

Is Mexico Really So Helpless?

With intervention trembling in the balance, the people of the United States are seeking information respecting the Mexican Revolution as hitherto they have not sought it. They realize, at last, that any moment may plunge them into war, and that the war may not be of that walk-over character their natural self-confidence has pictured. Gradually there has crept into their consciousness the suspicion that, although this country has a fleet with which Mexico cannot pretend to cope, the war will not be one of fleets, since Mexico, like Russia, is not dependent on her foreign traffic. Gradually they are learning that though their armies may march into Mexico City and a few other places of importance, Mexico's life, again like that of Russia, does not lie in her cities. They begin to understand also that Mexico is no longer an unarmed country; and that, although her federal army may be a thing to scoff at, the existence of countless peons, with rifles in their hands and a determination to use them after the most approved guerrilla method, is not to be dismissed with a contemptuous laugh. They are acquiring some slight knowledge of Mexico's scorching wastes and rocky mountain fastnesses. The contemplated enterprise grows more serious the more closely it is inspected, and it is to be hoped most ardently that if Mr. Hearst finally induces us to tackle the job, we shall be treated to the inspiring spectacle of Mr. Hearst himself marching in the ranks.

The reflective pause has come, and with it a desire for genuine information. We are not content to trust the spread-eagle Hearsts or that more solid element of which Otis is typical. It is comprehended that they themselves are keenly interested, and a brisk demand for facts is springing up. The public questions whether Mexicans are giving up their lives and enduring incalculable hardships because they are quarrelsome cusses who would rather fight than eat. That is not the character common to agricultural peoples, and we are disposed to look for other reasons. Knowing what we know about our modern trusts, and understanding that the Rothschilds, Standard Oil, the Guggenheims, Tobacoco, Rubber, Sugar and what not, stepped across the border long ago, to plunge their talons into Mexico's comparatively virgin wealth, we will not bolt unquestioningly the invitation to fly to the relief of the horny-handed American settler, who has cleared his few poor acres by the strength of his own right arm, and is being ousted by rapacious peons. That plea smacks too strongly of the old, anti-slavery gag respecting the widow and her solitary slave; a gag worked to death in its day, but without the slightest effect on subsequent developments. In a word, we want to know, and that spells great advance.

It is not possible to attend to the varied details of "Regeneration's" propaganda and spend much time outside the office. Nevertheless I still cling to a habit of passing a part of each day down town, chatting with a miscellaneous acquaintance. I wish all our sympathizers could do likewise; presuming, of course, that they have taken the trouble to master elemental facts and are prepared to talk intelligently. I wish they could stir abroad; find out for themselves how keen is the desire for information, and how quickly the ordinary man sees a new light when faced with such facts as those in which this section habitually deals. When reformers were eloquent over our well-meaning President's desire to bring about a fair election in Mexico, I present them with the old statement that Madero, in all his glory, coaxed less than twenty thousand Mexicans into voting for him. They are thunder-struck, and another rosy-hued illusion goes glimmering, never to return. When I tell them that the "Times" special correspondent recently found 18,000 well-armed men grouped around Zapata alone, they are apt to walk away shaking their heads, and I believe they read their next day's Hearst editorial through different-colored spectacles. The Mexican question has been dragged into general discussion and I am convinced that the demand for reform is really there. The pity of it is that we are in no position to supply the market; that there are not enough of us who know; that too many of us have been content, as always, to be led by our emotions and have been too mentally indolent to dig into the facts. When serious issues are at stake emotional talk does not convince.

We have constant call for articles. Almost every mail brings copies of, or clippings from papers dealing with various phases of the Mexican question from, standpoints which astonish me by reason of the instinctive insight they display. Many of these papers we never heard of; others carry articles which, considering their known character, fill me with surprise. For example, our great local Christian Scientist, Senator Works, has been yelling for intervention, yet "The Christian Science Monitor" of Nov. 12 published a really exhaustive review, which concluded with the declaration that peace will be restored only with the "distribution of land to the poor." It tabulates the strength of the various parties in the field, and, although I cannot pretend to say how accurate the estimate may be, the article appears to be so well informed that I am inclined to give it more than ordinary credit. It declares that "the Zapata party, or peon party, includes the bulk of the nation and many idealists who are supporting it from many parts of the world." As for the Mexican Liberal Party—or "Flores Magon Party," as the writer prefers to call it—the criticism is that it "in-

cludes the radical, energetic, aggressive, awakened Mexican workers, who have been in the United States." You may be surprised to hear that this writer considers that the Zapatistas constitute fifty-five per cent of the population and the Magonists possibly fifteen per cent. That leaves a meager thirty per cent for all the others; Catholics, Constitutionalists, in my personal opinion, the difference between the Zapatistas and the Magonists, both of which parties draw exclusively from the peon element, is the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. I can see no earthly difference between them. Moreover, reason why they should not work hand in glove, and believe that, if they are not doing so today, they will be tomorrow. If they are really seventy per cent of the population they are quite a bunch, and that again flings a suggestive light on intervention. Those men are pretty certain to put up a fight, and again my dreams are troubled by the specter of William Randolph Hearst exposing his venerable person to the hail of bullets.

Judging from our exchanges it seems that Hearst has overplayed his part, and that his clamor for intervention has brought us lots of friends. The man is distrustful most profoundly. All sorts of editorial writers are pointing out that he is not only interested directly in huge Mexican properties, but that he is habitually a heavy borrower, and that, therefore, when Wall Street pulls the strings he has to dance. The American Federation of Labor, in its denunciation of him in the most scathing terms for endeavoring to plunge the nation into war. We should be grateful but I myself expected it, for Gompers and his fellow leaders are not to be hoodwinked into the delusion that the American worker is dying to chase his Mexican brother off plutocracy's preserves, incidentally giving up his life to do so. Even the American labor press, often the most narrowly hide-bound of all, is falling into line, and had we the space, we could begin at last to quote from it freely. The Socialist papers have been almost as backward, but nothing could be better, as a summary of the situation, than the short quotation we take from last week's "California Social Democrat," which itself took it from the "New York Call." As for the W. V. papers, the lengthy extract given from last week's "Wooden Shoe" speaks for itself. Who the writer was I do not know, but he could not possibly have penned that article without having devoted much study and reflection to the question. There is plenty of thought now stirring, and the thought will lead to study, which is all we who are pleading for Mexico are entitled to demand. We may not all be able to afford turkey this Thursday, but we shall offer up devout thanks for the progress registered. WM. C. OWEN.

WILL YOU FIGHT FOR THE TRUSTS?

Certain Trusts have an agreement with the Federalists; certain other Trusts have an agreement with the Constitutionalists; and certain Trusts have agreements with both of them. Certain Trusts attempted to make an agreement with the Zapatistas. The Federalists and the Constitutionalists are fighting each other to the last breath. Trusts have conflicting interests; hence the War of the Trusts. But beneath it all is the economic revolution, the struggle of the despised peon to get back the land. The bandits, the guerrillas, the agricultural peons, are units in the economic revolution. The Mexican government is trying with all its might to put down the uprising of the peons. These peons were opposed to Porfirio Diaz, Felix Diaz, Madero, and are now opposed to Huerta. They are fighting Authority, Government, and Law. Always fighting Authority, always fighting Government, always fighting Force of the Master Class. Its material is not who sits upon the throne of Mexico, he represents Authority, and the peon hates him and fights him. It matters not what the form of government, the peon hates it and fights it. Always against the government. What is government? The will of a master class upon a slave class. The peon knows that. As for the peon who, by force of circumstances or otherwise, is on one side and then on the other, fighting for a Master in the contending forces of government, he too is always fighting Government and the will of a Master Class. Always fighting Authority, and Government, and Law, and Tyrants. Is there a man opposed to slavery who will not fight a master? Direct action and sabotage are the weapons of the enlightened peon. Though he be fettered and uneducated, he knows that he is a slave and that the Ruling Class and the Working Class have nothing in common. This by no means applies to all peons. Many, many of them are sunken in superstition and reverence for Authority, the Church, and the Master Class; but millions are aiding and fighting in the economic revolution. They want the land that was stolen from them, they want to till the soil and reap the full product of their labor, they want the restoration of a social system which for centuries gave them peace and plenty and happiness. Millions of peons have been torn from their homes, brutally assaulted, sold into exile, and their lands turned over to American, European, and Japanese capitalists, and many concessions in industries producing enormous revenues have been turned over to parasites who toil not and have never even seen their own possessions.

The peon wants to work for himself and not for a master. And you have given him no credit for that? A multitude of blind patriots are awaiting the signal to spring upon Mexico. What harm did the Mexican workingman ever do to the American workingman? Why should the workingmen rush at each other's throats? One hears the American workingman boast that he is going to Mexico to fight for his country. His country! It is to laugh! The workingman who owns a foot of land in the United States holds it

only by the grace of the Master Class. The average workingman owns only the clothes on his back, and the clothes are shoddy. The American who goes down to Mexico "to fight for his country" is going to fight for the International Bankers. If he lose a leg or an arm, the bankers will not buy him another one. The working class by the production of wealth pays all the bills for all the wars. The Capitalists reap the benefits. And the International Bankers represent the Trusts—Wool, Tobacco, Sugar, Fruit, Mines, Agriculture, Real Estate, Railroads, Manufactures, etc. Are you going to fight for the Trusts?—"The Wooden Shoe."

REVOLUTIONARY CURRENTS.

Undated of November 12, "The Christian Science Monitor" published an article entitled "How Parties in Mexico Divide," which purports to be by a former high official now in exile. We refer to it editorially, but think it worthy of more extended comment, if only because it brings out clearly certain points we ourselves continually endeavor to explain.

Whether or no the writer is correct in conceding the Zapatistas fifty-five per cent of the total strength of all parties we cannot pretend to judge, but he is assuredly right in saying that it is a peon party and that it never will make peace with the Constitutionalists, who twice suspended constitutional guarantees against it, burning its towns and otherwise inflicting injuries which will not be forgotten. The writer says further that the Constitutionalists have been swelling their ranks by pretending alliance with Zapata, and that such ranks are full of men who yield Carranza only the flimsiest allegiance, since they are merely using his party for their own individual or social ends. He instances the Yaquis; who, he says, are Magonistas or Zapatistas, as occasion serves. The example of the 3,000 who recently took possession of lands along the Yaqui River promised them by Maytorena, Constitutionalist governor of Sonora, is a most significant case in point. We gave full particulars in our issue of Nov. 8, under the heading, "Direct Action." The writer in question also expresses the strongest opinion that, however fine a showing they may make for the moment, the Constitutionalists have no permanent strength. That has been our opinion throughout. Their leaders are Maderistas under another name, who somehow have got together the means to equip a following. But that following is today very largely independent of them; demands changes far more revolutionary than the half-measures of its chiefs, and is in a position to enforce them. Probably a good illustration of this is afforded by the land divisions that are being enforced in Tamaulipas and Nuevo Leon; a subject with which we dealt extensively several weeks ago.

Against all these rebellious and intrinsically Anarchal forces the Catholics and Federalists are fighting for their lives. The writer evidently thinks the latter extremely weak, for he states that their army is composed of three elements: (1) Old timers; very few. (2) Zapatistas, enlisted formerly. (3) Former revolutionists who considered Huerta one of them, and stand by him today chiefly because they have no use for the Constitutionalists, considering that they are only attempting to revive Maderism.

Mediation, in the opinion of this critic, must be resorted to eventually, but he is most emphatic in asserting that the Mexicans will not accept the mediation of the United States—"no, not even for a moment." He suggests that the South American governments might come to an agreement to that end, bringing pressure to bear on the various revolutionary leaders and hammering out certain general propositions on which all could unite.

That seems to us infinitely more sensible than the solutions offered from this side of the border, whether those solutions be the ballot-box proposals of President Wilson, or the bayonet urgings of the martial (for others) Hearst. There might be a chance, at least, of obtaining a tribunal that would have some knowledge of and sympathy with Mexico's needs and aspirations. The average United States politician and editor has neither, and, in the eyes of Mexico, our government is regarded as merely the tool of rapacious Wall Street. Our own contemporary literature gives ample warrant for that opinion.

HOW ABOUT OUR PEONS?

Under the head of "Anarchy in Mexico," that influential German daily the "Frankfurter Zeitung," under date of Oct. 31, gives a long review of conditions in Mexico; drawing, as might be expected, the conclusion that only the iron hand can bring back lasting peace. Naturally it does not ask whether such a peace will be what the masses want; just as it will never ask whether the peaceful German workingman, living on the slops from the rich man's table and ordered here and there every moment of his existence, has any right to be contented. It is the more significant that such a paper admits that in Mexico the "necessity of land reform is publicly acknowledged on every side," and that no government will be able to endure which does not understand and act accordingly.

If the Mexican Revolution were to come to an end tomorrow—which it will not—it would have done a mighty work, for it has forced on the attention of a thoughtless world the imperative necessity of putting an end to speculation in and monopoly of real estate. The game is getting a black eye everywhere, but it will take more than the mere example of Mexico to kill it in Los Angeles. Our own make-a-terrific-roar before things on this side of the border will begin to move. Won't somebody, please, stir up the unemployed?

If he who cannot reason is a fool; he who will not reason is a knave; he who dare not reason is a slave.

The Men in Jail.

In addition to the \$61.10 received from "Grupo Amor Libre," San Francisco, the Rangel-Cline Defense Fund reports the receipt of the following: Redlands, Cal., Kindscher and Leon, \$2; Fowler, Colo., Condrola, 25c; Duarte, 50c; Grajeda, 25c; Cardine, 35c; Martinez, 25c; Ramirez, 10c; Gonzalez, 50c; Estrada, 50c; Alvarez, 25c; Andrade, 25c; Cortinez, 20c; Tufkin, Tex., Morin, \$1; Mrs. Shie, Los Angeles, \$2. This gives a total received by the Fund to date of \$136.45. The editor of this section is in repeated receipt of amounts sent to him personally, which, as previously explained, are turned in immediately to the "Regeneracion" fund for the defense of the Texas prisoners, and acknowledged in the Spanish section. Amounts intended expressly for the Rangel-Cline Defense Fund should be directed to Victor Cravell, P. O. Box 1891, Los Angeles, Cal. Both funds are devoted to the same purpose.

By correspondence we learn of \$10 having been sent from the International Workers' Defense League in San Francisco, and \$9 from the same source in St. Louis. All such moneys are remitted to Vincent St. John, Chicago, to be expended for the Texas prisoners.

At present money is coming in very slowly, but it is perhaps too early to expect substantial results from organizations and distant points.

The San Antonio Defense Committee is finding itself in great difficulties with the legal authorities. The manifesto published by Mexican comrades at San Marcos, Texas, has been taken seriously by the authorities, and J. A. Hernandez, secretary of the San Antonio Defense Committee, has been arrested, for complicity in its publication, as we understand. We have received San Antonio papers with enormous headlines as to the "wildspread conspiracy," with Mexican agitators at head, and with "Industrial Workers involved," to "set free smugglers," etc., etc. The assistant secretary, Eustasio Garcia, is also in jail. Originally arrested on a charge of murderous assault he was discharged for lack of evidence and arrested immediately on a charge of carrying a concealed weapon. Those acquainted with Texas will understand how such an offense shocks the public conscience. According to our correspondence others connected with the committee's work find it impossible to make headway against the pressure brought to bear by the local authorities, and we understand from the editors of the Spanish section of "Regeneracion" that, under the circumstances prevailing for the moment, they have notified sympathizers that it will be best to remit moneys direct to this office. The Texas papers have been making all the sensation possible out of the San Marcos manifesto and the arrests mentioned above, and report the grand jury as having investigated the litigation sent out from Los Angeles by the Rangel-Cline Defense Fund. According to the papers it seems to have been struck most forcibly by the general criticism of the so-called administration of justice in Texas, so notorious for its lynchings and other barbarous survivals.

We repeat emphatically what we endeavor to explain in all our correspondence, viz., that these Texas cases are of the very utmost importance to the Labor and Revolutionary world; for the following reasons: (1) Texas was taken by force of arms from Mexico, and today swarms with Mexicans, employed by the thousands in the cotton fields and at other productive occupations, in which they coin wealth for their employers. (2) As a natural consequence racial prejudice always runs high, for it pleases many Texans of the employing class to consider the Mexican as on a par with the negro, and all the world knows what that signifies in Texas. (3) This racial prejudice, so narrow and unjust, has been stimulated incalculably by the constant fighting across the border. (4) Under these conditions every man and woman possessed of the smallest particle of common sense will understand that Mexican prisoners are likely to fare badly at the hands of Texas justice. Even if the men in prison were hitherto unknown workers in the cause of Labor such conditions would compel us, in all honor, to stand by them, as we have stood by many others who until their imprisonment were quite unknown. As a matter of fact several of the men in prison have records of which any battler for the cause of emancipation might well be proud.

Time slips by quickly, and within less than two months, the eleven still untried will be facing the San Antonio court. We trust, therefore, that our friends will see the necessity of coming to the assistance without delay.

Mexican Notes

Reports concerning the Federal attempt to recapture Juarez have been most conflicting, but the majority of despatches represent Villa, in command of the Constitutional forces, as having driven back the enemy at every point with heavy losses; most of them also depicting the Federal army as in desperate plight, unable to retreat safely either to the North or South. "The Los Angeles Times," however, in this writing, Nov. 28, still represents Villa as threatened by a large Federal force south of Juarez, and declares, on the reports of correspondents who went carefully over the field after the battle, which was the largest yet recorded in the campaign against Huerta, that the Fedally rumored.

Villa is reported as importing large quantities of provisions for his troops and as declaring that he will advance on Chihuahua as soon as the trains are loaded. An El Paso despatch dated Nov. 27 represents him as having captured unexpectedly a fourth federal troop train of ten cars, bearing five cannon and a quantity of ammunition. There seems to be no doubt that his gains in that direction have been heavy, and that conditions must be

such as to lead to a great demoralization of the enemy. Heavy fighting was reported, Nov. 27, near Saltillo, Coahuila, and a Mexico City despatch of that date stated that a train containing 300 federal soldiers had been blown up with dynamite, all perishing either directly or at the hands of the rebels.

Washington despatches of the same date were to the effect that there was increased unrest throughout Mexico, which was taken as evidence that Huerta's reign was nearing its close. State Department despatches were said to confirm the current reports that foreign representatives resident with their consuls stationed at different points, warning the subjects of in Mexico City had communicated their respective countries to prepare for emergencies and leave the country.

Hale has returned to Washington, but Lind has gone to Tampico, with Rear Admiral Fletcher, to investigate conditions in those most precious of all foreign possessions, the oil fields. Great Britain now has warships stationed off Tampico and Puerto Mexico, which is the terminus of the Tehuantepec railroad, a Pearson property.

Eager for Mexican Blood.

Four special Salt Lake Railroad trains are reported at this writing, Nov. 28, as being held in readiness in Salt Lake City for the immediate transportation to the border of the Twentieth United States infantry. Our daily papers have been having a little fit of hero-worship caused by the fact that a grandson of Gen. Grant has gone into the army—that he may fight in Mexico. Has the young gentleman satisfied his intelligence or conscience as to the rights and wrongs of the Mexican question? He has not. All he knows is that there is likely to be killing and he does not want to miss it.

The British Minister in Mexico City has notified British residents to report at the legation, for the furtherance of a plan of mutual defense in which natives of other European countries are participating.

Emiliano and Rufino Zapata are reported as again exceptionally active in Morelos and adjoining States. When we went to press a week ago that highly inflammable material, oil, was threatening to bring about at any moment an intervention conflagration. The Constitutionalists were in possession of the Tampico fields, United States warships were expected to land marines for the protection of the menaced property, a British squadron was reported as steaming for the scene of danger. The situation was relieved by a message from Gen. Aguilar, sent in reply to Admiral Fletcher's notification that, for the moment, the property was safe and the intervention postponed.

"Le Temps," of Paris, noted for its comments on foreign affairs, had a shrewd article, Nov. 21, in which it pointed out that Huerta's course in the armed forces was "an intervention on a constitutional basis, my attitude being to guard the interests of all foreign and domestic oil corporations in the territory I occupy, fulfilling in this manner the demands of civilization and not being governed by caprice or vengeance." Nov. 21 Secretary Bryan informed the British ambassador at Washington that a naval demonstration in Mexican waters would be considered as an unfriendly act on the part of Great Britain, and orders cancelling the voyage from the Barbadoes to Vera Cruz were issued.

"Le Temps," of Paris, noted for its comments on foreign affairs, had a shrewd article, Nov. 21, in which it pointed out that Huerta's course in the armed forces was "an intervention on a constitutional basis, my attitude being to guard the interests of all foreign and domestic oil corporations in the territory I occupy, fulfilling in this manner the demands of civilization and not being governed by caprice or vengeance." Nov. 21 Secretary Bryan informed the British ambassador at Washington that a naval demonstration in Mexican waters would be considered as an unfriendly act on the part of Great Britain, and orders cancelling the voyage from the Barbadoes to Vera Cruz were issued.

Oil Not the Only Interest.

If this be true, the investment seems to us a bad one. Doubtless there is a bitter struggle between rival oil magnates, but that is only one phase of the general conflict now enveloping the whole of Mexico. There are many interests there besides those of oil, and underneath the entire upheaval, and acting as the primary disturbing force, is the battle of the peasants for possession of the land. For example, one does not hear of Zapata in connection with this oil field struggle, or the troubles in Mexico City. He and his followers are in practical possession of whole States, and they may well be content to feed on the new domain they have wrested from the former monopolists.

"The London Outlook" comments bitterly on the attitude of the United States toward Mexico, claiming that the interests are determined on intervention, and that "there is in busy preparation, if certain forces can accomplish it, a crime against civilization, against humanity," which will involve the "slaughter of tens of thousands of young Americans and half-armed peasants, the devastation of humble towns and rude countryside, the sufferings of the helpless and the innocent and the outpouring of millions of money." It claims that the United States has been busily stealing territory from its neighbors for the last sixty years, and using the Monroe Doctrine, "which means anything it is required to mean," for the purpose of reducing weak States to dependence. It foresees a near-by day when "Jim Smith of Virginia will be cutting the throat of Leon Ramirez of Morelos in the sacred name of the oil trusts and the band of Wall Street hyenas." It has been our persistent assertion that the Mexican Revolution

ultimately would compel the world to think into social problems as it has not thought for many a decade. We submit that facts already are proving the truth of that assertion, and that Mexico is today making the most powerful anti-capitalist and anti-military propaganda we have had for years.

Under date of Nov. 23, the "Los Angeles Times," which for long past has given enormous space to Mexican affairs, published a map showing the present military situation in Mexico. The border States of Sonora, Chihuahua and Coahuila, together with Durango and Morelos, were represented as entirely in rebel hands, the Federals holding only five towns of any importance in all that enormous area. South of Puebla, which itself lies South of Mexico City, the country was pictured as still under Federal control; but in that territory is included Oaxaca, where the Indians are most warlike and rebellious, and Yucatan, which more than a year ago was the scene of continued uprisings, being one of the Republic's most brutally slave-ridden States.

Huge Forces in the Field.

Going into great detail and computing the forces massed at different points, it represents the rebels of various factions as having now 84,880 armed men in the field. Against these the government figures amount to only 38,735, and it is notorious that those forces consist largely of commandeered men, whose fidelity is open to the gravest doubt. The outlook for Huerta does not appear brilliant, but the total gives may serve to warn those who are treating the task of intervention as a light one, it being certain that the total of 122,615 would combine instantly against the common foe, and that their number would be increased greatly by volunteers who stand as yet aloof.

Ten United States warships are today in Gulf of Mexico waters, and four are watching Mexico's western coast.

Carranza has gone from Magdalena to Ixmiquilpan, his proposed provisional Capital. He is reported as having declared that henceforth the war in Mexico would be without quarter. Negotiations with Hale seem to have been abandoned permanently.

Following the capture of Victoria, capital of Tamaulipas, the Constitutionalists are reported as marching on Tampico, the surrender of which they have demanded. Their strength is estimated at 9000.

Villa declares that in attacking Chihuahua he will have, at least, 12,000 men, bringing 3,000 from Torreon and 7,000 from Juarez.

AS CHESTERTON SEES IT

The northern part of America is tranquil (but for a nigger roasted here and there), but it is tranquil not because there is no tyranny, but because there is no rebellion. It is possible that many good Presidents have been shamefully shot in South American Republics. But it is equally obvious that many eminent financiers have been shamefully and indifferently left unshot in the North American Republic. In small democracies, it may be that suspicion rises too swiftly, that scandal is too riotous and reckless, as it is in any free village. We may admit that there may be too much mistrust in Nicaragua. But few will deny that there is too much Trust in New York. According to the ordinary human, healthy, heathen, common sense of things, the case of North America is infinitely more awful; streets full of men dead is not so frightful a vision as one of the millionaires mildly alive. Doubtless the South Americans must be asked in judgment for the lives of the men they have slaughtered; and even the North Americans will have a good many black and red men to answer for. But when the North Americans are asked about the men they have not slaughtered, I wonder what excuse they will have to offer.

We have the main fact established. Apparently Southern nations revolt, and Northern nations do not. The only problem is: what is the reason? Is it because there are no real tyrannies in Glasgow and Chicago? Or is it because there are no liberties there? Is it because the yoke in the Essex flats has reached the highest stature and fullest fruition of humanity? Is it because the clerk in Chislehurst has had all his heart's desire? Or is it because (as I sometimes fancy) they have been so stunted in their stature and so starved in their desire that they cannot remember their rights, and so cannot resent their wrongs? Are we really above riots—or below them? (G. K. Chesterton, in "Illustrated London News").

IN MEXICO AND ELSEWHERE.

If we are all here by the equal permission of the Creator, we are all here with an equal title to the enjoyment of His bounty—with an equal right to the use of all that nature so impartially offers. This is a right which vests in every human being as he enters the world, and which, during his continuance in the world, can be limited only by the equal rights of others. There is in nature no such thing as a fee simple in land. There is on earth no power which can rightfully make a grant of exclusive ownership in land. If all existing men were to unite to grant away their equal rights, they could not grant away the right of those who follow them. For what are we but tenants for a day? Have we made the earth that we should determine the rights of those who after us shall tenant it in their turn? The Almighty who created the earth for man and man for the earth, has entailed it upon all the generations of the children of men by a decree written upon the constitution of all things—a decree which no human action can bar and no prescription determine. Let the parchments be ever so many, or possession ever so long, natural justice can recognize no right in one man to the possession and enjoyment of land that is not equally the right of all his fellows.—(Henry George.)

GREAT REVOLUTIONISTS

"The New Review," advertising itself as a monthly review of international Socialism, published in New York, is no less contemptuous of Socialism and is supposed to represent the flower of Socialist scholarship in the United States. As such we always read it, and the first thing we note in the November number is a protest by the board of Directors, as such and as members of the Socialist Party. The review, it appears, has been excommunicated; the Central Committee of Local New York having, to quote the protest's exact words, "promulgated an order forbidding the Branches of the Local from selling or distributing the New Review at public or propaganda meetings." Closing its November pages with this protest, the "New Review" opens then with an article entitled "The Coming German Revolution." By Charles Rappoport, of Paris; the second paragraph of which tells us that "the Social Democracy never fears criticism, self-criticism. It knows that life will ebb in any party that does not dare to think and to tell its faults aloud." If that were true one would have to remark that Socialism in Germany is very different from Socialism in the United States. As a matter of fact it is not true.

In our opinion the proof is overwhelming that the whole article is false. To say that the Social-Democratic Party is "an invincible fighting force" and that "it is in the vanguard of conquering an entire country" is a lie. To say that it has won, "undeniable advantages for the proletariat—an appreciable increase of wages, shorter working hours and better conditions," is a lie. The position of the German proletariat, in spite of all these years of organizing and parliamentary effort, is shameful, and we do not believe that there ever was a time when it was completely under the heel of authority and privilege as it is today. The real tragedy, however, is that the German proletariat is not only economically, but mentally and spiritually enslaved. Around him all Europe is seething with a new and true spirit of revolt. He alone remains the willing slave of discipline; welcoming the "verboten" (forbidden) that clips and prunes his life on every side, degrading him from a man into an authority-ridden machine; taking without a murmur the paltry crumbs of consolation his official leaders think it worth their while to throw him.

The evidence on this head is overwhelming. That German life today is tied hand and foot in official tape is the universal testimony of foreign investigators, and the thing that strikes them most forcibly is that the German proletariat apparently has been drilled into that abject state of mind which actually kills it. In his aversion to show how unfair are the election laws—a really ridiculous people would have rectified them long ago—Mr. Rappoport gives away the whole case, writing: "The German ministers are not even responsible to the Parliament. The young men are the masters of the country. Militarism is all-powerful. It means international peace. Religious education is imposed upon the public schools. For the crimes of lese-majeste and of the press the judges mete out sentences of hundreds of years imprisonment." We submit that there we have the true story; more reliable than the talk of the idealism and the absolute unconcernedness of its (the party's) leaders, in which Mr. Rappoport indulges.

PROTEST MEETING.

Sunday, Dec. 7 at the Plaza; 2:30 p. m. There will be a special rally of radical and revolutionary forces, to lay before the public the true facts concerning our fourteen comrades now imprisoned in Texas, and to collect funds for their adequate defense. Use this intervening week in notifying your friends, so that we may have a bumper meeting and collection, the whole of which may go to the prisoners, no tribute being paid to landlords.

THE MAJORITY DELUSION.

In England a prominent English statesman declares that it is impossible to give women the suffrage, since there is such a vast majority of men, and would the British Empire. In Ireland the Protestant "Ulstermen" threaten armed rebellion against Home Rule, declaring it would mean their subjugation to the Roman Catholic majority. In Washington, D. C., this nation's official capital, the population has no vote, because the negroes happen to be in the majority. Today, with the South in the official saddle, the color question is coming up as it never did before, for the white man does not intend to be ruled by the black, even if the latter can out-vote him.

It is a great thing, this superstition that counts of noses can determine right and wrong, and that life itself may be left solely to that count. Unfortunately also it is the quicksand on which the entire governmental system of the United States reposes, if you think that word suitable. To the Socialist it is the Rock of Ages, the Holy of Holies, or any other symbol of sanctity that may suggest itself. To be a good Socialist you must be ready to swallow smilingly the monstrous doctrine that the majority is always right, and that, through the rules and regulations passed by its legally elected representatives, the universe will be governed with the wisdom of the infinite. Think it over, and ask the next "scientific" socialist spell-binder who visits you about it. Pump it into him when he talks about Freedom, and ask him what show an Anarchist would have under Victor Berger, or an I. W. W. with a Gompers majority in full control of all the means of life.

How would it be to start an American Land League, with the motto: "We will not be sold out by priests or politicians." But, to live up to it would be the devil of a task.