heart depraved. This is a law of social life, which admits of no exceptions and is applicable to entire nations as well as to classes, corporations and individuals. It is the law of equality, the foremost of the conditions of liberty and humanity." (Bakunin.)

"Only from egoism can the lower classes get help, and this help they must give to themselves and will give to themselves. If they do not feel themselves constrained into fear they are a power." (Stirner.)

FACTS TALK EFFECTIVELY.

That most subversive of doctrines regarding the impossibility of the organization of unskilled and low-priced female labor has received its death blow at Lawrence, and a score of places on the East coast. On the Pacific slope, too the hopeless migratory has conducted splendid campaigns in British Columbia, which for endurance and pluck are worthy to be ranked with labor's notable fights. Everywhere the practicability of a homogeneous and united labor movement becomes more evident.

Along with many of the old trade union concepts has gone much of the faith of the Socialist working man in the efficacy of political action as a revolutionary force. More than ever he becomes impressed with the fact that politics is a game in which he can play but a very insignificant part, and in which he is largely at the mercy of forces over which he has little or no control.

Facts then, as is their way, have disposed of a whole heap of controversial matter which has choked the avenues of the labor movement for many years. We have seen many illusions shattered, many brave flags of theory hurled from the field riddled to rags, many leaders discredited. More than all we have seen the English-speaking world produce an almost incredible program of social and political reform, so that, as one of the greater capitalist papers recently remarked, Debs must feel quite conservative in comparison with Roosevelt. (Austin Lewis, in "The Industrial Worker.")

What the worker wants is access to the means of life. Of that Debs will only talk indirectly, at so much a talk.

What the worker wants is to get the throw monopoly, which hars him from access to the means of life. Of that Berger won't even talk.

What the worker wants is to get the parasite off his back. What the Socialists want is to load him down with more, chiefly from among the clerical and legal office-seekers.

When the Spanish wish to speak contemptuously of a politician they call him a "policastro." This is best translated the "politically castrated."

OUR LYING PLUTOCRATS.

One B. A. Worthington, recently elected president of the Chicago and Alton, has been delivering what the papers call a "blistering attack on Socialist doctrines." He addressed the convention of the Traveling Engineers' Association, and urged his audience to "change the feeling of jealous hatred against the more fortunate ones into a feeling of generous fortitude and hospitality." He complained that "there seems to be a yellow fever of literature prepared for the spread of incorrect information, which is misleading to the men who have not the chance or opportunity to get at the facts," and declared that "labor in all lines of service never has been better paid, and working conditions never have been less arduous than they are at the present time." So spake the railway president.

In the same paper that reported the foregoing appeared another article, taken from "Leslie's" and dealing with crowded housing conditions and their results. After showing that everything tends to produce, from earliest childhood, a population necessarily corrupted to the core, the writer gives certain details, from which we clip the following: "I know one street in New York City, lined with tenements, many of them full of windowless bedrooms, and on the ground floor of a single block of that street are two rooms, three every corner, one booth-like stand, two factories, twenty-three pushcarts, ninety-one shops. Street women ply their trade along the crowded curb and rent rooms in the tenements. Yet in this one block live 1075 children, of whom 462 are under school age."

It is libelous to misrepresent a private individual to his injury, and we punish it with imprisonment in the penitentiary. But when leading citizens, to whom society has the right to look for information, wilfully misrepresent the condition of the masses, we pat them on the back and give them lying utterances all possible publicity.

When the inevitable smash comes we shall discover that the United States is far more rotten than its most caustic Anarchist critics ever dared to hint. Truth! One begins to doubt if such a thing exists within her borders.

MORE SAGRISTA CARDS.

We have received from Fernin Sagrista, the celebrated Spanish artist, the second of the eloquent postal cards in which he is depicting the Mexican Revolution. This one, of which we now have quite a supply on hand, gives us the picture of a woman waving a banner inscribed "Land and Liberty." In her left hand she bears aloft a torch, heading an attack on one of Mexico's Bastilles, a broken pillar of which indicates that it is yielding to the assault.

These cards are for sale at five cents each, or fifty cents a dozen. The profits will be devoted to clearing off the deficit still hanging over "Regeneration," as to which we are being hard pressed.

"The stage of evolution to which the State belongs will soon be left behind by man. The State is doomed." (Kropotkin.)

INTERNATIONAL BALL.

Don't forget the ball at Burbank Hall, Saturday, September 21. The objects are excellent and the attendance should be good. Tickets only twenty-five cents.

SEND US NAMES.

You can assist greatly by sending us the names and addresses of those to whom it may be worth while to mail sample papers and other propaganda matter.