

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. 84.
Saturday, April 6, 1912.

Drop The Bone To
Grasp Its Shadow

No one can become a real champion without brains and courage, and it must be admitted that the "Los Angeles Daily Times" is a real champion of plutocracy. We may not like the paper, but no one can deny that it has the sagacity to recognize an enemy when it sees one, and the pluck to fight him, which is more than can be said for nine-tenths of the labor and so-called revolutionary press. So, while these latter have ignored the Mexican Revolution or been too indolent to investigate it, the "Times" has made that most ominous upheaval its special study. In its issue of March 26 the following true sketch of the revolution's inwardness and tendencies appeared:

"Socialism has found a remarkably strong footing in the country during the last few years. This doctrine is being promulgated by agitators in many parts of the republic. The seeds which these emissaries are now sowing may spring into a harvest of trouble for the government in the not-distant future. Already the masses are being arrayed against the classes, and to this latter fact is largely due the strength of the Zapata and Gomez revolts. In the opinion of persons who have made a close study of the political and economic conditions of Mexico, the time is closely approaching when the conflict between the poor class and the so-called aristocracy, or financial powers, must be fought to a finish. This day is coming, irrespective of what may be the result of the present internal turmoil. "Many of the land barons who know the temperament and secret aspirations of the masses are preparing for what they believe is to be the inevitable result of the general discontent that is now manifesting itself by selling their vast estates at a sacrifice. There has been a general exodus of these wealthy land owners from the country during the last few months. This is particularly true of the Spaniards who in times past owned many vast acreage tracts. It is claimed that the existing down-trodden and oppressed condition of the peons is largely due to the burdens placed on them by their wealthy ranch and plantation employers, and it is owing to this fact that there has been aroused a strong sentiment in favor of confiscating and dividing among the masses these big properties.

"This is the platform upon which Emilio Zapata is conducting his revolution in the southern part of the republic. Individually he was a long sufferer through the despotic methods of the aggrandizing and all-powerful land owner. He is now seeking his vengeance upon former oppressors of him and his people.

"In many respects conditions in Mexico afford the most interesting studies of the age. Here are to be found problems to be solved that have perhaps never confronted any other government. How to meet the just demands of the lowly peon class which forms the bulk of the population and at the same time serve and protect the legal rights and invested interests of the higher and wealthy members of society is one of the great economic questions that is demanding attention on the part of those who want to see the integrity and existence of the nation preserved."

The "Los Angeles Daily Times" is right; absolutely right. It is a thoroughly reliable watchdog of privilege, with a nose that scents infallibly the approach of danger to its master. It does not care how the unwelcome visitor is dressed; it does not care whether he labels himself Socialist or Anarchist. I. W. W. Trades these terms impartially. What it cares about is what it is. What it cares about is that its master's sleep is disturbed; that its master's property is threatened; that there is a hateful smell in the air which bodes no good. What it sees in Mexico is a turmoil out of which has grown, and is growing with cyclonic rapidity, a contest between the disinherited and the privileged, with a set determination on the part of the former to strip the latter of their monopolies. It does not care about the incidents and it does not care about the individuals involved. What it cares about is the general condition; what it recognizes is that Mexico is now in the throes of parturition and is giving birth to a child who may make trouble in the future; that from her loins has sprung "the conflict between the peon class and the so-called aristocracy, or financial powers," which must be "fought to a finish." That is the one important fact, and personally I take off my hat to the "Times" for having the sagacity to recognize and the frankness to acknowledge it.

It is unfortunate that the general Labor press of the United States has not the nose the "Times" possesses; that it cannot recognize its Mexican friend when he walks straight into camp with credentials beyond cavil. It is still more unfortunate in the case of the Socialists, the Single Taxers, and even a small portion of the Anarchist press. But one need not impute dishonesty, and as regards the Socialists and Single Taxers it is clear that they have fallen victims to their own fallacious cleverness, for, having

invented what they conceive to be a cure-all, they have lost all sight of the original disease and do not even think it worth their while to watch the patient. I say that the ordinary Socialist's indifference to the great Mexican Revolution is because it is not working itself out at the ballot box, and that the average Single Taxer is hostile because the disinherited peon has not adopted the plan recommended by Henry George as the easiest method of doing away with private property in land. I personally had some acquaintance with Henry George, and was always positive, alike from his letters, his books and the one conversation I enjoyed, that to him the abolition of land monopoly was everything and the method a subsidiary detail.

When I took hold of this English section nearly a year ago I had no conception of the extent to which the mass of Socialists and Single Taxers is in bondage to the slavery of plan. Knowing that the Mexican Revolution was essentially economic I wrote numerous letters to active Socialists of my acquaintance, and was astonished at receiving cold replies. I also wrote to various Single Taxers, for I knew that the land question was everything in Mexico, and I assumed that the followers of the great agitator who traced the cause of poverty to private property in land would be profoundly interested. They were not. From one man, whose name is known to every Single Taxer, I received an answer of which the following is the essential part:

"As far as our Single Tax interests are concerned, we have no objection to having people dispossessed, for, to use the words of one of our best men, 'having planted and nourished the tree of monopoly, the people cannot complain of the fruit.'

It will be observed that not only does this "best" man rather like it when people are driven off the land without which they cannot live, but that when they are fighting to get it back they receive no sympathy. They are not campaigning according to the Single Tax plan; they are unorthodox.

Look at the matter straight and ask yourself if the spectacle is not pathetic itself. Here are hundreds of thousands of people quite in earnest, quite honest, quite convinced that economic evolution of some kind is the only way out of their misery. But it MUST be according to their social pattern, and if evolution works otherwise so much the worse for evolution. They have heard that in Mexico there exists a condition of affairs unmatched for brutality in Darkest Russia, and undoubtedly they would like to see that condition overthrown. That the Mexican people, misunderstood as being the most humble of persons, has risen against his oppressors must give them one supposes, mental satisfaction. They may even grasp the central fact that successful revolt in one country furthers the revolutionary movement in others, as no speeches or small political victories by any possibility can further it. But, though they feel all this instinctively, they dare not trust their instincts, for they have sworn adherence to a special plan and into the framework of that plan they hope to coax or force the rest of us.

When, more than three centuries ago, England was truly great; when she hurled defiance at Rome, drove the Spanish armada from her shores and, by asserting the right to express thoughts freely, paved the way for that great movement of emancipation which created modern literature and gave birth to science, the struggle was fought and won on very different lines. Men perished at the stake, but in so doing they bade their comrades "be of good cheer, since we have won the light of knowledge, and that shall never be extinguished." They could not know where the battle would be waged or around what particular standard the fighting would be fiercest; but they knew the battle was on; they knew it was for what seemed then the greatest thing in life, viz., liberty of conscience; they knew, as all who have the genius of combat know, that "the letter killeth and the spirit giveth life." Standing for authority and privilege the "Los Angeles Daily Times" knows well that the spirit generated in Mexico is the most dangerous of foes; and we also, who are of the opposite side, know that in that spirit lies the promise of a future which will not be denied. The candle of economic freedom has been lit and shall not be extinguished.

WM. C. OWEN.

THE PROLETARIAT WING.
Ten thousand unemployed and I. W. W. men to march from San Francisco to San Diego; new contingents to be picked up at Oakland, Fresno, Los Angeles and all along the line; the great fight in San Diego to be fought to a finish; then a return to the lumber mills of Washington, where a general strike has been called—does that look like social peace? Does it look like a contented people? Does it look as if every one could get work, or as if the American laborer, ballot in hand, is the self-satisfied sovereign the politicians paint him? There has been fully a generation of constant revolutionary talk by the "intellectuals" up above. Can it be that the men at the bottom have got tired and begun to act?

THE SILK-STOCKING BRIGADE.
Insurgent Republicanism coquettes with Socialism and affords encouragement to disorder and anarchy. The "progressive" press, so-called, teems daily with assaults upon wealthy men, merely because of their wealth. "Big business," "special privilege," "predatory wealth," "loathsome capitalism"—with these and other pet phrases assaults are made upon those who, by industry, thrift and activity, have accumulated wealth, or who have inherited wealth from their progenitors. ("Los Angeles Daily Times.")

Notice has been given in the Spanish section that after April 15 the names of those in arrears with their subscriptions will be struck off our lists. Our English readers also will kindly take notice.

Impossibilists!

"Impossibilists!" This is the word bandied once more from mouth to mouth by the shepherds, terrified lest the flock should get beyond control. "Impossibilists!" It is time for us to enquire what is and what is not impossible.

It is impossible to cure helplessness—from which all poverty springs—while leaving in full activity the causes that make men helpless. Minimum wage, compulsory arbitration and similar measures so dear to lawyers and officials, who thrive on the multiplication of laws, cannot help us so long as monopoly endures. They cannot for the simple reason that the monopolist commands the situation and dictates the terms.

When, in bitter need and without being able to give good security, you try to borrow money, the anti-usury laws do not protect you in the least. You must pay the lender's price, for he has you at his mercy. Your helplessness and not the law decides the bargain and this is typical of all "prohibition" legislation. That class of remedy is impossible.

It is impossible to get richer by monopolizing industries while leaving land monopoly intact. You merely enrich the landlord. His property rises in value and he raises your rents proportionately.

It is impossible to win by hiring legislators and other to fight for you. You are the ones robbed and you yourselves must save yourselves. You cannot ever yet made a revolution and never will; for revolutions involve risk, and always "the hiring fleet because he is a hireling." For the past fifty years plutocracy has been winning at every point, precisely because you relied on your paid representatives to fight it, which they never did.

It is impossible, quite impossible, to give the many their rights without stripping the few of their privileges. Reformers, and many who pose as revolutionists, tell you perpetually that they can perform this miracle. Cowardice or secret alliance with the other side fathers the lie.

Such is the general program of those who are raising this "impossibilist" cry; of the politicians who pretend that they want the masses to have the cake, but insist that the classes be left to eat it undisturbed. It is itself the most impossible of programs. We, on the other hand, whom they brand as irresponsible dreamers, suggest that the following are not only possible but are the very things which, sooner or later, you will have to do.

It is quite possible for you to insist that monopoly must go and a genuinely square deal be started. Thousands of Mexicans have so insisted within the last twelve months and have started the square deal. Unless, therefore, you are inferior to them in pluck and intelligence it is quite possible for you to do what they have done.

It is quite possible to insist that the gates of equal opportunity swing open to all, and the productive capacity of the race be allowed full play by giving it, free access to the machinery of production it has evolved.

It is quite possible to insist that no one shall bar you from the use of this earth, to which you were born and from which you must make your living. This is not merely possible; it is imperative.

Who, then, are the "impossibilists?" We who point out the struggle and simple way or the labor politicians who gave you, for example, San Francisco? They were in power there for years. Did the result satisfy you? They have been pursuing this safe and sane, step-at-a-time, sit-on-two stools policy for generations. See where you find yourselves today, with millions of unemployed and life harder than it ever was.

PROFESSOR TALKS STRAIGHT.

Professor John Graham Brooks, special lecturer on economics in the University of Berkeley, recently said to a class of students, "If you could stop the work of either the reformist or the revolutionary Socialists. The reformists are not going to accomplish what they wish to accomplish, but they are going to learn a lot by trying, and, incidentally, they are going to teach the rest of us a lot. But they will not be able to accomplish Socialism through legal reform." The same gentleman said, with a wisdom which happily will be lost on Gen. Otis, that the capitalists had been very foolish in fighting trades unionism, and that the bulk of the present "order" was re-marked that Pittsburg, where they have been crushed out, "was rapidly becoming a seething cauldron of revolutionary unrest." He added that he had talked with Frick and Gary, and had found them pessimistic and worried over the outlook.

THE LAWRENCE LESSON.

The fact that workers of all nationalities acted as one man in the Lawrence struggle is being cited on all sides as a triumph of organization and a testimony to the strength of international solidarity. It is nothing of the kind. What it really testifies to is the fact that action is the great crystallizing agent; that struggle brings men and women together in a day as years of solemn business meetings and red-tape flummery cannot. It is so in Mexico. Under the cementing spell of action, Mexicans who speak a score of dialects and can barely understand one another in the simplest conversation are acting in perfect harmony. Action brings to life the sense of common interest, and the necessities of the combat evoke fraternity. Continuous argument, on the other hand, intensifies private differences, and that is precisely what is the matter with the "intellectuals." Most of them would rather die than recede from some erroneous position they have taken in debate.

By a very little personal trouble our readers can assist our propaganda enormously. Send us in names of those likely to be interested, and we will at once mail sample copies and other matter.

Lull Succeeds Long Spell
of Storm

Press Teems with Intervention Rumors

When American and other plutocrats bought Mexican land by the hundreds of square miles did they ask what right the vendors had to sell it? Did they ask how it was that a few were able to dispose of principalities? Of course they did not. They took their alleged titles knowing them to be absolutely rotten. They knowingly made themselves partners in one of the most gigantic crimes on record. By every principle of justice they should be punished. Most certainly they should not be upheld by American bayonets.

According to despatches of April 3 Orozco's expected advance on Torreón has been checked by Campa's failure to take Parral. He found there a force estimated at 2,000, under the command of General Villa, Teller, Urbina and Sotelo, and has been compelled to fall back on Jimenez. The correspondents unite in the opinion that Orozco will have to fight another decisive battle, probably in the neighborhood of Jimenez, before he can advance on Torreón, which Gen. Huerta has been busily fortifying. The escape of Gen. Aubert after the federal defeat at Corralitos evidently gave the Orozco forces great concern, for, by forcing his way North, he threatened the base of supplies at Chihuahua. He had 1,200 men with him at Antonito, where he was defeated by the rebels after an engagement in which losses on both sides were reported as heavy. He then fled through the mountains with Fernandez, Salazar and Campa in pursuit, having at their command forces estimated at 2,500, but he eventually eluded them.

The revolt of the Twentieth Battalion of the Federal troops at a critical moment in the battle of Corralitos has occupied much space in Mexico City papers. Gen. Galvan and another officer who tried to stop the revolt, pistol in hand, were killed instantly, but the mutineers were subsequently attacked by Gen. Blanquet's column and subdued.

As it is impossible for any revolution, however energetic, to produce big battles continuously, the six-days fighting at Corralitos has been succeeded by a calm, broken for the first time by the news as to Campa's reverse at Parral. Meanwhile the United States press has run over with reports and articles dealing, directly or indirectly, with the all-important question of intervention.

For American Defense.

On the request of Ambassador Wilson, who indorsed the petition of the American Council of Defense, one thousand rounds of ammunition and a million rounds of ammunition were sent from New York City to Vera Cruz, for use in Mexico City. March 30 brought the news that the rebels surrounding the capital had given notice that they would do all in their power to stop delivery, and that, if the arms found their way into the city, they would attack the American quarters. It has been pointed out in many quarters that the sending of these arms, to which Mr. Macdonald has consented, is itself an act of intervention based on the admission that the existing Mexican government is no longer able to guarantee protection.

Madero opened the twenty-sixth session of Congress April 1, with a characteristically long message of 10,000 words, the gist of which was that peace was near but that United States intervention would mean bitter war. He estimated the federal forces at 40,000, apart from those maintained by the governments of various States, but for fighting trades unionism, and that the bulk of the present "order" was re-marked that Pittsburg, where they have been crushed out, "was rapidly becoming a seething cauldron of revolutionary unrest." He added that he had talked with Frick and Gary, and had found them pessimistic and worried over the outlook.

The peace envoys despatched by Madero to Gomez were reported, April 3, as having returned with the ultimatum that unless Madero resigned the war would continue. According to despatches of that date to the "Los Angeles Evening Herald" the Zapatistas were gathering closer around Mexico City. They had given notice of intention to take Puebla by assault. The Hearst papers in particular have been full of alleged details of the United States' plans for the invasion of Mexico, according to which one army is to embark from Mobile, Ala., another cross the Rio Grande from San Antonio, Tex., and a third be shipped from San Diego, Cal. It is declared that the camps have been selected and that detachments from forty-three States will take part. Gen. Forbes of California has been reported as saying that the camp at Atascadero has been inspected and found satisfactory; that within a few days 4,500 California troops can be placed in San Diego, and that the number can be increased to fully 10,000 within three weeks.

To Amend Dick Law. Meanwhile a Congress is being urged to rush the new militia bill which will permit the president to call the national guard into service without waiting for a declaration of war, thus remedying what is considered by the autocrats of government a fatal defect in the Dick law. If we are not advancing on the path of military despotism one would like to know what country is, and one would also like to enquire what percentage of our population knew anything

about the passing of the Dick law or even today realizes that it has made possible conscription, after the most approved European model.

From various newspaper reports it appears certain also that the army and navy boards have been continuously in joint consultation, enquiring into transportation facilities by sea and land. Two battleships and a cruiser have been sent to the Gulf of Mexico. Despatches from Washington, dated April 2, declared that, as the result of a cabinet meeting, Madero had been informed officially that the Vera Cruz line must be kept open for the delivery of arms to Mexico City, and that failure to do so would have the "gravest consequences." It was reported also that four army transports were at Hampton Roads, loaded and ready to take aboard 4,500 troops to enforce the keeping open of the line. All ships of the Atlantic fleet have been ordered to be at their home ports by April 15, for repairs and re-fitting.

Meanwhile another scare has been started in connection with the reported negotiations for the sale to Japan of Magdalena Bay, as part of the 5,000,000 acres and 500 miles of Mexican coast claimed by certain Los Angeles speculators as "their" property—a typical case on which we have commented more than once. The "Los Angeles Examiner" of April 4 has it that "the moment the United States intervenes in Mexico a Japanese force will attack the United States."

Press censorship in Mexico is, if possible, more stringent than ever, but, judging from the information that gets through, there is no cessation of guerrilla warfare. Particularly does this appear to be the case in Vera Cruz, through which the arms for Mexico City must pass, and in Sinaloa. Orozco is said to have received a letter from Zapata urging co-operation in the attack on Mexico City and to have acquiesced.

PEACE! GENTLE PEACE!

Within a single column the "Los Angeles Daily Times" of April 3 managed to convey the following Pacific Coast war intelligence.

At Aberdeen, Wash., sixty-one agitators were arrested yesterday, around the plans of the State mill "were strung fifty special officers armed with shotguns and with orders to shoot any one who attempted to cross the line." The mob made a desperate attempt to rescue Thorn, secretary of the I. W. W., was repulsed, made a second attempt and was beaten back by police clubs.

At Hoquiam, Wash., fifty regular and two hundred citizen police "checked the I. W. W. outbreak" and are arresting the I. W. W. leaders "around the plans of the State mill 'were strung fifty special officers armed with shotguns and with orders to shoot any one who attempted to cross the line.'"

One hundred Greeks who were shipped out of Raymond, Wash., returned yesterday. "They got off the train and then turned and went back again, with two hundred angry citizens prodding them along."

Also at Hoquiam, Dr. E. Titus, "Socialist leader of Seattle," was given a preliminary hearing and bound over to all Federal grand jury in \$400. He is charged with sedition in connection with the present labor disturbances in Gray's Harbor.

In San Diego, Cal., the day produced two serious clashes between I. W. W. men on the one side and the police and sailors from the U. S. cruiser Maryland on the other. Benjamin Butcher, stated as being an English Anarchist, is to be deported.

As we go to press the news comes that armed vigilantes seized all I. W. W. prisoners who had been turned over to them by the police, and transported them beyond the county border.

NO CALL FOR TEARS.

"Guarded as he sits in exile. Gen. Terrazas shares with Diaz war's sorrow. 'I am a man of iron,' said the ex-lord of the empire, 'I am not decimated by rebel looters.' That is the 'Times' head for its front-page, illustrated interview with what the caption under the cut describes as 'The Rockefeller of Mexico.' The caption is good and the head is good; for it tells the story.

Don't get mawkish over Terrazas' troubles. He is stopping, with a dozen members of his immediate family and a retinue of servants and attendants, at one of our most swaggy hotels. Of course you understand they all unite in cutting wood and doing other serviceable chores to pay the bill.

Force forged and riveted the chains of economic slavery. Fraud teaches the slave to hug them.

Will the United States
Intervene in Mexico?

Send for copies of
"Regeneration's"
Special Pamphlet
on the
Mexican Revolution
Its Progress, Causes,
Purpose and Probable
Results
Sixteen Pages Price 5 cents

Take A Stand!

The editors of "Regeneration" have sent the letter given below to "Les Temps Nouveaux," of Paris, with the statement that they intend to give it the widest publicity in the revolutionary press. "Les Temps Nouveaux" is the successor to "La Revolté," of which Krpottine was long editor, and it has Jean Grave as business manager. It enjoys, therefore, considerable prestige in Europe; but not on notice, since we are not worshippers of big names or established reputations. We even think them usually a handicap, for humanity is too prone to sit down, congratulate itself on what it has accomplished and become a conservative stumbling-block. The letter has been written as notice to more than one revolutionary editor and writer that the Mexican Revolution is a subject too large to be straddled, and that to ignore it while professing to stand at the head of the revolutionary movement is an absurdity. The letter is as follows:

In your issue of March 2 there appears a letter by R. Froment, on the Mexican Revolution. In our opinion it is a letter that meets unjustly the revolution, to the Mexican Liberal Party and to "Regeneration," of which we are editors. We enter, therefore, public protest, and shall take special pains to bring that protest before the world's revolutionary press. In this we consider ourselves justified, both because the revolutionary movement cannot afford to be misled on a subject of such enormous importance as is the Mexican Revolution, and because the letter in question is the latest star in an attack that has been carried on for months by the underground methods of innuendo, depreciation, hints, suggested suspicions as to the good faith of an immense upheaval which, so far as shown by your pages, "Les Temps Nouveaux" has not troubled to investigate.

Making much pretense of fairness by declaring that "it is our role to leave our readers to be sole judges of the facts," the letter in question proceeds to set out—what? Certainly not the great central facts on which alone adequate judgment can be formed, but one or two insignificant episodes in that long and most honorable struggle. Even those it distorts, presenting them in that half-light which always misleads.

Fully one-third of the communication consists of quotations from a private letter by some unnamed author in which is reiterated the charge made by "Cronaca Sovversiva," to the effect that R. F. Magon had circulated a reactionary prospectus, as to which it remarks: "I send you one that you may see how the so-called libertarians of the Mexican Liberal Party are deceiving those who are so stupid as to believe them sincere revolutionists." It then comments in the most hostile manner on the alleged fact that Magon has written of Zapata as "comrade."

Having reproduced this nameless letter and thus—with your kindly assistance—prejudiced all readers against our cause, M. Froment devotes himself to reflections on the obvious, explaining that if the Mexicans get the land they need not worry about wages or hours of labor. The writer is evidently not sufficiently acquainted with our movement to know that such is our perpetual teaching, and we think it would be hard to find a copy of "Regeneration" in which, for the benefit of the strikers, who have been until recently so numerous in Mexico, that lesson is not driven home.

On the other criticisms of the letter we have this to say:

(1) We have explained, long ago and "ad nauseam," that the Mexican Liberal Party has evolved, and that the manifesto in question was old and long since abrogated. Furthermore we have explained that copies found their way into circulation solely because at that particular moment we were out of funds and had no other propaganda matter.

(2) We cannot remember that any of us has ever written of Zapata as "comrade," but if we have, we are not ashamed. When Zapata bids the peasant dispossess the land monopolist, and actually helps him to do so, we feel toward him a closer comradeship than we do toward the talking revolutionists of the parlor. On the other hand, the files of "Regeneration" bear ample witness to the frequency with which we have declared that if Zapata's "Iron Man" should lead an ambitious for office, he should be opposed as stupidly as we always have opposed the personal ambitions this struggle necessarily has developed.

(3) If you wish to clear yourself from the charge of being monstrous, unjust and ourselves not by some special passage in a large literature, but by the movement's general conduct and by our writings, taken as a whole. We do not hesitate to say that both the movement and our own writings go straight to the goal—the recovery of their inheritance to the disinherited. For all we know our writing may not be as polished as that of some of the "intellectuals," but no one dare question its straightness and honesty.

We have to suggest to you also that it is not your business, or that of "Les Temps Nouveaux," to pass judgment and decide whether the editors of "Regeneration" are, or are not, good Anarchists, as measured by your yardstick. Your business is something quite different, for it is your paramount duty to put yourself to the trouble of ascertaining whether there is, or is not, in Mexico an economic revolution, the people having risen against and being engaged in overthrowing privilege and power. That is what you teach, theoretically. It is by teaching that you earn your salary, and on the strength of teaching that your paper applies to revolutionaryists for support and receives it. When the thing itself comes along, you, at least, cannot afford to ignore it. Still less can you afford to depreciate it, because you have not taken the pains to investigate.

Monroe Doctrine

What is this Monroe Doctrine, invoked so feverishly by the "interests" now clamoring for intervention in Mexico? It rests on President Monroe's message to Congress in 1823, nearly a century ago, at a time when it was believed the European powers would try to establish monarchy in the western hemisphere and thereby imperil the republicanism of the United States. The passage on which the doctrine is founded runs as follows: "We could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

The doctrine rests, therefore, on a mere presidential message.

That message was delivered nearly a century ago, when the United States were really republican, there being great economic liberty, substantial economic equality and no class war between the rich and poor.

It was intended obviously to prevent intervention, for it was a declaration that the powers of Europe had no right to interfere with weaker nationalities, "for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny."

Yet on the strength of that mere message, intended so obviously to check authority, plutocracy now claims that the United States has a right to assume the role of Authority, to play the policeman; to step in and see that a nation struggling for economic freedom shall pay its tribute regularly to absentee landlords and money loans.

What is much, more to the point, the United States is actually on the beat; is patrolling the border with thousands of soldiers, although no Mexican has ever dreamed of invading her; is policing the distribution of arms and seeing that Madero, who stands for property interests, gets them, and that the rebels, who are expropriating property interests, do not get them. It runs into jail an armed Mexican who tries to cross the border that he may help his country in her struggle toward liberty. It becomes sickening kowtow to Terrazas, who has got the entire State of Chihuahua into his talons and is reputed the greatest of all land monopolists.

How faithfully the Mexican Revolution mirrors the struggle that is rending every nation! Yet there are thousands of radicals, and even revolutionists, who cannot see that there is anything in it.

Municipalization

In the "California Social Democrat" of March 30, W. Scott Lewis writes on the above question, in answer to requests received from Socialists in towns where municipal elections are about to be held. He cites Pasadena, Columbus, O., and many other cities to prove that electric light and power have been cheapened greatly by municipalization, but says nothing of the fact that rents have been promptly raised, thus leaving the worker not one penny better off. He is aware, however, of this rotten link that makes the entire chain of Municipal Socialism's argument worse than worthless, for he closes his letter thus: "Boost for your municipal ownership planks, but be sure to emphasize the necessity of electing Socialists, so that they are operated for the benefit of all the people and not merely to reduce the taxes of a few large landholders."

That makes the matter worse, for it adds untruth to bolster up a previous lie. Mr. Lewis knows, in the first place, that the objection is not that landlords are enabled to reduce their taxes but that they are able to increase their rents, and do so, when ever by municipalization of industries or other methods a neighborhood becomes more desirable. The point is of first-class importance because here, in Los Angeles, some of the most scoundrelly hypocrites unhung are raising heaven and earth to have the community taxed for improvements that will double, treble and quadruple the value of their real estate. Did space permit, and were I running a local paper, I would gladly give details and names as they have come, and come daily, within my personal experience.

In the second place, Mr. Lewis is most uncandid in suggesting that the landlords would not reap the harvest if Socialists were in office. That would not be true, and that could not be true, until Socialists had abolished the land monopoly which enables and always will enable the monopolist to charge all the traffic will bear. That is the first thing Socialists should do. After that municipal ownership may come safely, with vast advantage to the public.

It is because Socialists deal in half-truths that their propaganda is so unsatisfactory, and it is because the Mexican Revolution accepts the whole truth and goes for free access to the land that its propaganda is so satisfactory. One is dealing with people who face instead of dodging the issue.

More and more this section deals with the land issue in the United States, that it may make clear the solidarity which should exist between the disinherited of this country and those of Mexico. In this particular matter of municipal ownership we have to do over again the work done so splendidly nearly thirty years ago by Henry George in "Social Problems." It is the work the Single Taxers ought to do, but they turned their backs on it long ago.

"We will speak out, we will be heard,

Though all earth's systems crack;
We will not bate a single word,
Nor take a letter back

"We speak the truth, and what care we
For hissing and for scorn,
While some faint gleamings we can see
Of Freedom's coming morn.

—James Russell Lowell.