

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

No. 226
Saturday Feb. 19, 1916

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

BOLD EVENTS DEMAND BOLD TREATMENT.

Militarism! The United States today is thinking and talking of nothing else, and why? Because it dreads it. The thing that really worries us is on our minds continually, day and night.

Shall we have to go to war with Mexico? Shall we be dragged into the European maelstrom? If we arm ourselves against possible invasion shall we not be taking a remedy worse than the disease itself?

These are the questions all men are putting to themselves and discussing heatedly on every corner. They are not splitting straws. They are not concerning themselves about the abstract theories over which Socialists and Anarchists delight to wrangle. They know nothing and care nothing about the dogmas of the "class struggle," "economic determinism," and all the rest of it. But they do know that if the other fellow has a gun and they haven't, he has them at his mercy; and they also know that the big army and navy of which they are supposed to be the owners may end by owning them. So it is in Europe, and so it may be in these United States. What a dilemma!

Here is the President of the United States running about the country and telling it, though in polished phrases, that it is being kicked and spat upon; and that all he can do is to write interminable notes of protest. "Do you wish to have all the world say that the flag of the United States can be stained with impunity?" he asks at Detroit, and the audience thunders "No." And again: "Do you want the situation to be such that all the President can do is to write messages; to utter words of protest?" And yet again: "The dangers to our peace do not come any longer from within our own borders—I have come to tell you that there is danger to our national life from what other nations may do."

That last quotation will not stand analysis. From within our own borders does come, all the time, the greatest of dangers to our peace. It comes in the shape of our shameful monopolies, and the laws that support them; our shameful traffickers in human life and liberty, and the murders they commit; our ten thousand millionaires and that vast proletariat, employed and unemployed, for which they are responsible; our most unenviable record as a nation wherein homicide, insanity and suicide are rampant as they are rampant nowhere else; above all, in that unshakeable corruption which has made our politics, whether municipal, State or national, a by-word and a hissing. Does not Wilson know that? Does not Wilson know that of all our unreliable and undesirable citizens the politician is the one most universally distrusted? If he does not know it he may be President of the United States but he is an ass; he may have been at the head of a noted university but he should be still in the Kindergarten class.

Personally I am far too susceptible to fine words and those declamations on behalf of individualism and liberty which Wilson, like alas every capable politician, has always on his tongue. I find it hard to read coldly his appeals to honor, courage, self-restraint and other high ideals which, as I hope at least, I cherish dearly. And yet, when I compare these passionate avowals with the actual record, they ring to me false.

President Wilson had such an opportunity, in the matter of men

as fall to the lot of very, very few. He KNEW that Mexico could have no peace as long as absentee landlords were permitted to own estates often comprising millions of acres, and it was his duty to tell the American people that, and tell it straight. That duty he, politician that he is, dared not perform. I have specialized on Mexico, and to me our President's whole course toward Mexico has been a lie.

In my judgment our President's entire course in the matter of this European war has been a lie; a foolish lie that began with a frantic, peace-at-any-price appeal to the nation to abstain from all public discussion of the war. What folly could have been greater than that appeal, for who observed it? The war is a most monstrous crime, involving the ruin and misery of untold millions. To me, at least, the man who does not find it worth his while to investigate as to who was responsible for that crime is a characterless creature, cold as a jelly-fish, indifferent to human suffering as a spider. Yet Wilson is now declaiming that men and nations without character are not worth their salt!

I cannot believe Wilson's constantly-repeated vociferations that he is not playing politics. He is; most shrewdly; with a master hand. His political appointments, calculated carefully to catch the vote of otherwise hostile sections, alone would prove it.

By the way, our readers should get "The Saturday Evening Post," if only for the sake of Blythe's story, "A Western Warwick." Many of our leading writers are doing the finest kind of revolutionary work in stories and especial articles, but it seems to me that Blythe hits hardest. No newspaperman knows the inside of politics more thoroughly than he does, and I do not believe any thoughtful person can read a "Western Warwick" without losing, once and for ever, all confidence in politicians. Surly "A consummation devoutly to be wished."

Here is the point. For more than a century we have been trying this futile experiment of getting somehow—by a thousand hooks but still more by ten thousand crooks—the majorities by which to compel the helpless minorities to do our bidding. Always we have hoped to govern, and always we have found ourselves the ones actually governed. Seeking to rule we have become rotten rulers who hold us helpless in a net of steel. Of all delusions that which Herbert Spencer called "The Great Political Superstition" is by far the most injurious today and nowhere does it hold the people more in thrall than here in the United States, which is, as yet, State Socialistic to the core. There is the real enemy; around that standard the battle royal has to be fought: for without the politicians our present social inequalities would be wiped out of existence in a hurricane of public indignation. So slender is the prop that holds the entire Temple of Mammon from collapsing!

"All the world outside of Americanism fire," says President Wilson, and he would have us understand that this country, with its statue of Liberty and its devotion to lofty ideals of individual freedom—for so he insistently presents it—is the exception. To me that picture, painted with infinite care, is one huge lie. I am very sure that, although it may grow hysterical at meetings, this country is devoted, most passionately, to the pursuit of narrow, materialistic pleasure and the

seething volcano of violently eruptive discontent, and will remain so for many years to come. It has become so corrupted by the warfare of politics—a cowardly warfare, the chief weapon in which is the lie—that it cannot think straight; cannot shake off the disease of fooling itself; cannot take broad, cosmopolitan views; talks, as Wilson talks, of "America for Americans," which is as if I should say, "Owen for Owen, and the rest may go to Hell." A primitive, tribal, village view of life; bred into us by the partisans of politics and fatal to truth and genuine progress.

War is a terrific business, and calls for terrific language. These are war times, in the United States as elsewhere. You cannot pick up a paper without reading an account of some furious attack on property; some ship blown up in harbor, some plant dynamited. I do not believe that this is all the work of German sympathizers. I know that there is an enormous army of discontent eagerly-ready to snatch at the first excuse for violence that comes to hand. I know that terrific causes have brought that army to birth, and I hold that those causes have to be exposed in uncompromising plain language. They are not to be sidestepped or buried in a smother of political clap-trap and professional blarney.

Well then, since there is bound to be a row over this "Preparedness," why not make it the devil of a row; one that shall penetrate every household in the land and force even the most indifferent to think? It can be done if we will stop pottering away our time on non-essentials. Take Wilson at his word and say: "Yes, we agree with you; the country is in the danger of invasion. We must gather up ALL our resources, for without them we can not make adequate defense. Where are those resources; the great natural wealth of this rich continent, which we shall have to draw upon at every step? In the hands of a few millionaires? What are they doing there? Take them out! What is all this skilled and unskilled labor doing? Working for these same millionaires. Set them free. Alter your whole land and money system so radically that every one shall have the chance of working for himself and getting a real stake in the country he is called on to defend. This is no time for Nancy talk. If you want the decks stripped for action, strip them. If you really want your men fit for any fight that may come along, lose not a moment in encouraging them to get into fighting trim. They won't tumble over one another to give their lives for Wall Street, or for the sort of fellows who are running your sweatshops. If you mean business, get down to it. If you are going to do thing at all, do it thoroughly. And don't imagine that you can confine conscription to the mere laborer's flesh and blood. "A hole lot of other confiscation is in order."

No! I am not in favor of minimizing the danger. I am in favor of ringing the alarm bell loud and strong. I agree with our President that the world has broken into flames, and I opine that unless we move promptly onto a juster—which means a more "efficient"—basis, we shall go under. Dollars will not save us from shipwreck. What we want is MEN.

Wm. C. OWEN.

"LAND AND LIBERTY." Mexico's Battle for Economic Freedom and its Relation to Labor's World-Wide Struggle. Selected from writings of Enrique Flores Magon. Atlanta, Ga., P. Araya and Wm. C. Owen—10c a copy. An edition of over 50 copies, 7c per copy.

Several of our most stalwart friends have congratulated this section on its criticisms of the McNamara case. My convictions make me lots of enemies, and naturally the few words of encouragement which come along are doubly welcome. Nevertheless this special commendation makes me heart-sick. The McNamara case was, to me, of such trivial importance that I only threw it an occasional word, and it fills me with despair to observe how, even at this late date, everything written about attracts attention. The most insignificant of skirmishes in the great revolutionary struggle which rages all around us! The most meaningless of incidents, inasmuch as it was not a stroke for principle and served only to boost into notoriety the "Los Angeles Times," a lot of profit-seeking lawyers and a swarm of hangers-on. For example, Emma Goldman, a professed preacher of individual liberty, who is supposed to teach that the attempt to govern men is at the root of social troubles. What, I ask, had that lady to do with a closed shop conflict, wherein certain workmen hired out the job of attacking other workmen because they would not join the Union? Or Clarence Darrow, who professes to be a follower of Tolstoy, and whose book, "Resist not Evil," is being boomed by "Everyman."

This lack of discrimination fills me with despair; for without the capacity to discriminate all talents and all energies are worse than useless. The Mexican Revolution is evidently a thousand times more important than ever hope to be, for it challenges boldly the right of a privileged few to corner our joint heritage, the earth; and, challenging that, it strikes directly at the heart of all are bayonet-propped, government-supported, artificial and unnatural system of monopoly. It is, in almost every feature, a reproduction of the great French Revolution; still ignorant, still groping in the dark, but wiser and larger in its aims, thanks to the accumulated knowledge of the past century. The French Revolution was an event of paramount because of permanent importance. It marked the passing of another milestone and all the scenery changed. So will it be with its legitimate successor, the upheaval now taking place in Mexico.

Great land monopolists have been driven into exile and punished as they never have been punished since the French masses turned on their privileged nobility. American losses alone are placed at \$300,000,000. For five years past United States troops have lined the border, daily looking for the call to arms. A United States fleet has shelled one of Mexico's chief seaports and hundreds of lives have been sacrificed in that one episode alone. The cabinets of every civilized country have been perturbed increasingly by the threatening spectre of a nation that suddenly has turned on all that our diplomats, wedded to exploitation of the weaker peoples, hold most sacred. A proud church that for centuries ruled things with an iron hand has found its authority scattered to the winds. Examine this combination and ask yourselves if it does not present us with a problem worthy the attention of every serious man, whether he be conservative or radical. Then turn and contemplate the appalling indifference and ignorance our alleged revolutionary leaders have shown respecting it. There is apparently only one other subject on which they are so ill-informed, and that is the European war; a

question even more important because on its issue hangs the decision of whether we shall take an immense step forward in the direction of a true industrialism, or lapse into militarism, with all the slavery a military philosophy and a military regime entail.

Take no less a personage than Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, who only a few weeks ago made a great speech in which he denounced paternal governments and declared that he neither wished to rule over others nor be ruled by them—which is the position of the Anarchist. Look how Wilson is drifting back and back toward that very paternalism he anathematized; away from Jeffersonian Democracy, with its motto that the government which governs least is best, and toward State Socialism of the rank type. Today events have forced him out of the snug security of vague generalizations and into the arena of actual fight—that arena from entering which nineteen hundredth of our so-called revolutionists still shrink. Wilson has been forced to take a stand; to side with the idea of a strongly centralized, all-embracing government, or to put his foot down and oppose it, tooth and nail. Of course he has chosen the former course. What lawyer really wishes that the influence of the legal fraternity shall be diminished? What politician desires to curtail the power of the machine he owns and operates? Therefore, Wilson has turned rightabout, and today he is in favor of a "Preparedness" program he would have branded a year ago as militarism incarnate. But it is especially in connection with the Mexican problem that he is striding with seven-leagued boots toward reaction of the most virulent type. The Pan-American Scientific Congress drew a speech from him that tore away the mask and revealed to all the world exactly where he stands. He is in favor of a gigantic policing scheme, that shall insure tranquility to North and South America by suppressing revolutions. Of that policing force the United States necessarily the head, and its prime object will be, as the New Orleans "Times Picayune" well puts it, "to strangle popular risings regardless of their motive and necessity," and "to guarantee the permanence of things as they are and not as they ought to be."

Wilson urges the adoption of an agreement necessary to the peace of the American, that no State of either continent will permit revolutionary expeditions against another State to be fitted out on its territory, and that they will prohibit the exportation of the munitions of war for the purpose of supplying revolutionists against neighboring governments. "Those were his very words, and he justified them by insisting that they were necessary to 'not only the international peace of America, but the domestic peace of America. If American States,' he said, 'are constantly in ferment, if any of them are constantly in ferment, there will be a standing threat to their relations with one another.' There, if you like, is a Peace-at-any-price program for you. There, if you like, is a declaration that present conditions must be maintained at any cost. I have had that speech before me several days, and the more I have thought into it the more infamous does it appear to me.

To its great credit be it said a considerable portion of even the Democratic press has taken the alarm. The Brooklyn "Eagle" reminds the President that the cause of liberty "has always depended on outside purchases of arms. No phase of tyranny, no matter how gross, could be checked if the tyrants' minions had machine guns and no modern weapons were available for patriots." Most properly "The Outlook" reminds him that "Americans will never forget that their own national life was born in the throes of a revolution, and they can never take wittingly a position of opposition or even indifference, to those who, in desperation, undertake, through revolution, to establish justice and liberty." The Wichita "Eagle" asks: "What if the United States had been unable to secure munitions from France in 1776?" and the "Times Picayune," from which I have already quoted, sums up the matter thus: "Each of the American republics, including our own, was founded by force. The time has not arrived when the people of all the Americas may safely be deprived of that weapon for defence of their rights and liberties against domestic despotisms. Cuba was rescued from oppression by force. Force alone overthrew, or still more recently, Castro in Venezuela and Zelaya in Nicaragua. In all of these recent instances the overthrow was applauded by the American people. The despotism in Mexico, which had ceased to be benevolent and was guilty of grievous wrongs against humanity, could not have been smashed without the resort to arms. Another may take its place. For Americans do not have to be told that it is possible, under Republican forms of government, to set up régimes as despotic and corrupt as prevailed in medieval times."

As a matter of cold, hard fact the whole of this Pan-American scheme is a thoroughly undemocratic proceeding, and no one should be able to recognize that more clearly than President Wilson. Representatives of widely-scattered countries, most of them nearer neighbors to Europe than us, are coaxed into coming to Washington and formulating a paper plan. In truth they need no coaxing, for all of them are politicians, and politicians invariably jump at anything that will bring them into print. Then they calmly announce that their respective countries are unitedly in favor of our President's wise plan, and they formulate a treaty by which they profess to bind millions of their subjects who never heard of it and probably never will. What nauseating humbug! What appalling hypocrisy on the part of a man who today is on the stump, mouthing his loyalty to democratic principles and begging the people to make him their magistrate once more, precisely because he is so loyal!

Whenever I am tempted to bewail my lot I pull myself up by thanking God that, whatever other sins may lie at my door, I at least am not a politician. No good can come of entrusting power to these professional Turn-coats. No business, national or individual, can prosper when entrusted to men cynically devoid of principle. And it is in the sidesteppings, the twistings, the catering to opportunism, of politicians as we know them that we can read the inevitable failure of the whole State Socialist philosophy. To our politicians all existing forms of social iniquity look for protection, and find it. To our politicians Dives, staggering beneath his load of loot, runs for shelter, and is housed. On our politicians' militarism relies for that enormous system of compulsory taxation which enables them to plunge into and conduct their wars. Life is a serious business, to be conducted by men keenly conscious of the responsibilities resting on them. Politicians are the last of men to be so classified, and all who have any practical knowledge of politics will endorse that statement.

Wm. C. OWEN.

KEEP OUT OF MEXICO!

Collector of Customs John B. Elliott issued a statement on the Mexican-American crisis today. Mr. Elliott is very closely in touch with the government. His office here represents the executive branch of the government in this section.

It is felt, therefore, that the following statement represents the keynote of the government's views on the situation. Mr. Elliott is in very close touch with the situation, as he has under his direct supervision over 200 miles of American-Mexican boundary:

STATEMENT OF COLLECTOR

Mr. Elliott's statement follows: "The killing of nineteen Americans by bandits in Mexico is a very deplorable affair. The death of numerous Americans in that country during the past three years' strife there has been a matter of deep concern and regret. Every one must feel the fullest sympathy for the bereft relatives and friends of these latest victims.

"However, what is the answer? Have not all persons in this country been fully warned, time and again, to stay out of Mexico until order is restored there? Are not all Americans aware that life is not safe there? Has the United States yet told any one that it is safe to go to Mexico? It has not. Then why do they go? Why are they in such haste to rush into known danger. Only to 'make money in Mexico,' of course. And is that a cause that should agi-

tate us so much? Is there any one bold enough to assert openly that the citizens of the United States should be willing to shed their blood in a war with Mexico in order to make it safe for him to go there and 'make money'? Yet that is exactly what all this hue and cry about 'It is time to protect Americans and American interests in Mexico,' and 'It is high time for the United States to intervene in Mexico,' ect., means.

QUESTIONS INTERVENTION

"Let those who are not willing to stay out of Mexico until the trouble is over there tell us exactly what 'intervention' means. They call very loudly for 'intervention,' but carefully avoid explaining what is to follow 'intervention.' I do not believe one person in 10,000 in this country wants war with Mexico. The people know 'intervention' means war, and war means the death of thousands of Americans from bullets and disease that would attend a military invasion of the southern republic.

"Remember, it would be no forenoon picnic to subdue a country of certain courage, and undoubted pride of nationality, that has been living by the rille and the sword for nearly five years now. Besides death to themselves, it would mean all the misery and horror of war to our enlisted men, who would be ordered there, and to those left at home. It would mean the earned, deep fixed hatred of our country by Mexico for half a century and perhaps longer.

"Having subdued the Mexicans by means steel and lead—and we could, of course, do that—we should have to keep them subdued that way. Are we prepared for that—to maintain our will in Mexico with the cannon and bayonet for no one knows how long to come?"

MEXICO HAS RIGHT

"Besides all of that, we have no right to do it! In the name of all that is sacred in liberty, has not Mexico the right to fight, slay and bleed herself nearly to death in order that her hard questions may be settled—if she prefers to do it that way? We, in these United States, were quick enough to resent interference by outsiders when we were fighting the bloody contest between the states of the Union in 1861-65. We struck at anyone then who started to interfere in our fight. Why not grant to Mexico that same right to settle its own internal differences? I agree with those who say that Americans might best show their patriotism in those days by staying strictly away from places that are known to be dangerous and where their presence might cause trouble and involve this country in great difficulties—perhaps drag his countrymen into a war, and all that that entails.

"For nearly five years there has been practically a reign of terror in Mexico, comparable in many ways to the French revolution in cause and effect. Every sane person knows such a deep-seated revolution as this in Mexico cannot be quickly settled by any human agency. No power on earth can restore tranquility in Mexico short of a considerable length of time. General Carranza cannot do it, nor anyone else, in a day, a week or a month. Then why not stay out of that country until peace and order is fully restored.

OVER KEEN FOR MONEY.

"Only those who are over keen to make money out of Mexico are anxious to go there now. And this spirit is hardly one—bearing in mind how Mexico has already been so shamelessly plundered and bled by certain selfish interest—to call us to arms.

"Let those who loudly shout 'intervention' tell us just exactly about what is meant by 'intervention,' and what will follow it. It has required great patience, not only on the part of President Wilson, but all Americans, to endure all that has occurred across the international boundary to the south, but isn't Patience, mixed with Common Sense, the best thing to use in this case? If not, what is better? Let those who think there is something better stop shouting 'intervention' and tell us what is to follow 'intervention.'"

(Los Angeles Evening Herald)—a Hearst paper.)