

Macchiavelli Would Be Putty In Willson's Hands

Now that the star-bespangled diplomats, with their distinguished legal and official reputations, have taken hold of the Mexican peon's case, Col. Roosevelt is hurrying back from South America. He also is profoundly interested in the dear Indian, an interest he manifested by hatching a political revolution and stealing from him that desirable piece of property through which the Panama Canal will supply American plutocracy with cheap labor. Thus also, of course, the colonel was able to prepare the way for that ingenious construction of the Monroe Doctrine which regards the canal as the legitimate Southern frontier of the United States and declares it our duty to police our brown-skinned neighbors. Naturally he has been interviewed on the part he played in that somewhat irregular piece of business, and the gist of his answer is that Colombia was corrupt and that he acted while others, with timid regard for a weaker nation's rights, were only talking.

Though he prates eternally of Democracy, while being himself a pronounced type of the imperialistic aristocrat, wedded to militarism and all that favors a strongly-centralized government, Roosevelt nevertheless has the merit and weakness of being blunt. His fist is mailed and he makes slight effort to conceal it, while Willson wears a glove of velvet as thick and smooth as that of any British diplomat. As between Roosevelt and Willson it is the play of the big stick as against the skilled fencing of the rapier, the rough work of the loud-tongued hound as compared with the expert wheedling of the collie trained to the art of driving sheep. But the sheep are driven all the same. No President ever talked more effusively about the will of the people, as voiced by the elected representatives, than does Willson, and no President ever whipped those same free and independent representatives more remorselessly into line. No President ever insisted more strenuously on the necessity of dealing openly with the public, and never yet have we reverted to the Star Chamber so quickly as under Willson. No President, no man living, could have been less frank on this all-important Mexican question than Willson has shown himself. Many a competent critic has expressed his astonishment that Willson, in "The New Freedom," could attack monopoly so fiercely and yet sheer off with infinite caution when brought to the very edge of the great land question. That has puzzled men of the Marion Reedy type. Let them look at Willson's treatment of the Mexican problem, if they would understand his mental make-up. Let the many and powerful papers which are today confessing that land monopoly is at the bottom of the whole Mexican trouble ask themselves how they can continue to praise the very man who has spared no pains to hide that ugly fact. I, as an American citizen, had a right to look to my President as to a trustworthy schoolmaster who would give me reliable information on so grave a question. I have received only mis-information; have been told that the trouble was as between good and bad governors; have had to discover for myself the economic wrongs which have brought about this great upheaval. I write in all sincerity. I looked for truth and have been fed on lies. My confidence has been abused most basely.

Thousands of my fellow-citizens will see this matter as I see it, and I expect Willson will be eventually one of the most badly-discredited of politicians. He is not a Democrat but an autocrat, as his Congress already has learned. He is not a decentralizer but a most high-handed centralizer, and on that head the record now established is conclusive. His ideal is not freedom but a meddling State Socialism, than which freedom can have no greater foe. Under the pretence of friendship to the Mexican people he has launched against Mexico military forces intended to carve a road of conquest to the Panama canal. In these columns I brand unceasingly Hearst's jingoism, but never for one moment do I forget that Willson has opened the way for him. As between the astute diplomat and the brawling newspaper-vendor I consider the former by far the greater criminal. He is the man who has

concealed the truth, most willfully.

Literary critics are always the first to puncture humbug, and literary critics will be Willson's death. Already they have begun their work, and first among them is the distinguished Senator R. de Zayas Enriquez, a Mexican publicist of high repute. In "The Case of Mexico" Señor Enriquez tells us that, at first, he regarded Willson as a philosopher, swayed by idealism, but that he quickly found himself compelled to abandon that ingenuous attitude. He watched his skill in handling Congress, followed his career as literary man and president of Princeton, and came to the definite conclusion that Willson is merely a politician. In his own words, "Macchiavelli would have been clay in Willson's hands, and, what is more, Macchiavelli would never have known it." He considers, in conclusion, that Willson's attitude toward Panama, and Nicaragua, his speech at Mobile—when delivered it gave us great alarm, which we voiced in "Regeneracion"—and his whole course with reference to Mexico, indicate his desire to acquire suzerainty over all Latin-America. There cannot be a doubt, I think, that Señor Enriquez expresses the view generally held by cultured Latin-America, and who dare say that it holds the view unreasonably?

In a matter so large and complex as is this Mexican Revolution the best of us must fall back largely on conjecture, but I do my utmost to avoid that shaky ground and plant my feet solidly on established fact. I KNOW that the peon's need of the land, from which he has been ousted, is at the very bottom of this bitter conflict, and I know that Willson, by keeping silent on that all-important fact, is misrepresenting the whole problem. It is really a very simple problem, so far as the fundamental factor is concerned, and I propose here to reproduce at considerable length the proceedings at a meeting of the Chicago City Club, held April 25, that our readers may grasp its simplicity. That meeting was addressed by two noted men, the first being Charles Cheney Hyde, professor of international law at the Northwestern University School of Law. He had, as lawyers are apt to have, much to say about the sanctity of vested rights, and he advocated the creation in Mexico of a protectorate similar to that established by the United States in Mexico. Then came a man who really knows Mexico; a man who has lived there many years, not hunting dollars but engaged in archaeological research; a man who told his audience frankly that, living among and working daily with the Mexican peon, he had learned to love him. There is no reason why a man so situated should not love him, for these peons are largely descended from the Aztecs, and have generally the hospitable tendencies and fine manners of that ancient stock. At any rate here is part of what Prof. Frederick J. Monson, of New York City, told his Chicago audience, after explaining that the whole situation in Mexico had been changed with the incoming of those railroads Benito Juarez dreaded so greatly. He said, in part:

"Transportation made the land valuable. It was possible now to begin the development of those lands, but they (the Spanish-Mexican monopolists) could not develop them without labor, and the labor question was a very serious one. The Indians refused to work on the lands because, in the majority of instances, the Indians had their own little ranches and they were quite content and satisfied to live and work on their own land, just as you yourself would be more satisfied to live and work on your own land than to work on the land of somebody else, particularly if you were more successful and more happy on your own."

"Now, you see, this was a very serious thing with the Spanish-Mexicans, and they did not know for some little time what to do, but they finally devised a scheme and this was how it worked out."

"The Indians had occupied their lands for ages; long before the whites came to the country. It was theirs by heredity, and as they could not be moved except by force, jefe politicos and local magistrates were sent to ask them for their titles to their land. Now, the Indians had no titles or deeds. What did they know about titles? And so they simply said: 'We have no titles to the land.' Then, after a short time, they were told to

vacate the land, and when some of them refused to move, troops were sent from the City of Mexico and they were wiped out, murdered, shot—men, women and children—and that put the fear of death into the hearts of the smaller communities, and they were forced to leave their lands and go to work on the white man's land. Thus they became serfs and had a sixteenth-century serfdom forced upon them. On the large haciendas there were cantines or stores owned by the white landowners, where the Indians were compelled to buy everything they needed. These stores were run on a credit system and the Indians were always kept in debt, and when an Indian is in debt in Mexico even his children inherit the debt if the debtor does not live long enough to pay it."

"And so things went from bad to worse, for even so late as 1896 these conditions obtained. There was a locality in Chihuahua called San Carlos; a community of some 600 people. In 1896 the great Terrazas estate set out to annex their land. This estate, of something like 18,000,000 acres, at the head of which was Gen. Luis Terrazas, apparently had not enough land and so aspired to more. The desire for the land was communicated to headquarters and the Indians were told to leave. They refused to vacate and troops were sent, and 553 men, women and children were slaughtered in cold blood. And so, gentlemen, Gen. Terrazas acquired a little more land. Today the war cry of the rebels is 'Remember San Carlos.'"

I express the opinion that the Chicago City Club learned more from that simple address than it could have learned from all the lawyers in the country, and that if any of our readers wish to speak on the Mexican question they cannot do better than read to their audiences that address. I believe they and their audiences will understand through it how intimately connected is the cause of these battling peons with the cause of the battling disinherited throughout the world. I believe it was the duty, the high and commanding duty, of President Willson to give the country information of this type, instead of misleading it with endless talk about the necessity of giving the Mexicans free elections. Judging from the editorials in many powerful newspapers I believe that this country is beginning to understand the truth as to land monopoly in Mexico, but I believe also that the country will continue falsely trusting President Willson until it comprehends the crime of which he has been guilty, in the concealment of that truth. That, therefore, is the propaganda which, as it seems to me, is now most necessary, and through this great sinner we will preach an anti-slavery sermon which all the world shall hear. This Mexican agitation is, as yet, only in its earliest stages, and, before we get through with it we should show up the whole question of land monopoly and strike slavery a blow from which it will never recover. The firm conviction I hold respecting this is my excuse for imposing on my readers so long an article.

WM. C. OWEN

God Blast Thee, Thou Whited Sepulchre

"While the war goes on" is the caption attached by the "Los Angeles Daily Times" to its cartoon representing the Mediator crawling to Niagara Falls. It expresses truth. We are at war with Mexico, having invaded her and killed, at the start, some 200 of her citizens. We are making the matter infinitely more contemptible by being hypocritical about it. The Mexicans understand all this and despise us for it. Also, as a not unnatural consequence, when the news of what had taken place at Veracruz reached the Western coast, Huertista troops tried to retaliate by burning the Manzanillo docks. It may sound fiendish but the shooting of those Veracruz Mexicans, most of them private citizens, does not strike one as having been an act of mercy. Hearst, you may be sure, has not let slip this chance to fan the flame.

Washington despatches assert that the troops now in possession of Veracruz will remain there, supported by the fleet, until there has been "a settlement of Mexico's troubles by agreement among the Zapata, Carranza-Villa and Huerta factions and the United States." In other words, the United States will maintain its

armed forces in Veracruz to see that the pacification of Mexico is brought about by agreement between the local elements, and to see that the debts owing the United States are paid."

This means, as we have maintained from the first, that the Wilson administration means to protect, at enormous sacrifice of life, the vast monopolies which United States speculators have acquired in Mexico. That, in its turn, means that the whole power of the United States government will be used to defeat Mexico's struggle for economic freedom, since as long as those unjust monopolies continue the peon must remain in slavery. There is no escape from that conclusion. Meanwhile the army is furious—see the "Army and Navy Journal"—at being delayed in its eagerly-desired march on Mexico City.

The Washington correspondent of the New York "Evening Post" has the theory that President Willson supports the Constitutionalists because he understands that the problem in Mexico is an agrarian one and considers that Carranza will solve it. There is no evidence to support that theory. Willson has written much on economic freedom, but never has he dared to attack land monopoly. As we learn from a Los Angeles despatch, dated May 15, Mrs. Willson is an absentee landlord, having succeeded, by lawsuit, in establishing her title to land in California valued at \$8000, as against another woman who had homesteaded it. These people, in a word, believe in land monopoly, and show it by their deeds.

One True Voice.

No hope comes from the Progressive Party politicians, for Senator Beveridge has been delivered of a big oration in which he told his audience that Roosevelt would have cut in and settled this question long ago. Another great light of that party, Chester H. Rowell, of Fresno, begins an article in the "California Outlook" by saying: "The problem of Mexico is the land. It is a question which must be solved." Thereupon he declares that the Mexicans themselves cannot solve it, and that we must intervene. But John Reid, who has just returned from Mexico, where he spent four months among the revolutionists, has published a fine article in the "New York Times," in which he indorses practically everything we of "Regeneracion" have been saying for years past. He states that whoever pretends that this is not a revolution by the peons, having the recovery of their lands as its main object, is lying; that we are going down to murder "the peons and their wives; the ignorant, patient, generous race that has slept for 400 years and is now awake, at last, and struggling for liberty and self-consciousness."

Reid adds that "the unorganized mass of the people, without adequate arms of any knowledge of modern warfare—the embattled farmers' like those who stood at Concord and Lexington—will be murdered," for "they will take up their guns with reckless bravery and resist us desperately in the streets and at the doors of their houses." He closes his article with the most outspoken warning that we shall have, as the result of intervention, "the great estates securely re-established, and the peons taught that wage slavery and not individual freedom is the desirable thing in life."

Yes, that is the task to which Hearst and Otis, and the "Army and Navy Journal," and all the upholders of economic iniquity, have set their hands.

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.

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.

RANGEL-CLINE DEFENSE MEETING.

(Continued from page 3, col. 4.)

ception of liberty.

The law is a game where skill, money and training are vital factors—to discolor facts and stir up prejudice. In the pocket of a dead Mexican Liberal was found a flag inscribed, "Land and Liberty." It was found by an old tenant farmer who never owned a foot of land in his life and he went on the stand to swear one of the boys into the penitentiary for ninety-nine years. It is the kind of game we always face. The district attorney was shrewd. He knew the chains meant to the farmers that these were human beasts; knew the farmers were not intelligent enough to grasp the idealism of the flag. They do not understand the issues down there.

No fight made by labor ever leaves the community the same as it was before. It is our duty to go down there from this community and say to San Antonio, "We are going to attempt to present to you what underlies the flag, to ask you to search your minds and see if you are not as much interested in 'Land and Liberty' as are these Mexicans."

It will put new hope and confidence into the labor movement down there and lay the foundation for the future and when trouble comes on the Santa Fe and Southern Pacific you can carry the section hands with you—if you play the game right.

You cannot create a new social consciousness in a day. If we do this educational work in the south—if we save these men, it will tend toward gathering our power together and creating a social consciousness which will make future convictions impossible.

Rangel and Cline are absolutely penniless. They have wired for fifty dollars to argue a rehearing and there is \$1.25 in the treasury. We are past the stage of discussing abstract theories. We are facing the real issues of life. Shall our people go to the gallows and the rope, the gallows be made by workers, the news printed and read by workers? If we allow this thing to be done we are morally guilty. If we don't we will create a precedent in this country for all time and draw into the labor movement a part of the workers without whom we cannot get along.

These men did their best. We may not like rifles, but the workers in Colorado as a last resort took up guns and they were justified and should be supported. So with these. There are two fathers and sons in San Antonio jail. It is a searching time for a father when he asks himself, "Was I justified in putting my boy in this position?" I want you here to answer tonight—not by resolution, but in terms of action: "They were justified." I want you to go out and organize the state and make the protest of this coast reach San Antonio.

Chairman Bill Cook gave some of his own experiences in a Texas jail and Anton Johanssen followed with a tremendous appeal and a practical plan for work.

A large collection was taken up and the plan suggested by Johanssen is already being put into vigorous operation in this city to secure money for the delay in the cases which just now is so vitally necessary.

GEORGIA KOTSCH.

WOMEN'S COMMITTEE ORGANIZED

At the suggestion of Brother Johanssen, a committee of women has been organized under the direction of Mrs. Kneffler, to work for the Rangel-Cline Defense. This committee will visit the various unions and tell the story of the trials and urge the unions to act. Other members of the Women's Committee are Mrs. Georgia Kotsch, Eva Sturtevant, Mrs. R. Yarnell, Miss E. Yarnell, Eunice McMullin.

MEXICANS TO HOLD TEXAS PROTEST MEETING

Realizing that the Rangel-Cline cases are of vital importance to the Mexican workers. It has been decided to hold a gigantic Mexican mass meeting on Sunday afternoon, May 31st, at the Y. P. S. L. Auditorium, 116½ East Third street, Los Angeles. Ricardo Flores Magon, Enrique Flores Magon, Victor Cravello and probably one other speaker will speak in Spanish. It will be entirely in Spanish, but English-speaking workers are invited to show their spirit of Solidarity and be present, too.