

Does Dodging Issues Bring Results?

To talk for the mere sake of talking; to pass laws for the mere sake of passing them; to toil at organizing and producing merely a cumbersome, thoughtless mass—surely that represents a waste of energy which intelligence should be ashamed to tolerate. Yet in these United States, for at least two generations past, we have held millions of agitation meetings, conducted thousands of tumultuous elections, formed gigantic labor organizations, and passed, the lawyers and politicians themselves do not know how many laws, without even checking the onward march of that plutocracy we once worshipped and now view with wild alarm. We may not like to confess it, and of course our "leaders" deny the charge, but the fact is that we have failed most ignominiously. Now we must revise the chart and steer another course. We have to. The weather steadily grows worse. We must make port or founder.

Let us look back at the course pursued. First, and most persistently, we have tried the muckraking route. We have had great belief in words and reposed a touching confidence in detectives. We have cursed the rich with every variety of phrase and converted journalism into one gigantic sleuth-school. That has been our idea of teaching sociology, and in what has it resulted? On the one hand, in the choicest collection on record of one-liners, reformers, on the other hand, in a population either reformed with or completely callous to sensation. Man-hunts of the Shaw type, and obscene trials of the Drew-Cammett brand, might have taught some needed lesson years ago. Today they are merely the offal on which the morbid feed. In short, the role of the muckraker as social regenerator, if it ever existed, is today played out.

Thirty years ago, under the impetus of the International Workingmen's Association, from which sprang that extensive organization of labor which at one time threatened to have San Francisco at its mercy, there was a most radical and effective agitation on this Pacific Coast. Today it is forgotten. About that time the Knights of Labor, with a professedly revolutionary but muddled program, were 500,000 strong. Today they are only a memory. Great hopes were based on the American Federation of Labor, which promised to avoid the old centralization mistakes and form a highly-individualized fighting body. Today it is the stronghold of conservatism. With all those movements I myself was actively identified, and my experience, both as a propagandist and a newspaper man, should have taught me something, particularly as to the official rings and policies which invariably developed. Years have ground into my soul one unshakable conviction; viz., that, with very rare exceptions, labor officials and labor politicians cannot see one inch beyond their own immediate interests, and that the bureaucratic machinery is so arranged as to reduce the rank and file to helplessness. The overthrow of plutocracy is obviously as big a job as men can undertake. Like all big jobs it can be put through only by men who go straight to their mark.

Go to any labor mass-meeting, composed of whatever elements you please; with Gompers, Debs, Haywood or any other of the recognized priests as preacher. Always you will hear the same old story, repeated, to my personal knowledge, for the last thirty years. Always you will be told that the worker is in slavery to the capitalist; that the rule of monopoly and money must be overthrown; that the economic revolution is imminent. When you are very young and green you go away convinced, but later you learn a thing or two. You find, for example, that the union walking-delegate is not there to make war on the hated capitalist, but to humor and wheedle him, that the unionists may get jobs. You find that the walking-delegate is usually a political diplomat, and that in the councils he holds while on tour the question is not how capitalism can be best attacked but what candidates and platforms will give least offence to a score of conflicting interests and bring out the biggest vote. Beneath all the fine words that is the end held steadily in view. The one dominant factor is the job.

People write me that mere agitation of fundamental issues, as well as the Mexican Liberal Party conduct it and as the Socialists and Anarchists used to conduct it years ago, is so impractical. Good heavens! What is there of the practical in all the scheming and thimble-rigging to which I have alluded? Have such critics any conception of the real power of the existing system, and do they dream that it can be overthrown by men afraid of lifting so much as a little finger in genuine attack? Do they imagine that Wall Street or the great-landed interests care two-pence about these union business agents, who hand out the cigars and try to curry favor? Does "Big Business" feel that political power is slipping from it when the unions or the Socialist Party get an occasional man into office? The truth is it gladly throws these sons to Cerberus, for labor politicians are the cheapest on the market. In this new Abolition movement the slave-owners and Legrees are on hilariously good terms with the labor concession-hunters, but let a new Garrison arise, shouting from the house-tops that Monopoly must be slain, instantly and at any cost, and see what they will do to him. The Magons and their supporters have been men of that type, and they are in prison. Likewise, plutocracy in Mexico is face to face with a proletarian.

Why This Fight Is Irrepressible.

The following translation from the Spanish of Ricardo Flores Magon, appeared in this English section, Feb. 24, 1912. We reproduce it, because it seems as timely today as when it was written, and because, amid the pulling and hauling of this great struggle, we are apt to forget that the original causes still persist.

The resolute attitude of the people of Mexico in face of threatened intervention by the United States has caused the government of this country to deny emphatically that it has any intention of invading Mexican territory. We do not know to whom this declaration may be sincere. The one thing certain is that the American consuls resident at numerous Mexican points have given their government an account of the profound discontent and great indignation provoked among the people of Mexico by learning that the United States was preparing an army of a hundred thousand men to invade the Mexican Republic and establish a protectorate under the Stars and Stripes.

Well, for the moment the United States will not intervene. But does that fact dispel the danger of foreign intervention in Mexican affairs? The Mexican Revolution, by its economic character, must have, as its necessary result, foreign intervention. If the revolution were solely the result of the political ambitions of the various groups who are contending among themselves for supremacy, the United States and other powers would wait tranquilly the coming of peace, feeling assured that their subjects would continue to exploit the natural wealth of Mexico and the labor of the Mexican proletariat. But this revolution cannot end with the elevation to power of any one of the leaders of the revolutionary bands, just as it did not end with the elevation of Francisco I. Madero to the presidency of the Republic. This revolution will end when each and every one of the inhabitants of Mexico has been made sure of bread, clothing, shelter, education and liberty as the result of the refusal to recognize private property.

Well then, the great natural sources of wealth are in the possession of powerful foreign companies; magnificent estates, forests that are very rich, fine mines, oil deposits that yield abundantly, in addition to great factories and foundries, railways, etc., etc., are all in the foreigner's power. One can say that all Mexico is being exploited by foreigners, who, in the immense majority of cases, made use of franchises obtained under the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz, and often employed violence, to obtain control of the natural wealth of Mexico. By virtue thereof we Mexicans have been reduced to the condition of slaves to the foreign exploiters; we have been left with no other fortune than our bare arms with which to earn the miserable wages our executioners pay us in exchange for the sweat of our brows, our health, our future.

which NEVER will be again the charmingly submissive proletariat it was.

Recently I wrote of Bebel, and said we could not enlarge him. I invite you to look at Germany today, and consider to what impotence time serving tactics have reduced a movement of which Bismarck himself once stood in awe. "Freedom," of London, has a long letter on Bebel's death, by a writer who evidently is well-informed, and, among other things, he says that Bebel was "the coolest and craftiest of politicians;" that "he remained for nearly fifty years at the head of a party, lately grown to be immense; always managing to be on the better side, while this party was rent with internal quarrels, jealousies, etc., all along." To which he adds this passage: "This does away with the legend of the benevolent enthusiast, and to me it really opens glimpses into a life given to party slavery, which to anybody who is not devoted by ambition must have been an ordeal." Bebel never felt any pang over this, it seems. When he wanted a little freedom, he took it as the strictest sketch of future society in his book on "Woman." But all others must be dumb tools to work for the wining party program, or he would be down on them like a slave-driver. He crushed all attempts within his reach to aim at a less authoritarian conception of Socialism; he put his foot on all independent thought, all outbursts of revolutionary feeling. Thus, between Engel's pompous dogmatic pride and Bebel's "practical" policy of risking nothing, abstention from anything that might lead to revolutionary action was erected into a system which Social Democracy is practising in all countries, combining it with the meanest slander of Anarchists, from Proudhon and Bakunin onward to the present day."

I maintain persistently that the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, considered as a revolutionary force presumably devoted to the overthrow of slavery, is one of the most colossal fakes of all the ages. I maintain persistently that the German workingman has become, under the tutelage of that political party, one of the tamest serfs on record. I did not write as cruelly of Bebel as his "Freedom" correspondent, for I had not my facts at hand, but if Bebel was as that correspondent paints him, his career was infamous. To profess revolution while working to prevent it is the basest treachery. To prolong, for the sake of personal ambition, what is probably the most painful transitional period in the history of the race—what cruelty attributed to a Nero or a Caligula is equal to that?

An old soldier has been telling me of his campaigns, and, summing up his experiences with the remark that when men have made up their minds, they cannot stop them. To which he replied that he had expressed in a nutshell my own Revolutionary philosophy. When Americans, Mexicans or any others have made up their minds that life under the present slavery to money is not worth living; when they have become firmly convinced that they have as good a right to use this earth as has any other set of men; when they understand that all the materials for happy life are here and decide to get them or die in the attempt—when they get to that point the fight will have been virtually won. The problem is how to get them to that point. The wish—the burning, all-devouring wish, begotten by intellectual conviction—must be called into existence before the hand will strike. And, inasmuch as that all-devouring wish is not part of the politician's make-up; inasmuch as it does not inspire the walking-delegate or illuminate the union meetings at which the officials collect the dues; inasmuch, indeed, as electing labor representatives and pampering labor officials with salaries has merely brought conservative reaction and lying cowardice in its train, we must turn to other tactics. The Mexican Liberal Party put in years of hard, thankless, dangerous and unflinchingly radical propaganda before a blow was struck. All the world now knows that, somehow or other, the Mexican masses have become afire with discontent.

For my part, I try to study forces, and I believe the revolutionary movement of America, as yet, has not begun to tap the actual forces, or even to set about tapping them in the only way in which they can be tapped. The real force, as it seems to me, is not in organized labor, except for the politicians, to whom it is a nicely rounded-up body of disciplined sheep, handy at elections. The force is not in the well-drilled conservatism of the shops, among workers who think only in terms of jobs, but in the bitter discontent of the masses, and it must be appealed to by two methods; first, by the simple program of equal opportunity, which all can understand, since the instinctive complaint is that the masses are not given a square deal; secondly, by holding up persistently a true and noble picture of a future in which, with monopoly abolished, there will be more than enough for all. If you think that sort of program Utopian, I reply that the results reached in Mexico within three short years have taught you nothing, and that you had better look up the career of that Napoleon whom history has agreed to call "The Great." An eminently practical gentleman, whose periodical addresses to his army were studied with appeals to the highest sentiments, but who was also careful to remind his troops that the looting would be fine. Furthermore, he insisted that the secret of success was to attack and attack quickly. His soldiers adored him because he had the sense to share their hardships.

WM. C. OWEN.

Mexican Notes

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.

With the world for his audience, Victoriano Huerta has blandly informed his Congress that "upon taking charge, BY VIRTUE OF THE LAW of the Presidency of the Republic" he did such and such things. We had understood that he got charge by virtue of a very decidedly illegal unpleasantness, which resulted in the slaughter of Francisco I. Madero and many others.

Huerta stated further, in his semi-annual message, that the presidential election would be held, as scheduled, next month, and added smoothly that he would spare no pains to guarantee that such election should be absolutely fair. With the Carranzistas announcing definitely that they will neither take part in nor recognize it; with Zapata and other well-known leaders mocking it to scorn; with thousands of men throughout the country in arms and the masses always utterly indifferent to the ballot, it is to laugh. On the delicate question of whether he himself will be a candidate the Provisional President preserved a discreet silence, which is tantamounting to Washington. The last heard of Felix Diaz was from Biarritz in the South of France, where he was said to be taking counsel with his uncle, Porfirio. Biarritz is a long way off.

Furthermore, Huerta placidly informed the Powers, and naturally the United States in particular, that the courtesy by which their warships are at present permitted to remain in Mexican ports, for the protection of their citizens, will not be extended after the middle of next month. He added that he had now an army of 100,000 men, and, that thanks to the generosity of foreign bankers—those of France having helped him to the tune of \$30,000,000—he had been able to stock up, quite handsomely with munitions of war. Huerta knew what he was about when he seized the Presidency. He understood that to capture the Government of a country is to get credit from the usurers of all the world.

A Legal Tangle.

The neutrality laws appear, to our lay minds, queer things. Huerta is not recognized by the United States—he complains of it most bitterly—and it would seem as if, in the eyes of our law, he and his government should be non-existent. Yet our bankers are allowed to lend him all the money they care to, although it is fully understood that such money goes into the purchase of arms, and he himself publicly declares that it has done so. It looks to us as if our bankers were conniving at the importation of arms into Mexico, but we should advise them not to lose too much sleep worrying over the danger of being prosecuted. On the other hand, there are numerous Mexicans who are most anxious to get back to their mother country, whether to fight, against the military dictatorship established by Huerta, or to be ready for the American intervention, they are as near at hand. They may well be pardoned, we think, for considering it imprudent to wander about Mexico without having a gun handy, but if they try to pack one across the line Uncle Sam does his best to nab them. This fate seems to have befallen a party described by the papers, with many sensational trimmings, as composed of I. W. W.'s. We are sorry to find our most loyal comrade, J. M. Rangel, named among their number. Few men have suffered more for the revolutionary cause than he has during the last seven years.

From such facts our readers can form, at least, some faint conception of the desperate odds against which the revolutionists must struggle. They can get also some idea of the enormous power of Government, on both sides of the border; and it is obvious that the revolutionary cause would be entirely helpless when handicapped so heavily, were it not that there are powerful influences in its favor. There must be or it could not have survived so long. The main influence is, of course, the bitter discontent of the masses, their traditional hatred of militarism and centralized authority, and their determination to get back the land, possession of which will enable them to support themselves. Huerta may have got together 100,000 men and he may have armed them, with the aid of the foreign Money Power. What he cannot guarantee is their loyalty. The troops turned against Porfirio Diaz; they turned against Madero; they are with Huerta for the moment, and for what there is in it; the main object, we think, in many instances being to get possession of arms. Many a highly-successful guerrilla leader had to thank the Madero government for giving him the start, by furnishing him and his followers with weapons bought with national funds and ammunition fresh from the national arsenals.

Sugar-coating the Pill.

It seems to us that there was humor in Huerta's allusion to the tense-ness of the present position as being "with the government of the United States, although, luckily, not with that people." If he had expressed himself bluntly he would have said: "I know you would like to intervene and drive me out of this; but I also know that your intervention will be most unpopular with the masses in the United States and may lead to the devil of a row." That seems to us about the

true meaning of his polished phrase. Huerta further says that only the States of Sonora and Durango are "at the present totally beyond authority." Last week we pointed out that the Zapatistas had quitte Morelos only to transfer their activity to neighboring States. Thus they scatter their revolutionary propaganda, and, according to the "Los Angeles Times," Zapata has been for two months the head of the I. W. W.'s in Mexico. Well, we have always regarded Zapata as working for "One Big Union" of the Workers, and death on the idle landlords. We are certain, however, that he is not striking for short hours and more pay, and that he does not belong to the type of I. W. W.'s who tells you habitually that the land question does not interest him, his only concern being with the shop.

Last night was the hottest in Los Angeles' record, and today the official thermometer registered 108 in the shade, though the climate-boomers are not advertising the fact. If it is proportionately as hot in the country farther South, we can understand the hull in fighting.

REQUIESCAT IN PACE.

With the deepest regret we have to chronicle the death, after a long and painful illness, of Senora Concepcion A. de Rivera, wife of Librado Rivera, one of the members of the Mexican Liberal Party now imprisoned in the McNeill's Island penitentiary. Mrs. Rivera passed away at 9:30 p. m., Sept. 12, aged 35, leaving a girl and boy, aged respectively 15 and 11. She was for a long time housekeeper for "Regeneracion's" staff, and was universally beloved. Nearly two months ago she was sent to San Gabriel, it being hoped that the change would benefit her; but, although there was temporary improvement, she grew gradually weaker.

We had hoped that it might have been possible for Rivera to be present at the funeral, and President Wilson was so good as to give instructions that he should be released on parole for the purpose of attending. Unfortunately we found it impossible to raise the, to us, considerable sum needed for traveling expenses.

Interment was at San Gabriel, Sept. 17.

BY A NOTED AUTHORITY.

Notice of the excellent lecture on "Mexico," delivered at Blanchard Hall, Sept. 6, by Prof. J. D. Ricardo Uribe, was crowded out last week. No man can speak with greater authority on conditions in that country than can Prof. Uribe, for he was born and brought up there, and for years held highly-important positions, both for large companies and for the government. Since then he has been the best known teacher of Spanish in Los Angeles, and has devoted much time to writings respecting Mexico which are regarded by the best judges as most reliable and scholarly. Prof. Uribe is not a revolutionist, but, in the most emphatic terms, he declared that the struggle in Mexico was not political but economic, having as its eternal basis the ownership of the land by those who cultivate it. The lecture was given in both Spanish and English and was listened to with marked attention.

THUS SLAVEHOLDERS TALK

Mr. James B. Osborne is the author of a pamphlet entitled "The Way to Power," published by the Dominion Executive of the Socialist Party of Canada, which has been sent to us for notice. We think it worth our while to do so, because it reiterates, with the official sanction of the party, that the Mexican Revolutionists have not passed through the economic stages needed to entitle them to Liberty. That was the plea raised originally by Debs in the "International Socialist Review," and today the Socialists habitually insist that a large portion of the world-wide army of Labor is not fit for Freedom. Thus have slaveholders spoken since slavery began.

The agitator who declares that the Mexicans are not ripe for liberty will feel also that the slum disinherited are not, as yet, entitled to struggle for it. On that toboogan he will slide to universal denial of the right to Liberty; and indeed that is precisely the point to which logic is driving the Socialists.

Mr. Osborne is an old offender. More than a year ago he published, from Oakland, Cal., a pamphlet entitled "The Truth About Socialism." We reviewed it in our issue of Aug. 17, 1912, and showed that it was merely an attempt to catch votes for the Socialist Party by the contention that the "Socialist Party platform is but a latter-day version of the Declaration of Independence, and should receive the support of all good Americans." The words quoted are from our own review, for which we received the thanks of more than one Socialist.

For the rest, the present pamphlet is a plea to "organize on the plane of power." Pray, whence comes all economic power? From possession of the land, which is nature's great store and tool house.

SLAVE AGAINST SLAVE.

We have had frequent occasion to criticize the "Appeal to Reason," because false stories and misrepresentation on a subject so serious as the Mexican revolution call for severe rebuke. With all the more pleasure do we applaud the good work it is doing, through the pens of John Kenneth Turner and other correspondents, in its army exposures; an agitation on which all can unite. At the same time we have to insist that the army and the navy are themselves typical of governmental institutions as a whole, since whatever government undertakes becomes immediately honeycombed with corruption and ruled by a soul-destroying hierarchy. There are no exceptions; there cannot be. Examination would show our civil service at Washington, D. C., fully as open to attack as is the army;

nothing could be worse than the conduct of our public jails and lunatic asylums; our postoffice is today a most formidable engine for the suppression of rebellions thought, and will become far more so as this conflict grows more intense. Apart from its own merits, therefore, we welcome the present exposure as an attack on State institutions; as good, Anarchist propaganda.

Appropos of all this, we have before us the manuscript of an excellent article on the recent Seattle outrages, written by Eva Trew. Much has been published already on that subject, and the article is unfortunately too long for us, but the author makes certain points extremely clear. She shows that the speech of the Secretary of the Navy MUST have incited the sailors to their attack on the Socialist and I. W. W. headquarters, inasmuch as he said: "This country has no place for the red flag, nor for any of its followers. We must follow the action of the Mayor of Boston, when he threw the Socialist paraders in jail and found a law to cover the action afterward." That declaration, according to the "Seattle Times," was received with wild applause, the audience "jumping on chairs, waving handkerchiefs and yelling until they were hoarse."

Eva Trew properly remarks that the statute under which Quinlan and many other agitators have been sent to jail should render Secretary Daniels criminally responsible for the rioting that followed, and she gives extracts from Seattle papers to prove that the very crowd which cheered the speaker hysterically trooped along in automobiles to see the fun which followed.

Of course it was a case of one set of miserably-paid and brutally-commanded wage-slaves attacking their fellow slaves; of course as long as this continues plutocracy's privileges are safe; of course unflinchingly radical agitation alone can remedy this deplorable condition. For this Eva Trew pleads, and for this reason we criticize that element in the I. W. W. which wishes to restrict the propaganda to improved conditions in the shop.

We wish to add that, in our judgment, it is useless to waste words on proving that the government—its sailors in this instance—were the first to appeal to force. All government is an appeal to force; and, for our part, we consider the smooth methods of the law FAR more deadly to the people's liberties than is the apparently brutal sword. The sword awakens the fighting instinct of the mass, and thereby seals its own doom. The law, on the other hand, works as religion has always worked—preying on the finer instincts of the mass and winning by specious sophistry its moral support of an infamously immoral code, framed expressly for the upholding of injustice.

VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE

"The Herald of Revolt," London, has done an excellent piece of educational work in getting out a special Voltaireine de Cleyre number. It confesses itself largely indebted for the contents to W. Duff, who contributes a most satisfactory sketch of the career of our deceased comrade. In connection therewith a special appeal is made on behalf of the sale of Voltaireine cuts, at twelve cents each, half of the proceeds to go to the American fund for publishing her works and half to the "Herald of Revolt," which, like all revolutionary papers, is having a hard struggle.

No finer selection for the opening article could have been made than the speech in defence of Emma Goldman, delivered by Voltaireine de Cleyre in 1893. It is a model for propagandists, whether considered as an appeal to the loftiest thought or as an exposure of shams and an example of unflinching logic. It has both breadth and strength, and the pity is that agitation work of that character is all so rare. It is her protest against the imprisonment of a woman for saying to the common people precisely what Cardinal Manning had written in the classic pages of the "Fortnightly Review," viz., that hunger has rights which over-ride all human laws. With admirable skill Voltaireine developed her subject by showing that the arch-rebel, Christ, was imprisoned solely because "the common people heard him gladly," and that Manning could write with safety what only the well-to-do would read, while Emma Goldman became dangerous when New York's Jewish Ghetto was the audience. That is always the test, because, as Voltaireine showed so clearly, while the authorities do not fear the people as they are at present—a mere milling mass—they do fear greatly what the people may become under the influence of intelligent agitation.

Intelligence in itself is not power, but it leads to power, and is the one and only road by which power can be reached. To create that intelligence, therefore, is the agitator's first and sacred duty. It is also that which gives him, or her, the post of greatest responsibility and danger in our cruel social war.

Dogma Should Not Chain Us.

In connection with this we note that our friend the editor of the "Herald of Revolt" has been called sharply to account for his endeavor to read Benjamin R. Tucker out of the ranks of Anarchism, and we are glad to see that he has had the fairness to open his columns to a full discussion of the question. We have expressed ourselves already on the subject, and need only repeat here that Anarchism means exactly what it says, and expresses, "Without Rule" and does not chain humanity to the wheel of any economic dogma. Indeed, it is negative, declaring simply that no economic arrangement can be satisfactory which places one man in the power and at the mercy of another man. If Communism, for example, should result in that, Communism would stand condemned by Anarchism. In this connection our comrade Aldred did so well, we think, to study carefully the following passage from the very speech he publishes. Therein Voltaireine de Cleyre said:

"Miss Goldman is a Communist; I am an Individualist. She wishes to destroy the right of property; I wish to assert it. I make my war upon

privilege and authority, whereby the right of property, the true right in which is proper to the individual, is annihilated. She believes that co-operation should entirely supplant competition; I hold that competition, in one form or another, will always exist, and that it is highly desirable it should. But whether she or I be wrong, or both of us be wrong, of one thing I am sure; the spirit which animates Emma Goldman is the only one which will emancipate the slave from his slavery, the tyrant from his tyranny—the spirit which is willing to dare and suffer."

Perhaps the editor of this section may be allowed to add that he occupies precisely the position Voltaireine de Cleyre describes as being her own, and that he has occupied it for more than twenty years; that he conceives that when this muddled social question clears it will be seen that the true protest is not against poverty but against the social privileges which take away property from the only man entitled to own it, viz. its creator, and that under conditions of equality of opportunity competition will appear as what it really should be, the truest form of co-operation, the one guarantee against monopoly, that emulation which is nature's method of getting the best out of and the best for every human life.

Authoritarianism the For.

Ricardo Mazon is a Communist, but we are sure he is not a dogmatist. We are sure, from his writings, that he places the freedom of the individual first, and above all price, as did Voltaireine de Cleyre. In fact as we read it, the history of the Mexican Revolution has been the history of a Voluntary Communism struggling desperately against invasive governments which have wished to force him to its will; that the Mexican-Indians have grumbled themselves according to their individual needs and inclinations, and that their one vital instinct has been to protest against all authoritarianism that would force them into combinations to which they did not willingly consent. Furthermore, it would be impossible, we think, for any one to live among the most active members of the Mexican Liberal Party, as the writer has lived, without recognizing that their entire life is inspired by the philosophy above described. They are natural rebels against authority, and any one who has had the handling of large bodies of Mexicans will tell you that they are the easiest people in the world to coax and the hardest to drive.

The editor of this section has a horror of "out-and-dried" schemes of social redemption; simply because it is impossible to devise a scheme which a clever defender of the rich cannot riddle all to pieces. On the other hand, society has not yet produced a mind capable of explaining satisfactorily how we benefit by giving some special privileges at the expense of others. That, therefore, seems to him the enemy's vital spot.

ANOTHER WHOPPER.

Last week we accused the "New Times," published at Minneapolis and calling itself the official organ of three separate Socialist bodies, of having uttered two whopping lies respecting the Mexican Revolution. This week we accuse it of uttering a whopping lie about itself, for it declares loudly that it is not a State Socialist organ. "When any one speaks the word State Socialism," it cries indignantly, "demand an explanation and then explain the real status of the term. Let no one take the word Socialism in vain."

State Socialism is the doctrine that the State should run industries and own opportunities at present in the hands of private capitalists. All the talking in the world cannot make out of it anything more or anything less. The "New Times" advocates that, and it is a State Socialist paper. Berger advocates that, openly. Debs advocates that, Jesuitically, drawing all sorts of fine distinctions. The Socialists advocate that throughout the world; but, confronted with the notorious corruption and inefficiency of officialdom, they are trying to make the public believe that their State Socialism is in a class all by itself. In June 29, 1912, we printed a little item which we consider worthy of reproduction. It ran as follows:

"Jean Jaures, recognized leader of French Socialists, has been interviewed on the subject of hard times and rising prices. He says: 'The high cost of living has made life intolerable. The State must step in and save the citizen.' Then these same men roar furiously when you call them State Socialists!"

The agitator can have no more imperative duty than that of nailing these unscrupulous lies and exposing these slippery sophistries. We know there are some pretty straight-thinking men in Minneapolis and we suggest that they go for the "New Times" and its bombastic challenges.

LAND AND LIBERTY.

The first volume of our "Land and Liberty" series is now ready for distribution. It contains 64 pages of reading matter, set solid; three cuts; illustrated cover and some other matter. We believe it is a good and needed work, and we urge all our readers to help in pushing it. We know there are many who would like to be more active in the struggle but do not know exactly how to set about it. Surely this offers them an opportunity, for we put into their hands, at ten cents, a volume they need not be ashamed of distributing among their friends. We are not after money. If we were we should not be offering so much at so small a price. To agents who will make its sale a specialty, and to organizations or others ordering in lots of not less than fifty, we will even cut the price in half, though by so doing we shall be out of pocket.

Send orders to
P. O. Box 1236,
Los Angeles, Cal., U. S. A.