

Men Should Be Rebels, Proud As Lucifer

First, there is MAN, the world's aristocrat; and we are men. It should be no slight thing to us that we stand at the head of evolution; with capacities and possibilities far beyond the reach of other species. From that high pinnacle of pride we should not step down at the command of any slavish, submission-whining creed. As the world's aristocrats we should assert most aggressively our right to live; our right to the highest seat at life's rich table; our claim to all this world can yield in material, intellectual and spiritual wealth. Rich or poor, we should assert that claim, that we may not be traitors to the proud stock from which we spring or cowards afraid to take the heritage it has left us. By the great tide-deed of our lofty lineage every one of us should stand. From the Gibraltar of that individual claim every one of us should make his fight. For every one of us, as a human being, nothing in this world should be too good.

Secondly, there is Man as a member of some one of those races into which the long struggle upward has divided us. These races have their marked peculiarities, and long, tenacious roots which run down deep into the past. The Indian race, for example, now giving us so much trouble in Mexico and destined to give us infinitely more in all that world lying between the Rio Grande and Cape Horn, appears always to have had its basis in the spirit of Liberty. The Northern race have tended to materialism, as befits their climate and the modes of life it necessarily imposes. Southern thought, on the contrary, may have been narrow, but generally has been clear as its own skies, and, therefore, often bigoted. Our great religious persecutors have come from the South, and it is easy to understand that the man who sees narrowly but clearly may prove intolerant. In short, these racial divisions, with their intense differences of character, exist, and to one or other of them we all belong. We should be proud of it, for those characteristics have been powerful factors in our evolution.

We are also divided into nations, and every nation has its struggle, in which it has exhibited virtues of which its present members may be proud. They may not have been the virtues of the Sunday school and copybook, but they have been genuine virtues for they have enabled the nation to survive, which is virtue's supreme test. I will admit readily, for instance, that my own Englishman of today is pitifully the slave of money, but nothing will make me believe that English history has been slavish as a whole. I know it has been full of fight, and that, on the whole, it has fought for what it has considered right; that when thus actuated it has not flinched; that it has had a backbone and, thereby, has stood immeasurably above the manured mannikins our modern society, with its swarm of incompetent parasites, is turning out in their effeminate and degenerate thousands. I am striking the note of personal individual pride as a supreme virtue; as the stimulus to high flight and the natural check against decadence; and I think we should all be proud of the nation from whose loins we come. There is a good deal to be said for ancestor worship and study of achievements of the past, as a spur to present effort.

The argument touches us still more closely when we come to the minute family division, for there the struggle is pith and substance of the daily life. Nations may rust in peace for generations, but the family must be always on the watch; always defending its members' life and interests. The family bond is necessarily very strong, since it rests on sexual passion, and the old saying that "blood is thicker than water" has a truth which no philosophy can explain away. It rests on the everlasting bedrock of individualism; on the ineffaceable preference of the mother for the child which has been part of her own body; on those subtle similarities and attractions which are by children from that something in common which originally drew their parents to each other. There may be community of material interests but assuredly there is also something stronger, and the fact that our economic system is destroying even the home proves how enormous is its dissolvent force. The family is a most powerful bond, and we should be proud of it. That a man has had ancestors in whose record he exults is an immense incentive, and has always been one of the main elements of strength in every ruling class.

Finally, there is the individual, on whom the whole social pyramid rests; the individual who expands himself in the family, broadens out into the nation, receives further extension as member of a race and is one of the innumerable waves composing the great sea of life. He is basic. As one of Life's aristocracy he is entitled to be proud; proud of rebellion against injustice; against stupid and low ideas, against everything that makes for cowardice, hampers intelligence, restricts the play of individuality and cripples life in its higher and most necessary flights. The high flight is what we need today, for the lower problems have been settled. Our simpler material wants we now can satisfy with little effort and al-

most automatically, but the problem of ascertaining and enforcing equity calls for superior powers. It cannot be solved by those who hang their heads as slaves, or close their eyes as sluggards or gaze into the clouds as dreamers. It calls for the proud military spirit which never flinches from looking facts squarely between the eyes, and understands that throughout life's never-ending struggle we have but the single choice—conquest or death.

It is by no accident that we find the international Socialist movement throwing itself into more peace crusades, temperance crusades, limitation of the family crusades, which hitherto have been the monopoly of Pecksniffs of the Carnegie type. The Socialist philosophy, as shaped by its politicians to suit their selfish ends, has not voiced the proud claim of the individual man. On the contrary, with more than the servility of the dying religions, it has sought to minimize his worth, to teach him that only as a single brick in the huge social structure has he any value, to assure him that only by mass, collective movements can any advance be made. It is false to all history and the experience of our daily life, but that is a trifle in the calculations of those ambitious to be the herders of the mass. It rots the basis of the social pyramid by robbing the individual character, but of that no account is taken. It robs us of our rebellious pride of species, pride of race, pride of nation, pride of family and pride of personality, and thereby it plays directly into the hands of those greedy for power, since it is only when the Romans have degenerated into sheep that the Caesars can do their worst. It would gladly castrate the virile energies of the splendidly fighting species, Man, by limiting his revolt to periodical declarations at the polls as to his choice of rulers. I can conceive of no greater insult to my race.

This I write as my feeble contribution to that war-cry with which, as I see it, rebels should be making every country ring. I write it also as an answer to many letters received from those who apparently are conscious that there may be something more in life than the submissiveness taught us from the pulpit; taught us by the politician; taught us to which we run as instinctively as ducks to water; taught us by that vast system of laws and officialdom which this country has evolved with a rapidity unparalleled in history; taught us in the huge industrial barracks on which we pride ourselves; taught us by the policing of the huge cities into which we crowd, that we may pay rent to landlords, widen immeasurably the ever-widening gap between wealth and poverty, and get as far as possible from natural life. These letters generally sense a fear that we are marching far faster than we realize toward a slavery more absolute than any this country, or perhaps this world, has known; that we are growing dependent on the holders of the money-bag as we never were before, and that all the little would-be legislative stop-gaps over which we are shouting ourselves hoarse are about as effective as throwing pebbles into Niagara Falls. I agree with them.

Above all, and this is their most saddening feature, these letters generally voice deep distrust of the masses, and often their writers ask me if I have had experience with the working class or ever taken stock of the material that gathers round the soap-box. It is the pessimistic thought that marks these times. It finds perpetual echo not only in the huge mass of legislation with which we seek to hold in check what we assume will be the bad passions of the mass, but also in the whole conduct of the labor movement, which itself is always trying to restrict; which shows no confidence in men as such; no understanding that, if given a fair chance, they almost invariably will do the right thing; which has no faith in Liberty, Syndicalism, the I. W. W. movement, the most advanced wing of the great Labor army, are still saturated with that distrustful doctrine, begotten by the dogma that the individual is a demon, a mere number in the industrial procession, a thing to be ruled at every turn, a humble stone in the social pyramid whose apex is despotism.

From all this tangle of illusion we must wrench ourselves free, if we are not to lose ourselves entirely. We must understand clearly that old-fashioned institutions and not modern human nature are at fault; that man's history and vast upward climb is not such as warrants distrustful pessimism but optimistic confidence; that he has a right to be rebelliously proud, and that only when he falls into slavish submission is he guilty of unpardonable sin; that when given a proper chance he will use it properly; and that we must fight unceasingly to tear from Monopoly that proper chance. Most righteously does the individual man convert himself into a demon of destruction when opportunity is denied him, as the Mexican today is doing. Give him opportunity and you convert him into an angel of construction. Man's chief characteristic is his genius for construction. Were it otherwise we should still be jammering with the apes.

WM. C. OWEN.

Mexican Notes

The Mexican Revolution raises, apart from many side issues, these all-important questions: (1) The question of the restoration of the land to those who actually cultivate it; (2) The question of the steady weakening and subsequent overthrow of the central governmental power, which alone enables those who take no personal part in the cultivation of the land to retain legal property in it; (3) The question of the part the American government—today probably more money-ridden than any government on earth—will ultimately play. As to the first, the Yaqui rebellion is the most important development of the last two weeks. The Yaquis played from the first a somewhat independent hand, but of late they have been supporting the Constitutionalists. Now they have revolted and are claiming the restoration of their lands. In its issue of Sept. 4, "El Paso de Norte," which is not a revolutionary paper, discusses the position at considerable length, pointing out that their defection weakens seriously the Constitutional movement. It ends its article with these words: "Apart from all this, the Yaquis are only insisting on the fulfillment of a solemn promise made to them, and we say once that what they are asking is entirely just, and that they have our fullest sympathy. We must be prepared for repeating what we have said so often, viz., the trouble is that the Yaqui lands are today owned, legally, by foreign speculators, among whom Americans predominate. Meanwhile the Yaqui attitude has become so threatening that the American consul at Hermosillo issued a special warning to foreigners and urged his government to send a man-of-war to the relief. The transport Buford has been dispatched to the West coast, to take away refugees.

We judge that the Constitutional cause is being ground, as we have prophesied, from the first. It stands in the same relation to the land question as the Made government did; that is to say, it has been prodigal in promises and a miser in their performance. We venture the prediction that the moneyed men and politicians, who abound in its ranks, will favor creeping in under the wing of United States protection, as the Maderistas would have favored it. Ojeda, the Federal commander, has been receiving considerable reinforcements, by way of Guaymas, and is, through the aid of the army, the heavy fighting in Sonora and Chihuahua, while resulting in serious losses on both sides, has been, as yet, undecisive. The Constitutionalists had to abandon Cuatro Ciénegas, an important strategic position, but reinforcements arrived and enabled them to defeat the Federals. Col. Villareal, who left the Mexican Liberal Party to support Madero, caused 108 Federals to be shot for violation of a flag of truce.

Take Your Choice. "Le Temps," of Paris, which usually comments intelligently on Mexican affairs, says: "The least untrustworthy opinion in Mexico is that Huerta is capable of re-establishing peace, and that the work of pacification is making undeniable progress, despite countless difficulties." On the other hand, the Associated Press report of Sept. 7 asserted that the information collected by Mr. Lind had convinced him that Huerta was making "little, if any, real progress toward the general restoration of peace, and that there is a growing unrest in the capital." It is added that the Zapatistas were said to have been driven from Morelos, they are still numerous; that the rebels about Zacatecas and Torreon are stronger and more active than ever; that there are vigorous movements in close proximity to the capital; that railway communication is again at a standstill, and so forth. American refugees who reached San Francisco, Sept. 3, in considerable numbers, expressed much skepticism as to Huerta's program.

Torreon is still beleaguered by the Constitutionalists, and the government has sent troops from Monclova, Coahuila, to its relief. As is generally pointed out by Mexican papers, they have a long and arduous journey before them, through a bitterly disaffected country. There is much revolutionary activity in Coahuila, and the experiment of withdrawing troops from it must be dangerous.

The Constitutionalists, recognizing the weakness of their position, for reasons previously indicated, are seeking popular support by partitioning lands. They have begun with a large ranch property owned by Felix Diaz. So far so good.

Advices from Nogales, Ariz., dated Sept. 9, were that all the mining companies in Sonora—essentially the State of American investments—have decided to suspend work indefinitely.

Have They Inside Information? On facts rather than on words, we note that Huerta is getting much more help from Mexico City, banks and from the railway bondholders, located in New York. Also that certain of the large foreign ranch proprietors have been importing Chinese in large numbers, to supply the lack of Mexican labor. We feel certain that these people are far more likely than anybody else to be "in the know," and that they would not be investing large sums of money under what seem to be the exceedingly risky conditions of the present if they had not received the tip that, in some way or other, they would receive protection more powerful than any Huerta can afford. The Presidential election is still slated for Oct. 26. It has always been a farce, for the peon knows and cares nothing about politics. If held under present conditions it must be a roaring farce, as Carranza himself has pointed out. But President Wilson's message conveyed the strong impression that Mexico has only to hold an election, and the peon will be the day of good citizens to support the duly chosen President!

We have no way of penetrating behind the scenes and learning what is really going on in diplomatic circles. Our guess is no better than that of

any other persons, except so far as we make this question our special study and watch developments. Anyhow, we guess that the newly-elected President will prove entirely incapable of restoring order, and that the United States will step in to assist him, allegedly at the request of Mexico's governing class. Already various publicists are pointing out that this was the course pursued in Cuba. October is nearly here, and an immediate future will tell the tale. Meanwhile, Col. Murguía, one of the Constitutional leaders, declares that the Federals have been trying to induce him to desert to them, and that the invitation extended to him emphasized "the almost certain relations with the neighboring Republic on the North" and that the country needed the "united help of all good citizens, to preserve the respectability of Mexico." Note that word "respectability."

Huerta unquestionably has been making desperate efforts to crush Zapata, and claims to have driven him from Morelos. Mexico City papers, however, comment cynically on the ease with which the Zapatistas concentrated in the neighboring State of Guerrero. They are "essential guerrillas, and change of locality affects them little. In fact, it gives them a good opportunity to spread their propaganda."

THIS LOCAL UNDERSTANDS.

"Solidarity," under date of September 6, contains a really admirable series of resolutions, headed "Mexico's Fight for Freedom," and passed by Local 222, I. W. W. of Phoenix, Ariz. They emphasize the economic character of the struggle, and the fact that it is strongly anti-governmental and anti-authoritarian, as every revolutionary movement that understands itself MUST be. The resolutions conclude by citing approvingly a recent editorial in "El Era Nueva," of Paterson, N. J., which ends: "The movement now taking place in Mexico should not only receive the attention it deserves but should be limited and surpassed, if possible." Furthermore, the resolutions state that the local considers itself well informed by reason of its proximity to Mexico, and adds that it "feels justified in expecting that those who have not been so closely in touch with the situation will attach a certain amount of significance to the unanimous opinion of members of this local."

The resolutions referred to also state that "the nucleus of the coming free society is being implanted in every nook and corner of the Republic by agitators and educators from all parts of the world," and in this connection we may call attention to Senator Fall's recent article in "Leslie's." As himself the owner of large interests in Mexico, and the legal representative of still larger, Senator Fall is not on our side of the house, but no man in public life is better informed on this special subject. In the article named he classifies the "Causes of Unrest," and speaks first of the constant intercourse between the United States and Mexico, which has given the Mexican peon new ideas and filled him with new ambitions. The Senator might also have added that it has given the Mexican a good insight into the real industrial and political life of the United States, and that the peon considers the first unspoken slave and the second unspoken corrupt. He has sampled most fully and carefully the treatment meted out to the poor, particularly if they are unemployed, and he has not the slightest taste for a civilization of that brand.

The second "Cause of Unrest" is stated by the Senator in the following words: "Present conditions are even more largely due to the exile of many liberal and progressive men as well as agitators, and the formation of the so-called Liberal Junta in St. Louis, in 1906; to the dissemination by this committee and circulation of literature of militant socialist and anarchistic literature through the columns of their paper 'Regeneracion,' and through circular letters, pronouncements and plans (platforms), forwarded to their agents in every town and hamlet in eighteen states, and more or less thoroughly distributed in the other states of the Republic; to the promulgation by this committee and circulation of literature concerning the plank in the platform of these agitators, calling for the confiscation of real estate and the ruling class, as it was claimed, by graft and by favor and without compensation to the public treasury."

We may add that Senator Fall is not only well qualified to speak on Mexico in general, but that the present revolution and its causes have been his special study. He was a member of the U. S. Senate committee that spent many months in the examination of that question.

TWO WHOPPING LIES.

"But when peace is restored in Mexico," says "The New Times," a Socialist paper published at Minneapolis, "it means only the abolishing of war between two rival capitalist factions. The war between capital and labor will still go on in mines, mills and factories."

That is partially true, but it is one of those half-truths which are generally the most dangerous of lies. In the first place, the intimation sought to be conveyed is that the present revolution is not an economic struggle by the peasants, seeking to recover their lands, but merely a war between rival politicians. That is a lie. In the second place, it expresses the old Socialist delusion that the strife between capital and labor is one to be waged only in mines, mills and factories. What about the millions of Mexicans, constituting the overwhelming bulk of the population, engaged in agriculture? Are they not human beings? Are they not interested in the fight?

SEND IN YOUR ORDERS.

We expect to have the first volume of our "Land and Liberty" series on the markets within a few days. Sixty-four pages, with three cuts. Price ten cents. Believing that this will be most useful propaganda matter we hope our friends will order liberally. Agents wanted.

Which Road Will They Take?

Time tests all things, and by that touchstone theories current in the labor movement for a century must now be tried, since we cannot go on forever trusting to assertions. Unquestionably the hour for a thorough examination has arrived.

Go back a century and, apart from the limited nobility caste, there was comparatively little economic inequality. Certainly there was nothing like the appalling contrast that exists today, when every city possesses a wide circle of millionaires whose expenditures are on a scale that would have excited the envy of royalty itself a hundred years ago, and its army of penniless proletarians beside whom the Sans-Culottes of the French Revolution were but a handful. Never, in all the world's history has there been so enormous and prodigious a class of spenders, on the one hand, or such an array of hopeless, helpless misery on the other. The development of this condition has been spectacularly rapid, and the pace increased. Hence the unrest shaking the whole social structure.

The disinherited—those who had nothing to sell except their labor—had to meet this economic revolution, and they adopted methods that were in vogue when the Pharisees ruled. In fact, one of the curious features of trade union literature is the frequency with which its writers assert that labor organization is as old as the hills. The ancient shilliboleths that "Union is Strength," that "United we Stand," and so on "ad nauseam," were brought out and polished up to look like new. For a century past labor leaders have been simply repeating, with infinite variety of phrase, the time-worn declaration that slaves must stand together; they have been placidly assuming that the miracle of winning economic power without dispossessing those who had cornered it can be accomplished by mere force of numbers.

Bands, Banners and Processions.

Fully a century has elapsed. Time has applied its infallible test and has proved that the old methods have failed; failed miserably; failed so obviously that only slaves, who constitutionally lack courage to face facts, could help seeing the failure. Monopoly has whipped them out of their boots and seated itself firmly on what is today an almost impregnable throne; all the fine talk and ringing speeches, the monster parades and the proudly-mottoed flags have amounted to nothing. The numbers still shiver outside the door while the few are feasting comfortably within. The workman is still to be found inhabiting the workman's portion of the city; he is still clinging tremblingly to his job, as the one thing that stands between him and starvation; the gulf between him, who must get employment, and those who have in their sovereign power to give or withhold employment, is greater than it ever was before. Otherwise nothing has been changed. The test of time has shown conclusively that numbers in themselves are no guarantee of victory.

"The patience of the poor is THE wonder of the world," as Froude says in his "Life of Caesar." But the greatest patience has its limits and under repeated trampling even the worm will turn. The failure of the old, orthodox trade unionism became finally so self-evident that the I. W. W. was born. Now the I. W. W. is on trial, and the main issue is whether it is going back, like the proverbial dog, to the old trade union vomit, or whether it will have the pluck and energy to strike out of hopelessly barren ruts and into new and possibly fertile revolutionary fields. That, in a nutshell, is what all the row now on in I. W. W. circles is about. It is a great, big row, and it should be fought to the bitter end.

Flapdoodle on Trial.

A week ago our editorial consisted of a review of Mr. Pease's article on the I. W. W. published in last month's "Forum." We did not mind language in denouncing the time-dishonored policy of sensationalism, bombastic boom and belief in big words, which the I. W. W. shares with all other trade union movements; but we had no expectation then that our position would receive so speedily an indorsement from the organization's own leading paper. Turn to "Solidarity," of August 23, and read the editorial entitled "Satisfactory versus Organizing Ability," and you will find more bitter denunciation of the shilliboleths of the fools who think they help a revolutionary movement by setting up idols and cheering their every word, than any we have penned. So far so good. If a nation-wide attack on flapdoodle and hero-worship has been started a fair beginning has been made.

Now turn to the I. W. W. papers for the last three weeks and see what the storm, nominally over the editorial of the "Industrial Worker," is really all about. It is about the old question of centralization vs. decentralization; about leaving everything to leaders or trusting to ourselves. First, you will notice that the official organs are all on the centralization side. They always are. Secondly, we do not believe that any fair mind can read their articles without admitting that they are making a poor defense. The fact is, there can be no real defense. If the I. W. W. is anything it is a revolt against capitalism and its methods. When it betakes itself to always being centrally copying these methods. The I. W. W. is itself a declaration that the old trades union methods have failed, and it has been attacking the A. F. of L. most bitterly, and properly, for being a hide-bound organization at the mercy of leaders, of official rings, of centralized power. Politics, and especially Socialist politics, have come in for the I. W. W.'s most caustic criticism, and the main charge has been the centralization of power which the politics always been. Finally, the I. W. W. has reiterated constantly the Anarchistic declaration that it has no use for the State, and the quintessence of the State is centralization of official power. In a word, the I. W. W. is the last organ-

ization in the world to be able to talk centralization without making itself supremely ridiculous. That its editors are endeavoring to do so is only another proof of the fatal effect of officialdom.

Old Poisons Still at Work.

If you will turn to the "Industrial Worker" of Aug. 21, you will see how profoundly the movement is still influenced by the old trades unionism. Therein appears an article entitled "In the West," which asks: "Does true radicalism express itself in free speech fights, in tirades against the army, church or State, or does it find its real expression in the shop or factory?" The writer of that article, which is a bitter attack on Western methods of propaganda, is nothing but a trades unionist, as, if we are to believe him, are all Eastern members of the I. W. W. "In the Eastern locals," he writes, "we have only one faction, anti-ten hours and anti-small wages."

Furthermore, it is to be remarked that such an attitude implicitly excludes all who are not shop workers, and we are certain that he, and the editors of the official organs, would protest against our own emphatic claim, viz., that the essence of the I. W. W. movement is the gathering up of the huns, the hoboes, the unskilled and often unemployed, in which sort of a loose organization, in which their revolutionary discontent can find articulate expression and become more effective through co-operation. Between that idea and the idea of getting better conditions for shop slaves whose slavery will thereby be organized more regular, there is all the difference that exists between a revolutionary movement and a reactionary attempt to form close combines of the A. F. of L. brand.

Slaves to the Past.

To sum up. There is a bitter quarrel over the respectability of centralization and decentralization, and it is clear that the upholders of the former are still under the reactionary influence of the political Socialist percentage from which the I. W. W. very largely sprang. There is also a bitter quarrel between the side that is always whooping up the importance of disciplined organization, and aiming at trifling improvements in shop conditions, and those who feel an irrepressible urge to make revolutionary propaganda on the broadest scale. The former are obviously still under the influence of the trades union tradition, and if they should win the day the I. W. W. either will disappear or become a side-partner and satellite of the A. F. of L.

The quarrel started over the editorialship if the "Industrial Worker" is a quarrel that has been smoldering in the I. W. W. for a long time past; as it smolders, and breaks periodically into flames, in the labor movement throughout the world. It is the quarrel between the bite-at-a-time reformers, who talk about their constructive work, and expect to advance by inches, and the destructionists, who are for throwing the whole system to the scrap heap.

It is needless to say that our sympathies are with the latter, even if we criticize their weakness for frothy talk. The Mexican Revolutionists have no belief in the old trade union methods, and we submit that Time has shown they are correct in that. They have no belief in concentrating power in the hands of officials, for the history of their own deeply-betrayed country has shown them the fatality of that. They have no belief in the step-at-a-time theory, and we point out that, when in the limited field of action represented by the strike, the Mexicans have won triumphs that throw such contests as that at Lawrence completely into the shade. Take, for example, the comparatively recent strike of the longshoremen at the important port of Vera Cruz. By their determined martial attitude they brought the employers to their knees immediately, and they are now working eight instead of twelve hours daily, and receiving from three to four dollars a day as against from one dollar and seventy-five cents to two dollars. Naturally, they did not pursue the "Let us see who can starve the longest" tactic.

Over the entire labor movement of the United States a dense fog of time-hallowed illusions hangs heavy. It has to be cleared away, that we may see the battlefield as it actually is.

THE TIDE IS TURNING.

It is with very great pleasure that we find "The Socialist Worker," of Tacoma, Wash., carrying on its front page a double-column article headed: "The Martyrs of McNeill's Island Prison." Mexican Comrades behind bars because of loyalty to working class. That tells the whole story and tells it truthfully. It is the whole story. No one in his senses, who has studied the evidence, can doubt for a moment that the Magons and their fellow prisoners, in McNeill's Island and elsewhere, have suffered and are suffering solely because of their absolute loyalty to the working class. In the same paper appears a long article headed "A Revolutionary Defense League." It is by J. E. Sinclair, who we note, is one of the secretaries of the Socialist Party's State Educational Bureau. It voices certain vital truths; painful and most regrettable truths, but truths that we MUST assimilate and live up to if we are to amount to ANYTHING. Here are some of them:

"In fact the leading lights of almost every so-called working class organization, be it political party or labor union, are almost a unit in joining the masses and their vile press in denouncing working men who are violating the unwritten law of capitalism: THOU SHALT NOT INTERFERE WITH PROFITS. "It is the part of politicians to purr. It is the part of whipped dogs to whine. It is the part of men in the face of oppression to fight and protect their rights and the rights of their children to the uttermost. That long predicted war between those who make the wealth of the world and those who take the wealth of the world is here. THE REVOLUTION which we have longed for as a great adjustment of our wrongs is here in blood and tears. It is working-class blood."