

Freedom Or Slavery; Ours Is The Choice.

To long for rulers and at the same time to long for freedom is to long for the impossible. Once and for all we have to choose one of two things—either to be free, entirely free, denying all Authority, or to be slaves and perpetuate the rule of man by man.

It is only under a system of economic inequality that the ruler or the government is a necessity. If I have more than Pedro has, I fear naturally that Pedro will take me by the throat and get from me what he needs. In such a case I need a governor or chief to protect me against Pedro's possible attack; but if Pedro and I are equal economically; if we have the same opportunity of using natural wealth, such as the land, waters, forests, mines and so forth; or the wealth created by the hand of man, such as machinery, houses, railroads and the thousand and one articles now manufactured; if we have this, reason tells us that it would be impossible for Pedro and me to pull one another's hair in a dispute over things that are of equal profit to both of us. In such circumstances we need no chief.

There are many who say that we cannot live without rulers or governments, and if those who say this belong to the bourgeoisie I grant that they have good reason, for they fear that the poor will throw them out, neck and crop, and snatch from them the wealth amassed by forcing the workingman to sweat. But why do the poor need a chief or government?

In Mexico we have had, and have, hundreds of facts to prove that humanity needs rulers or governments only where economic inequality exists. In the small towns and rural communities her inhabitants have felt no need of government. Until recently the land, waters and pastures were the common property of the dwellers in each district. When you talked to these simple people of government they would begin to tremble, for government to them meant the hangman and was equivalent to tyranny. They lived happy in the enjoyment of their liberty, for often they did not know even the name of the Republic's President, and were aware that government existed only when the military chiefs passed through on the hunt for males of whom they might make soldiers, or when the government collector visited them for the sake of collecting taxes.

Could such people feel that government was necessary? They had no need for it, and thus they lived hundreds of years until they were stripped of the wealth of natural opportunities for the benefit of the hacienda owners. They did not eat one another up, as those who know only the capitalist system, in which every human being has to compete with all the others for the morsel of bread he raises to his lips, fear men would. The strong did not tyrannize over the weak, as is the case in our capitalistic society, in which the greatest rogues, the most covetous and the most pliant dominate the honest and the good. All were brothers in those communities; all aided one another, and as all felt themselves to be the equals that they actually were, they needed no Authority to guard the interests of owners against the assaults of those who had nothing.

At this very moment, in the Yaqui free communities, in Durango, in the South of Mexico, and in so many other districts in which the inhabitants have taken possession of the land, what need have they of government? As so n as they regard one another as equals, with an equal right to Mother Earth, they need no chief to protect privileges as against those who have none, for all are privileged.

Brother Proletarians, let us have done with illusions. Government is able to exist only because economic inequality exists. Let us adopt then as our moral guide the Manifesto of September 23, 1911.

From the Spanish of Ricardo Flores Magon.

The army cry is reported as being "On to Mexico City—because the climate at Vera Cruz is so trying. Many an American will fall victim to dysentery and other tropical diseases before this war is over, but Hearst will not be one of them."

Advocate Strike Against War

At the Tannenbaum protest meeting, held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, April 19, Haywood, representing the I. W. W., called attention to the action of the United Mine Workers' convention at Indianapolis in adopting a resolution favoring a general strike against war, and said:

"The mine workers of the country will simply fold their arms and when they fold their arms, there will be no war. Sherman said 'war was hell.' Well, let the bankers go to war, and let the interest takers and the dividing takers go to war along with them. If only those parasites would leave the country it would be a pretty decent place to live in. They live on graft, and if they stay here the best I can promise them is that we will speedily bring them to the day when they will turn over the keys of the city to the marching men, such as Tannenbaum led against the churches."

"Solidarity" backs up this speech in an editorial which runs, in part:

"Modern wars are altogether commercial and economic in their aspects; that is, capitalists who have invested in property in foreign countries, want unrestricted privileges and opportunities to advance their property interests. When an acute situation arises, like that of the Mexican revolution at present, the interests of the capitalists are endangered, and they bring pressure to bear, internally and externally, to protect them. Counter revolutions are started in the country affected by the revolutionary crisis; while the outside government is urged, admonished and finally coerced by the masters into declaring war. The workers of either country are the ones who fight the battles, being manipulated by the economic masters like pawns upon a chess board. The workers have no real quarrel with each other; are, in fact, simply dupes of their masters; they have nothing to gain through war except hardship, disease, crippled bodies or death. Those who return from war only find economic conditions pressing upon them as hard or harder than before. They have simply fought to strengthen the power of their masters to exploit and oppress the working class. Therefore, why should not the workers refuse to go to war, and why should they not take steps to prevent war altogether?"

SPOILED A GOOD RIFLE.

The United States has its own civil war in Colorado; though, indeed, that is but one of a succession of civil wars which have been devastating, at continually shorter intervals, our unhappy country. A telegram from Trinidad, Colo., dated May 2, seems to us specially suggestive of what has been going on. J. R. McDonald, stenographer for the military commission, was under examination and testified that he met Lieutenant E. K. Linderfelt and asked him if Louis Tikas, the Greek strike leader, was to be hanged. "No," replied Linderfelt. "I gave instructions that Tikas was not to be killed, but I spoiled a good rifle." The witness then swore that Linderfelt was carrying his rifle over his shoulder, stock to the rear, and holding it by the barrel. The physicians' autopsy showed that Tikas' skull was fractured.

CHICAGO CONDEMNS WAR.

According to a special despatch printed in "Solidarity" of April 25, copies of resolutions declaring against war with Mexico, which were adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor, were sent to the various headquarters of the unions, April 20.

LET HEARST DO IT.

But there is still a recourse for Mr. Hearst. He still retains his estates in Mexico. Why should he not return to that country, complete the process of naturalization, rally to his standards all those who desire the welfare of Mexico and are willing to push forward the march of civilization and with Arthur Brisbane on his right hand, Alfred Henry Lewis at his left and John Temple Graves bearing his standard, sweep down upon the enemy and carve his way to the presidential chair in the City of Mexico?

Then Mexico would, indeed, be civilized, wouldn't it?—("San Francisco Bulletin.")

REGENERACION

Wm. C. Owen
Editor.

Has It Collapsed?

The lesson of the Mexican war: scare and its collapse is that war is going out of favor with sensible people. Since 1898 there have been sixteen years with more than three hundred days in each one and twenty-four hours in each of the days, and all that time people have been thinking. They have thought about the patriotism that goes to war, and the patriotism that stays at home and makes money from war, and the patriotism that demands that there shall not be any war; and they have decided that the first is foolish, the second sinful, and the third the only proper kind for good citizens.

The country did not blow up as it would have done sixteen years ago, though there were plenty of designing people trying hard to touch it off and plenty of foolish people trying hard to help them. The old shibboleths left the public cold. The glamour of flags, music and fatuous warlike phrases had faded; the tinsel was seen to be tinsel, not gold; glory was spoiled by being spelled without the "l."

Mediation! For What?

Now they are trying "Mediation"—anything and everything to rescue from the fire the foreign investor's chestnuts and impose on the rebellious Mexican peasant a good, strong government which shall take care of him.

That is precisely what he does not want. He wants to be in a position where he can take care of himself, and for that he wants possession of the land.

Consider who those new interveners are. The Argentine Minister, described as "a diplomat of wide experience; an international lawyer." The Brazilian Ambassador, a "trained diplomat." The Chilean envoy, "for some years Chilean Minister at Mexico City." Frock-coated, uniform-bespangled idlers, who have as much in common with the toiling peasant as the lamb has with the famished wolf.

Not by any such hocus-opus can this fundamental question of the right to a free and equal seat at nature's overflowing banquet-table be settled.

As for Good Government! We have had our bellyful of it in these United States. Its name is Roosevelt—the hardest taskmaster the disinherited could have. Woodrow Wilson is his logical successor.

We have received from A. Stackhouse, Phoenix, Arizona, copy of a pamphlet he has issued, entitled "The Church That is Knocking Hell Out of Religion." Its gist is given in the remark that "in order to throttle any fake we have to throttle it on its own ground, and in order to destroy our worst enemies, the religious and salvation fakes, we must use the bible and common sense. This the writer proceeds to do, and, attacking remorselessly our so-called courts of justice, our so-called freedom of industry and that clerical hierarchy which has elaborated a religious system that offends all common sense, he insists that 'the whole biblical record shows that its intention is to teach men the lesson of co-operative or collective action, without special privilege to any class.' That the bible teems with instances of any exhortations to direct action is also a point on which the author insists vigorously. The pamphlet sells at \$2.00 per hundred.

HAVE YOU A GUN—?

"The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." Constitution of the United States.

THE ARMED CITIZEN

A new periodical which lays before its readers Practical Plans for Labor's Armed Defense. Should be read by all workingmen—especially the radicals.

Read, "An Appeal to Red Blood" in the first issue. Send in your name and 25 cents for three months at once—TODAY, to

JOHN MURRAY, Publisher, The Armed Citizen 203 Labor Temple Los Angeles, Cal.

Socialist Party Protests

The Socialist Party is to be congratulated most heartily on the protest against war with Mexico which its Executive Committee has put forth. It reminds the public that in order to subdue Mexico the American army must march across it as Sherman marched to the sea, and that the harvest of all the consequent bloodshed will be reaped by German, English and American capitalists. The protest, which is signed by Victor L. Berger, Adolph Germer, George H. Goebel, James H. Maurer, J. Stitt Wilson and Walter Lanfersiek, reads, in part:

"The American people are being lashed into a war by those who profit from war. Capitalist drums are beating, trumpets blaring and forces recruiting—all this that the nation may be goaded into war and the workers made to consent to shoot and be shot.

For centuries the resources of Mexico have lain dormant. That country has now been touched by the magic wand of capitalism, and the same development is taking place there that always takes place when modern capitalism clashes with backward feudalism. Ninety per cent of her population are still landless and propertyless. For hundreds of years her people have struggled against almost insurmountable difficulties to overthrow tyrants who have ruled and ruined them. For hundreds of years the Mexican people have been in a state of continuous revolt because the great majority are in a condition of peonage. Robbed of their lands in an agricultural country, the change from Spanish rule to an independent republic availed the Mexican people little or nothing. So long as peonage remains revolt must follow revolt. In vain did the Mexican people elevate Madero to the presidency. Their hope that he would recognize their needs and restore the land to the people was not fulfilled. They are still fighting to win Mexico for the Mexicans.

Aid Exploiters of Land.

In Sonora, Durango and Chihuahua, where the revolutionists are in control, the people are taking possession of the land. Now when the revolutionists believe a victory is in sight the great American republic, controlled by sinister capitalist interests and without a declaration of war, lands an armed force on Mexican soil. No nation in modern times has ever begun hostilities upon a pretext so shallow as the flag incident at Tampico."

We rejoice, above all, at the emphasis laid on the land question, because it promises that the Socialist Party in the future will give that question far greater prominence than hitherto has been the case. Our race has still to be educated by events, and the Mexican Revolution is beginning to play its true role in that necessary process.

"Now for the job," writes that irrepressible Progressive politician, Chester H. Rowell, in the "California Outlook." "The first task, of course, is to take Tampico and Vera Cruz, and enough of the Vera Cruz railway to hold safe the road to Mexico. Then, if we are to continue, there will be an army of about 500,000, of whom 200,000 will be regular soldiers and trained militia men, and 300,000 volunteer recruits." It is superfluous to add that, like the rest of these belligerent editors, Mr. Rowell does not propose to shoulder a rifle.

"And God said: 'Let there be LIGHT.'" Surely it never was more needed than it is today.

HELP! HELP! HELP!

There will be a mass meeting at Labor Temple next Sunday evening addressed by Austin Lewis, of San Francisco. Mr. Lewis is the attorney for the defense in the case of the Wheatland hop pickers. This meeting is the beginning of a campaign by the Wheatland Defense Committee for the release of Richard Ford and Herman D. Suhr, who were sentenced to life imprisonment in connection with the Wheatland "Red Sabbath," and whose cases have been appealed, and also for the preservation in California of the right to change of venue and to prevent the establishment of a precedent of conviction for conspiracy to murder in cases of this character. Mr. Lewis is an able speaker.

GEORGIA KOTSCH, For Committee.

WAR ENOUGH AT HOME.

Our I. W. W. friends in Portland Ore., are circulating by the thousands a leaflet entitled "Thou Shalt Not Kill," in which they say: "We, the workers of these United States, have made a pledge. We refuse to go to Mexico and plunge a bayonet into the breast of our Mexican brothers. We refuse to shoot our Mexican brothers who are struggling for Land and Liberty. We have war at home; we won't go to war; we won't permit murder. General Strike rather than military service. Insurrection before war."

"The underlying contention of Mexico is the land question. Huerta has the support of the great landlords, who desire to maintain the present conditions of great landed estates occupied by dependent and loyal peons; while Villa professes to represent the landless, who insist on such changes in the laws as, through taxation or otherwise, shall make it reasonably possible for the landless to get land." The foregoing is from the "San Francisco Chronicle," of April 22, a strongly conservative Republican daily and close ally of the "Los Angeles Times." Commenting thereon the San Francisco "Star" says: "One of the great Mexican landlords is Hearst; another is Otis, and Prof. Barrows, of the University of California, who has been clamoring for war with Mexico, is said to be another, or at least interested in a large amount of land in Mexico. Had Madero stuck firmly to his original policy of restoring the land to the people of Mexico, it is probable that there would have been no revolt against him, and there would have been peace where there is now war."

"After the battle of Churubusco," says Prof. Frederick Starr, of the University of Chicago, in his late work, "Mexico and the United States," "where the Mexicans in small numbers in an ancient convent building held a considerable American force—5,000 or 6,000 men—at bay for a long time, Gen. Twiggs entered the convent building. He enquired from the Mexican in Charge, Gen. Anaya, where the ammunition was. The reply was: 'If there had been ammunition here you would not be here.' Prof. Starr gives the above as one of many proofs that the success of the United States in 1848 was not due to any lack of courage on the part of the Mexicans but to the fact that they were torn up by internal warring factions.

Curiously enough the first hostile criticism of President Wilson's course in sending troops and ships to Vera Cruz came from the "New York World," which had been his staunchest defender. It refused to accept the Mayo incident as sufficient and argued that there must have been far more powerful reasons which the administration was concealing.

Do You Believe In Learning Things For Yourself?

Are you aware of the fact that many earnest people are trying to establish the Millennium on earth without the aid of the preacher, the lawyer or the politician?

Emma Goldman, the well known anarchist, will deliver 10 lectures from May 17th to 24th at 8 p. m.; Sunday 3 and 8 p. m. Burbank Hall, 542 S. Main St., and Walker Auditorium Bldg., 730 S. Grand Ave., 3rd Floor.

Walker Auditorium—Sunday, May 17 at 3 p. m.: "Anarchism vs. Socialism."

Sunday, May 17, at 8 p. m.: "Our Moral Censors."

Monday, May 18, at 8 p. m.: "The Individual and Society."

Burbank Hall—Tuesday, May 19, at 8 p. m.: "Beyond Good and Evil."

Wednesday, May 20, at 8 p. m.: "Revolution and Reform—Which?"

Walker Auditorium—Thursday May 21, at 8 p. m.: "The Intellectual Proletarians."

Burbank Hall—Friday, May 22, at 8 p. m.: "The Hypocrisy of Charity."

Saturday, May 23, at 8 p. m.: "The Conflict of the Sexes."

Walker Auditorium—Sunday, May 24, at 3 p. m.: "The Place of the Church in the Labor Struggle."

Sunday, May 24, at 8 p. m.: "The Mothers' Strike."

Admission 15 and 25 cents.