

Regeneration.

Published every Saturday at
914 Bosto. 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. 114.

Saturday, November 2, 1912.

Syndicalism

Expounded

Shortly before going to press, and too late for extended notice, we have received a copy of the pamphlet, "Syndicalism," by Earl C. Ford and Wm. Z. Foster. It is produced under the auspices of the Syndicalist League of North America, which, as the pamphlet itself states, "is not a labor union, and does not allow its branches to affiliate with labor unions," being "simply an educational league, with the task of educating the labor movement to Syndicalism." It is described further as "somewhat similar to that of the Industrial Syndicalist League, which is playing such a prominent part in the present revolution in the English labor movement," and as "a variation from the French plan."

The work of the league, therefore, is assistant, perceptive, educational. In the language of the pamphlet, "it is based on the demonstrated fact that the labor movement will become revolutionary in the measure that the individuals composing it become educated. It is, therefore, seeking to bring about this education by the exploitation of the militant minority." Indeed, the power of a militant minority is emphasized throughout, and that is correct, for it is in accordance with all our experience of life. It suits politicians to sing the praises of the majority, but they do not believe those praises, for their universal habit is to treat the majority as putty ready to their own ambitious hands.

Notes struck with emphasis throughout this pamphlet are, first and above all, belief in autonomy and utter distrust of centralized leadership. As centralization of deputed power is the quintessence of politics, the league naturally has no use for that method of settling the social question. On that head it sets out with great clearness the lessons to be learned from recent history, the barren outcome of forty-two years of leadership by the German Social-Democratic Party being set out in terms that challenge answer, if answer can be made.

Great stress is laid on the fact that the Syndicalist is a possibilist, wedded to no special program but carrying on a guerrilla warfare according to the requirements of each particular case. A right that lacks the power to enforce it is recognized as worthless. There are also some excellent observations on the fallacy—cultivated, oh, so assiduously by paid labor officials—that long years of preparation and elaborate red tape are necessary to the effecting of a fighting organization. The Lawrence strike, of course, is cited as proof to the contrary.

Industrial Unionism—the I. W. W. comes in for powerful criticism, it being pointed out that the "One Big Union" carries one back inevitably to centralization of power and its logical ultimate, an autocratic State. It is noted that the I. W. W. was founded by Socialist politicians, in Chicago, in 1905, and that many traces of its Socialist origin still linger, despite its avowed aversion to politics. The Syndicalist is represented in this pamphlet as being, above all else, an absolute disbeliever in the State as other than an autocrat and stumbling block to emancipation. He has no patience with the "two wings" theory so dear to Socialists.

This pamphlet is full of really valuable information, and is unflinchingly radical, both as regards the goal and the means of reaching it. Complete social reorganization, involving the total extirpation of the wage system, is held up as the only thing worth working for.

The price of this forty-seven page booklet, which is neatly got up, is ten cents, and we should be glad to receive orders.

Read the "Los Angeles Municipal News." We shall be glad to direct you to where the newboys dump it. Make a few enquiries as to the plant they purchased, the personnel of the staff, the salaries paid and the work exacted in return. Then ask any ordinary printer how long his business would last, paying on that basis. In calculating salaries you should make allowance for the campaign contributions.

"The Prohibition Party of the United States of America in convention at Atlantic City, N. J., July 11, 1912, recognizing God as the source of all governmental authority." We always thought that was at the bottom of this authoritarian trouble.

It is a well-established fact, not confined to Great Britain or Ireland but universal over the civilized world, that landlordism among a people almost wholly agricultural will reduce the entire working population to slavery. The evicted tenants, denied all rights to land, must form bands to plunder and kill. (Henry Rawie, in "Wages and the Price of Land.")

"He who wants much, and knows how to get it, has at all times taken it to him. Therefore the only point is that the respectful 'lower classes' should at length learn to take to themselves what they want." (Stirner.)

Conspiracy and Revolution are two entirely different things. A conspiracy, when it assumes shape, is an uprising manufactured artificially by two or more persons. A Revolution is a natural upheaval, an inevitable growth, springing from underlying causes which gave it birth. The Diaz conspiracy against Madero may help the Mexican Revolution, but it is no more the Revolution than the wagging of a dog's tail is the dog itself. It may, or may not, prove more successful than Reyes' abortive attempt to restore a military regime, but it belongs to that class alone. It has been engineered carefully by certain interested persons; it has not budded spontaneously from the people themselves and from the conditions that made the rule of the elder Diaz no longer possible.

Take our national mania for palliatives: a mania nurtured most carefully by the politicians, each of whom is anxious to convince his constituents that he is working day and night for some all-important measure. When I came to this country the Granger movement was supposed to be a power, and one of its chief aims was the passage of anti-usury bills. Anti-usury legislation never has been, and never can be, worth the paper on which it is printed, as any one who tries to borrow money without security immediately discovers. Against four years Bryan kept this up in an unbroken over the proposition that government, thanks to some mysterious omnipotence, could decree that one ounce of gold should be worth sixteen ounces of silver, neither more nor less. I myself once foolishly tried to explain to a political audience that Great Britain had experimented with that very same sort of legislation for no less than two hundred years, and given it up; all of which may be found, although few Socialists will know it, in Karl Marx' "Capital." My educational effort was rewarded with shouts of: "British goldbug! Throw him out!"

In these columns figures on the rapid increase of crime, unemployment and suicide are set forth repeatedly, to show readers that, despite all our desperate attempts to multiply the means of happiness, life in these United States, the most advanced capitalist country in the world, grows more and more unhappy. We all want to be happy and we are missing it; missing it beyond all question, as the tables prove. Suicide is the one decisive test, for common sense tells us that only when they find themselves desperately unhappy do people voluntarily cut out of life. Furthermore, what common sense tells us the historians confirm, for their unanimous testimony is that whenever a particular form of society is going irredeemably to smash, suicides multiply. It is one of the infallible signs of coming dissolution.

If an individual becomes convinced that a given course tends to make him more and more unhappy, there is only one sensible thing that he can do—revolutionize his life by abandoning that course. If he discovers that booze is killing him, he should cut out the booze. If he finds that getting the best of his neighbors and gobbling up the earth and the fullness thereof, is making him and every one else unhappy, he should turn over a new leaf and revolutionize his life. He should recognize that it is human to err; and confess that, although he honestly supposed he was heading for happiness, he has learned that he is steering away from it and now proposes to go on an entirely different tack.

PUTTING ON THE SCREWS.

From our point of view one of the best things that has happened lately is the arrest by the McKeesport, Pa., police of two organizers of the American Federation of Labor, who were distributing union labor literature at the homes of the unorganized employees of the Steel Trust. We say it is a good thing because it puts on the screws, and the American Federation of Labor needs to have the screws put on it, if ever an organization did.

When one considers what labor produces and what it actually receives; when one considers the millions of parasites that feed on its carcass; when one considers that rearing palaces it lives in hovels, and that, being the creator of all wealth and power, it stands habitually hat in hand, begging to be set to work—when one considers these things, what they call the "conservative" workman is seen as the monster he actually is. It is he who gladly builds mansions in best cities and schemes to rob him and his brothers in which they enjoy his fallen daughters. It is he who will slave his life out for the pirates who slay his own kin, and then thump himself on the chest, declaring, with preposterous self-conceit, that he is an "honest" workman, who gives "a fair day's labor for a fair day's pay." I will find you any day stores of literary workers who will refuse with scorn to put their brains at the service of infamy. Find me a carpenter, a bricklayer or a painter who will take a stand and say: "Notorious scoundrels shall not have my vote!"

No criticism of the social problem is worth a button that does not recognize the workman as the most conservative creature on earth, and, therefore, the greatest drag on the movement to effect profoundly radical changes that must be made. His home is largely in the American Federation of Labor, and one is glad that even there plutocracy, most foolishly, is putting on the screws.

"State and pauperism are one and the same. The State does not let me attain my value, and exists only by my valuelessness. Its goal is always to get some benefit out of me, to exploit me, to use me up." (Stirner.)

SUBMITTED AS DISGRACEFUL.

Unquestionably, in England and Scotland, if not indeed in Ireland, there is a widely-distributed conviction that until land monopoly shall have been successfully attacked and overturned no great headway toward the abolition of poverty can be made. Unquestionably in this respect they are far ahead of the United States, in which land-gobbling has grown almost into a second nature. We are glad to see, therefore, a stirring article on that subject in the November issue of "Freedom," which, while doubting the efficacy of the Single Tax plan, declares it imperative "that the people shall recognize no man's claim to monopolize the land or the minerals, and shall refuse to pay over the proceeds of their labor to any idler or monopolist in return for the permission to live upon and use the soil." It expresses the belief that direct action will be needed, and that this great act of individual and social emancipation will have to be done against and in defiance of the State.

"Freedom's" article ends: "Oh, for the great International General Strike against rent, followed by the march of the people to take possession of the land for common use and benefit—the only secure basis for economic freedom." As to which we remark that Mexico happens to be the one country in the world that has started that march, and that "Freedom" can find notes of the revolutionary movement of almost every country in the world—excepting Mexico.

What do "Freedom," and several other allegedly revolutionary publications, mean by gushing over the admirable life-work of the late Voltaire de Cleyre, and at the same time deliberately ignoring the fact that, during the last year of her life, she came to the firm conclusion that the Mexican Revolution was the greatest and most drastic uprising of the proletariat against its masters that had taken place during her lifetime? The editor of this section says outright that the boycott virtually placed by a clique of anarchists upon the Mexican Revolution seems to him the most disgraceful fact that has come within his notice during thirty years.

It is disgraceful because the publications in question profess to be ardent disciples and followers of Kropotkin. It is disgraceful because the Mexicans whom "Regeneration" represents have been as devout admirers and propagandists of Kropotkin, whose works they have been circulating for years. It is disgraceful because they have paid the penalty—literally thousands of them—in prison and on the battlefield. It is disgraceful because all these facts are well known to the editors of the papers in question.

One says outright, without making any bones about it, that such editors and publications belong to the class that will talk violence by the year, justifying it with all the eloquence at their command; but that when the common people take them at their word and put their teaching into effect, they turn the back. That is disgraceful; that justifies the sneers of Socialists who maintain that the Anarchist celebrities are parlor propagandists, after notoriety and the dollars notoriety brings.

The Mexican Revolution is a tremendous fact, which is about to bring in its train many other of what the Germans are fond of calling "world-shaking" facts. To attempt to ignore it should be to publish oneself as belonging to the class of alleged revolutionists who deserve to be ignored.

ITS UNIVERSAL TONGUE.

The order of old has been reversed. Leaders don't make strikes any more. It is the strikers that make the leaders nowadays. This was strikingly shown in the Lawrence revolt. There the leaders were incidental. They came on the scene after the strike was started, after the mills were closed.

The real leader of the strike, the man with initiative who precipitated it, was quite innocent of his leadership. He was one of the mass, but he was not of those who wait for the word of command before they act. He did not wait to see what the others were going to do.

He stood at the short-pay envelope, then he looked into the face of the well-dressed pay-master, whom for the moment he characterized as the embodiment of the atrocious system that was oppressing him and his fellow slaves. Instantly the wrath of a thousand wrongs stored in his breast rose into a towering passion, and he flung the envelope in the face of the astonished official, exclaiming: "Back to hell I fling it."

That was the signal, the inspiration for his comrades, who instinctively followed him out of the mill. Who could resist following such a leader? He the type of leader that will one day empty the principal factories of the world and precipitate the Social Revolution.

No other act of leadership would have moved that impulsive, unorganized mass, speaking a quarter of a hundred languages. They all understood him. Direct Action is the universal language of Labor. ("The Agitator.")

MORE SAGRISTA CARDS.

We have received from Fermín Sagrista, the celebrated Spanish artist, the second of the eloquent postcard 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.

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.)

PLUTOCRACY'S MURDERS.

Chicago Bureau of the Times, Oct. 16.—(Special Dispatch.) A suicide commission to study the causes and prevention of self-destruction is proposed by Coroner Hoffman in his report just issued covering four years.

The most significant statement in the booklet is the information that in 1911 there was an increase of 29 per cent in the number of suicides over 1910. Fifty hundred and thirty-three coroners' inquests returned the verdict of "death by suicide" for the year. Of 18,760 deaths in four years, 2023 were suicides.

"The statistics of this office show that 54 per cent of all suicides are those over 40 years of age. It is not far-fetched to suppose that a large number of the industrial army who find themselves permanently out of employment through no fault of their own save old age should seek solace in a self-chosen death," says the report.

In noting the increase in the number of suicides during my administration of the office, I believe it is high time that the subject of suicide be intelligently studied by our community. After due consideration I believe it advisable that a suicide commission be appointed by our city council which will give the entire subject thorough study and investigation."

VALUE FOR THEIR MONEY.

Vincent St. John's report to the Seventh Annual Convention of the Industrial Workers of the World shows that, during the preceding twelve months, 75,152 members of the organization were engaged in strikes, of whom 1446 were arrested and 577 convicted. The proportion of arrests is enormous, and points to a prodigious amount of serious struggle. As a contribution to the growth of that deep discontent which is the soil from which all revolutionary changes must spring, it should be most significant.

Total receipts for the year were only \$28,269.71, which is the merest bagatelle as compared with the sums handled by the American Federation of Labor, but it is certain that the I. W. W. got something for their money. Here, in Los Angeles, our conservative trades unions squandered some \$336,000 on an utterly impotent fiasco of a building strike, to say nothing of the \$236,000 odd dissipated on the McNamara farce, most of which went to lawyers. It looks to us as if the I. W. W. got, at least, a run for their money, which is more than most labor organizations can say truthfully.

BULLY FOR NOME!

None of our strictly labor exchanges do we esteem so highly as the "Daily NOME Industrial Worker," published by Union No. 240, Western Federation of Miners. Some one is at the head of it who knows enough to discuss the labor question from a hundred different angles, and understands that the duty of a labor editor is not to corrupt his readers with continual doses of sensation, but to get them into the habit of discussing the problem from those various angles. Its issue of September 28 has an admirable leading article on Socialist politicians, and it is the only one we have come across for weeks past that has seemed worth the quiver. Usually such labor papers as favor the Socialists exalt them as Gods, while those opposed brand them as corrupt politicians. No argument is used; epithets take the place of logic and the appeal is to sentiment entirely.

The writer of the article in question points out the grave importance of the action taken at the last national Socialist convention, in the adoption of a resolution condemning direct action. He explains how futile is the cry that Roosevelt has stolen the party's thunder, shows that the party is quivering with the fear of becoming "non-revolutionary" and strictly reformist, and calls particular attention to the fact that such economic ideas as the political leaders have formulated point to conditions "which would center in the politician the control of what they might call State Socialism, but which would be nothing else but State slavery."

Do the workers understand this? They do not, for with very few and most honorable exceptions, their own press keeps them in the dark. Do they understand that when they are invited to place all their trust in politics they are really being asked to walk into an official prison that would be ten thousand times worse than that from which they are now endeavoring to escape? It is the solemn duty of their press to lay the facts before them, but editors such as the man at the head of the "Daily NOME Industrial Worker" seem to be pitifully scarce. As for the Socialist press, it is bitterly partizan, and will do all in its power to keep the workers from hearing a single argument against its own set programme.

The hope of the social reformer is to open wide the gates of opportunity, so that every creature, from the least to the greatest, may make his life a moral adventure and a joy, and shake his possible existence as a thing he can best do. (George D. Herron.)

OUR LETTER BOX.

A. C. Talling, of Colville, Wash., writes us at considerable length, in criticism of our article entitled "Rooseveltism." He complains of the word "give," and writes: "You can't give people freedom; it is a matter of taking it." Indeed we think so, and write constantly to that effect. The word "giving" has been used too loosely.

Mr. Talling insists that people follow leaders "because they are built that way," and that "you can't change the system until humanity changes." We suggest that the readiness of men to follow leaders comes from ignorance, since the man who does not know distrusts himself and leans on others. We are quite sure human nature cannot be changed, but institutions can be. We consider that the system depends on the existence of numerous institutions which have been, for a long time, out of date. If it is urged that we cannot change them, we reply, with Cassius: "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars but in ourselves that we are underlings." Shakespeare, three hundred years ago, anticipated Mr. Talling's argument.

"Of course," he writes, "things will change as evolution proceeds, but it is a slow process. You can't speed up evolution." To us this is a miserably fallacious doctrine. The editor of this section found it necessary to learn Spanish, and his evolution has depended on his industry. If we lie down before the superstitions that enslave our forefathers our evolution will indeed be slow, but if we choose to avail ourselves of our information science has put at our disposition, the clouds that have obscured the way will vanish and the journey will be quickened. Probably the Mexicans have learned more during the last eighteen months of struggle than they did in fifty years previous.

"You refer to equality of opportunity as having never existed. Of course it never did and never will until everybody is equal." What we wrote was that in the United States "equality of opportunity has existed only on paper." Equality of opportunity merely means that all should have, as far as possible, a square deal and equal show. However just he may be, no father supposes that his children are equal in each and all of their abilities, nevertheless he tries to give them all an equal chance. He does not load the one with wealth and turn the other out of doors, a penniless outcast.

"It is no use your laying out plans for humanity." We agree in that. All one can do is to present the evidence, that other minds may draw their individual conclusions as correctly as possible.

"All striving for excellence is a striving for inequality." Again the language appears loose. Individual struggle leads to infinite variety and differentiation, as all the biologists show. If Mr. Talling means that it necessarily leads to inequality of opportunity the statement seems absurd.

Let none suppose that dark forebodings of the future are confined to so-called revolutionists. We hear them on every side, and I take as typical an address delivered recently by Dr. William E. Dodd, professor of history in the University of Chicago. As reported in the "Los Angeles Tribune," he said, in part: "The average man has a better chance before the courts of England or France than in the United States; and the wealthy man has a better chance to win an unrighteous suit under our laws than under the laws of any other civilized country in the world. While we have slumbered our birthrights have been taken away—we have democracy in name but not in fact; other countries are monarchies in name but democracies in fact. Democracy and special privilege cannot dwell together in peace, and that is what we have been trying in this country for half a century. Every one now recognizes the experiment to be a failure. If we cannot re-establish democracy we shall have to submit to feudalism; a new feudalism, but not less oppressive than the old."

But we shall not submit; or, if we do, we shall prove ourselves even more cowardly than the few who are said to have crept into the Titanic's lifeboats that they might save their individual skins at any price.

TAFT SPEAKS OUT.

Four years ago President Taft, being asked what a man, out of work and money, was to do in times of panic, answered "God only knows." Immediately the Socialist press christened him "God Knows" Taft, and it has never ceased parroting the cry. In reality the answer did Taft great credit, for it showed that he was not the common type of spellbinder who launches into torrents of words that he may side-step an awkward question.

Similarly Taft has been giving his views in "The Saturday Evening Post," and it seems to us that again he has said a straight thing in his criticism of Roosevelt. It runs as follows: "As we listen to demagogic or to fatuous reformers let us not forget that votes are not bread, constitutional amendments are not work, referendums do not pay rent or furnish homes, recalls do not provide clothing, initiatives do not supply employment or opportunity. For any definite plans from those who advocate these innovations, which will promote equity of opportunity and ameliorate hardships, we listen in vain."

If we could only get that thought into the public's noddle we should have a social revolution. If we could get them to realize that all these paper reforms amount to nothing, and that possession of things alone counts, the present system of monopoly would shrivel up like the proverbial snowball in hell.

"People will see that they are freest and happiest when they have no plenipotentiary agents and depend little on the wisdom of representatives as on that of providence." (Kropotkin.)

WHY MEXICO REVOLTS.

"The capitalistic new channels on both sides of the line seem to be blocked against all information as to the real secret of the present revolution in Mexico."

"But few understand why Madero's government is unstable. The cause is not far to seek. Fundamentally, the Mexican question is the land question. Madero came from one of the large land-holding families. Zapata, Gomez, and Orozco say their complaint and that of their followers is that capitalists of foreign countries have bought up all Mexico through concessions which the Federal government had no moral, even if it had the legal right to grant. Before this change took place the people had grouped themselves into their own self-governed communities with a sort of communism in land. Now they are tenants at will of foreign corporation landlords. These are largely from the United States. That is why the 'Interests' on this side threaten intervention. When Mexico gets a government based on land owned by the people she will have one that will be stable. Otherwise, never." ("Florida Beacon.")

HIS SILENT LIE.

"The dominion of one class," writes Jean Jaures, the noted French Socialist political leader, "is an attempt to degrade humanity. Socialism, which will abolish all primacy of class and indeed all class, elevates humanity to its highest level." He begs the question. He offers no reply to the million-times repeated objection that the officials—the runners of the great Socialist productive and distributive machine—would be themselves the most powerful, the most autocratic and the most irresponsible class this world has known. He knows that is the one great objection to the Socialist political program, and he passes it by in silence. It is in silence the greatest lies are told and the greatest deceptions worked.

"But the evil of pinning faith to indirect action is far greater than any such minor results. The main evil is that it destroys initiative, quenches the individual rebellious spirit, teaches people to rely on some one else to do for them what they should do for themselves; finally renders organic the anomalous idea that by massing stupidity together until a majority is acquired, then, through the peculiar magic of that majority, this supreme act is to be transformed into energy. That is, people who have lost the habit of striking for themselves as individuals, who have submitted to every injustice while waiting for the majority to grow, are going to become metamorphosed into human high-explosives by a mere process of packing." (Voltaire de Cleyre.)

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.

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 government in its campaign against the rebels. In a statement today he said: "The Speyer, Morgan and Hariman 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 property to the American lives and protection in the republic and all friction along the border with Americans will cease."

DO YOURSELF THE FAVOR.

There should be nothing too good for the worker physically, and he should make up his mind to that. Still more, there should be nothing too good for him mentally, and to that he should make up his mind even more firmly, for our mind are the best part of us and without them are nothing. Therefore the workers should take advantage of the offer made by Chas. W. Bergman, of Alpine, Mich., and send to him for Tucker's "State Socialism and Anarchism," paying forty cents a hundred, or \$4.20 a thousand, besides postage. Tucker's pamphlet is one of the few masterpiece labor literature can boast. Half an hour's study of it will teach you more than all the slush most of our so-called "leaders" have wasted their lives writing.

This is not an advertisement, but a propaganda notice.

TO RETAIN OFFICE.

Among the innumerable crimes of government there is none more unspeakably hideous than that of stirring up a war for the sake of obtaining a new lease of power. It has been done over and over again by England and other countries, it has been done in the United States; the probability is that the Taft administration will try the trick once more. It is the favorite card of politicians who discover that their influence is waning, for they calculate that war is popular and that the nation will hesitate to swap horses in the middle of the stream.

Important to Our English Readers

Probably our comrade, William C. Owen, who has so ably conducted the English section of "Regeneration," will retire from the editorship.

ABE RUEF'S CASE.

When Charles Edward Russell writes on prison questions he is fine, for then he ceases to be a politician. In the last issue of "The Coming Nation" all his reflections on the Ruef case are well worth reading, but I believe that he has not the whole truth respecting Ruef himself. Months before the agitation for the release of Ruef began I was informed, by what I consider reliable San Francisco authority, that it would begin; that the leading San Francisco Jews were pooling issues, and bringing great financial pressure to bear; that their action was dictated by racial considerations, just as in India all Englishmen pull together. One has known the rich San Francisco Jews do this before; thereby forcing, for instance, insurance companies to pay for fires confessedly incendiary. It is a suicidal policy, for it keeps alive the tribal tradition, and the idea that, at bottom, Judaism is still a compact for the spoiling of the Egyptians.

COVERING IT UP.

"Something for nothing" is the title of a forty-eight page pamphlet, published at 337 N. Main St., Los Angeles, for twenty-five cents, by George Whitney Slocumb, an earnest Single Taxer. I am glad to think that the Single Tax is coming to the front, because I am glad of anything that shows up the hideous monstrosity of land monopoly.

Henry George taught that what labor has produced is a proper subject for private property and sale; but that land was not so produced and, therefore, private property in land is wrong. That is the simple doctrine, but it has been overlaid, and con-

Our objection to the Socialist Party is not that it is conservative but that it will not allow anyone else to be radical. We know what it has done in Russia; we know what it has been trying to do in Mexico, and we can see very clearly what it would like to do in the United States.

Any coward can curse big business and throw stones at Morgan. Where pluck comes in is when you face your neighbors, the petty thieves who live on dollars they never earned and think themselves paragons of virtue. Try the experiment at your next labor meeting.

Roosevelt says the tariff ought to be made "a material issue and not a moral issue." But the tariff grants privileges, and privilege always sacrifices the interests of some one man to the interests of some other man. Which is the very quintessence of immorality.

"The general welfare may exult aloud while I must lie like a hushed dog. The State may be in splendor while I starve." (Stirner.)

Debs' treachery to the Mexican Revolution, the cold, calculating treachery of a political Pope—did more to raise doubts as to the good faith of the Socialist Party than all its other history. The strokes on which politicians most pride themselves usually prove to be their most colossal blunders.

We speak of great monopolies as created for the purpose of facilitating production. They are in reality organizations to forcibly prevent the people from producing for the common consumption; organizations for the sole purpose of compelling the people to produce for the profit of the few, instead of the consumption of all. And this congestion of economic goods, which has been the historic destroyer of nations and religions, we are in the habit of calling prosperity and the increase of wealth. (George D. Herron.)

"The International Socialist Review" devotes its back cover-page to an ad by the American Correspondence School of Law, in which rising young revolutionists are urged to study that sure road to office: "More lawyers in the Socialist Party! Good God!"

What we want is not more books, but more people with the opportunity and ability to read and understand the excellent books now written on the social question. A short, clear pamphlet that a hundred workmen can master, is worth more than a bulky volume into which a few philosophers will condescend to dip.

How rapidly the revolutionary movement advances everywhere! Yesterday you could kill a man by calling him an Anarchist. Today you make him popular. Four years ago the people still had faith in politicians. At this moment the common attitude toward the warring factions is: "A plague on all your houses!"

Why do the papers waste space trying to induce the preachers to declare themselves in favor of Sunday amusements, which necessarily keep the people away from church? It is as if one should ask lawyers to deplore the amount of money squandered on litigation.

Does the proletariat think he can slough his way to economic freedom? Has he any reason for supposing that he is an exception to the rule that for everything we have to pay the price? Does he imagine we can have a more intelligent society while he remains stupid, or that the struggle can be successful while he hangs back?