

Calls On His God To Shield His Moneybags

It was inevitable. A child could have foreseen that God would be invoked to justify the invasion of Mexico in the interest of the American dollar. Nor did it require much penetration to prophesy that Hearst would be among the earliest to call on his creator to protect those princely revenues, wrung from the Mexican peon's unpaid toil, amid which he has grovelled since that tragic moment when his mother dropped him on an already over-burdened world. For publication in all his papers he writes, under date of April 26: "Righteous wars seem superficially to be made by men, but they must surely be destined by God. They are part of the scheme of civilization, part of the plan of progress. Liberty has been won by war and the sword has often cut the path for the advance of enlightenment, the march of progress." From these nauseating hypocrisies it is a relief to turn to the editorial in the "San Francisco Bulletin," of April 25. It is headed, "Greed prompted the first war against Mexico, and greed will bring about another war if there is not a protest against it." The full article follows:

The war with Mexico in 1847 was fought because Southern slaveholders wished to extend slave-holding territory toward the South, and so regain their balance of power against the free North. It was the war of an aristocracy to strengthen itself against the growth of a free democracy. If the plot failed it was because the years of chattel slavery in America were already doomed to be cut short.

The war of 1847 was a shameful piece of land-grabbing, authorized by no law of God or man, save the law of superior might. If, by any wild reversal of probabilities, there should be another triumph of insane greed, and another war of conquest should be entered upon, it would be as shameful as the first. Just as the first had the rotting institution of slavery to push it forward, so the second would have the greed of exploiting money interests behind it. The desire for intervention in Mexico originated among the men who would make money if there were intervention.

Investment in Mexican properties has been a risky speculation. The men and corporations who put money in enjoyed the privileges of speculative buyers. They bought cheap. Now their desire is that the whole power of the United States, under pretense of "civilizing" Mexico—God save the mark!—shall be devoted to securing their unearned profits. They would be glad to sacrifice money—if it is paid by the Government—and lives—if they are the lives of other men—to add to their dividends.

Peon labor is cheap in Mexico, and the country's resources are large. Industrial feudalism in its worst form flourishes like a weed in that soil. The black counties of Colorado, where feudalistic oppression has driven the miners into armed rebellion, would be, in comparison, models of enlightenment if the Rockefellers and the Hearsts were allowed to carry their ideas of "civilization," human liberty and money-making into Mexico.

It is not likely that President Wilson and the other officials at the head of the Government will lend themselves to this plot to commit murder and robbery for the sake of planting in a foreign country those evil institutions that we are trying to check in the United States.

But to strengthen the hands of the President and defeat the plot against the commonweal, every labor union and every organization representing the common people of this country ought to join in a general protest and a general demand for peace.

THE PITY OF IT.

Washington, April 21.—Secretary of War Garrison is flooded with letters from men who wish to offer their services in the event of war. "Many of the letters," said Garrison, "are pathetic, containing stories of hard times and no work. The writers said they were anxious for any sort of job."

Is Conscription To Your Taste?

In case of war with Mexico every able-bodied male citizen of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45 is liable to be called into the service of the United States for war purposes.

About 22,000,000 men, constituting a little over 43 per cent of the total male population of this country, are interested in this statement.

An act of congress, approved Jan. 21, 1903, and amended in 1908, commonly known as the "Dick militia law," makes it possible for the president to call into the service of the United States not only the regularly organized militia of the various states, but also the so-called "RESERVE MILITIA," which constitutes ALL CITIZENS BETWEEN 18 AND 45.

Section 4 of this law provides that "whenever the United States is invaded or in danger of invasion from any foreign nation" or in OTHER CONTINGENCIES named, "it shall be lawful for the president to call forth such number of the militia of the state or of the states or territories, or of the District of Columbia, as he may deem necessary."

Furthermore, it is provided that when the president calls out the militia for such purposes, "he may specify the period for which such service is required, and the militia so called shall continue to serve during the term so specified, EITHER WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES, unless sooner relieved by order of the president."

Wilson Can Do It.

The use of the language "either within or without the territory of the United States" shows that it is only necessary for the president to decide that there is a possibility of danger from invasion by Mexican troops, federals or constitutionalists, in order to have authority to ship to Mexican soil as many state militiamen and of "RESERVE MILITIAMEN" as he may "deem necessary."

Although workmen's organizations made some protest against the passage of the Dick law at the time, and although it has been roundly denounced since on account of the use of militiamen in strikes and labor troubles, the far-reaching character of the law has not been realized by the public generally.

It will be surprising to the ordinary man in the street to know, therefore, that he may be SUMMONED AT A MOMENT'S NOTICE to join the militia; that he is, in fact, already a reserve militiaman and as such SUBJECT TO IMMEDIATE CALL by the president for service either within or without the territory of the United States!

Not only that, but Section 7 provides drastic penalties for failure to obey such summons. After providing that members of the militia, when called out by the president, shall be mustered into the service of the United States and shall thus become regular soldiers "WITHOUT FURTHER ENLISTMENT AND WITHOUT FURTHER MEDICAL EXAMINATION PREVIOUS TO SUCH MUSTER," this section says "that any officer or enlisted man of the militia who shall REFUSE or NEGLECT to present himself for such muster, upon call forthwith as herein prescribed, shall be SUBJECT TO TRIAL BY COURT-MARTIAL and shall be punished as such court-martial may direct."

Fight or be Shot.

In time of war the punishment could thus extend to death.

Section 9, in effect, makes regular soldiers of the militia men when thus called into the service of the United States. It says "that the militia, when called into the actual service of the United States shall be subject to the same rules and articles of war as the regular troops of the United States."

Violation of the articles of war is about the most serious thing that could happen to anybody. Many of the penalties prescribed for such violations call for death in war time and other penalties are very severe.

There is another act of congress entitled "an act to provide for temporarily increasing the military establishment of the United States in time of war," the act of 1908, by which a volunteer army could be raised. But the failure of men to volunteer might very readily be followed by the enforced enlistment of citizens under the Dick militia law without the

necessity of congress passing a special act authorizing conscriptions. THE DICK LAW FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES IS ITSELF A CONSCRIPTION ACT—"The Daily News," San Francisco)

THEIR TRUE ENEMY.

The war against Mexico is not being waged for any ideal of justice, or for the sake of any humanitarian interest, and there is not a trace of generosity about it. The government of the United States is seeking to overthrow Huerta and elevate Carranza to power that the interests of the Yankee capitalists may be protected. Huerta is protecting the European capitalists, to the prejudice of the North-American capitalists.

And Carranza proposes to protect the North-American capitalists to the prejudice of the European capitalists. The Mexican people ought not to fight for Carranza, or for the Mexican flag, or for the fatherland, or for any government, but for its own well-being, its own individual independence, and its own true liberty.

The Mexican people, and all peoples, should abhor wars, for they are the cause of their ill-being and of the tyranny that oppresses them.

In this supreme moment, when Mexican tyranny is breaking down and the North American government is seeking to impose on Mexico the caprices of its own capitalism, the Mexican workers ought to form a revolutionary army, and unfold the banner of social war, combating all the bourgeois armies, be they those of Huerta, of Carranza or of Wilson.

This is the propitious moment for the arousing of the revolutionary spirit, that the producers may be made to see that they are being asked to shed their blood in the name of a government which has denied them all the rights of man and is now calling on another oppressive government to save it from the threat of death—"Fuerza Consciente," San Francisco.)

LIFTING THE MASK.

At last that great Democrat and friend of the workingman, William Randolph Hearst, has summoned up the courage to speak out. In his "San Francisco Examiner"—that city is responsible for having fathered him—he says, under the date of April 24: "War unites the feelings of the men in Mexico as it does in the United States. We must beat the whole of Mexico, pacify the whole of Mexico, annex and civilize the whole of Mexico—our work will not be done until that is done." And again: "The war has well begun, with a wise step at Vera Cruz. It will be carried out ably; finished as soon as a task so serious can be finished. Finished once it will be finished FOREVER. What is Mexico now will be the United States then—and the work will not have to be done over again." And, concluding the article: "The day is not far distant when Mexicans and Americans will unite in rejoicing that the war is over, the boundary line wiped out and Mexico made part of this country."

Immediately below this article, which is set in huge type, is a notice calling attention to the army's need of horses, and ending with the comment that "if this trouble in Mexico develops to great proportions (it will not be Hearst's fault if it does not), those ranchers and stockmen who have good animals on hand will surely make a good profit, for the chances are that prices will double." There follows an item intended to be facetious. It runs: "Do you think we ought to cross the Mexican border?" asked one old veteran of another. "No," was the reply. "No; I don't think we ought to cross the Mexican border. I think we ought to put our soldiers along the frontier and just pick up that Mexican border and move it South."

Kindly remember that, as we showed in "Regeneration" of March 22: "A syndicate of United States multi-millionaires is so fully satisfied that intervention will follow at the proper time that it has employed lawyers and agents to take options on over \$600,000,000 worth of Mexican lands. Today, in Mexico, lands that in the United States are worth \$50 can be bought for \$1, or less. Annexation, to those who have framed this terrible conspiracy, would mean the entrenchment of capital against society at large."

We took that from the "New York World," from an article by C. F. Z. Caracristi, an engineer of international reputation and specially well versed in Mexican affairs.

WE HAVE MANY FRIENDS.

That old-established and influential San Francisco evening daily, "The Bulletin," comes out flat-footed in its editorial of April 24, headed "To a man who wanted war. A few plain words for one who has done his best to embroil us in a national disaster." It denounces Hearst as an editor who has "devoted a portion of his paper, day after day, month after month, to the advocacy of incendiarism." To which it adds:—

"War is a crime against labor; it is a crime against capital; it is a crime against humanity. We play with loaded dice. No one can win."

What, then, shall be said of you and your fellows, who were responsible, so far as your strength went, for involving us in hostilities with Mexico, and who will not be content, even now, until you have brought on a general war between the people of the United States and the people of Mexico?

Have you not played the part of traitors—traitors to your country, traitors to the common good, traitors to civilization?

"We are there," you cry, "to avenge the murders of American citizens, to safeguard the Mexican country, to civilize it, and, if desirable, to make it part of the United States—the most highly civilized of nations."

To civilize it! Your words reek with the bitterest of irony. Is civilization in this age, nineteen centuries after the death of Christ, to mean battleships and cannon, bayonets and bullets, devastation and murder? Is civilization to be thrust home with the point of the bayonet and written down in the heart's blood of dead soldiers? Is it to mean a callous disregard of those murders of American women and children that took place this week in Colorado, while we visit a barbarous revenge on thousands of innocent Mexicans?

BRAVO, PASADENA!

Bully for conservative Pasadena! Its Board of Labor is the first we have seen reported as urging workmen to have no part in war with Mexico.

WHERE DOES GOMPERS STAND?

New York's radical women, assembled in mass meeting at Cooper Union, have led the way in protesting against this war. The San Francisco and the Pasadena labor councils have followed suit, and we assume that organized labor throughout the country will follow the precedent thus set. Where does Gompers stand? We of "Regeneration" left no stone unturned to induce him and the American Federation of Labor, at last year's Seattle convention, to take time by the forelock and warn the government that Labor would not stand for intervention in Mexico. Gompers then turned us down. Where does he stand today?

WORSE THAN PANKHURST.

Most cordially do we welcome the appearance of "The Woman Rebel," an eight-page monthly, published and edited by Margaret H. Sanger, 34 Post Avenue, New York City, for \$1 a year. It carries as its motto: "Working Woman, build up within yourself a conscious fighting character against all things which enslave you," and its initial editorial ends with the statement that at all times it will strenuously advocate economic emancipation. We hope and are confident that it will hew bravely to that line, for there lies the real fight and there the most honorable scars are to be won. Give us a woman who has her economic freedom, through owning the things without which life is impossible, and no legal formality or social tyranny can force her to the whip. Let a woman, on the other hand, be dependent on us for every mouthful she eats and no legal protection or independence of character will curb our mastery. Economic facts are facts, and an ounce of them is worth a ton of libertarian theorizing.

HEARST'S PROGRAM.

"The overthrow of Huerta is only part of the task. We must invade Mexico, reduce its lawless elements to submission, restore order and make it like the United States by making it part of the United States."—"San Francisco Examiner," April 27, 1914.)

"Terror reigns in Mexico City." And terror also reigns in Colorado, and has its eternal seat in the hearts of million of "free" American citizens, owned by the monopolists and trembling at the thought that they may lose their jobs.

SEND FOR SAMPLES.
All communications to and remittances for the forthcoming paper, "Land and Liberty," should be addressed to R. F. D. No. 1, Hayward, Cal. There will be eight pages, printed on excellent paper, and the first issue will bear date May 1. The second issue will be May 30, and it is hoped that the support will be sufficiently generous to insure publication thereafter every week. We are assured that the paper's only policy will be that of uncompromising adherence to truth, and Comrade Owen promises that he will speak, at least, as plainly as he does in this section. The subscription has been placed at one dollar a year, and the names of earnest persons, to whom the mailing of sample copies would be worth while, are solicited most earnestly.

"WAR IS HELL!"

Your Hearsts and Otises and other large land-owners in Mexico are yelling their heads off for complete occupation, subjugation and annexation of the land to the south.

But, Mr. Plain Citizen, before you get excited and let your patriotic fervor run away with your good judgment and shout for war and blood and carnage, just ponder this fact:

Mr. Hearst and Mr. Otis, and also Mr. Rockefeller of Colorado and Mexico and elsewhere, ARE NOT GOING TO DO THE FIGHTING.

If this becomes real war, and we fear it is, the common people of the United States are going to shoot and be shot up by the common people of Mexico.

The Hearsts and Otises and Rockefellers who have property interests to advance and the beef trust and steel trust and powder trust and the other trusts who have something to sell are always strong for war. But they don't do the BLEEDING AND DYING necessary and incidental to conquest and subjugation and annexation.

WAR IS HELL. Likewise it is insanity except where the nation's preservation demands it. In that kind of a war we would fight shoulder to shoulder, all of us.

But don't shout for war with Mexico if war can be honorably avoided.—"The Daily News," San Francisco, April 24.)

Among the innumerable cases calling for defense funds, that of Joe Hill, now in prison in Salt Lake City and charged with murder, seems to demand special notice. He served with Jack Mosby in Mexico, was the author of the I. W. W. song book, and is asserted by his friends to be the victim of spite on the part of the police and the Utah Copper Co. and Utah Construction Co., alias the Mormon Church. It is said that the authorities are diligently hunting up his labor record, to create prejudice. A defense sub-committee has been formed in San Francisco, but funds should be sent to Ed. Rowan, Local 69, 28 S. D. Temple St., Salt Lake City, Utah.

William Randolph Hearst concludes his special letter to Mexico, dated April 26, thus: "The great waters of American sentiment and obligation are rising and rolling towards the occupation of Mexico. They will not subside until their task is accomplished. They will not retreat until boundary lines have been eliminated, until Mexico is included within the borders of the United States, within the confines of civilization."

Think it over, and think over the man who has written it. Think over the personal interests he owns and serves.

The "Fundamental Reform Committee," Leary Building, Second and Madison, Seattle, Washington, is the publisher, both in plat and postal card form, of a map showing the almost incredible extent to which the land on which that city stands is monopolized and held out of use by a handful of speculators. "Idle land makes idle men" is the motto the map carries, and it is stated in a footnote that maps of other counties are being completed. Good. All over these United States we have our reproductions of Mexico, with the same cause preparing a similar upheaval. Speed the day.

Our earnest friend and indefatigable comrade, Thorwald Siegfried, is the prime mover in this unostentatious but most beneficial piece of propaganda.