

Regeneration.

Published every Saturday at
914 Bosto St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Telephone: Home A 1350.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
5 months, \$2.00; 6 months, \$1.10; 1
year, \$2.00; Single copy, 5c;
in bundles, 3c per copy.

No. 111.

Saturday, October 12, 1912.

While The Grass
Is Growing The
Steeds Starve

According to figures published recently by Dr. Hoffman, actuary for the Prudential Life Insurance Company, suicide in the United States has jumped from 128 per hundred thousand, which was the figure twenty years ago, to 203 for the five year period ending with 1911. This is to say, while we have been increasing wealth and the means for enjoying life at a rate absolutely unparalleled in history, life actually has become so unenjoyable that the suicide percentage has almost doubled within twenty years.

The one great, overwhelming fact about our so-called civilization is that "we are all doing it," all trying to get money and power, that we may outdo our fellow men. We live in what is really the civil war of savages; a war which is not fought with traps and ambushes, in which every one is sheltering behind his particular tree or rock in the hope that he may save his own skin by getting the other fellow's hide. Whatever the preachers and moralists may say, truth cannot survive in such an environment, since to speak the truth is to emerge from shelter and make oneself a target for the foe. Whatever settlement work-ers and the enormous army that now devotes itself to "charity" may say, charity in the true sense of the word kindness and consideration for our fellow beings, can have no place in a system of universal guerrilla warfare. Whatever political and other reformers may say, war is war, and it makes not a particle of difference whether one is slaughtered with a weapon sanctioned by the official brand of censorship, or by a Black Hand bomb. Let me amend that last sentence and say that the murders of commercialism are, in my judgment, infinitely more cruel than any to which the Apache Indian ever put his hand.

Naturally that last statement will be denied indignantly, and it will be asserted that most of us are employed in producing or distributing what others need, thus playing our respective parts in the world's co-operative drama. That is the pretense, but it is a hypocritical pretense. Men today—it was not always so by any means—are playing exclusively for their own hands, grabbing everything in sight and trying to outdo one another in wealth and ostentation. Industrial organizations are formed to gain a monopoly of industrial power and to compel others to get the monopoly of political power and lay down the law to the vanquished. It is not a co-operative beehive but a blood-soaked battlefield, followed by Caesarian triumphs in which the slaves of the factory and the mine, the toilers of the field and the starvelings of the gutter, are dragged at the victor's chariot wheels. Cruelty of so vast a scale probably this world has never seen, and it is begetting, as was inevitable, a universal exasperation such as probably this world has never known. That is the blood upon the moon, and it is blood of the deepest red. Consult the daily papers if you doubt the statement.

We have to be hard, in thought at least. We have to shake off our illusions and look facts in the face. We have to give up the optimistic folly of supposing that we can right the radically wrong by charity or settlement work, by the red tape play on which labor unions hitherto have been mostly wasting their time, or by the childishness of this last is surely the mania of manias, for we have to use every atom of intelligence we can command, and politics kills all sense of fairness, all capacity of discrimination, all ability to distinguish the true from the false. It beclouds all issues, substitutes the fanaticism of the idolator for cool judgment, and robs the masses of all power of self-control. There is no greater illusion in existence than the supposition that political contests educate the public, and one need only look at the history of tariff discussion to understand how true that statement is. The tariff question, which involves the vast and all important problem of special privilege, has been in politics for fifty years, and an ordinary English school-boy can give you a better summary of the arguments for and against free trade than can nine-tenths of our professional politicians. As for the masses, they are hopelessly befogged.

Consider the Socialist national platform, for which thousands shout one who pauses to study and analyze it. The platform contains six general demands, with five subdemands, every one of which proposes to increase the powers of officialdom, municipal, State, and national. That in itself is a most doubtful policy, but hardly any one stops to question the platform from that standpoint. Then it advocates no less than nine industrial and eighteen political reforms, every one of them a palliative, which,

is declared, can be made to work under the existing system and bring temporary relief. If I had the space at my command I could take those palliatives one by one and show what are, to me at least, good reasons for supposing that none of them is workable, and that none would benefit the down-and-outs, who must be our first care, if we are to reform from below, as the Socialists maintain. But apart from that it is evident that—judging from the past rate of progress—it will take at least half a century to bring such reforms about, and the existing robber system will not, and should not, hold together another half century. Meanwhile all energy expended on such palliatives is obviously energy withdrawn from the revolutionary movement.

Up to a few months ago New Zealand was held up to us as the workers' paradise, the country in which he had the game in his own hands and was putting through a great palliative program, to the confusion of capitalism. Then Charles Edward Russell, a most distinguished Socialist, came back from an inspection tour and declared publicly that the whole thing was bogus, that New Zealand was the least revolutionary country in the world, and that its celebrated labor legislation was a mockery and snare. He disclaimed most expressly the absurdity of supposing that labor could be emancipated by electing the Socialist Party managers, and then he said he took it all back. Meanwhile it is now known to all the world that New Zealand labor has discovered that compulsory arbitration is the holiest of shams, and is in open rebellion against the very political panacea for which it was shouting so eagerly. The labor unions are reported as cancelling their registrations under the "Conciliation and Arbitration Act," in order that they may stop work when it pleases them. In other words, they discovered that they jumped out of the frying pan into the fire when they gave up their individual freedom and handed themselves over to the mercy of the State. Yet mark this well! If ever there has been a country in which the workers could justly say, "We are the State," that country was New Zealand. The lesson is significant.

This article is written as a suggestion to those who still talk at the word "Revolution," and fancy that those who call themselves "Revolutionists" must be abandoned spirits who are spoiling for a row. It is penned in the hope of making some understanding that it is quite possible for men who think earnestly, and put themselves to the pains of careful investigation, to arrive at the conclusion that the whole grab game, the whole business of special privilege and of the few trying to hold the many in subjection, is completely out of date and should be thrown on the scrap heap. It is prompted by the thought that if we could only get more realists during the comparatively quiet times of Evolution, there would be no need of those devastating hurricanes known as Revolutions. But this apparently we cannot do; mainly, as I think, because the politicians are too strong for us. It is they who are goading the people into madness by making promises which cannot be fulfilled, by imposing on them quick remedies which, like Dead Sea apples, turn to ashes on their lips. It is they who, using all the arts of hypnotism and working the public into continual hysteria, rob it of its intelligence and leave it the only other resort—the appeal to force. Well, if we must fight let us fight, at least, for something worth the having: the land and economic independence, as the Mexicans are fighting.

Names do not count, and whether or no people label themselves, or are labeled, "Revolutionists" amounts to nothing. What is of importance is the fact that there exists nowadays a strong and rapidly-growing body of opinion to the effect that this earth, and man's capacity of extracting from it the wealth necessary for individual and social happiness, should be used for that purpose, and not for the purpose of clothing the few with omnipotent power over the lives of the many. What is also quite clear to many of us is that to place the means of production and distribution at the disposition of all would be to abolish that helplessness which cripples the ordinary man and is the direct cause of ninety-nine hundredths of the unhappiness, stupidity and crime now prevalent. But it is equally clear to us that the cure can be effected only by the extinction of the crippling cause. To flinch from the necessary application of the knife and to potter away the years in politicking mere symptoms is to betray the patient and proclaim oneself a quack. In the treatment of the suffering individual this is generally recognized, and surely it should be even more so when we face the appalling suffering of that vast conglomerate of individuals we call society. In other words, it is the revolutionist who is cruel, but the Reformer, for he prolongs the agony by his cowardly refusal to face conditions as they actually are. With all the means of happiness at our disposal, life grows more and more unhappy. Within twenty years the rate of suicide in the United States has almost doubled. Why then should the Mexicans, or other comparatively undeveloped countries that still retain their senses, wish to be ruled by the United States? WM. C. OWEN.

"It has always appeared to me one of the most utterly ludicrous, absurdly irrelevant things that a person can do or say, when approached for relief or assistance by a striker who is dealing with an immediate situation, to respond with, 'Vote yourself into power!' when the next election is six months, a year, or two years away." (Voltaire de Cleyre.)

Freedom is the one purpose, wisely aimed at or unwisely, of all man's struggles, toiling and sufferings on this earth. (Thomas Carlyle.)

Taft Hopes Things
Are Quieting.
Are They?

President Taft having given Madero permission, once again, to pass his troops over American soil, for the condition of his enemies, one reads the following despatch, dated Douglas, Ariz., Oct. 8: "American Consul William Dye will leave Douglas tomorrow morning for Colonia Morelos, clothed with authority from the State Department at Washington to restore Mormon homes occupied by Mexicans to their rightful owners. Preceding him are 300 Federal troops with instructions to co-operate in the American Consul's mission. Consul Dye will visit the American mining camps of El Tigre and Nacozari and ascertain conditions."

Such is neutrality! Thus we live up to the noble impartial principle of leaving Mexicans to fight out their own battles. Fancy the uproar there would be if the Mexican Liberal Party marched 300 men from Los Angeles to reinstate their friends in Mexico, who have been ousted by scheming financiers and corrupt politicians from lands they and their forefathers had occupied from time immemorial! Who dares say that governments do not stand by governments, regardless of the rights of man?

From Dalton, Mass., Mr. Taft, who has been enjoying an automobile tour, gave out a statement in which he said: "Mexico seems to be emerging from its troubles, which have probably not been as bad as reported. This government has been careful to respect international obligations in dealing with the questions that have arisen in connection with the disorders that have afflicted our southern neighbor, and I hope and am confident that the patriotic spirit of the Mexican people will lead to complete restoration of the internal peace and harmony essential to their national welfare."

Neither Mexico, nor any other country—the Balkan States, for example—has any chance of "emerging from its troubles" until justice has been re-established, which is the last thing the present rulers think of.

Hopelessly at Outs.
That same day the "Los Angeles Daily Times" contained a special despatch from Mexico City, which ran as follows: "The Madero administration is torn with internal dissension and confronted with revolution in the north and south. The army is both inefficient and out of sympathy with Madero. If a real leader should appear, the army would rebel tomorrow. The government is out of money, the 53,000,000 pesos on hand being already pledged and reserved for stated purposes. There is danger at any moment of a breach between Madero and the Congress. If the government should be ousted, the administration would fall, for public sentiment is overwhelmingly on the side of the legislative body."

"These facts are well-known here, and therefore the people are holding their breath fearing the crisis may occur at any moment."
"There is actual organized revolution in the northern States of Sonora, Chihuahua and Coahuila, and disorder and brigandage in Nuevo Leon, Zacatecas, Durango, Jalisco, Sinaloa and Michoacan. In the States of Mexico, Guerrero, Morelos, Oaxaca and Puebla there is a constantly growing revolutionary movement. Through all this great extent of territory human life and the property of neither native nor foreigner is respected. The warfare there is conducted in the most barbarous manner, including mutilation, outrage, burning, robbery and looting. Brigandage is rampant in the States of Tamaulipas, Vera Cruz, Tabasco, Chiapas, Yucatan and Campeche. The central government is utterly unable to put a stop to these disorders and outrages. Only in this capital, thanks to the police organization, is there peace and safety."

"The economic situation in Mexico is very bad and it is growing worse. Some planters cannot sow their crops, others cannot harvest them for want of help, and others cannot get their produce to market on account of the bandits and the demoralization of the railroads, which is more marked since the American engineers and conductors left."

"Politically the situation is nothing less than anarchy. Congress is suspicious of President Madero and may oppose him at any moment. The President's cabinet is made up of conflicting radical and conservative elements so that there is continual friction and reversal of policies. One week we have speeches of brotherly love and conciliation, and the next week there is a perfect tempest of tyranny, unlawful seizures, savage repressions against the rebels and wholesale arrests."

Army Deemed Unreliable.
The army, where it is, is not wholly efficient, is dissatisfied. The pursuit of the rebels is half-hearted and the appearance of a strong leader among the revolutionists might be the signal for a revolt by the army. The public complains that Madero has substituted the tyranny of the mob and brigandage for the benevolent despotism of Diaz, without carrying into effect the reforms that were promised. The army is murmuring against its increasing and apparently hopeless task of restoring order and peace."

We give the foregoing despatch in full because we believe it pictures the general situation better than would any mere category of the innumerable conflicts going on at widely scattered points. It agrees, in the main, with reports that have come to us direct. On the whole it may be said that writers think the movement in the North greatly disorganized, which they attribute largely to the difficulty of getting arms. The weakness they emphasize most, however, is the predominance of politicians in the Northern movement. In the Central

and Southern States, on the contrary, the revolution is generally regarded as purely agrarian and not under the control of any set leaders, and as dominated by ideas held as unalterable convictions by the people, and, therefore, not to be set aside by fine political promises.

The National Chamber of Deputies, October 5, authorized Madero to raise another loan of \$20,000,000, but only after a most stormy session. On the same date Gen. Salas, minister of war, resigned. Politicians, whose chief stock-in-trade is Patriotism, are very much alike everywhere, and one notices that, October 7, the Mexican congressmen voted to double their salaries.

Will Zapata Yield?
Rumor has been busy with the statement that Zapata is willing to make terms with the government, and Minister Jesus Flores Magonis is quoted as expressing himself confident that the negotiations will be successful. As we stated in last week's issue, the government has made no secret of the fact that it is trying to patch up a peace, but it seems prudent to be very doubtful as to the result, since previous overtures have been rejected several times. Furthermore, as we have stated on the authority of leading Mexican papers, and in conformity with what seem to be the facts in the case, the personal surrender of Zapata and his brother would in no way pledge their revolutionary followers to follow suit. According to Jesus Magon's quoted statement Zapata refused Orozco's offer to supply him with \$500,000 and ample arms, the ground of his refusal being that the money came from American capitalists and represented a scheme with which he would not connect himself. Orozco is being generally accused of having made much money out of his part of the revolution. Gen. Campa, who is now an American prisoner and was one of Orozco's right-hand men, making most specific accusations.

Despatches of October 9 state that seven hundred men of the El Rio Mining Company in the State of Hidalgo, which adjoins the Federal District of Mexico, are in danger of being overwhelmed by Zapatistas, who are attacking the camp. They add that other towns and villages within a few miles of the capital are being assaulted daily.

Conflicts in the North.

Coahuila is displaying considerable revolutionary activity. At Los Presnos, west of Muzquiz, a hundred and fifty rurales were routed with the heaviest loss by rebels under Marcelo Garaveo, with whom Orozco is said to be in touch. One recalls of seventy rurales, belonging to the Twentieth Regiment, deserting to the rebels. The population of Monclova is said to have fled to Saltillo, Texas, the capture of Santo Domingo, Piedra Blanca and Bahia having caused a panic. On the other hand, Gen. Aubert and Blanquet are reported as showing great activity in their efforts to disperse scattered rebel bands. The first named is in charge of the troops that are crossing American soil, that they may attack the revolutionists, by way of Eagle Pass. The rebels captured a convoy that left Muzquiz with provisions and war supplies, the soldiers in charge of the same mutinying to shouts of "Viva la Revolucion!"

In Chihuahua Pomposo and his two sons, who had accepted amnesty, have been shot. It is a warning to other rebels who may have illusions as to the good faith of the government. Pearson is again cut off by the destruction of bridges and telegraph wires. No attack has been recorded, but three bands of revolutionists are said to be operating in the immediate vicinity. There is much interruption of communications throughout the State, due to burned bridges and the wrecking of the Kansas City, Mexico and Orient Railroad. A large bridge on the Mexican Northwestern, which leads into Juarez, has been destroyed, and Alamo, with 400 rebels is reported as within fifteen miles of the city.

Durango and the northern portion of Zacatecas report much revolutionary activity; the governor of the former having sent urgent appeals for help to Mexico City. It is frankly admitted that the Indian uprising in Oaxaca is giving the authorities great anxiety, the capital of the State being apparently the only city that has been able to make successful resistance. The warlike character of the natives of this State is well-known, and it is openly admitted that the struggle there is a social one.

Despite the reported suspension of activities by Zapatistas, pending negotiations with the State of Guanajuato is complaining bitterly of their assaults, and accusing the government of doing nothing to repress them. As to the State of Mexico, itself, our reports show, among others, successive and successful raids and captures of towns by bands operating independently under the various leaderships of Antonio Limon, Manuel Mendez, N. Beltran, Alberto Samano and Lorenzo Samano.

SEES A GREAT LIGHT.

Roosevelt has made the "International Socialist Review," at any rate, see a great light. Its editorial in the October issue is a remorseless condemnation of the whole palpitating activity, and an exposition of the fact that those lines since politicians of the Roosevelt type will always steal its thunder. Furthermore, it says:

"These reforms settle nothing; they only postpone the day of settlement." Bravos! That is the true talk, and let it be clearly understood all round that we do not want the settlement postponed. We do not want the agony prolonged. We want the attack on the enemy hurried and driven to a moment's slacking up. We are not content to remain killing on the stove of capitalism; that concessions may be made to the conservatives and a few extra votes recorded. The very existence of the disinherited is at stake, and to yield to privilege is to be guilty of unspeakable cruelty and the most perfidious of treasons.

Rooseveltism

Nobody can speak with more authority for Roosevelt than does William Allen White, and nobody can write more explicitly. One has only to read what he has written for the "Los Angeles Tribune," of October 7, to be able to grasp firmly, once and for all, exactly what both Roosevelt and the Socialists want.

Mr. White's plea is for a strong central government, which shall be able to control the trusts and railroads, conserve our natural resources, attend to the currency, etc. He declares emphatically that the individual States are no longer able to perform that protective duty. The whole idea of the "Progressives" is a strong protective government, and it is no wonder they dare not tackle the tariff issue, for they, above all men, are Protectionists.

Having made this quite clear, Mr. White writes: "To reject the Progressive ideal of government control leaves open just one other alternative—that of government ownership. It will be either the Progressives or the Socialists who will solve the problem."

That puts the Socialist position accurately and justly, inasmuch as the Socialists want the government not merely to control but actually to own all sources of wealth. While Roosevelt wants a government far stronger than we have today, the Socialists want a government infinitely stronger than any humanity has known. Owning all the means of life the Socialist government, beyond all question, would own the lives of every one of us.

We say that the more powerful the government is made, the deeper grows the gulf between the utterly dependent and the practically omnipotent. We say that such an arrangement would intensify incalculably the social inequality with which even now the world is cursed, because poverty has its root in the artificially-created helplessness of the many and the artificially-created omnipotence of the few. Therefore, if we oppose the centralizing, strong-government ideas of Roosevelt, we oppose still more strenuously the more centralized and more omnipotent government ideas of Socialists. We declare that all history proves our position to be infallibly correct; and we point to Russia and to Asiatic despotisms as evidence that the strong-government fetish has shown itself to be everywhere and in all ages, the most oppressive idol at whose feet humanity has had the folly of worshipping.

Mr. White is either a shameful ignoramus or a shameless liar when he writes that Roosevelt's propositions and those of Socialists offer the only alternatives. That is an infamous and most pernicious lie, and it will be written down by history as the eternal disgrace of Socialism that it has fostered so deliberately the wide circulation of that lie. It is not necessary to create a powerful central government and give it either despotic control or ownership. There is another way, and that is to give each individual, simply because he is an individual, free and equal access to the means of life. That necessitates the overthrow of ALL monopoly, governmental or private. That means that men and women shall be made economic masters of themselves, and placed where they themselves can regulate their own lives by mutual agreement, instead of handing over all their rights and liberties to autocratic officials. It is the program of LIBERTY.

The real fight is between Liberty, which—by giving each equality of opportunity—seeks to abolish the rule of man by man, and Socialism, which seeks to make government all-perading and omnipotent. Roosevelt, going only half-way toward socialism, is merely an incident. He is doing great educational work, however, by forcing the real conflict to the front, and compelling us to take our stand either for or against the omnipotent government idea.

Let me mention that the "Los Angeles Daily Tribune," writing editorially on the same day, and elaborating Woodrow Wilson for certain alleged criticisms of Democracy, remarks: "Americans may be divided on economic issues, but surely they stand as one for the maintenance of those conditions of equal opportunity under which the poorest child of the humblest worker may hope, through industry, etc." That statement is a lie, the typical lie of plutocratic press circulates untiringly; a lie far more deadly and destructive for our age than any other that could be uttered. As a matter of fact there never has been an hour since the foundation of this republic in which equality of opportunity existed; there never has been a moment in which the man with money at command did not have the moneyless at his feet. Equality of opportunity has existed only on paper; has been from the very first, in fact, a sham and fraud. We took our system direct from Europe, and under that system it is not man but money that talks. All that we shall have to change, if we have any sense, is coming to grips with the money power.

We have today one of the strongest governments on earth, and the strongest the gulf between rich and poor. Do you believe that by making our government still stronger you can bridge that gulf? Why, the State official may roll in wealth and power while the disinherited pauper starves helpless in the gutter.

Mexico could teach us this most valuable lesson if we would but learn, for in Mexico the pauper, even now, to some extent is coming into his own. For example he is often able to get possession of a patch of land on which he can raise his food, and feed on the millions of cattle that range the mountains of Chihuahua, to which hitherto Terrazas has claimed title. He can get some access to the means of life, and he can get it ONLY because his government is comparatively weak. His position would be improved enormously and immediately if it were not that his tottering

government is being propped up by Washington. The poor have as good right as any one else to full opportunity to live, but from that right governments, which exist solely for the protection of monopoly, always have barred them. To dream of tearing down the bars by increasing the power of government is to dream that you can protect yourself from the highwayman by giving him your gun.

IN ITSELF A REVOLUTION.

Those who have been following, for example, Samuel G. Blythe's articles in the "Saturday Evening Post" on the political outlook, will have noted the persistent assertion that we are on the eve of a tremendous splitting up; that both in the Republican and Democratic parties there is widespread revolt, which is bound to break into flames, however the pending election may go. "If Roosevelt wins," writes Blythe, "it will be a landslide brought about by the spirit of unrest, the demand for readjustment of political and economic conditions, the desire for a change and the protest that shaped itself to a degree, in the nomination and the campaign of the third party. There will be nothing in coldly calculated about that. It will be an uprising, a tidal wave." All which is a tribute to the spirit of revolt; a force incalculably more potent than the coldly-calculated organization on which timid labor leaders have been wasting the energies of the disinherited for the last thirty years. In the industrial world Lawrence recently gave the proof.

This tendency, and the growing inclination of the public to do its own thinking, are most significant developments, which no thoughtful Revolutionist will ignore. The symptoms are national, and it is evident that the Socialists' thought-process is at work in the Socialist Party, despite the tremendous discipline the leaders have worked tooth and nail to enforce. Haywood's demand for an expression of party opinion on the Mexican question is one sign; his protest, and that of Charles Edward Russell, in the matter of the Secretary Barnes election scandal, is another.

Socialist Party squabbles are none of our business, but the development of a truly radical, as opposed to an unquestionably reactionary, movement is our business, as it is that of every earnest man and woman who wants to see the longer era of fooling with the social problem brought to a close. From our correspondence, from our reading, and from the Socialists who drop in on us from all parts of the country, we know very well that there is a profound split in the Socialist, as in all the other parties. Why should it be otherwise? How could it be otherwise? How can a really revolutionary movement form itself save by the repeated splitting-off of the radical few from the always conservative mass, to which the leaders cater?

HELLO! HELLO! HELLO!

In "Wiltshire's Magazine" Ben Tillet, the notorious English labor leader who distinguished (or was it extinguished?) himself by calling on God Almighty to strike Lord Day's export dead, explains why this year's strike of the Transport workers was lost. He says, first, that the carmen did not respond; this year, and that, therefore, employers were able to get food supplies. Secondly, that last year they were able to stop the great refrigerating works, but that this year London's meat supply was hardly affected. Thirdly, that the strike came too early in the season, and, fourthly, that "last year the whole of the Transport workers were alive with resentment against the employers, and fighting in all the ports, and they were without organization or agreements. This year they had both, and would not see the same after fighting so hard for them. Last year the union officials risked nothing, but this year they had something to lose and so cried off when the national stoppage was declared."

Do you understand? Last year these same men fought with the courage of those who have nothing to lose. This year they had all the timidity of the petty trader with five dollars in the savings bank. Last year, when the won, they had no organization, but they did have the spirit of revolt. This year, when they lost, they had little of the spirit of revolt but they had no leaders and trusted themselves. This year they trusted leaders, who "had something to lose." What a lesson! We amend Marx' famous war cry by making it read: "Proletariat of the world, fill yourselves with the spirit of revolt!"

One is glad to see that the I. W. W. at its recent convention, sent telegrams to Ricardo Flores Magon and Fernando Palomares, both now in prison, together with many other of our comrades, for alleged violation of the neutrality laws. We also note that the convention spoke of starting a Spanish I. W. W. organ in Los Angeles. We should be glad of this, for there are many Mexicans hereabouts who are not getting the opportunity of reaching. But that Spanish paper will have to be conducted with more ability than the little leaf against "Regeneration" has shown, and it will have to run straight.

A WASTED WARNING.

Noting the increasing suicide rate, the growth of crime, the universal discontent which finds its inevitable outlet in the appeal to violence, Mexico and other Latin countries say firmly to the United States—"We don't intend that YOU, of all the powers in existence, shall rule us, if we can help it." Intervene and we will blow the smouldering flames in Cuba, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, wherever your plutocracy has laid its avenging hand. And while you are sending your rebellious proletariat to die in Mexico, our sympathisers within your own borders will not be idle.

Haywood Reminds
Socialists Of
Their Duty

Haywood has submitted the following amendment to the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party. "It calls for an expression of Socialist opinion throughout the country, and is one of the healthiest and most promising signs we have seen for many a long day. It will be found, we venture to prophesy, that the rank and file of the Socialist Party is frankly revolutionary, and understands quite clearly the great principle of international solidarity, which demands imperiously that it should side with the disinherited proletariat of Mexico and not with the Wall Street buccanniers. The resolution runs as follows:

"A war with Mexico seems imminent. The United States troops have been at the order for months, waiting for a pretext to begin the blood-letting.

"The working people of the two countries are about to be driven to butcher one another in the interest of a handful of capitalists, oil magnates and owners of railroads, mines, ranches and franchises.

"Now is the time for Socialists to act. The Socialists of England and other nations are at this moment voting on a motion proposed by the English and French delegates at the last international congress, calling for a general strike, especially of railroad employees and the producers of military supplies, in the case of a declaration of war. The motion will undoubtedly be carried, and the Socialists of this country cannot afford to wait until the final decision has been reached. Our time to act is now.

"This general strike may require some time for its preparation. Immediate action is also possible. The Socialist Party should at once declare that any of its members who enlist either for this or any other threatening war, such as the impending attack on Nicaragua, ceases by that act to be a member of the Socialist Party.

"This action is demanded not only by the danger of fratricidal butchery but also by our duty to come, however late, to the aid of our brother revolutionists in Mexico—who might be in a far better position today if the Socialist Party had not steadily refused to do its duty in this regard up to the present time.

"We hereby call upon the membership of the Socialist Party and the working class generally to take immediate steps to prevent war with Mexico."

FERRER MEMORIAL MEETING.
Mammoth Big Hall, 517 S. Broadway, Sunday, Oct. 20, 8 p. m.
Admission, ten cents.

Members of the staff of Regeneration, and others known as radical speakers, will deliver addresses. Good music and chorus singing.

Francisco Ferrer was shot to death at Montjuich fortress, Spain, October 13, 1909, by the Spanish government at the urging of the Roman Catholic Church. We celebrate the anniversary again this year, because that middle roused Labor everywhere from its long sleep and set its feet again on the revolutionary path it since has trodden.

Labor and the revolutionary spirit were awakened because Ferrer was a great educator; because he had devoted his life to teaching all that makes for human liberty, and to opposing all that makes for human slavery. As such he was one of the greatest Revolutionists that ever lived, and as such he was murdered.

We do not celebrate this anniversary in any spirit of hero-worship. We use it to further the revolutionary propaganda, and the strength of which will depend the emancipation of Labor from poverty and serfdom. In doing so we continue Ferrer's work, and perform the duty that he, who scorned all forms of idolatry, held most imperative.

DON'T FORGET THE DATE—SUNDAY, OCTOBER 20: OR THE PLACE—MAMMOTH HALL, 517 S. BROADWAY.

GOOD WORDS OF CHEER.

Under date of September 21, "Le Libérateur," of Paris, publishes a long well-informed and sympathetic article on the Mexican Revolution, in which it declares that the movement has now reached a stage of special interest to all who believe in the struggle for economic emancipation. It does full justice to Zapata's uncompromising character, and says—as we believe, correctly—that he is opposed to useless blood-shedding. It adds, however, that in the Central, and even more in the Southern States, the revolution is one of famine, which does not depend on leaders; and that, "with or without him the revolt will continue until the conditions in which the unhappy Mexican peasants find themselves are changed."

"Le Libérateur," remarks that "now is the time to make an effort on behalf of these admirable peasants, who are setting us so fine an example of courage and tenacity." It hopes that, at least, the revolutionary press will follow the lead of "Les Temps Nouveaux," whose fine article we reproduced last week.

WHAT SYNDICALISM IS.

Syndicalism is the natural outgrowth of a labor movement that, for forty years past, has been fooled by politicians into believing that, if clothed with power, they would emancipate it. It is the inevitable protest against that centralization of power by which Socialism everywhere has played into the hands of authority and special privilege. It is, above all, a righteous revolution against the Socialist dogma that, by the natural process of industrial development, the number of capitalists diminishes, and that, therefore, the disinherited will be able to recover their heritage without a fight.