

No. 184.  
Saturday, April 11, 1914.Caught In The Net  
Of Money Jesuitry

As one approaches the central buildings the first inscription that catches the eye is "Leland Stanford Jr. Museum." Henceforth that name greets one at every turn. By a large and charming grassy oval, dominated by a statue labelled "Faith," one passes to the departments of Zoology, Physiology and Physics; wherein, presumably, researches are conducted on the principle of discarding faith and trusting to experiment alone. Next comes a graven tablet which reads: "Memorial arch to memory of Leland Stanford, Jr. Born to mortality May 14, 1868; passed to immortality March 13, 1894." Through this one enters Memorial Court, disfigured by a hideous group representing the late Senator and Mrs. Stanford and their son, which brings one to "Memorial Church, erected to the glory of God and in loving memory of my husband, Leland Stanford." Frescoes and painted windows, which tell the story of Christ, leap to the eyes from every side.

What an extraordinary psychology! What a pitiful attempt to compromise with truth and teach a science that shall be cramped at every step by the shell of withered dogmas! The whole fabric founded on the stealings of a man who was the champion corruptionist of a society and generation that recognized only one code—"Get money, at any cost!" The whole institution governed, until a few months ago, by a scientist whose reputation rests on his teaching of Darwinism in its crudest and most materialistic form! What on earth can Prof. Starr Jordan have had in common with these Christs and angels; these spiritualistic and evangelistic mottoes? I cannot conceive him as passing to and fro about his daily task without a constant sneer upon his lips. I lose myself also in wondering conjecture as to the effect on his own character, and those of the young beneath his charge, of such appalling Jesuitry.

Stanford University has some two thousand students, about a quarter of whom are girls. The girls, they tell me, regard it mainly as offering a promising field for matrimonial adventures, though a certain number of the well-to-do expect to acquire a literary polish which has an acknowledged social value, while a small minority is bent on passing examinations by which it will qualify for teacherships. The boys are there for similar commercial reasons; their devotion to law, medicine, chemistry or other special studies, being generated by their desire to catch in after years, as easily as possible, the nimble dollar. The tail of commercialism is over all of it, according to the sad testimony of idealists whom I interviewed; and with such a percentage, and such a philosophy of life, it could not be otherwise. Men cannot gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. Youth cannot be enthused with love of learning for learning's sake when urged unceasingly to follow the example of a Stanford. The student will not venture from the safe path of orthodoxy while walking daily amid surroundings that preach respectability as the highway to success. When later life forces him into contact with the social struggle, it is easy to forecast the commercially-calculated role he will assume. The Stanford millions and the Stanford traditions will have done their work.

Palo Alto is the university town. The audience that patronized my lecture on "The Mexican Revolution" numbered about fifty, three of whom were Stanford students; but it listened attentively, asked many questions and bought all the literature I had. Unluckily it was vacation week, but the town was full of students, and I doubt if the result would have been materially different had term been on. Of necessity our universities have to make use of text-books which bristle with promptings to revolt, for our great educational are also our great revolutionary writers. Of necessity they have to teach science, and to conduct laboratory experiments which laugh out of court the bible's fairytales. But the spirit of the age is infinitely stronger than are the text-books, and that spirit is commercial;

meanly commercial. It teaches youth that its first duty is to itself; that it must "get on in life," and that it can get on most easily by swimming with the tide and catering ignobly to the powers that be. Thus it trains our nation's future rulers.

The university owns, as I am informed, 10,000 acres, the revenue from which is devoted to providing education for a class that can well afford to pay its own bills. There are many who protest because a large proportion of the money comes from the manufacture of wines and spirituous liquors, but that seems to me an insignificant objection. What I recognize, however, as fundamental is that the whole thing rests on land monopoly, represents in its origin wealth acquired by fraud and implies in its maintenance a continuous robbery of labor. From such foul sources no pure stream can flow.

WM. C. OWEN.

## Why They Hate Us

Prof. Frederick Starr, professor of anthropology at the University of Chicago, knows Mexico as few Americans do; for he has visited it repeatedly and lived among the peons, as one of them. Recently he gave out for publication the article we print below. Observe the emphasis he lays on the land question, and the Mexican conviction that we are exploiting them. What else have we been urging in "Regeneracion" for more than three years past? The article follows.

Anti-Americanism is a reality in Mexico! We Americans are hated as a people, we are hated as a nation.

Why do the Mexicans hate us? Primarily and fundamentally because they are Spanish-Indian, while we are Anglo-Saxon. Our characteristics are profoundly different. Our ways of looking at things are different. We despise the Mexicans, because they differ from us; they hate us because we differ from them.

We have sent them quantities of adventurers who have gone there to "show them how to do things." They think everything in Mexican methods is a mistake; they will introduce real American methods.

But in a thousand ways American methods of business are ill-adapted to Mexican surroundings, and the attempt to force them upon the country is pure folly. No other foreigners who go to Mexico make that attempt. Even the English do not, and the Germans, the French, and Italians adapt themselves to the conditions of the country as far as possible, and not the conditions of the country to their own ideas. So there exists between them and the Mexicans a much better feeling than between the latter and ourselves.

Another reason the Mexicans do not love us is that they have had small reason to admire our official representatives among them. Our consular service the world over has been a laughing stock; particularly has it been a disgrace in Mexico. Often our representatives there have been men of inferior ability, with no intelligence or social training, and with no moral ideals.

We are informed that one consular officer, still occupying one of the most important positions in the service, had to have the superintendent of schools in his own town write his letter of acceptance for him when his appointment came from Washington! All the affairs of his office have been in the hands of a painstaking German assistant, who is not even an American citizen!

The incompetence of our representatives as officials, their lack of character as men, their scant mental endowments and total lack of social qualities, have done much to make the Mexicans despise us.

The Mexicans hate us because we have deprived them of territory. The loss of Texas was a serious blow, and they have always ascribed it to us. We took from them more than HALF their territory as a result of the unjust war of 1847. We took advantage of Mexico's internal difficulties at the time, and the Mexican war was no great credit to our ability.

As a fact, we wanted land—and we TOOK it! Mexico has not forgotten—she will not forget—that act.

It is not strange that she suspects us in the present, with this record of past aggression.

The idea prevails throughout the republic that we have our eyes on lower California and that we are encouraging the rebellion in the north. It is believed that we hope to play

there the same part that we played when Texas pronounced its independence.

American mines, American lumber camps, American grazing land, American oil wells, they believe will be our excuse for taking over another slice of their territory, and reducing Mexico to the position of a Central American state as insignificant as Guatemala.

But undoubtedly the chief reason why the Mexicans today hate us so heartily is that THEY FEEL WE ARE EXPLOITING THEM AND THEIR COUNTRY. Everywhere they find American capital owning their sources of wealth. Blindly, they feel that they have been defrauded. "This is how," as John Kenneth Turner says in his book on "Barbarous Mexico," "this is how the typical Mexican farm is a millionaire farm, and why it has been so easy for such Americans as Wm. Randolph Hearst, Harrison Gray Otis, E. H. Harriman, the Rockefellers, the Guggenheims and others, each to have obtained possession of millions of Mexican acres."

The Mexicans know that they have been robbed. But they also know that we Americans will fight if need be for our so-called "rights." So they feel the hopelessness of it all, and in that hopelessness their hatred takes deeper and deeper root!

## THE CONQUEST OF BREAD.

Coxey announces the speedy starting of an unemployed army with half a million followers. We can only trust that among them will be many who have learned the lesson the authorities and ordinary labor papers try so hard to teach them. That lesson is that they must trust entirely to themselves. The police club them; trades union papers, such as the "Labor Clarion" of San Francisco, declare that the "industrious, honest, anxious and deserving" unemployed are not to be found in "this nomadic army," and "Solidarity," official organ of the I. W. W., insists that the problem "cannot be solved by Zapataism—that is, Zapataism as it must appear when transplanted from the present soil of Mexico to that of the United States." It then informs the unemployed, in startling capitals, that they must "look to the shops and to those who are working therein," declares that there must be "first, revolutionary agitation among the unemployed, tending to prevent them from scabbing on their fellow slaves in the shops," and, "second, those at work must be willing to divide up the work available." There follows, of course, a strong appeal to "organize into one big union." Fine diet for the starving!

From such official mockeries one turns with relief to "Fuerza Consciente," organ of our Spanish-speaking comrades in San Francisco. It is trying, at least, to do something practical; proposing immediate relief for needs that will not wait. It points out—and we can think of nothing which requires pointing out so sternly—that strikes, as at present conducted alike by the I. W. W. and A. F. of L., are really a hindrance to the starving wage-slave in his movement to recover the wealth, and opportunities for creating wealth, of which he has been despoiled. It says:

"If the efforts spent in organizing strike movements were employed in organizing the producers, whether in or out of work, into a mass bent on entering into possession of the wealth it has created, undoubtedly the results attained would be more positive and the coming social transformation would receive a great impetus." It sketches at considerable length the methods to be employed, and we understand that a movement looking to that end is seriously afoot. As it explains, this is what the disinherited will have to do, sooner or later, and the idea that a number of intermediate bridges must first be crossed is a delusion, cultivated sedulously by labor politicians.

The editor of this section has been lecturing at Palo Alto and San Jose, where he was the guest of Mr. and Mrs. Nielsen and Mrs. Hipolito. We are in great hopes that we may be able to reach more of the smaller Californian towns this summer with talks on Mexico and the land question, for, while much interest is always shown, the general ignorance is deplorable. The daily press devotes columns to the warfare between Federalists and Constitutionalists, but abstains as religiously as ever from explaining the economic wrongs which have driven Mexico into revolution.

## Mexican Notes

Now that Villa has taken Torreon, after the bloodiest conflict of the revolution, in which one out of every four of the combatants on either side is said to have been killed or wounded, it is going hard with the Spaniards once more. Villa showed them no mercy at Chihuahua, four months ago, and he has now ordered the deportation of the 600 resident in Torreon, their property having been confiscated until such time as the owners shall have proved that they did not aid the Federals. One would not give much for their chances of recovery, and the Spanish ambassador has filed a formal protest with our Secretary of State.

Villa is voicing a national hatred which dates back to the Spanish conquest; for the Mexican regards the Spaniard as the first of the land-thieves who stripped him of his natural heritage, and the first, therefore, who reduced him to slavery. Zapata has declared specifically that he will show no mercy to the Spaniard, and has lived up to his declarations, in Morelos and neighboring States. As a land monopolist, a storekeeper and money lender the Spaniard has been a universally unpopular figure. It may be well for us to consider also that a similar feeling against the United States was born with our seizure of vast territory after the Mexican war.

It is stated that other foreigners have been free from molestation in Torreon, and that the acting American consular agent, J. M. Ulmer, has posted, with Villa's consent, notices on all American property which announce that it must be held inviolate. Meanwhile, as after the federal defeat at Ojinaga, the rich have fled the city, uniting with Gen. Velasco's forces. Torreon is to be the temporary capital of Coahuila, and Villa is represented as having taken the sanitary condition of the city energetically in hand, turning his attention first to the water supply.

The fighting qualities displayed on both sides seem to have impressed the war correspondents, and will add to the rapidly-growing conviction that intervention will not be the picnic depicted by the jingo press generally and Hearst in particular. As we pointed out recently, the sagacious "Los Angeles Times" was among the first to sense the danger and declare, smothering its former warlike clamor, that the United States is entitled to call on Europe for assistance. We are glad to note that its back-down has attracted much attention. Similarly "The Bulletin," of San Francisco, remarks editorially: "Torreon was taken after six days of desperate fighting, during which about one man out of every four engaged was either killed or wounded. Wouldn't it be a nice little holiday excursion for a few American regiments to go down into Mexico and drive these gentle fighters out?"

The campaign against intervention will receive material aid from the article by Gen. John W. Foster published in the "Literary Digest" of March 30, for Gen. Foster is a recognized authority, having been Secretary of State under President Harrison and United States ambassador to Mexico, Spain and Russia. He writes, among other things: "The appeal to the Monroe Doctrine, so often made in the press and by public men to justify intervention, is entirely unwarranted." We should think so indeed, for the Monroe Doctrine was an announcement to the European Powers that they must not interfere in the internal affairs of the young Republics South of us, but leave them to work out their own destinies and manage their own affairs. It is, of all doctrines conceivable, that which should bar us from intrusive meddling. Gen. Foster says also that "the injuries inflicted on Americans in Mexico are not to be compared to those suffered by Great Britain and France during our own Civil War, and our government at that time would not tolerate the suggestion of intervention. Secretary Seward even refusing to receive a joint visit from the ambassadors of the aggrieved countries."

At the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, held in Philadelphia April 3, a British journalist named Maurice Low told the convention that "it would be easier to explain the attitude of Europe toward the Monroe Doctrine if Europe knew what the doctrine really was." Former Governor McCorkle retorted that "Euro-

pean earth hunger is not dead," and he instanced the British occupation of Egypt, the Italian war in Tripoli, the case of Morocco, etc. It is too true, but the most conspicuous of all instances is the invasion of Mexico by the land syndicates of the United States.

The correspondent of the London "Times," whose views carry exceptional weight throughout the British Empire, gives the following as among the leading difficulties which confront the Wilson administration: "The failure of Republican Congresses to compensate Colombia for the loss of the province of Panama, which, she alleges, became autonomous by the help of the United States. The consequent distrust of American altruism aroused in other Latin-American countries, especially in Central America. The possibility of being obliged to take strong measures to end disorder in Haiti and Santo Domingo. The possibility of having to do the same on a vastly larger scale in Mexico." Last month's "Review of Reviews" is authority for the statement that "it has all along been the view of the army officers that we were soon to invade Mexico."

The campaign against intervention, therefore, must not be relaxed.

With Huerta sinking steadily into deeper difficulties the central governing authority becomes more and more paralysed and the peon's attacks on the landed proprietors meet with decreasingly-effective resistance. We note renewed activity on the part of Genevevo de la O., whom the papers killed off long ago, and on that of Zapata.

## OUR LEGISLATIVE CLOWNS.

The trouble is not due to lack of brains but lack of moral courage. We have the facts but dare not face them; and, therefore, we waste our years in idle tinkering. Look, for instance, at this whole business of lawmaking, to which our President and Intellectuals still fondly pin their faith!

Take the evidence which Howard Elliott, now head of the New Haven railroad, has been collecting so carefully. The railroads—undoubtedly—pirates, and Frederic C. Howe, in his "Privilege and Democracy in America," estimates that they steal from us annually no less than \$750,000,000; although they were presented, by our noble lawmakers, with domains that would have made the great Napoleon gasp. Nevertheless Elliott is right in pointing the finger of scorn at what is going on today, and in saying that the introduction, since January, of no less than 1395 bills affecting the operation of our railroads spells hysteria gone raving mad.

In the ten years ending with 1909 the British lawmakers at Westminster inflicted on their unhappy helots no less than 3,882 new laws, and conditions in England grow ever more unbearable. But during the same period our own legislative tyrants tied us up with 16,000, and the bitter wail of the unemployed is echoing throughout the country as it never did before.

The whole representative system is one gigantic farce, in which the clowns stir up the dust, that they may blind us to what is happening in the ring. Not one in ten thousand has an adequate acquaintance with the details of the businesses their measures seek to control, for nineteen-twentieths of them are lawyers, who know only how to work their lungs. Not one in twenty thousand of them can have the good of his constituents whole-souledly at heart, for they look, first, to keeping themselves in office, and secondly, to maintaining their own party in power at any cost.

## SEND IN YOUR NAMES.

The publishers of the forthcoming "Land and Liberty," who are now installing a printing plant purchased last week, write us asking for the names and addresses of those to whom it will be worth their while to send sample copies. That is work in which all can assist the proposed propaganda and also that of "Regeneracion."

## RANGEL-CLINE DEFENSE FUND.

The money received by this Committee till April 8th, 1914, was from the following States: CALIFORNIA: J. F. Haven, \$1.00; ILLINOIS: Collected by Vincent St. John, \$98.63; NEW YORK: Collected in cigar factories by Chas. Cutrona, \$7.70; PHILADELPHIA: McKelvey, Louis and Wilmont Defense Committee, \$25.00; TOTAL, \$132.33.—To this sum is added \$14.66, received from the Spanish speaking comrades, as published by this Committee in the Spanish Section of this issue, and which gives as GENERAL TOTAL: \$147.43.

VICTOR CRAVELLO, Fin. Sec.