

Regeneración

English Section

Edited by WM. C. OWEN

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Single copy, 5 cts.
One dollar a year.—6 months, 50c.

No. 237

Saturday May 6, 1916

Send money payable to
ENRIQUE FLORES MAGON.
P. O. Box 1236, Los Angeles, Cal.

THEY GET THE KERNEL AND Leave Us The Shell.

(Continued from last issue)
I agree, therefore, with President Wilson's Anarchistic declaration, and I see its working-out both in Europe and in America. For what was the fight put up by Belgium, Serbia and other supposedly subject nationalities but a declaration that they no longer intend to be more counters, shoved hither and thither as suits the convenience of some greater power? And what does Mexico's revolution mean except that the Mexicans no longer intend to be the dice with which American and other powers gamble away the future of their race?

For my part I never expect a Socialist to understand all this, for a Socialist is at bottom a fanatic on government and considers that it is the duty of the minority to submit. But I do expect an Anarchist, because Anarchism is nothing save so far as it upholds the individual in his efforts to shake off domination. And if we have been disappointed most bitterly in many supposed Anarchists it is because they are not really such; because they are revolutionary Socialists who do not think in terms of the free individual but in terms of the supposed interests of the collectivity, and are slaves to the delusion that the collectivity can thrive by withholding justice from the individual. Such people do not think. They are merely emotional sentimentalists, and the words are full of them. Confront them with a real struggle by real men to achieve real freedom and they side-step every time.

President Wilson is a study, and not at all a difficult one. Having read many of his speeches and writings I have no hesitation whatever in saying that he is at heart a Jeffersonian Democrat; a believer in the sociological conclusions reached by Buckle; essentially, in all his philosophical attitude toward life; a non-interfering Anarchist. And this man is in politics! This man is the standard-bearer of a party that once believed in individual liberty and as little government as possible, but today practices the feudal-Socialism of which Tammany Hall is the legitimate representative! There is the contradiction—a contradiction that plunges him daily deeper and deeper into mud. As a student, as scholar, his sympathies are all with individual freedom; and he knows, as well as any man, that while the masses are denied access to natural resources it is idle to talk of personal independence, democratic equality or fraternal co-operation worthy of the name. As a practical man of affairs, on the other hand, he has tied himself to an organization that is not working for individual liberty but for party power; which, therefore, is the assassin of individual liberty; which has nothing in the world to offer but a miserable State Socialism that multiplies officials, institutes on every possible opportunity that very paternalism President Wilson professes to abhor, and will make this country the helpless football of professional politicians. Were I a bitter foe of the United States I could wish it no fate more tragic than that of slowly succumbing to this Socialistic poison which today has penetrated every artery of public life and has reduced what should be a powerful nation of a hundred million people to the degrading level of a helpless mob that can only clamor while its drivers herd it into whatever pen their private interests dictate. We talk, rightly, of the corruption of commercial life, but it is driven snow as

compared with politics. We talk of the tyranny of capitalism, but it is baby play as compared with the despotic pressure our politicians exercise. For, mark it well! Otis owes his economic power mainly to his control of the political machine, just as Hearst, and all the land-grabbers who gorged themselves on Mexico, owe their special privileges to the governmental monopoly wielded by Porfirio Diaz and the " Cientificos."

Wilson the man and Wilson the Democratic leader are necessarily in eternal conflict, and thus we have White House declarations such as would fill my own heart with joy were they not accompanied, step by step, by Democratic policies that slap them in the face. It is a fact, a frightful fact, that during the brief rule of this theoretical opponent of paternalism the United States has been driving headlong into those very conditions. President Wilson so repeatedly deplores; States being stripped of their initiative, Congress being shorn of its powers and the entire law-making function having passed more and more into the hands of bureaucratic groups run by departmental clerks. And similarly, in my opinion—and I have watched things carefully—the very President who, as an individual, has been most in sympathy with Mexico, has steered persistently the course certain to bring about the situation now confronting us. Hating the idea of intervention, and denouncing it repeatedly, Wilson has been intervening all the time most ineffectively and, therefore, most irritatingly. Siding with Madero, who was an impossible Portuguese Jew, he made war on Huerta, who was an Indian, understood his country and, in my judgment, shared the Indian's time-honored hatred of land monopoly. For, few people seem to remember that Huerta proposed measures of land confiscation which threw the "Los Angeles Times" into hysterics, drawing from it one of the most denunciatory articles I ever read.

This was followed by a see-sawing between Villa and Carranza, with the latter of whom we are now apparently in close alliance. Yet Carranza's Minister of War comes out, under the date of March 29, with a statement that begins, "The United States is responsible for the trouble long the border;" while the U. S. Senator Fall, who is credited with long and exceptional knowledge of Mexico, insists that, as compared with Carranza, "the autocracy of the Czar of Russia is not in the same class. Was it not inevitable that a man of Villa's type would resort to war against a government that, having made love to him most amorously, threw itself suddenly into the arms of his most hated rival?"

No; neither in politics nor in revolutionary agitation can we hope to arrive unless we have principles and stick to them. Wilson, the individual, undoubtedly has principles; but Wilson, the politician, has formed alliances which force him to swallow his principles as best he can. The organization, and the craze to hold on to the organization at any price, pulls him down, precisely as it has pulled down every labor and revolutionary leader I have known, in an experience that now covers nearly forty years. Invariably they have started out with enthusiasm for those bottom truths which alone are capable of making men enthusiastic. Invariably they have succumbed to the crave for a following and an organization that shall give them standing. Then they set out on the fatal path of being all things to all men,

Then the avalanche of compromise begins to slide, and all is lost.

Through fear of offending, our public leaders, headed by President Wilson, have refused to state a simple truth they know quite well; viz. that there can be no peace in Mexico so long as land monopoly endures. There cannot be because the population of Mexico is chiefly Indian, and all Indians look on land monopoly as equivalent to slavery. Uphold land monopoly and you are necessarily at war with them; at war with ten millions of them; at war with men who have plastered their country with pronouncements that declare their war will be an Indian war, a war without mercy, a war in which every weapon will be regarded as legitimate. It will be by far the greatest Indian war on record, and, in my judgment, it will prove to be the most disastrous piece of work to which the United States could possibly have set its hand. In North America we exterminated a people that preferred death to slavery, that we might erect on their graves a plutocracy that can only exist by slavery. In Mexico we are now proposing to open a similar page of history, but one that will be far bloodier and even more fatal to that spirit of liberty from which this would-be Republic sprang and at whose shrine it still is supposed to worship.

Wm. C. Owen.

London Predicts War With Mexico; "Stop Invasion."

WASHINGTON, April 3.—Opposing the emergency appropriation for the Mexican expedition of the United States Army, Socialist Congressman Meyer London bluntly told the House that it must be prepared within a fortnight for war with the whole Mexican people.

He declared that owners of a powerful section of the press with "unclean motives," were driving President Wilson headlong into the most serious blunder of his career, and that the program of these newspaper owners, to maintain a large American army in Mexico and to spread out the area of invasion, was merely serving to increase the prestige of the vandit Villa.

The Socialist Congressman urged that the American policy should be one strictly of defense of the territory of this, in order that no foundation might be laid for a war of conquest in our neighboring republic. He pointed out that "punitive" expeditions such as the one upon which the administration has launched, have generally been mere pretexts to the seizure of foreign soil.

"One-half of the wars by which European powers have secured colonial expansion in the last fifty years were preceded by 'punitive' enterprises," he said.

EUROPEAN WAR BEGUN THIS WAY
"The present conflagration in Europe started by a 'punitive' expedition against helpless Serbia. Madagascar, one of the largest colonies of France, was acquired in this way, and so were other African possessions.

"You cannot chase a bandit with an army of 50,000 men, just as you cannot send a locomotive to chase a bird. The entire proposition is an indefensible one. Within a week or two you will find your army deep in the territory of Mexico, and you will find the Mexican people rallying around that bandit as a patriot. Every day that this invasion continues you are increasing the

strength of Villa or some similar bandit.

"Only yesterday the President was compelled to appeal to the press to stop inflaming the passions. To stop publishing misleading 'news.' In spite of this, he will be forced by a dishonest press, by a press dictated by the most unclean motives of its owners, to maintain a large army in Mexico and to spread out the area of invasion.

WILL EMBROIL WHOLE NATION

"You will find yourselves at war, not with the bandit, Villa, but with the Mexican people. That is why I voted against the resolution the other day, and if I had more time now I entertain the hope that I could convince a great many that his expedition into Mexico is one of the most serious blunders of the President's career and one of the most serious blunders of this Congress.

"What I would do is this: I would have the National Guard, the regular troops and a citizen army protect every inch of the border of the United States. I would not permit a single soldier to invade the territory of another people, because that means laying the foundation of a long war, which will be a calamity to the United States."

(Social Democrat,
Los Angeles, California.)

Who Are The Invaders?

It will be the crime of the ages—the unpardonable sin—for the United States, with its claims of neutrality and peaceful disposition, its boasted superiority of civilization and its calm assumption of a benevolent protectorate, to interfere in Mexico at this time, or any other time.

"To protect American citizens and their property" we hear. American citizens have no right to acquire property in Mexico except at their own risk. There is plenty of property in our own country for good citizens to acquire and no one is morally bound to protect them when they stray too far from home on an expedition of expansion. They will not be molested if they act like human beings and brothers; workmen are not molested; it is only the exploiters that are sought.

Again American citizens have no right to acquire property in Mexico contrary to the wishes of the Mexican people. "The Mexican government sold them the property" you say. The Mexican government had no right to give or sell; it did not belong to the Mexican government, it belonged to the Mexican people. It was the Mexican government, not the Mexican people, that allowed Americans to enter and despoil; it is the American government, not the American people, that sends the troops to protect the despoilers. Our governments have gotten us into trouble instead of protecting us; but the people of both countries will have to pay the price in tears, lives and money.

What is government? It is an institution created by the people of any nation, to protect and benefit them better collectively than they could do for themselves individually. Now it has grown in every country to be greater than the people who created it; to be their master, instead of their servant, as was originally intended. It is now a thing separate and apart from the people instead of an integral part of the people and their national life. The great question now is, "Do we elect public officials to be our rulers or our servants?"

The Mexican people, if not the Mexican government, has every reason to resent the entry of the U. S. army—not the U. S. people—for interference or for conquest. Any one who has studied the Mexican situation for the last four years knows how the people have been despoiled and dispossessed, driven and hounded, until they are desperate. They are like tigers at bay; fighting for

their live snaking their last stand for land and liberty, home and the means of living. Why should not they resent and resist intrusion? Why shouldn't they fight and kill their despoilers? Would not a courageous, self respecting, patriotic, liberty loving American citizen do the same thing under the same circumstances? The only difference between us is that we have not known as hard times and not for so many years, and have not become so embittered.

We have no right to police Mexico; it would be better to play the part of neighbor and brother than of policeman and censor. But as long as we can not help Mexicans to regain their rights

without crossing so many conflicting interests, the least we can do is to leave them to settle their own differences. There is no cause for hate—or for war—between the people of the U. S. and the people of Mexico. The Mexican people are intensely patriotic, loyal to their people and to their country. They want Mexico for Mexicans and they have a right to it.

The writer is an American born citizen, of puritan descent, and would like to see this country live up to the high ideals and libertarian principles for which our fore fathers fought, bled and died.

NORMA RAY.

The Suppressed Papers.

So far as we know three rebel papers have recently been suppressed by the postal authorities. They are "The Blast" of San Francisco, "The Alarm" of Chicago and "Revolt" of New York.

The Post Office Dept. is doing its best to silence all the rebel papers that show any spirit, but these papers are also determined to keep alive as may be seen by the following extract taken from a circular we have received from "Revolt":

"Friends and Comrades:

All issues of the REVOLT are suppressed by a secret order of the federal authorities.

We are not even allowed to send the REVOLT in closed envelopes—as first class mail matter.

"We do not whine. The REVOLT is suppressed but not our spirit. We shall continue the fight in our own manner.

"LOOK OUT FOR OUR NEW PUBLICATION!!"
"REVOLT Publishing Ass'n."

A PROTEST.

The trial of Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magon is to begin on May the 31st. The Magons have for many years suffered relentless persecution for their unceasing libertarian work.

The trial at everyone of their convictions has been a shameful farce and a fraud. All of those who disapprove of such methods and dislike to see a repetition of same can show their protest by writing to Judge Benjamin F. Bledsoe who will try the Magons and to Prosecuting District Attorney Albert Schoonover, Federal Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif. Act at once.

OUR VANISHING LIBERTY Of The Press.

For over a century it has been believed that we had abolished rule by divine right, and the accompanying infallibility of officialism, and that we have maintained inviolate the liberty of conscience, of speech and of press. However, this belief of ours is fast becoming a matter of illusion. Though a love for such liberty is still verbally avowed, yet in every conflict raising an issue over it, it is denied in practice. There is not a state in the Union to-day, in which the liberty of the press is not abridged upon several legitimate subjects of debate. Here will be discussed but one of these, and that perhaps the most unpopular.

By gradual encroachments and unconscious piling of precedent upon precedent, we are rapidly approaching the stage in which we will enjoy any liberties only by permission, not as a matter of right. In this progressive denial of the freedom of conscience, speech and press, all three branches of government have transgressed, without seriously disturbing the serene, sweet, century-long slumber, into which we are lulled, by the songs of liberty, whose echoes still resound in ears but whose meaning we have long since forgotten.

A century ago we thought that we had settled all these problems of liberty. In all our constitutions

we placed a verbal guarantee of liberty of speech and press, then stupidly went to sleep, assuming that the Constitution had some mysterious and adequate potency for self-enforcement. This is the usual mistake, always so fatal to all liberties, and the multitude is too superficial and too much engrossed with a low order to selfish pursuits to discover that constitutions need support of public opinion which demands that very doubtful construction shall be resolved against the state and in favor of individual liberty.

Extract from THEODORE SCHROEDER's book, "Free Speech for Radicals."

The Magon and May Day Meetings.

Two militant and interesting meetings have been held within the last few days. The first was the Magon protest meeting given by the Latin groups at Symphony Hall the 29th of April. The second was the lively May Day celebration held at the Labor Temple Auditorium Monday night, the first of May, under the auspices of the Workers International Defense League.

There is no doubt that at the present time we are going thru an unusual depression of spirit in the labor and radical movement all over the country. Taking this into consideration, the above mentioned meetings were well attended and the spirit their manifested was very gratifying.

At the first meeting the addresses by the speakers were very well received, and the audience also seemed to enjoy a chorus of Mexican children that was part of the program, and who after the meeting were invited to participate in the May Day celebration where they also took part.

A very appreciable feature of both meetings, and especially the one at Labor Temple, was the mixed and varied appearance of the crowd that attended, giving it a truly international aspect.

Every part of the program at both meetings was most enjoyable, and so were the fitting remarks of the speakers. But unquestionably the surprising and outstanding feature at both celebrations was the impassioned and eloquent espousal of the Mexican Revolution by Sam Atkinson the noted Rationalist lecturer who spoke at both meetings. His good grasp of the social and economic phases of the Mexican situation is really surprising when we consider that he devotes his time to a very different field of activity, and still more so when we realize how very few are the radicals in this country who really understand the Mexican Revolution as it is.

A better idea of Atkinson's remarks may be had from the following extracts of his speeches: "I am in sympathy with the Mexican Revolution because it is the greatest movement of emancipation that ever was known. The Mexican peon is a great revolutionary and he is as high above the socialists, I. W. W. s and anarchists of this country as the stars are above the ground. The Mexican peon can tell you in three words what he wants: 'Bread, Land and Liberty'; and

he fights to get it, where as the socialist, I. W. W. s and anarchists talk, philosophize and pass resolutions and don't know what they want.

"The Mexican peon fights for the land and absolute social and economic freedom. The American peon fights for the 8 hour day and a few cents increase in wages."

"Zapata is truly a great general; he is not an authoritarian but a libertarian. His soldiers fight of their own volition and pleasure without a master from above, and they know what they fight for. The capitalist papers speak of Zapata as a bandit but a Sunday school teacher by the name of John D. Jr. in this country steals \$2,500 a year from each of the thousands of his slaves and is called a gentleman. If the word 'gentleman' means anything it should well apply to Zapata.

"The Magon Brothers are being hounded because of their work for a great cause, let us challenge the Government and show that it is breaking its own laws in order to persecute the Magons.

"I cannot help this great cause in a financial way but I will help it in any way I can with my voice, my pen and even with my body."

Such is Sam Adkinson. The pity of it is that there are so few like him, else the Mexican Revolution, its course and aims would not be ignored by so many as it is now in this country and elsewhere.

R. G. Cox.

MAY THE 31st.

Very unexpectedly and without any notice, our comrades Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magon were hauled before Judge Trippe's court on Monday April, 24 to decide upon the date for the beginning of their trial, which was set for May the 31st.

So, once more Ricardo and Enrique shall sit before a court of the land and face the old scenes again. As in former times, the Magons are not the ones on trial but it is a cause that is at issue. And this particular time it is the freedom of thought and expression for the underdog, for those who dare to speak out and denounce in plain terms the misrule of the present order. The capitalist and yellow sheets are absolutely immune from all this, the Hearst papers for instance, carry a continuous scream urging and inciting people to fly at each others' throats, but they are not molested. At the present time he is working day and night to force the people of this country into a bloodfest with the Mexican people, but we don't see screaming headlines announcing that Hearst has been arrested for "using the mails to circulate matter that tends to incite to murder, arson and assassination." There is a difference.

R. G. Cox.

An Explanation.

Since the arrest of the comrades some lesser articles have appeared in the English section of "Regeneración" without signature. We like to explain that all such articles are not written by comrade William C. Owen, as he signs all his writings. The articles referred to above are from the hand of R. G. Cox,

Report of the money received by Los Angeles Branch Workers' International Defense League for MAGON defense.

RECEIPTS FOR WEEK ENDING 4-24-16.

Previously acknowledged—\$272.88

Workman's Circle No. 248 Los Angeles, \$2; Jus. Roman, Ladd, Ill. \$2; Sheet Metal Workers Union No. 349, St. Louis, Mo., \$2; Geo. Billings, Chicago, Ill., 50c; Antonio Touri, South Range, Mich., \$2; Workmen's Circle No. 70 New York, N. Y., \$1; Collection by Leonard D. Abbott, New York, N. Y., \$1.65; Mrs. M. A. Spurgeon, Austin, Tex., \$1; Frank Fox, Santa Clara, Calif., 25c.—Total: \$285.28.
P. D. Noel.