

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. 109.

Saturday, September 28, 1912.

Make A Wilderness
And Call It Peace

Such struggles as that now rending Mexico have one redeeming glory; they drag fundamentals to the daylight, where it is impossible to flinch them. Any one can discuss, for the airing of senseless views carries with it, at most, only the penalty of having proved oneself a fool. But action is quite a different thing, especially when the action makes life itself the stake. Men think before risking their all, and seldom will jeopardize their skins for what they know to be a lie. The presumption of thought and sincerity is always in their favor, and we may be certain that within the last eighteen months the people of Mexico have gone for bottom questions. First and foremost is this problem of Protection; this delusion that the disinherited should look to politicians for relief.

Two children are born into the world; clanking blindly at their mothers' breasts. Nature, with magnificent impartiality, has made them equally dependent, but the law regards nature as a blunderer and proceeds promptly to undo her work. One it wraps in purple, guarding it for life against want and the fear of want. The other it exposes to the slums, imposing ten thousand barriers between it and the satisfaction of its needs. It seems needless to add that the child in the purple is the exception, to whom all the enormous majority is sacrificed. Yet people talk of the impartiality of the law, and owlish orators assure their audiences that without its Protection the poor could not exist!

In the forest a poor woman is gathering sticks to save her family from cold. In the palace lounges a delicately-scented seigneur, and, as Carlyle says, he will take every third stick the old woman gathers, and call it rent. The delicately-scented seigneur has the protection of the law—a protection that kills his manhood and makes him a crawling prostitute. The poor woman gets—What? The Protection of the law? Oh! Irony of words!

They thought these things out in France, more than a hundred years ago; thought them out to the crash of the Bastille, and the thunder of Napoleon's guns; that Napoleon whom England, putting herself at the head of the intervening powers, forced on; the French revolutionists. They thought them out, and the nobles had to mount the guillotine or scurry into exile; those same nobles who had whipped their peasants and broken them on the wheel when they failed to produce the money court luxury demanded. It is what they are doing in Mexico today, where Zapata and a hundred other rebel leaders are sweeping out an Augean stable with brooms of steel. They have suffered and been forced to think on this question of Protection.

Here, in California, we have a strong anti-capitalist punishment agitation as to which I believe that the State cannot diminish murder by turning murderers, and that the real murderers—the men who lay field to field and pile money-bag on money-bag, "that they may be alone in the midst of the earth," invariably escape the gallows. Meanwhile, in this "protected" City of the Angels, twenty-four men are lying in the county jail, accused of murder, to say nothing of twenty-two awaiting trial on charges of attempted murder. Six of the accused murderers are Americans, and the others bear Mexican, Italian, Chinese and Japanese names. The "Times" and prison officials declare crime is increasing and trace it to the lawless reformers, who are stripping the law of all its former terrors. They howl for more Protection, and again I invite readers to consider facts.

About the six Americans one does not know; but, in the vast majority of cases, the Mexican is devoted to the soil, and if allowed to raise his beans and maize, will trouble no one. Unfortunately the law compels him to pay about \$500 an acre for the privilege of getting at the land, so he hangs about looking for a job, until one day he loses patience and draws his knife. As to the Italian, he naturally loves to farm and garden, as do the Chinese and the Japanese. To every one of these land monopoly, and those who will uphold it, deny the opportunity, adding insult to injury by calling on their victims to worship—the Protection of the law.

They have thought these things over in Mexico, as the French peasant thought them over. They have had this alleged Protection of the law under genuine investigation, which the people of the United States, chloroformed by spellbinders, have not. Here they have been skillfully steered away from main issues and bamboozled into quarreling over complicated wage schedules which the ordinary worker never has been able, and never will be able, to understand. But even then the most cursory examination gives the whole case away. For example, if there is a highly-protected industry it is that dominated by the steel trust, and I find, by report No. 1127, 62nd Congress, that, in

1902, the workers received \$125 for producing only \$15.64 worth of pig-iron, while in 1909 they were paid the magnificent sum of 82 cents for producing \$17.44 worth. In other words, for every additional dollar's worth of product they turned out their wages fell a quarter of a dollar. Regarded from this limited point of view was there ever a greater swindle?

Look at Protection on a larger scale—the Protection given by the law to those who desire to gobble up the earth and drive us from this planet. The official Protectors are the Senators and Congressmen who frame our national laws, and the cold truth is that to railroad corporations these Protectors gave away, within the short twenty years from 1850 to 1870, one-twelfth of the total area of the United States. It may please you also to hear that today a few railroad corporations, 56 alien corporations and individuals, and 98 American citizens and corporations, own just one-sixth of that total area. All this under the sheltering aegis of the law; that great Protector without whom the workingman would starve!

Last week Roosevelt—who is the incarnation of Protection pushed to its logical conclusion—took Los Angeles by storm, and yesterday we had Bryan, who, apart from other meetings, addressed one of 25,000 at Fiesta Park. All which proves merely that Americans love oratory, and that the trail of the pulpit is over them all. Every Bryan said a lot of true things, the first being his convincing demonstration that Republican conventions are organized and run by a cut and dried committee created four years before the event itself. With this he contrasted Democratic methods, and stated: "In our party it will not be possible for a dead hand to reach out from the past and strangle a living convention." The declaration was greeted with tumultuous applause, yet in those few words Mr. Bryan gave an exact description of the manner in which our whole legal system works. The so-called Protection of the law is nothing but the government employed to enforce on the living the tyranny of the mouldering dead. Things and the enjoyment of things should be earned by service which the live actually perform. They should not be distributed according to the dictates of a corpse.

I do not flatter myself that Bryan reads "Regeneration," but in this attack on the all-government, aristocratic idea, he used just such words and arguments as those with which readers of these columns must be familiar. Here, for example, is a criticism on Taft, though it applies far more forcibly to Roosevelt. "Mr. Taft," said Bryan, "has the aristocratic idea of government, and it is just the opposite of the Democratic idea. The Democrats believe that government is built from the bottom. The Aristocrat believes that it is suspended from the top. The Democrat says, legislate for all the people, and their prosperity will find its way up through all the classes that rest upon the masses. The Aristocrat says legislate for the well-to-do, and then be patient and wait while their prosperity leaks through upon those below."

That statement of the aristocratic position is, to me, absolutely true, and exposes the foundation on which the towering sophistry of Protection has been reared. But we must carry the argument far beyond the cramped confines of tariff schedules, and understand that it attacks and exposes almost every page and line of that imposing library we call "The Law." We should be in love with and obedient to today; we should not be taking orders from the tomb. We should see the New York proletarian forced by tribute robbery into depths that would have appalled a Dante, and it should be to us no answer that the venerable father of the Astor family had the foresight to gobble up Manhattan island a century ago. We should see labor struggling and falling over tasks that might well have daunted a Hercules, and it should be no answer that the slaveholder has an inherited million invested, on which he is entitled to draw dividends. We should see Man the prey of an artificial inequality so preposterous that no pen can be hired to defend it, and we should recognize that such inequality is begotten and nurtured by the law.

Bryan is an eloquent gentleman, and doubtless sincere in wishing that prosperity should begin at the bottom. But facts are more reliable than eloquence, and the facts are all against him. For any long year was his party in power, and vainly shall we search the record for a case in which the wreck and driftwood of society—the very bottom of the bottom—profited by that abstract legislation by the people for all the people of which he is the champion. Naturally, for the slum dweller exists, not because they have not legislated for him, but exclusively because they have legislated against him, bestowing on others that on which his life depended, and creating the monopolies that cut his throat. Old men sleep on park benches, or crawl into almshouses, soldiers' homes and similar human hells, not because Berger has not passed his Old Age Pension bill, but because monopoly has robbed them so brutally that neither they nor their relatives have been able to provide for the decline of life. California Socialists today are clamoring for a "Mother's Pension Law" based on free society, wherein all had equal opportunities, and none was rendered helpless, such an official plaster would be needless. Whether it be Bryan or Debs, Roosevelt or Taft, they are all in the same boat; all believers in that law which robs men of their rights; all apostles of that doctrine of protection which assumes to shelter the pauper but actually makes him such; all saturated with that delusion which, playing on human indolence and cowardice, teaches men that they can confide to deputies the task of protecting and governing themselves.

WM. C. OWEN.

WITH OUR APOLOGIES.

It is necessary to apologize for letters unanswered and the shortcomings of this week's English section. The editor has been knocked out so completely by inflammatory rheumatism that it has been impossible for him to complete his usual task.

PLAIN TRUTHS.

By Ricardo Flores Magón.
The Mexican workers should understand clearly that if the Government, the politicians, and the bourgeoisie are concerning themselves today with the conditions of the poor, this is due solely to the fact that the latter have ceased to supplicate and have taken up arms; that one argument that is able to dethrone pride, to crush the haughty, to humiliate the arrogant.

"The farce! This honest definition, which I gave when our trial began, has much displeased a certain Robinson. I do not know his first name, but, with two others, he is counsel for the prosecution. 'The farce!' they cry indignantly. 'It is an insult to the court! It is bringing the law into disrespect!'"

We should not be a mass; that is to say, we should not share the prejudices, the preoccupations, the errors, the customs of the unthinking multitude. The mass has a firm belief in the necessity of a chief or a leader who must be at their head, who must conduct them to their goal, bring them to tyranny or freedom, guide them by carresses, or by spitting in their faces, for good or for ill. This habit, so rooted in the human being, is the fount of inexhaustible evils for the redemption of the race. Life, honor, welfare, the future, liberty—all are placed at the disposition of him who has been made chief. It is the chief who must think for all; it is the chief who is charged with the duty of watching for the well-being and liberty of the mass in general and the individual in particular; the result being that there are millions of brains among the mass that never think, because the chief has to think for all. Thus it comes about that the masses remain passive, that they have no initiative, and that they drag out a sheep existence; wheedled, at election times, by the politicians and place-hunters, who beat them when the elections are over; deceived, during times of revolutionary action, by the promises of the ambitious, who reward them with kicks for their self-sacrifice when the victory has been won. There should be no mass; there should be a league of thinking individuals, united among themselves for the attainment of certain ends; each, whether man or woman, thinking with his or her own head; each exerting himself or herself to give an opinion as to what must be done to realize our aspirations, which are no other than the liberty of all based on the liberty of each; the welfare of all based on the welfare of each. (From "The Herald of Revolt," London, Eng.)

THE PARTY OF REFORM.

The Democratic party was ever modest, even to the very bribes it demanded for its betrayal of the South. It has made the statute books of the South black with legalized crimes against the working class. Its "agrancy" and "contract labor" laws are the soul of peace, and are enforced by as vile a set of petty judicial grafters and as brutal a force of thugs and gunmen as ever drew the breath of life.

Its land laws are all in favor of the landlord and Ireland in its darkest hours never suffered from a more degrading tenantry than that upheld and conserved in the Southern states by the Democratic party; the Mexican system alone is comparable to it in the extortion it imposes on the tillers of the soil.

Its whole theory of government is based on the aristocratic idea that all workers are born peons, all tillers of the soil born tenants; that the exploitation of labor is a "divine" and "vested right," against which to protest is blasphemous and to rebel a crime.

There is not a modern prison under its jurisdiction, and the treatment of the convicts of the South, whether in the hideous mines of Alabama or on the frightful penal farms of Texas, has only been surpassed in atrocious cruelty by the rubber demons of the Congo and the Amazon.

From the day on which it first seized power down to the present moment its whole reign has been based on fraud and violence, a government of the people by bulldozers for the timber thieves and land hoards. Calmly it witnesses the murderous assaults that are now being daily committed on the members, organizers and officers of the Brotherhood of Timber Workers and, not only does it do this, but it commissions the thugs and gunmen of the Lumber Trust as officers of the law so that they may more easily and with the least possible personal danger to themselves carry on their trade as man-butchers for the Trust.

This is the record, black with infamy, inhumanity, savagery and treason—this is the record of the Democratic party South, and the Democratic party South absolutely controls the Democratic party North, East and West. (Covington Hall, in "The Coming Nation")

LAWMAKERS INVESTIGATING.

The U. S. senatorial committee, now sitting in Los Angeles to investigate revolutionary activities in Mexico, pursues its researches in what seems to be real secrecy, for none of the dailies appears able even to guess at what is actually transpiring. What all the world knows at present is that Mexicans—the Junta members—who were urged on by the highest and most disinterested motives, are in jail, while notorious American adventurers, who were out only for the dollar, have gone free. It is devoutly to be hoped that the committee will be able to throw some light on this by no means trivial side of a most important question. The bigger the game it brings down the better the public will like it.

Divided Counsels

Public opinion on intervention is by no means unanimous, if the editorials in our leading dailies are to be taken as a test. In New York City many papers of influence have come out as strongly opposed to any meddling, and one notes in particular the "Evening Post," "Sun," "Journal of Commerce," "World," "Times," and "Tribune." The "Jersey City Journal," "St. Louis Globe-Democrat," and Portland "Oregonian" take similar positions.

On the other hand the Minneapolis "Journal," Cleveland "Plain Dealer," and Cincinnati "Enquirer" are instances of noted organs that strongly favor intervention, urging, among other arguments, that the Monroe doctrine binds us to preserve the general peace, at all hazards, between the Rio Grande and the Panama Canal.

The contrast between the promptness with which we have invaded Nicaragua and the long hesitancy over Mexico has not failed to attract attention, and the last issue of "The Literary Digest" quotes the Baton Rouge "State Times" at considerable length as follows:

"In Mexico Americans have been hung, slaughtered, robbed, outraged, denounced."

"In Nicaragua the miserable, ignorant, bankrupt people fight in sheer despair of existing conditions, egged on by rival foreign concessionaires who deem themselves apt to gain from the success of this or that faction—and at the shadow of a threat against Americans, marines and ships and infantrymen begin hurried progress to Corinto and Bluefields."

"Has the time come when the United States of America regulates and governs its attitude toward other countries according to their size and power?"

Draw Their Conclusions.

"More than all else the American Government is held in contempt because the Mexicans judge of the different treatment accorded Nicaragua and Mexico by the American Department of State, and hold that American forbearance toward Mexico is inspired by fear."

"The United States controls in Nicaragua only by pure weight of arms, and it is doubtful if in all the bounds of that country there is one native who is a sincere well-wisher of the northern Republic."

"In Mexico the adherents of the old regime hold the United States responsible for Madero's success because of the utterly laughable failure to stop the passage of arms and ammunition across the border; the Maderistas feel under no obligation to the United States because this country went through the awkward and comical motions of 'preserving neutrality'; and the present revolutionists, comprized chiefly of the extremists who first fought for Madero, bitterly hate the Americans because, when revolt was aimed at Madero, the United States proved how quickly and easily it could change its arms and ammunition movement could be impeded."

Similarly the El Paso "Times" says: "Is American life and American property interests in the Republic of Nicaragua any more valuable than American life and American property interests in the Republic of Mexico? Is a man any less an American because he has made his home and invested his money in Mexico? Is the American flag the emblem of strength, power, and protection in Nicaragua and only a rag in Mexico?"

CARDBOARD HOUSES.

Robert Allerton Parker publishes in "The International" an excellent study of Georges Sorel and his relation to Syndicalism; in the course of which he says that Sorel points out that men, having freed themselves from the illusions of the past, should be keenly on their guard against becoming enslaved to the illusions of the future; that the revolution cannot follow a path comfortably set out for it in advance; that to embroil plans for the future, as so many Socialists do, is little better than an idle holiday pastime, and that we waste our time trying to patch up the capitalist system, or attempting to abolish this regime by participating in and supporting its structure. In brief, the political activity of the Socialists, for Sorel, is in reality giving a new lease of life to the capitalist system and is of an intrinsically reactionary character.

That is all profoundly true, as it seems to us; but Sorel doubtless also knows it to be true that it is waste of breath to submit such views to the preachers, lawyers, paid lecturers and notoriety hunters who have become the leaders, everywhere, of the Socialist party. These people want not a revolution but personal power; that they may get office, build up their law practices and secure the audiences that bring the money. They are after the most re-actionary alliances, and are holding out government ownership and Milwaukee Municipal Socialism as a bait to the conservative; although they understand, just every day, as clearly as does the editor of this section, that landlordism and not labor will reap the benefit. They also dream of a majority, in order that, as one of their high-ups expressed it at a recent Los Angeles conference, "we may run the steam roller over these I. W. W.'s, Syndicalists and other rebels."

Meanwhile they fool the workers externally, building card houses that fall to pieces, as here in Los Angeles, at the first breath of wind. If one could round up the bitterly disillusioned Socialists and workers of this city it would be difficult to find a hall to hold them. However, the harvest certain scheming individuals have reaped is by no means an illusion.

"To slaughter men on the battlefields, that remains the duty of the State; but these very States recognize their inability to take care of their own wounded, and abandon the task, to a great extent, to private initiative." (Kropotkin.)

ROTTEN TO THE CORE.

Ohio has been calling itself, if one remembers right, the "Mother of Presidents," and prides itself on being a strictly progressive State. The following telegram from Columbus, O., is, therefore, suggestive, and we need hardly say that it mirrors a condition that is national and world-wide. Amid all the exultation over this year's overflowing crops, let us not forget that the real test of a society's soundness is the men and women it produces. Everywhere in the United States one finds the same conditions—suicides increasing, jails and lunatic asylums overflowing, plutocracy ruling the nation to the marrow of its bones. The telegram follows:

"Columbus, O., Sept. 24.—(Exclusive Dispatch.) Unless something is done and done real quick, the State of Ohio will be bankrupt in its care for its weak-minded, declared President Allen W. Thurman of the State Board of Administration today, who, alarmed by the increase in the past year in the number of imbeciles in Ohio, was prompted to make the statement.

"What was perhaps the most striking feature of Mr. Thurman's investigation of the number of imbeciles, and that feature which brought forcibly to his attention the danger of the present marriage law, was when a family of six idiots, ranging in age from 7 to 16 years, was transferred to the State institution from the Brown County Children's Home."

THE ARMY OF A DREAM.

Kipling had visions of an army which seemed to him about all that an army should be, and wrote a story concerning it.

Artists as well as writers have dreams. As a result one of them portrayed an ideal army marching on Mexico.

There is a strong feeling that the sentiment in favor of intervention has been skillfully conducted up to a point where there will be difficulty in curbing it, although such intervention would be a wrong against a neighbor people.

However, if the army imagined by the artist could be induced to go to the front it would be cheered on its way and the cordial hope expressed that, once having crossed the line, it would stay there.

At the head of this army marched Morgan, and following him Archibald, Charles Taft, John Hays Hammond, the Rockefeller, Guggenheim and other enemies against society. But, alas! these are the chaps that create war for the other fellows to fight. They run none of the risks, and they absorb all the profits. They think more of a dollar than of the lives of a regiment of soldiers, but even in their devotion to respectable pillage they do not forget the wholeness of their own skins. ("Los Angeles Daily Tribune.")

CALUMNIES REFUTED.

The "Los Angeles Daily Tribune," of September 21, published a long interview with W. V. Llanphar, an American by birth and education, but for fifty years past, a well-known resident of Mexico. It was a strong protest against intervention and a timely reminder that any such action would destroy all those hopes of a brisk trade with the Spanish-American republics to which the approaching completion of the Panama canal has given birth. We call special attention to the following paragraphs, because we know them, from the personal experience of many friends who lived long years in Mexico, to be true. Mr. Llanphar said:

"During the fifty years I have lived in Mexico, I have had close business and social relations with its people. I can say like many another American of experience in Mexico, that I have been better treated by all classes than I would have been treated in my own country under like conditions. I have always noted that the foreigner who conducts himself as a gentleman in Mexico is so treated by all classes."

"The foreigner in Mexico receives a consideration which he does not get in his own land. This is true. Let students of national psychology determine the reason. Perhaps it is the glamor of romance which the imaginative Mexicans cast over the newcomer and which inspires them to accord him the best that is in them. Perhaps it is because the average American residing in Mexico, desires to acquire himself creditably. I do not know. The fact looms large upon the minds of all Americans who have lived in the interior of Mexico. Along the border it is different; there are bad Americans and bad Mexicans, many of them outlaws."

Nevertheless, let the fact that the Mexican is invariably polite and generous to a fault deceive no one. That is the type that finally becomes armed and fights, as it is now doing South of the Rio Grande.

ABOUT THOSE MASSACRES.

If one is to believe the "Los Angeles Daily Times" reports every Mexican rebel is a bloodthirsty assassin, and the outrage and torture of American women and children their special sport. Not that it has been much worse than other Pacific Coast papers, all of which played up atrocities committed on refugees as the sensation of the day. Recently the "Times" suggested that it would be well for the United States to swipe Lower California, since it has military value and Mexico owes us money. Particular attention is directed to the expressions in which the lie is given to all the previous charges blared abroad so loudly. The quotation is from the concluding paragraph of the article and runs:

"It will probably be some years before anything is realized on this plan. The minor claims which this country has against Mexico arise from the killing of Americans on American soil by bullets from Mexican Federalists and rebels, and are already in rapid course of settlement. The major claims for damages, of course, will come from the great concessionaires who have suffered unmeasured loss in the last three years. Scarcely an American

has been killed within the limits of Mexico, and American property has been protected by both factions. But in spite of these precautions American losses have run into the millions, and it will not take many millions to buy Lower California. The claims of concessionaires would of course then be paid in cash by the United States."

AWKWARD COMPARISONS.

The "Los Angeles Daily Times" begins a glowing editorial on the Grand Army of the Republic, lately junketing in Los Angeles, with a fierce denunciation of slavery, taking as its text Jefferson's saying, "I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just." In view of what the United States has been doing of late years to the temporarily weaker Latin countries—to say nothing of its own poorer and weaker citizens—is there any reason why Jefferson should not be trembling still? The "Times" continues:

"Until slavery—aggressive by that very necessity of its nature which demanded expansion as a condition precedent to its existence—repealed the Missouri Compromise, the North was content not to interfere with it where it existed. The banks, the exchanges, the pulpits, the press, the bar, the bench, the social forces—North as well as South—either defended it or were indifferent concerning it." Compare this with the situation today.

The article continues with a demonstration that "the real motive that impelled the southern politicians to organize the Confederacy was a determination to hold on to the offices." Apparently the "Times" has a revolution on its editorial staff. He draws such obvious comparisons that the dullest should be able to read between the lines.

TAKE YOUR RIGHTS.

I will not ask the employing class or any part of it for permission to speak on the streets. And I don't want to see the workers doing that. I want them to speak on the streets without asking anybody's permission. Suppose they do club or bayonet you. There are worse things that can happen to a man than being clubbed by the police or put in jail. I want to see the workers of America aggressive, impudent, self-asserting, bold, daring. Let them call a spade a spade. Let them act upon the presumption that there are no rights in all the world which are not theirs to the limit.

Read the story of the French revolution, and you will find this to be true, that the only thing those old feudal autocrats could understand was power. The enemies of that great revolution were the spineless compromisers. And remember that any kind of legislative body, I care not by what name it is called, is rotten with compromise. The demands of the workers for the coming days are not to be entrusted for a moment to legislative bodies. We get in this world exactly what we have power to take ourselves, and no more. (Wm. Thurston Brown.)

NECK OR NOTHING.

The Chicago "Inter-Ocean" is strong for intervention in Mexico, declaring that we should not only march our troops across the border and take possession, but that we should take possession permanently. It dilates editorially on the losses United States and European capital has suffered, and insists that the Monroe doctrine requires that we should protect the latter, at least. Of course it considers that the fighting now going on shows that the Mexicans are incapable of self-government (What an argument to those who remember our own Civil War!), and speaks of Diaz as "a benevolent despot." Madero it considers utterly impotent and it winds up a strong intervention article as follows:

"Whatever is done, let it be done wholeheartedly and without any hypocritical pretenses, that we are going into Mexico to restore its government to its own people." When we have once sent our flag across the Rio Grande we shall not be able to bring it back without national disgrace. Therefore when we send it let it be with the distinct understanding that it is going there to stay."

WITH A LITTLE MORAL.

Last week I visited an old revolutionist, but a most skillful and industrious wage-worker, who glories in his craft. He was much worried over his grandson, a typical Californian lad, who will learn no trade and does not believe in work. The grandfather is personally charming, but, by his persistent idleness, sustains the very system he wishes to destroy. The grandson is personally detestable, but his worthlessness is a destructive force that is bringing to realization the old man's dream.

Slavery makes industry a vice, while the lazy loafer has the virtue of being at least a protest. In these United States the more intelligent today shirk honest work for they understand that all their effort goes to benefit the boss. Thus intelligence and unwillingness to labor advance hand in hand, and the existing system moves swiftly to its death. T. K. G.

DAIRYMAID TALK.

Dr. Jacob Gould Schurman, president of Cornell University, has been making a speech on the Mexican Revolution, in which he opines that if the peons get back their land they will lose it again through their improvidence. That is the old slaveholders' argument, and the lips of a university president are precisely those from which such an argument is sure to come. Rockefeller & Co. know what they are about when they endow those hotbeds of misinformation, aristocracy and reaction. The modern university president is an expert milkmaid of the plutocratic cow, and she does not propose to kill that cow.

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.)

MORE HALF TRUTHS.

"Direct action," says "The Syndicalist," "sabotage, the general strike are more effective than the perorations of politicians. To raise the standard of life for the workers, teaching them to demand more, is better work than having Berger as a Congressman, or Siedel as a Mayor, only to find these political victories vanish at the next elections. Syndicalism makes more revolution, it breeds self-reliance, determination, decision; parliamentarism makes for reform, it breeds compromise, treachery, and impotence."

True enough, but "to raise the standard of life for the workers" is not revolution, and determination and decision are worse than useless if you determine to attend to the impossible. Probably there is nothing more impossible in this world than to improve the position of the workers while leaving the few in possession of what makes the workers absolutely dependent on them.

"Already the American vulture wishes to make a Neronian banquet of our country. Many people, to arms! With enthusiasm take the field! The sons of Zaragoza, Guatemalco, Hidalgo and Juarez, always left their huts in the national defense. Leave the yoke, the plough, prepare to fight the pachyderm of the North." Not even the Latin grandiloquence of that tocsin can hide the stern purpose back of it, or its inspiration. Nor could we, if we really thought of fighting, which we don't, fail to feel a tickling in our funnybone at the cocksureness of this:

"Many will come, but they will see that very few will return. There will not be lacking a Chapultepec, Angostura nor yet another Molino del Rey, to show the valor of the Mexican hosts, which in the sublime frenzy of gaining glorious triumph will transform themselves into heroes, like the boy cadets of the military college." So if we want a fight we can have it and it will cost us something, for no matter what the odds, as we know from one experience, our swarthy neighbors don't run away, and if pushed on are good at coming back. It's all a question whether or not we want to pay the price to boost the values of some rich Americans who hold Mexican concessions. ("Daily Tribune," Los Angeles.)

GRINDING ITS OWN AX.

Great Scott! How the International Typographical Union, and its president, Lynch, have gone for the Socialist daily, "The Chicago World," in connection with the pressmen's strike! The actual merits or demerits of that strike would take us into long discussion, but the charges alluded to need not. They are that the paper in question has been actuated solely by circulation greed and the frying of political fish. They will do it, although they know the outcome is always stink.

Let us tell you what the Mexican Revolution is. It is simply the revolt of almost the very poorest people in the world against the very richest people in the world—Wall Street. Just that and nothing more. You expected that the Socialists and a lot of other professed revolutionists would feel interested in such a revolt? That is where they fooled you. You did not know them.

If you want to learn either English or Spanish, and learn quickly, you might do worse than apply to the editor of this section—Wm. C. Owen, 914 Boston St., telephone Home A 1360. He has had much experience in teaching languages and guarantees that, if he teaches you at all, it will be quickly. Knowledge of both languages is a valuable asset.

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.