Regeneracion.

Published every Saturday at 914 Boston St., Los Angeles, Cal.
Telephone: Home A 1360.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
3 months, 50c; 6 months, $1.10; 1 year, $2.00; single copy, 5c;
in bundles, 3c per copy.

No. 86.
Saturday, April 20, 1912.

Yes: Actions Speak Louder Than Words

In "The New Times" of April 6 Robert Hunter discusses "The Milwaukee Plan," and calls attention to the fact that the Socialists of that city translated and published August Bebel's speech on "Labor Unions and Political Parties." He writes: "Bebel's position is briefly this: The *Trade Unions* should keep *politics out* of the Unions. They should unite the workers without regard to religious, political, racial or national differences. They must flee from everything *which tends to divide or disrupt them.* For them unity and solidarity are fundamental, and nothing should be allowed to interfere." Following which he emphasizes the ancient truism that "actions speak louder than words." Indeed they do.

What have been the Socialists' words? They preache—it sounds grandly generous—the uniting of the workers "without regard to racial or national differences."

What have been the Socialists' actions? The advocacy of laws excluding such races as they please to deem inferior. As Voltairine de Cleyre wrote recently, in "The Mexican Revolt," Berger himself "makes anti-immigration speeches against Chinese and Italians, in the name of protection to American labor!"

Along comes the Mexican Revolution, and once more Berger is on the aristocratic side, denouncing as "bandits" the revolutionists of what he *considers* another inferior nationality. His side-partner, Debs, falls into line and pronounces solemnly that the Mexican workingmen are unfit to control their own industries.

"Actions speak louder than words." Everybody knows that under government ownership under the worker becomes a military slave, guilty of treason if he disobeys official authority. Accordingly Berger is to the front with a bill for the purchase by government of telegraphs and railroads; as to which even an "International Socialist Review" writer says, "he is guilty of having (unintentionally) aided the capitalists in *their schemes.*" He *drags* red herrings of old-age pension bills across the trail, switching off the pack whenever the capitalist fox finds himself hard pressed. That is going to help plutocracy, invaluable time; just as Debs proposed to give Madero a breathing-spell of a generation or two while the Mexican proletariat was being educated.

Sworn to Keep Order.

Berger is a Congressman and as such is sworn to uphold the club of Government, and to be on the side of the bayonets that "keep order" in Lawrence. But this ugly fact he must conceal, *for only by posing as the* poor man's friend can the politician exist. Hence his activity at Washington in connection with the Lawrence strike, and sensible persons will *appraise at its true value the* "International Socialist Review's" boast that "Congressman Berger worked hand in hand with Haywood and rendered valuable assistance." He had to, but all the papers he influences did their best to keep Haywood off the National Executive Committee, and Berger even clamored for his expulsion from the party. Berger is no friend of Haywood; what Haywood stands for is worse to Berger than the banditry of Mexico. Berger is a man who wants to govern from the top, and all his actions prove it. Haywood is a man who wants to revolutionize *from the bottom, and all his actions* prove it. "Actions speak louder than words."

Kautsky, who is a typical Bergerite, wrote recently a ponderous article *in which he warned the workers* to have nothing to do with what he styles the "slum proletariat." Every Berger paper has been playing up that article, hoping to withdraw sympathy from the element represented by the I. W. W., just as they try to withdraw it from the Mexican Revolutionists. It is part of the carefully-studied policy that would exclude the Orient, that would exclude from Labor and the Shop that sought to boycott the Mexican. It crawls to that self-satisfied aristocracy of labor which is a deplorable and ridiculous element in the American proletariat, and it crawls because it wants to catch its vote and elevate other Bergers to office.

The Grand Sophistry.

Hunter makes much of the famous "two-armed movement" argument, but it is notoriously a sophistry of the most shallow type. Note how carefully he abstains from saying, flatly, why, which is that a rotten arm may cost you your life. A far greater revolutionary genius than is Robert Hunter said, nearly two thousand years ago, "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off." He was an intensely practical man; he proved it by *launching successfully* what was, in its day, the greatest proletarian movement on record; he understood human nature and knew well how small an amount of the venom of personal *office-seeking is needed to poison the* whole loaf. Popes, official popes, took all the proletarianism out of his movement, just as popes, official popes, have taken all the revolution out of the movement in which Berger is a cardinal. "Actions speak louder than words" and the race's experience is ten thousand times more reliable than the abstract reasonings of those whose profession it is to beguile with talk.

Today fear gnaws at the politician's heart, for he knows that the people have begun to DOUBT. The proletarian cannot get at the books and trace the individual leaks, but he can judge the situation as a whole and he does so judge it—cynically, remorselessly. He knows that he rides the brakebeam while the politician travels, whither he will, by Pullman; that he, as a homeless "vag," is run into jail while his alleged representative stops at luxurious hotels; that the tramps penniless while the other is always in funds. That is to him a summarized condition; the concrete outcome of a series of actions that speak *much louder than any words.* Today, therefore, the proletarian, on whom hitherto the politician has lived so comfortably—DOUBTS.

I should be justified in writing bitterly, *since* American politicians turned their backs on the solid reality of the Mexican Revolution that they might chase the bubble of popularity and catch the sacred vote. In reality I write rejoicingly, for I know that above everything else committed by Bergerism, that betrayal has shaken confidence, and that when confidence is shaken the idol totters to its fall. Idols have to have the prestige that must get up from its knees and trust not Bergers but itself.

As we go to press, the Magons and other members of the Mexican Liberal Party are in jail awaiting the dock and facing *the possibilities of* another long term in prison. They stand there penniless, but they stand there enjoying the absolute confidence of those who know them and *their work. In those minds* there is not a shadow of a doubt as to the honesty of the Mexican Revolutionists, however much opinions on other matters may differ. That is their only asset; but, for the stern work in hand, it is worth all the offices into which ambition ever clambered and all the fleeting popularity ever won by catering to prejudice and throwing dust.

WM. C. OWEN.

Be Patient! Wait!

In "The Mirror" of April 4 appeared an article entitled "Ownership of Land," by William F. Woerner, a Single Taxer. I call attention to it because it seems to put in a nutshell just exactly what is the matter with the Single Tax movement.

Mr. Woerner is fully convinced that the land question is the thing; but, having explained that at great length, he turns to the question of how we are to recover our lost heritage and expresses himself as follows: "*Solution, and we congratulate the Ad*-Any solution proposed by the present *ministration* on its candor in stating problem will give relief in a measure. Free trade will give still greater relief. But perhaps we will have to look to the single tax for real emancipation. The ultimate conflict to be waged some day against land privilege will make all others pall into insignificance, for it will be to grapple with the owners of the earth. However, it is probable it will not come tomorrow. We cannot yet hear its rumblings. Nobody will ever advocate confiscation of titles to real estate, at least not in our day. Even the zealous abolitionists in ante-bellum days never soberly contemplated confiscation of *slave property* or emancipation without due compensation."

The conclusion, therefore, is that we must proceed gradually, first tackling *the trusts, then abolishing our pro*tective tariff and finally raising public revenue from the land values by a tax on land values. "Possibly in the end," Mr. Woerner writes, "the State may force all the landowners to accept a fair valuation, and transfer all title to the State, which will not some all the people; and that would mean the abolition of poverty."

I had even more complacently conservative opinions conveyed to me about a year ago by a Single Tax travelling agent, who sat in my room and demonstrated how the modern workingman could save money, purchase a lot, build a home and make comfortable provision for old age. I listened with astonishment to this amazing exposition of Georgism brought up to date; for I knew George taught that *there could be no such thing as valid* title to real estate, and that all land values should be confiscated without the payment of one cent of compensation. I saw a light, however, when my visitor revealed himself, and, of course, he earned more than could the workingman.

Blinded by Prosperity.

Mr. Woerner, I imagine, is in the same boat. Having situated himself comfortably to understand that a volcano is seething at our feet and is not likely to wait several centuries while we are making arrangements that shall avoid all friction. He is doubtless that even *the zealous Abolitionist* never thought seriously of confiscating slave property shows that he has never been interested enough to study the life of Garrison and writings of Garrison, *Wendell Phillips, Gerrit Smith* and other Abolitionist leaders, every one *of whom insisted* vehemently that the enslavement of human by man is a crime, to be swept out of existence at the earliest moment. Beyond all doubt Henry George was saturated with their feeling when writing "Progress and Poverty," and applied to the far more extensive slavery of land monopoly what they had taught respecting the relations of Southern planters to their serfs.

When Mr. Woerner writes that we can hear no rumblings of protest against land monopoly he is evidently *unconscious of what* has been, and is, going on in Mexico.

The whole article is unfortunately typical of modern Single Taxism, which occupies about the same position as that of the *well-to-do Peace* advocates, who go into conniptions over war while upholding injustices that make war inevitable. Both are so conservative, whether by virtue of their own personal prosperity or character, that they believe this question will settle itself by easy stages, after several generations of debate.

Warn Mexico that Property Needs Protection

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.

Owing to enforced absence from the city these notes are written two days ahead of regular time, but already the situation has revealed itself as it actually has been for a long time past, and the American public is now aware that intervention is, to say the least, extremely probable. The trap was sprung in the instructions sent from Washington to Ambassador Wilson under date of April 14. The public by this time has read and reread them, and we think it necessary to reproduce the second paragraph only, that telling the story. It runs: "The enormous *destruction*, constantly increasing, of valuable American properties in the course of the present unfortunate disturbances; the taking of American life, contrary to the *principles governing such matters* among all civilized nations; the increasing dangers to which all American citizens in Mexico are subjected, and the seemingly possible indefinite continuance of this unfortunate situation, compel the government of the United States to give notice that it expects and must demand that American life and property within the republic of Mexico be justly and adequately protected, and that this government must hold Mexico and the Mexican people responsible for all wanton or illegal acts sacrificing or endangering American life or damaging American property or interests there."

Readers will not fail to note that the first place is given to the loss of American property caused by the *revolution*, and we *congratulate the Ad*-*ministration* on its candor in stating without circumlocution the real cause for intervention. The enormous interests acquired by absentee speculators must be protected at all and every cost, however true it may be that the titles were obtained by what is now universally known to have been the connivance of a most corrupt official-dom, and however true it may be that the Mexican people has been given the choice of either remaining in perpetual economic enslavement or taking back its stolen heritage.

An Irrepressible Conflict.

The conflict has been from the first as irrepressible as was that for the overthrow of chattel slavery, and as is that for the overthrow of wage slavery which already rocks the world. It needed no special astuteness on our part to foretell it, as we have foretold it for years, and that all was only necessary to note the fact that there were so many hundreds of millions to which monopolists laid claim and that the people disputed the claim, not argumentatively but with weapons in their hands. As society is constituted today the rest seemed inevitable.

Concealed behind a rampart of smooth diplomatic talk preparations for intervention have been going on for months. Charles Edward Russell wrote on the subject several weeks ago, in "The Coming Nation," and his remarks seem so appropriate at this special moment that we reproduce them at some length. They may open eyes that until recently were closed. He said:

"A very fair example of the kind of legislation that may be called Duplex is afforded by the joint resolution that conferred upon the President, the extraordinary and unwarranted power to forbid the exportation of arms to any 'American country' in which he may think a state of insurrection to exist.

"On the face of it, this is designed to strengthen the enforcement of the neutrality laws. What it really means is that more troops are to be sent to the Mexican border.

"The experience of a year ago showed that ordinarily this cannot be done without arousing the determined opposition of the people, suspicious of the fact that Charles F. Taft, and other American capitalists, *exercising an enormous influence in this* administration, have very great investments in Mexico. But under this joint resolution troops will be required to carry it out; about 25,000 of additional troops, in fact.

"If the Interests cannot get what they want in one way they get it in another.

"By a curious coincidence, on the very day that this resolution was passed by an obedient Congress Mexico made public the fact that its government is being financed by Mr. Thomas F. Ryan. The man that put the joint resolution through was Elihu Root.

"Mr. Root is of old-time Mr. Ryan's personal attorney. Some of these schemes are so thin that you would expect even the American public to *see through them.* But it never does.

"Meantime, it is understood on the quiet that American intervention in Mexico is only a matter of time, and these additional troops on the border, secured by this joint resolution, will be in just the right position to make the intervention easy and quick."

The Final Spark.

In such cases the final explosion always comes from an apparently trifling spark. The execution of Thomas Fountain, an American fighting as a Mexican federal gunner, has been apparently in this instance the spark. Orozco telegraphed the President, April 15, that "Fountain's execution was made because he was fighting as with a rapid-fire gun in Villa's forces, and without regard to his nationality." We don't like executions, but war is war and we remind readers that Fountain had given his services to a government that, as we have shown *in this issue, deliberately slaughtered*, in cold blood, a thousand noncombatants within a single week. That was in the effort to put down the revolution in one State only, the State of Morelos, to which we call the atrocity in No. 77 of this paper. It seems to us that those who volunteer for service in such a government as Madero's has proved to be must expect retaliation of this kind, for governmental violence is always, sooner or later, repaid in kind. Of course the probable truth is that Fountain volunteered because he had to live, and that is not a crime in any country or Mexico. It is needless for us to say again that, in our opinion, money advantages are the great spur to foreign country hunting corrupt bargains, should bear any losses that may come, just as they reap all the benefits when their ventures turn out successfully. That is one of the *fundamental principles of commercial law*, but where a ruling plutocracy is interested principles do not count.

Similarly, much is made of Orozco's refusal to recognize a consular representative of the United States because the United States refused to recognize him. We have heard this phase of the question discussed informally in a mixed company, and the opinion expressed by more than one was that Orozco followed a good general rule. Those who so expressed themselves were apparently not sufficiently acquainted with the Mexican question to understand and appreciate the great provocation under which Orozco has labored, since the United States government has permitted his adversary to import all the arms and ammunition needed while denying him and his *followers* that *privilege*. There has been much talk lately to the effect that the tide is turning in favor of Madero, but he is now being supplied with artillery and other war mu*nitions, of which there is thought to* be a shortage in the rebel camps. That has not tended toward making Orozco or any other rebel amiable. On the contrary, they have regarded it *as in itself a most deadly form of* intervention and infringement of the strict impartiality which the United States has proclaimed so loudly.

Plutocracy's Real Enemy.

It is unnecessary to say that Orozco does not share our economic views, being himself anxious to install a government which, like that of his enemy Madero has to fear, nor is he the real incitive to formal intervention. What Madero fears, and what American plutocracy fears, is the rebellion of the masses, sick long ago of fine words and promises, convinced that they have been robbed remorselessly, recognizing that this is their opportunity and willing it by themselves taking back their stolen heritage. They have formed themselves for that purpose *into guerrillas that are operating at a* hundred different points, and the armed force those guerrillas represent far outnumbers any that Madero or Orozco can muster. These are the forces against whom American troops will be sent, if intervention comes, and they are the formidable enemy with which a fight that may prove interminable must be waged.

San Diego Calls

The United States is the country where monopoly has reached its highest development. The United States is, therefore, the country that actually needs most an economic revolution. That economic revolution must come from below; as it has come in Mexico, as it has come always and everywhere. Until the greatest sufferers, the unemployed, are roused to action the system that produces millionaires and paupers is not really attacked.

Explaining that it is proposed to make San Diego the place of mobilization for the "vast army of unemployed, *unorganized, disinherited and* homeless workers," the California Free Speech League has sent us the following advertisement.

UNEMPLOYED OF AMERICA—March on to San Diego. Join the army of ten thousand marching from San Francisco; join the March of the Hungry. Go to San Diego. Demand your right of Free Speech; demand bread. Demand increased wages. Do not wanted where you are and San Diego needs you. Fall in line. BE MEN. (Signed)

California Free Speech League.

TRIAL POSTPONED.

On the appearing for trial, April 18, of the members of the Junta of *the Mexican Liberal Party*, accused of violating the neutrality laws, hearing was postponed to April 25.

Will the United States Intervene in Mexico?

Send for copies of

"Regeneracion's" Special Pamphlet

on the

Mexican Revolution

Its Progress, Causes, Purpose and Probable Results

Sixteen Pages. Price 5 cents

A FINE VICTORY!

In the "California Social-Democrat" the editor, Mr. John Murray, tells his readers that "this year's anti-trust papers play up" the attacks of the Mexican peons upon the land-holders, the great organizations of labor in the cities of Mexico know full well that free land was not the spur to liberty for *the city worker.*" Ignoring, for the moment, the fact that the Mexican has been robbed of the independence he formerly enjoyed as possessor of his communal land and driven into the *helplessness of hunting a city job*, we should like Mr. Murray to give his readers particulars of these "great organizations of labor in the cities." The fact is that such labor organization as exists *today to any extent dates only* from the present troubles, city workers having caught the fever of revolt from the land revolutionists and done their utmost to co-operate loyally with them, recognizing the cause of all labor as one. In this they have set a fine example to American Labor, and particularly to such labor editors as Mr. Murray, who has devoted much of his editorial notes to advocating the boycotting and exclusion of what he considers inferior nationalities.

The position the party represented by Mr. Murray has taken throughout the Mexican Revolution is well illustrated by "El Socialista," of Madrid, Spain, whose issue of March 15 has just reached us. It heads its editorial notes *with the item*, "A strike in Mexico," which begins as follows: "Thanks to the intervention of the government of this country there has been solved in favor of the working class the GREAT MOVEMENT OF TRUE IMPORTANCE that has manifested itself in this Republic." The capitals are ours.

"Would you like to know what this FIRST organ, lucidly and clearly by what calls itself the "Central Organ of the Workingman's Party" in Spain, amounts to? Simply this. Following a spinners' strike the government called a meeting of the workers and their employers, as a result of which is was agreed to reduce the hours of work to ten a day and to increase the number of working days. The government then appointed a commission to enquire; a proceeding that seems to have a familiar ring.

In the last few months large strikes have been fought and won in Mexico. They have not been led by politicians but by country workers, such as *rail-road men and miners. They have been* won not by the government-invoking tactics of Socialism but by determined revolt, with arms in hand. They have spring from and have been inspired by the *great* rebellion against the invasion of Mexico by the money power; a rebellion which the Anarchist press properly chronicles as a labor and revolutionary event of the first importance. The Socialist Party, on the other hand, for long months ignored the Mexican Social Revolution of the Murray type, finding that course no longer possible, now seek to belittle it.

WHEN PUT TO THE TEST.

"Il Contro-Pelo," of Barre, Vt., criticises caustically the attitude toward the Mexican Revolution assumed by *Galleani in his "Cronaca Sovversiva,"* and reproduces the letter written by Kropotkine to that paper in November, 1909, relative to the revolutionary movement in Spain. Kropotkine urged all revolutionists to help, explaining and illustrating by historical examples, that "all revolutions begin timidly with some fact of minor importance, but their aims rise in proportion as they are prolonged. If this revolution lasts two, three or four years, and if the revolutionists have sufficient intelligence to prevent the formation of a strong government, it will reach a climax of communism." Citing Russia he added that there "the Social Democrats had put sticks in the wheels of all the radical elements, instead of aiding them to overthrow the autocracy."

*It is significant that Galleani in pub*lishing that letter indorsed it most cordially, saying that the revolution would succeed and acquire character in proportion to the boldness, the tenacity and the conscientious vigor with which the Anarchists took part in it."

We do not like dragging into print the Murrays, Galleanis, Jean Graves, etc., for in so large a matter as the social revolution personalities should cut no figure. But it is necessary to take up the cudgel in defense of what have obtained a following on the supposition that they are revolutionary, and ask how it is that when put to the test, as in the case of Mexico, they have fallen down.

When any considerable section of our fellow-workers anywhere strikes *for economic freedom all revolution*ists, whether they call themselves Socialists, Anarchists or Single Taxers, are bound to applaud the stroke, and, if possible, assist it. For, all the three schools named have this in common—they believe that the root of slavery is economic. The Single Taxers and the Anarchists attach more importance than do the Socialists to the overthrow of land monopoly, but the last named do not venture to deny that land monopoly is an enormous factor in the enslavement of mankind.

That an immense effort is being made in Mexico for the overthrow of *land monopoly* now *beyond dis*pute, and the failure to support that effort is as astounding to us as indifference by Wendell Phillips to an attack on chattel slavery would have been to Garrison.

Apparently the United States is now about to intervene, and on the righteousness or iniquity of that intervention it will be impossible to be non-committal.

NOW IN PAMPHLET FORM.

Mr. Geo. B. Wheeler, of Chicago, has paid this section the compliment *of reproducing* in pamphlet form and at his own expense, the editorial of Jan. 12, entitled "McNamara Case and Socialism." Ten thousand copies have been printed and they can be obtained at this office or from Mrs. Dora Crouter, 4259 State St., Chicago, the price being twenty-five cents for a hundred copies. The pamphlet raises a question of great importance

Lest We Forget--Lest We Forget

While these lines are being printed our Mexican comrades will be standing in the prisoner's dock, accused of having violated the neutrality laws in their eagerness to secure "Land and Liberty" for the despoiled people of Mexico. As is known to all the world, the politicians of the Socialist Party have seen fit to display the bitterest hostility toward them. Accordingly Mr. John Murray, editor of the "California Social-Democrat," to which every member of the party in this State is forced to subscribe—Oh, Liberty! What crimes are committed in thy name!—has picked this particular moment to attack them in a signed editorial which begins: "Those that cry 'back to the land' are one and all city dwellers whom dynamite could not dislodge from their accustomed urban life." The animus of the article is seen in the following sentence: "Today anarchists from all over the world are seeking to influence the Mexican Revolution, and have succeeded *in* lettering the banner of the Mexican Liberal Party with the words 'Tierra y Libertad,' meaning Land and Liberty."

Straws show most accurately the direction of the wind, and one notes, as *illustrative of the writer's caliber and bias, that he is careful to capitalize* "Socialists" and "Populists," while treating "Anarchists" and "Single Taxers" to the discourtesy of small letters. But I let that pass, the one important thing being that Mr. Murray has been himself to the task of proving, in its *hour of need, that the propaganda of the Mexican Liberal Party is a delusion.* For this he employs what are, to me at least, the following discreditable methods.

He pretends that the Populist Party failed because it was a land party. That grotesque falsehood is advanced that he may drag in this sentence: "The theories of anarchists and single-taxers are born of the same ill-conception and are doomed to the same grave." Mr. Murray knows well that the Populists did not venture to tackle the land question, and he and his party associates have been never weary of repeating that Populism failed because it was only half-hearted Socialism. He knows, moreover, that our city proletariat suffers far more acutely than does any other class as the result of land monopoly, and that Populism, paying no attention to the tribute collected by city landlords, made no appeal to the city proletariat.

Mr. Murray pretends to believe that the emancipation of the Mexican workers must be accomplished by the city element. He was at one time connected most closely with the Mexican revolutionary element and knows that, in Mexico, the city workers are even now almost a negligible quantity, although they have increased much of late under the influence of land monopoly.

He pretends to believe that the country worker cannot co-operate either on the field of politics or on the battlefield. That is to falsify all history, to falsify especially all revolutionary history, and to falsify in particular the history of Mexico since the revolt against Diaz began. To suggest that city organized labor overthrew Diaz is to make oneself ridiculous.

Above all, it is a preposterous falsehood to pretend that the land question, paramount with the Mexican revolutionists, is anywhere a minor question; and, if Mr. Murray actually believes that, any Mexican whom you may meet on the streets is infinitely wiser than is Mr. Murray. Everyone who has his senses knows that the land is the source of ALL wealth; that from no other *warehouse can humanity get supplies. If we choose to do so we can abolish* metal currency, wipe out the tariff, erase the patent laws, do away with government, adopt communism or any other form of organization that may seem to us desirable. These are things man can decide for himself, but that he must live on and from the land has been *decided for him by nature.* That we cannot increase the earth's area or get sustenance from the moon is self-evident to the most rudimentary brain.

Mr. Murray has lived a long time in and near Los Angeles, and he has had every opportunity of learning how land monopoly works. He must know many men who have become millionaires, not by performing any useful social work, but by sticking to a piece of land which finally we land-livers have been compelled to buy at any price. On the other hand, as the price of land has soared he has seen all other prices, except that paid to labor, rise; he has seen work more poorly remunerated and harder to obtain, and he has seen, right under his nose here in Los Angeles, a penniless and homeless proletariat multiplying on every side. If all his years of residence here have not shown him that, he has been far more stupid than many others with whom he has been associated in the Socialist movement, for they have learned it so well that they passed long ago into the plutocratic class. Such men will not go to the bottom of the social question, and they will not let their party do so. Wayland and the "Appeal to Reason" are excellent examples, but I could give names of millionaires.

Recently I alluded to the Land Fair which all the real estate interests here boosted so vigorously, and I quoted the semi-Socialist "Record" as admitting, at last, that the real "big interests" which rule Los Angeles are the land *monopolists. Since then every paper in the city has been drilling into its* readers the truth that the land is the foundation of all wealth; although, with a commercial unscrupulousness worthy of Satan himself, they do so to secure the advertising of the real estate interests and help along the gamble. Apart *from that, however, they speak the truth and prove it to be the truth.* They interview the richest Jew on this coast, I. W. Hellman, and he tells them that as soon as he came here he began to pick up land. It is his constant boast that he is the heaviest real estate taxpayer in this city. They show how our transportation companies corner land prior to developing a new section, that they may reap a harvest from the rise in prices which follows such development. They give detailed proof that Standard Oil, the railway companies, the lumber and mineral trusts, all the vast financial system we sum up as "Wall Street," are based on control of natural supplies.

The truths, the indisputable truths, I am trying to express are those for championing which our comrades have suffered already long terms of imprisonment. They have recognized that the first step toward the abolition of poverty and slavery in Mexico is the restoration to the people of those natural resources of which plutocracy, conniving with corrupt officialdom, robbed them on a scale and with a rapidity probably unequalled in history. As the result of the straight, intelligent and uncompromising stand taken by the Junta of the Mexican Liberal Party there has been in Mexico during the last twelve months one of the greatest and most general acts of *confiscation*—of recovery by the people—on record. The proof, as Mr. Murray well knows, is the fact that Los Angeles has become the Mecca of expatriated land monopolists; men of the Terrazas stamp, who hitherto have called entire States *"theirs," being now in exile here. Does any one in his senses suppose that* these exiled millionaires, and all the Wall Street and European Bourse interests now exercising pressure on their respective governments for protection in Mexico, do not HATE the Junta of the Mexican Liberal party, whose prop*aganda has slaughtered* and is slaughtering their bank accounts? Is there a person of the slightest intelligence who cannot see that the attack launched by Mr. Murray at this particular moment plays directly into their hands?

Fortunately the land movement in Mexico is now so general, so earnest and so strong that the imprisonment of a thousand leaders could not stop it. To that movement, therefore, the article I criticize can do no harm; but it will do harm to that section of the labor movement in America which follows leaders, accepts as gospel what it reads in "official" papers, and lacks the courage and common sense to do its own thinking.

Whatever may befall the Mexicans themselves their work will last, for it has been clean, and brave and straight; thorough, with the thoroughness of intelligent conviction; evading nothing, compromising nothing; the work of free men. On the other hand, the work of official placeholders, pledged to the advocacy, right or wrong, of such programs as their *short-sighted* political employers deem temporarily politic, is a rope of sand that crumbles to pieces at the touch of criticism.

There is a deep reason for the appearance of such articles as that of which *the editor of California's official Socialist* organ *has been guilty. The polit*ical wing of his party dreads the contrast between the substantial benefits secured by Direct Action and the oratorical sterilities with which its own followers must be content. When its own high-priced advocates produce *only soap bubbles, while the poor and despised members of the I. W. W. and* Mexican Liberal Party achieve actual results, there is drawn a parallel that is absolutely fatal. It rips the gas out of the balloon, and leaves only the stench of unsavory alliances, dishonest money deals, a thousand humiliations submitted to for nothing. That is the fate which must befall the politicians as soon as a true revolutionary movement commands the stage, and to postpone as long as possible that inevitable tragedy no measures are too desperate and no weapons too foul.

WM. C. OWEN.