

Prices Soar That These May Profit

The world is interested in the Mexican Revolution because it is a fight for the possession of the land by those who cultivate it, and the world begins to understand how closely that question touches it. In these columns, therefore, I harp perpetually on the Land Question, attack the Socialists for side-stepping it, and express my scorn for those who, knowing the true nature of the social struggle, shrink when the hurricane starts blowing, at last, in Mexico.

In "Collier's", of April 5, there is an exhaustive and admirably illustrated article by Carl Snyder, entitled "The Shrinking Dollar and the Swelling Cost of Living." That problem interests us all, for it is no laughing matter that "it cost just three quarters more to live last year than it did sixteen years ago." Consider also the further statement that "if prices go on rising as they have in the last sixteen years, by about 1950 you will be paying four times for everything that you pay now." The outlook is unpleasant, and Mr. Snyder concludes his article thus: "It is a very important matter of vital interest to all wage workers and men on a salary. It is of profound importance to a still larger question. Twenty-five years more of rising prices, as in the last fifteen, will mean in the United States a landed aristocracy. Do you want that?"

For my part, I consider that we have it now; but, for the moment, we will let that pass. My immediate concern is with the fact that prices have increased enormously, that this has worked incalculable hardship on wage earners, and that the land monopolists have prospered correspondingly. I desire to emphasize the stern fact that all our labor organization and Socialist political wriggles have had no more effect on that swelling tide of prices—the profit to the land monopolist than would the casting of a pebble into the sea. Against monopoly's inevitable results they orate and organize in vain, and for all the benefits their followers reap they might as well be living in the moon. Causes take no account of eloquence, and in the actual struggle only those who tackle causes accomplish anything.

The Mexican people are not saints or heroes; and, for my part, the one thing I dislike about them is their unwillingness to fight. I am prejudiced against a people which has been so careless in the past; which has allowed tyranny to get so strong a foothold; which did not go on the martyr long ago and head off the misery which, at last has driven it to revolt. I have no information to pose the Mexicans as warriors; on the contrary, I agree with John Kenneth Turner when he writes that "more nearly than a madness for war the Mexican people are affected with a madness for peace." To me the indolent good nature with which they submit to imposition constitutes their greatest crime. With that I find it hard to sympathize, for it is the father of all tyranny, the cause of all injustice, the direct author of the unbearable conditions in which we find ourselves.

Nevertheless, whatever may have been their past, the Mexicans today are fighting the good fight. Alone of all the nations they are digging down to bedrock and grappling with bottom causes. Not from any partisan or racial standpoint, but as wanting to see monopoly overthrown and Man in possession of the economic liberty indispensable for health and progress, I judge Zapata as being, at this moment, far more valuable than any orator or writer. I consider the illiterate Mexican peon, at this particular moment, a most powerful factor in the world struggle; just as, more than a century ago, when feudalism had to be overthrown in France, the fighting peasant was worth a ton of spouters. At particular epochs particular work has to be done. At this particular epoch feudalism which is only another name for land monopoly and monopoly has to be swept away, and the men who are using brooms of steel are doing the needed work. They are, if only for the time being, the valuable men. Therefore they are our men, and, therefore, we should stand by them at every cost.

Turner has contributed a most valuable article to the same number of "Collier's", in which he victoriously defends the so-called "bandits" from the charges hurled against them so recklessly by plutocracy and politicians of the reactionary Berger type. He shows how desperate has been their struggle; he shows how tolerant, in the matter of plunder, they actually have been; he absolves them, as a class, from the oft-repeated accusation of rape by showing that "the peaceful inhabitants of the bandit districts are overwhelmingly sympathetic to the bandits," and that, therefore, they "can get all the women they want without kidnapping them." And he continues:

"Individuals are uncertain. But I am sure as to the mass. The mass is fighting for liberty. To each of these rural Mexicans liberty, before every thing else, means a small piece of land upon which he may deposit himself, his family, and his household effects; a bit of soil which he may scratch to produce some corn and beans; a piece of land from which he cannot be dragged by force to serve another man; in thousands of cases a certain piece of land, a certain piece of land once owned and recently taken away by force or fraud to be incorporated with one of those gigantic haciendas that are typical of agricultural Mexico.

"The Mexican people are fighting their way through seas of blood back to the land. Feudalism is the issue. Feudalism has lived a century over time in Mexico. It is dying hard, but it must die. The fight is a necessary one. Success is inevitable. Whoever raises a hand against it but causes a greater waste of human blood. The so-called bandits of Mexico are not bandits, but patriots. The real bandits of Mexico are the ones whom our Ambassador has recommended shall be recognized as the legal rulers of the country."

The Socialists tell us that feudalism has vanished, but nothing could be more erroneous. Feudalism is based on land monopoly, and wherever land monopoly exists feudal conditions remain. We no longer call ourselves serfs, but, compelled to live on land and on the products of the land, we are still at the mercy of the landlord. To him go ultimately all the fruits of human industry and accumulating knowledge; and the benefit which has come from the increased production of gold, with consequent rise in prices, finds its way ultimately into his pocket. We may double and treble our supply of money as we have been doing, and ultimately the landlord will reap the harvest. New chemical discoveries may enable us to extract gold and silver from every rock and from the waters of the sea. The men who hold the key to the universal warehouse will get it all. Until he shakes off the fetters of landlordism the human Prometheus must remain chained to the rock, scorched by day and frozen by night, with the vulture of poverty tearing at his liver ceaselessly. All power to the Mexican's elbow in his effort to strike off the chain. WM. C. OWEN.

Mexico's Bandits

The truth is that the bandits of Mexico are very little for personalities, and their leaders care very little for office; an astonishing thing, which hardly renders them worthy of further consideration.

If the bandits were fighting for personalities, would not they have one supreme leader clothed with supreme authority? If the leaders were personally ambitious, would there not be jealousy and friction? Would not each leader be proclaiming himself provisional President?

But none of these men has as yet proclaimed himself provisional President. Most of them, on the occasions when they treated with Madero, expressed a willingness that he remain in office, provided he would come to their terms. Some of them are now treating with Huerta, and these have expressed a willingness to recognize the pretensions of Huerta if he will do so on their terms. Huerta may promise, Diaz may promise, but neither will come to the terms of the bandits and the fight will go on.

Then what are the terms of these bandits? If they are not fighting for loot or for fun or for ambition, what are they fighting for? If they are not bandits, what are they?

The bandits of Mexico are fighting for liberty not for some chimerical or ideal liberty that is of the mind and far away, nor even for a liberty so immaterial, though so universally demanded, as political liberty, but for a concrete, tangible thing that means to them not only the broader liberties of the mind but the more pressing needs of the body. The bandits of Mexico are fighting for land to stand upon.

The centers of the bandit revolt are all found where a few men have all the land and the many have none, where production from the land is the only means of livelihood, where those who have not land must work for those who have, and under conditions to which no man with a spark of manhood in him would willingly submit.

These rural bandits, an overwhelming majority of them, once belonged to one or both of two classes—illegally dispossessed small farmers and liberated slaves. When I say slaves I mean slaves. Lincoln never freed any slaves whose lot approached in misery the lot of these Mexican wage slaves, and who are retaining their liberty only by retaining possession of their guns.

Their leaders are not carpetbaggers. The Zapata family was among the victims of a wholesale dispossession of Morelos lands by a rich friend of Porfirio Diaz. Salazar and Orozco are from the ranges of the north—big, rough men of the people. Almanzan, a youth of fire, went from the revolution of 1910 to an American university, but when the promises of that revolution were repudiated he returned and has since been a leader of "bandits" in the State of Guerrero. Cheche Campos was an idealist. He had valuable lands of his own in Durango. He gave up all to become a bandit. John Kenneth Turner, in "Collier's."

FREE SPEECH FIGHT. The I. W. W. is making a fight in Denver for the right to speak on the public streets. Up to date, as we are informed by letter, seventy have been arrested and fined from \$50 to \$120, which they are working out in jail. New recruits are being sent from California, under the leadership of P. F. Little, and funds to assist them in their struggle are solicited. They should be sent to the Secretary of Local 26, I. W. W., 1509 Nineteenth Street, Denver, Colo. It is also suggested that letters of protest be sent to Felix O'Neil, the Chief of Police, and to Mayor Arnold.

BALL, APRIL 12. A dance will be held at the International Workers' Home, 809 Yale Street, Saturday evening, April 12, having for its special object the rallying of the friends of "Regeneration." Admission will be free.

Bares Secrets Of Mexico's Great Struggle

Committee's Report Makes Strange Disclosures

"Revolution in Mexico," being the full report of all the testimony taken before the Sub-Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, is a most imposing volume, consisting, as it does, of more than nine hundred large and closely-printed pages. We approached it with genuine dread, and we have read it and re-read it with ever increasing interest. It is the most fascinating of histories; made up of chapters taken fresh from actual life. In it men of all classes have their say; the revolution is cursed unreservedly by the rich, and advocated by the poor with the ardor of fanaticism. The whole social struggle of the world is shown as in a mirror; and, while the evidence is often contradictory, it is possible to unravel much of it and arrive at definite conclusions that must be, at least, very close to truth.

The grouping of interests is very closely marked; the hand of the great oil interests, to say nothing of many less formidable monopolies, comes clearly into view; the support lent to Madero by the United States government, and resented most bitterly by Mexican revolutionists and by the nation at large, stands out in startling outline. In fact, a specially careful study of that portion of the evidence has convinced us that the main undoing of Madero was the aid he received from Washington. This proved affiliations killed his popularity, and practically signed his death-warrant.

What may be called the ultra-revolutionary propaganda, including that of the Mexican Liberal Party and the Industrial Workers of the World, is reproduced in fine shape, thanks largely to the desire of the California authorities to paint the two last-named in the blackest colors. And the contrasts are most effective. Side by side with the declarations of a Terrazas, who seems still unable to understand how any one who trespasses on his empire-embracing monopolies can be other than a scoundrel, come the burning pleas of a Ricardo Magón or the bitter outbursts of Orozco, who is reported thus, on page 43:

Orozco Curses Washington. "I do not think the Americans could hurt me any more than they have. They have cut off my arms and ammunition. They have hounded me and my men away from the border. They will not let them get in a thing. They allowed Madero to bring in everything he wanted, and I do not know but perhaps it might be best for me. That would cement us all together, and we would all be fighting for one common cause, and we would have a country again; and, never fear, you would not be able to take this country as you did before." In short, the testimony of this investigation also shows that the sending of troops to the border, and still more particularly the permission granted by Washington to transport Madero troops over United States territory, roused a wave of hatred against Americans that swept all Mexico.

As a sample: Mr. Newman, of El Paso, large landowner and intimately acquainted for many years with Madero and the leading financial interests of Mexico, testifies: "The sentiment all through the country, especially this Northern country, is very bitter toward Americans, and it is largely on account of the very stringent measures that have been used to keep out arms and ammunition." Much other testimony shows that the Mexicans feel that the country, while professing impartiality, played, from the very first, into Madero's hands, thanks to his close connection with heavy United States financial interests.

Who Financed Madero? To what extent was Madero backed by Standard Oil? That we have been scientifically anxious to discover, and the evidence is conflicting. For example, the Mr. Newman just quoted, insists that Madero financed his own revolution, and several other witnesses express the same opinion, but against this view there is apparently strong and most direct testimony. For instance there is a Mr. Loughborough, of San Francisco, owner of a sugar plantation in San Luis Potosi, who seems to know all the leading people in Mexico and is apparently a man of weight. He testifies that Maj. Itagadorn told him, "that there was no doubt in the world, from what he had found out in his secret work for the War Department of the United States army, that American money had furnished the sinews of war for Madero's revolution." He then adds that "Maj. Itagadorn is for the United States army, and has been during this revolution, exactly what W. J. Burns has been in the service of the United States government as a secret-service man."

Sr. Lujan, who described himself as Orozco's personal representative in the United States, gave very startling testimony. He swore that the Maderos had agreed with Limanour to put a stop to their revolution in consideration of the payment of \$25,000,000, and that, on this account, the attack on and capture of Juarez "was made without the consent of Madero and in contravention of his orders." His evidence continues thus: "Before these negotiations with Limanour, Gustavo Madero, representing his brother Francisco, remained in New York for some time, and it is public and notorious that he made arrangements with the Standard Oil Co., under which he was to grant concessions, and especially kill off competi-

tion in Mexico with the Mexican company, Compania Mexicana de Petroleo El Aguila," controlled by Pearson and Sons, an English company operating with Rothschild money. He points out that Madero did this at once.

Vast Interests at Stake. Mr. Loughborough, previously quoted, had a brother in command of troops from Fort Leavenworth. He testifies that his brother "told me that of his own knowledge he knew nothing of the intentions of the War Department, but that his private opinion was that there would be nothing done in Mexico by the United States, because there were private interests in large corporations of New York City who were furnishing the money to Madero to overthrow the Diaz government. He told me that this information came from one of the bankers in San Antonio, whose name he did not care to tell me, but that the same banker had told him that through his bank and one other in San Antonio there had passed millions of dollars in aid of the Mexican or Madero revolution." Later on, p. 85, he says:

"From the best of my knowledge and the best information I have obtained in the oil fields, the Pearson people have been the big oil people of Mexico. They are a British corporation. As I understand from employees of the Standard Oil Company, the Standard Oil people have been trying for years to get oil concessions on a large scale in Mexico, and Diaz would never let them in there to the extent that they have a hold in the United States, and that after so many years of trying to get in, the Standard Oil Co. have taken this course to obtain a foothold in Mexico in the oil regions; and I do know this, what immediately after Madero assumed the reins of government there was introduced into the Mexican Congress a resolution, or whatever it might be termed, requesting the Mexican Congress to grant to some one of the Mexican Congressional members a certain concession in the supposed oil stock of Mexico, which was so tremendously large that even the Mexican papers commented upon it; that it was so blood raw, in Madero's attempt to make good with the Standard Oil Co. of the United States, which they believed had put him in office, that he now was going to give away the rest of the country." Mr. Loughborough then states that the "Mexican Herald" demanded that this Congressman should declare who his principals were, since he could not possibly handle alone a concession of such magnitude; and "he said that he had the best backing in the world behind him."

Madero Raised \$10,000,000. John R. Phillips, of Los Angeles and representative of a land company operating in Sinaloa, testifies still more strongly to the same effect. He is recognized generally as an authority on Mexican affairs, and states that at the beginning of their revolution the Maderos were reported as having sold their Quayle land for \$10,000,000, to a certain American financial institution. He testifies that "it is generally believed in Mexico, and the conviction is forced upon me by what I have seen in the United States, that during the Madero revolution practically no effort was made by the United States government to enforce the neutrality laws"—a statement that should be read in connection with the eagerness of the United States authorities to oblige Madero by pushing the prosecution of the Mexican Liberal Party Junta. This has been admitted by the chief prosecuting attorney as given in another column of this issue.

Mr. Phillips then discusses the oil situation in Mexico, explaining that the Tampico field was controlled by two concerns, the Pearson syndicate, employing Rothschild money, and the Doheney interests, formerly of Los Angeles and now associated with Standard Oil. He states, giving names, that, soon after Madero's inauguration, New York and other business men went to Tampico and obtained two pipe-line concessions, after which the stock of the Mexican Petroleum Co., listed on the New York Stock Exchange, increased in value more than fifty per cent. "A large number of the Los Angeles people," he adds, "who were interested in that Mexican Petroleum Co. made their clean-up." He then states that the control of that company changed hands, because "it is obvious that those enormous oil fields can not be worked by an organization except one which must be affiliated with the Standard Oil Co., directly or indirectly;" and that "this change in the control of that very large organization, with a capital of something like \$50,000,000, is due to the fact that it was necessary to consolidate the large interests in the Tampico fields and to market that oil in the United States or other parts of the world by the largest oil concern that we know of. That must be the Standard Oil Co."

Tampico Oil Fields. It will be remembered that "Regeneration" has cried out persistently against the influence of Wall Street in Mexican affairs, and that in a recent lengthy editorial the editor of this section endeavored to explain the struggle for monopoly of the Tampico oil fields now being waged between the Standard Oil Co. and the Rothschild interests, represented by the Pearson Syndicate. That article was written before this report had come into our hands, and the report has much to say concerning the Pearsons. Their interests are enormous, and Mr. Chihuahua representative, W. W. Turney, testified before the committee that they had \$35,000,000 invested in that State alone.

So much for the great oil question, and now a word respecting the constantly-threatened American intervention, with which it is evident that oil is closely linked. Mr. Malcolmson, who was formerly manager of the mines of the El Paso Smelting Works, says that his people considered Taft's first proclamation very ill-advised,

"because everybody in Mexico felt that intervention was coming immediately." However, the President seems to have changed his mind, for he had an interview with Malcolmson in which he said: "We can not think of intervention." Various witnesses testify to a sudden and, at the time, inexplicable change in Washington policies, and, as one put it, the general impression seemed to have been that "President Taft lost his nerve." There does not appear to be any reason for this, since Taft himself would not have been called on to fight, and we suggest that a more plausible reason is furnished by Phillips, who testified that, after the proclamation and the sending of troops to Texas, the American Smelting and Refining Co. closed down, the managers being summoned to New York. "Shortly after their arrival in New York," said Phillips, "the word went out that there was to be no intervention."

Still Expect Intervention. In this connection it may be stated that many of the witnesses, and especially those who represent big American interests, expressed their conviction that, sooner or later, there will be intervention. The bulk of the testimony, however, shows that its threat was viewed by the American population resident in Mexico with profound alarm. That it made Americans most unpopular seems to be universally admitted.

We expect to review other portions of this report in subsequent issues of "Regeneration," for it is a mine of wealth. This week we limit ourselves largely to demonstrations of the influence of Wall Street in general and the oil interests in particular; our position being always that the Mexican peon is fighting to save his country and race from being swallowed by the foreign speculator, and that in this fight he deserves the sympathies, if not the more active assistance, of all who have become alive to the menace of plutocracy. Thus far he has not had even their sympathies to any appreciable extent, but the Mexican situation has been hard to unravel, and people who will go to the trouble of study and thought are, unfortunately, rare.

Score Magons And Praise Otis

Public Prosecutors Throw New Light on Junta Trial

From the official Senate report, entitled "Revolutions in Mexico" and printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations, we extract portions of the testimony given by Mr. Dudley W. Robinson, who is assistant United States attorney for the Southern District of California, and conducted the prosecution that resulted in the conviction last June of the members of the Junta of the Mexican Liberal Party.

In his very second sentence, and by way of informing the investigating committee as to why he became interested in Mexican affairs, Mr. Robinson says that the Junta was prosecuted "upon a charge of violating the neutrality laws by forming a conspiracy to enlist men to go to Mexico to fight as soldiers against Madero, or otherwise unorthodox, but that they actually paid men whom they enlisted in the United States. Testifying, however, before the Senate Committee, Mr. Robinson's evidence was, perhaps properly, chiefly confined to descriptions of the Magons' principles and methods of propaganda. He considers the literature they circulated as that in vogue among Socialists of the more radical type and Industrial Workers of the World.

Mr. Robinson's testimony on this head is corroborated by that of his chief, A. I. McCormick, the United States attorney, who said: "The difficult thing in our prosecution was to prove that the expedition was of a military character, and in that connection I may state that the Magonistas were constantly advised by the best attorneys, who posted them on the neutrality laws, and for that reason they kept everything absolutely secret which had anything of a military character attached to it at all. In other words, their idea was: 'You go down to the Mexican line, and do not be a soldier or indicate in any way that you are a soldier until after you get across the line. Then you will receive your gun and ammunition.' That is correct, is it not, Mr. Robinson?" And Mr. Robinson answered, "Yes."

(To be continued.)

Let there be no mistake as to this. Never has any one connected with "Regeneration" denied that the Junta did its best to convince the Mexican people that in substituting Madero for Diaz they were merely changing masters and jumping from the frying pan into the fire. It counseled the keeping up the fight against Madero, and it would have been useless to deny it, since for that purpose we agitated and collected money from sympathizers throughout the world. But we did say, and we do say, that to counsel men to go to Mexico and, when they have arrived there, to fight for the economic freedom of the proletariat, is not to enlist them in this country as a military expedition, and, therefore, is not a breach of the neutrality laws. It was necessary for the government to prove that soldiers had been hired and armed in the United States, and for that the services of the Paul Smiths, the Reeds, Pete Martins and others whose affidavits we have been printing recently, were requisite. Their affidavits state that they committed perjury, not merely for the sake of money, but to purchase their own freedom.

Furthermore, is it not curious to read the following in Mr. Robinson's own testimony? "The men who were enlisted were not always exactly volunteers. Of course they went voluntarily, but they were persuaded by agents of the Magons. These volunteers were given their bare expenses to get to the Mexican line. There was no money consideration given to them." Yet the prosecution moved heaven and earth to prove that their witnesses had received an enlisting fee.

REGENERACION STILL LIVES.

The testimony to which we are calling attention carries vastly greater weight from the fact that Messrs. Robinson and McCormick are obviously most hostile to the Junta. For example, the former states, and with evident regret: "The paper El Regeneracion (his Spanish must be weak) still lives and is being published. We still have the propagandists who stand in the plaza or in the street and preach on anti-patriotism and the folly of obeying law." To which one may add a remark thrown in by McCormick gratuitously, which runs: "You notice that they (the Junta) do not hold up the American Government as a model." That was intended to prejudice the committee, and it drew fire instantly, Senator Fall taking occasion to interject: "They say that the Madero party is endeavoring to establish such a government as that of the United States, which they are absolutely against." However, it is sadly true. In our eyes the government of the United States is one by money, of money and for money; a plutocracy if ever there was one. That is precisely the great general question we have tried to raise, using the Mexican Revolution as our lever.

Referring to the Junta trial Mr. McCormick also dropped the following suggestive remark: "In fact, it is the Madero government that has insisted on this vigorous prosecution that we have had here." This he supplemented with a vigorous declaration to the effect that all the propertied interests had been "violently opposed to the Magons," and added: "I know that Gen. Otis and Harry Chandler and the rest of the fellows have always backed up the government in a vigorous prosecution of these men." It is the chief prosecuting agent of the United States who is speaking, and he knows what he is talking about. Mr. McCormick also said: "It seems to me that before long the United States will be in honor and duty bound to intervene in Mexico, more than ever it was in Cuba."

(To be continued.)

Mexican Notes

"It is feared here," says an Associated Press despatch from Mexico City, under date of April 9, "that Durango, capital of the State of the same name, has been taken by the rebels. Communication virtually has been cut off for two weeks. The Minister of the Interior, Garcia Granados, publicly stated today that the reason a more vigorous campaign has not been made in the North is that the gov-

ernment lacks money." Other despatches have reported the rebels as boasting that from Durango they will advance on Torreón, which they expect to take without difficulty. As we have pointed out several times, it is the most important railroad center in the country and the gateway to Mexico City.

Despatches of April 9 say that the federal forces won an engagement the previous night, sixty miles North of Monterrey, but give no particulars, and add that Gen. Truett Aubert is advancing on Monclova, Coahuila.

Notwithstanding talk to the effect that the Huerta government had landed 4000 troops for the defense of Guaymas, Sinaloa's important seaport, refugees from a neighboring colony assert that not more than 500 are there at present, desertions having been numerous.

The Yaguis are on the warpath in Sinaloa and are said to be torturing prisoners.

Ojeda still holds Naco, Sonora, against a greatly superior force, and has been making numerous sorties, in which he is said to have inflicted serious damage on the rebels. Lack of artillery and artillery operators is said to be hampering the State forces, while the federalists are reported as having had their machine guns served largely by deserters from the American army just across the border. The State troops are now reported as having constructed, at great sacrifice of life, breastworks and trenches within 300 yards of the town, and as being determined to crush Ojeda utterly. All business in that part of the town situated on the Arizona side has been suspended, martial law has been declared and bullets have been reported as flying thick as fast.

War Office Takes Action.

In consequence of the reported firing across the international line, alike by Federalists and Constitutionalists, American Secretary of War Garrison sent a demand to Ojeda, insisting that it be stopped immediately. According to the despatches, "he raised his fist and let it fall in a gesture of despair." Naturally the Hearst papers, and others favoring intervention, have made the most of this.

Various despatches, while barren of detail, owing to the severe censorship and generally disordered conditions, make it clear that the Zapatistas are still in open rebellion, and that the rumored alliance between Orozco and Huerta is rumor only. Orozco is said to be forbidden to leave Mexico City, and three more officers were reported, April 8, as having been placed under arrest in Mexico City, charged with plotting against the government.

Minister de la Barra has abandoned all intentions of going to Washington to plead for official recognition of the Huerta government.

In the taking of the town of Lampazos, State of Nuevo Leon, forty-eight Federalists were reported as having been killed outright, twice as many injured and twenty-seven taken prisoners. The despatch reads: "In retaliation for the orders of Huerta, through which State troops taken at Laredo were executed, these two were summarily shot." In short, fighting is reported from widely-separated points, and is of the most savage description; the government appears to be lacking alike in money and men, and constant desertions are draining its ranks. A special despatch to the "Los Angeles Evening Herald," dated Mexico City, April 8, reads as follows: "Federal troops which were rushed to relieve Teneango, the second city of importance in the State of Mexico, have returned to Toluca in equal haste, saying there were too many Zapatistas on the road for them to continue. One thousand troops, with artillery, have been sent to relieve the city."

Wilson Under Fire.

The attack on United States Ambassador Wilson continues, with increased severity, and the Hearst people have secured a long interview with the widow of the late President Madero, who makes most serious charges. The "Los Angeles Tribune" congratulates our administration on its wisdom in refusing to recognize Huerta, and says that his army has dwindled away to 14,000, many of whom are of doubtful loyalty, and that, to save his face, he has been forced to make a compromise with the Maderistas.

The American colony in Mexico has sent a second appeal to Washington for Ambassador Wilson's recall, but he publicly announces that he will not resign.

It appears that the report of Huerta's resignation was premature, but rumors of negotiations to that effect are continuous, and Felix Diaz is said to have fortified his castle-like home and garrisoned it strongly. The government has been unable to send troops to the States of Durango and Tepic, where they are wanted greatly, owing to the threatening conditions in the capital.

Los Angeles has a new Mexican consul in the person of Sr. Manuel Pina y Cuevas, formerly congressman under the Porfirio Diaz regime. According to the "Los Angeles Times," he is "firmly convinced that Mexico's destiny must be guided by a man of iron resolve—a military dictator with a conscience." "That is a rare breed; probably extinct."

SHIRKING THE ISSUE.

We observe that "The Public" professed expounder of Henry George, and, therefore, pledged to war on private property in land, is beginning to give news of Mexico. Its latest issue dwells on the Constitutional upheaval and the uncompromising attitude still maintained by what it is careful to call "the brigand Zapatistas in the South." In short, it gives fighting news, but not a word on the one important fact, viz., that these brigands are fighting for the restoration of the land to the disinherited.