

Regeneration.

Published every Saturday at 914 Bostor St., Los Angeles, Cal. Telephone: Home A 1360. SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 3 months, 60c; 6 months, \$1.10; 1 year, \$2.00; Single copy, 5c; in bundles, 3c per copy.

No. 105. Saturday, August 31, 1912.

Mexico Follows In France's Footsteps

About the time when these United States were rebelling against Great Britain, France was starving and on the verge of bankruptcy, from causes that were simplicity itself. Practically the only asset was agriculture, and the land had to support a continually-increasing number of idlers, whose taste for luxury grew even faster than their numbers. They consisted mainly of the nobility and their enormous retinues, the office holders, clergy and lawyers, all of whom had multiplied enormously. Their maintenance depended on the peasant's toil. The peasant held the land on what was called "fief" from the land monopolist, and was subject to a bewildering array of dues. For what would seem to us trifling offenses he was branded or broken on the wheel, and the convict galleys were always full. Especially was he punished mercifully, for His Lordship's amusement must be guarded at all costs. When His Lordship ran out of cash he pledged his peasantry dues to money lenders, who farmed them out to others. If the peasant made improvements the dues were raised; but it seems almost superfluous to mention this, since landlords follow to this day that homicidal course. In a word—a nation starving, and from the simplest causes. On the one hand the leeches, ever demanding more and richer blood. On the other hand the unfortunate patient, praying that they stop the bleeding.

In the simplest words at my command I sketch the causes that begot the French Revolution. My object is to compare it with what we know of the social question everywhere, and, of course, more particularly in Mexico; since Mexico also is a country wherein the land has been monopolized by a few, whose increasing luxury has called continually on the money lenders for help; a country wherein the peasant has been forced to carry all the burden, and has been punished with medieval ferocity when unequal to the load. What I have said about the leeches is only a paraphrase of Tolstoy's celebrated declaration that the rich will do everything in the world for the poor, except the one thing necessary, viz., get off their backs. Whether man has been living under the sway of Imperial Rome, the feudal regime or our modern money rule, the cause of poverty has been always the same—monopoly by the few, who have crushed the many to fill their own pockets and elevate themselves to power. Names, forms, of government, time and place, make not the slightest difference. The cause and the result are always and everywhere the same.

Today we all recognize that the French Revolution was inevitable; that things had reached a pass wherein slow measures of reform were like attempting to stay Niagara by throwing pebbles at the current. As a matter of fact the ruling classes foresaw the danger and strove to avert it. They established an Estates General, just as the Russian ruling classes established a Duma, and for a time the peasant looked to it confidently for salvation. Then the peasant found, as the Mexicans have found in the case of Madero, that only talk resulted, and his bitterness grew more and more pronounced. Luis XVI tried a number of financial ministers, but they dared not go to the roots, and their makeshifts came to nothing. The ablest and most daring of them all, Necker, finally proposed to tax the clergy, the nobles and the parliament; for, said the most truly, "They alone can pay." He proposed to bleed the privileged as if they themselves were mere peasants, and that finished him. As today, the rich were eager to help the poor, but they would not get off their backs. Have their incomes confiscated and go to work for a living? Never! They preferred to die in their tracks, and die they did; save those who flew to other lands for safety, as hundreds of monopolists have flown of late from Mexico.

Into power came the Jacobins, who were the counterparts of our modern Socialists. They worked for a democratic State, thirsted for rule and had no conception of individual liberty. Their creed was that the Republic could have only one will, which, of course, was that set out in the Jacobin platform. They talked and talked; held conventions and cut a tremendous swath in the annals of oratory, with which unfortunately history mainly concerns itself. Meanwhile throats were cut and property confiscated right and left, until capital, headed by England, formed a European coalition, which tried to put down the revolution; just as those who now favor intervention in Mexico would try to put down that second French Revolution. While the Jacobins were misconducting themselves in Paris and other centers, the French peasantry were fighting for their newly-acquired homes, and fighting with a courage that held Europe at bay. This is how they felt, as described by one of France's most reliable writers, Stendhal, in his "Memoirs sur Napoleon": "To our eyes the inhabitants of the rest of Europe,

who were fighting to keep their chains, were only pitiable imbeciles or knaves sold to the despots who were attacking us. Pitt or Cobourg seemed to us the chief of these knaves, and the personification of all the treachery and stupidity in the world. In 1794 our inmost, serious sentiment was wholly contained in this idea; to be useful to our country."

Napoleon and his artillery made short work of Jacobin rioters and reformers, just as today the galling gun will put the most determined city mob to flight. He knocked democratic politics sky-high, but the economic demands of the peasantry, which carried on guerrilla warfare at ten thousand points, he could not crush, and to them he had to bend. He gave the peasantry the land, because he had to give it. He not only gave it to them there and there, but, by his celebrated code, he made it almost impossible for the peasant to divorce himself from possession of the soil. So, after Jacobin talk had come to nothing; after political reform had been thrown on the scrap heap and royalty had swelled to empire, there remained the peasant; the peasant no longer hung, broken on the wheel or thrown into the galleys, but master of himself because master of the soil on which he had been formerly a helpless slave. Poor enough in truth for the country had been brought up by years of war, but master of himself. As for the Jacobin politicians—they started by decapitating a king and wound up with the crowning of an emperor!

Napoleon was no believer in equality, but he was a masterful calculator, who conciliated where he could not crush. He crushed the city mob, the talkers and the politicians, remorselessly. The peasant he could not crush and he conciliated him; economically by giving him the land, religiously by making peace with the Roman Catholic church, for the peasant was religious and his devotion was a force to be appeased. In fact, Napoleon acknowledged frankly that religion, and the "transplanting the idea of equality to heaven" was the one thing that could "save the rich from being massacred by the poor." I have quoted his own words, and, by way of amplification, I give the following from one of his letters to Roederer: "Society," he wrote, "cannot exist without the inequality of fortunes, and inequality of fortune cannot continue without religion. When one man is dying of hunger by the side of another who is overfed, it is impossible for him to submit to this difference unless there is an authority which says to him: 'God wills it thus; there must be rich and poor in the world; but afterwards and for all eternity, matters will be arranged otherwise.'" Napoleon may have been unscrupulous, but I think he understood.

For years the great French Revolution drew into its vortex an enormous proportion of the activities of Europe. As for its legitimate successor, the Mexican Revolution, that is young as yet—but look around you! Contemplate the international complications over the ownership and use of the Panama canal, as they have developed within even a few weeks. Consider the growing distrust toward the United States which the Latins begin to manifest most sharply. Are Cuba or the Philippines really content? Is Japan pleased with our treatment of her as racially inferior, and what about the wolves in our own country who growl at the palace gates, sniffing a coming fete? For the present they are doing little more than baying at the moon, but I think they are baying at her because they recognize instinctively that she is rising red with blood.

It must be forty years since I read and re-read Carlyle's "French Revolution" with its declaration that the revolution would repeat itself indefinitely until the principles that gave it birth had become part and parcel of our racial life. Those principles were, first, individual liberty, without which nothing is possible; equality of opportunity, without which individual flourish must remain a mere rhetorical flourish; fraternity, which, if it is to come at all, must spring spontaneously from the matured manhood and womanhood of the other two. The Jacobins, like the Socialists of our day, thought they could force fraternity into life by compelling all men to adhere to the set governmental program they themselves adopted. They thought, like modern Socialists, that they could progress by putting the cart before the horse; and Napoleon danced, as Roosevelt may dance, triumphantly upon their grave. On the other hand, the peasants went straight for the one liberty they understood—the economic liberty of the man who owns the land he tills—and got it, securing the substantial one while the city politicians and wage-workers were left to growl discontentedly over the shadow. The lesson is tremendous, and it applies not only to Mexico but to the disinherited throughout the world.

Revolutionary movements are put through, not by the city worker, but by his despised country brother. All history proves it. Christianity was originally a revolutionary movement of colossal force, and it started, not among the disputatious city Jews but with a country peasant, who gathered round him other peasants. Rome was overthrown, not by her own degenerate population but by the simple Hans and Goths, who brought with them the healthy appetites and virile thought of country life. The real achievements of the French Revolution were due to the country doers, not the city talkers; as was the case recently in Russia, and as is the case in Mexico today. Even in the United States it is noticeable that those who hold the soil have carried to success many of the social improvements on which they set their hearts, whereas the city worker is falling steadily into a helplessness more and more profound; for he remains, of necessity, dependent on others, and where there

is dependence there cannot be strength. Looking across the border one sees clearly that not from the proletariat of Mexico City but from the rural peon must salvation come. Always and everywhere the city exists at the pleasure of the country, which can starve London itself into abject submission within a week.

WM. C. OWEN.

PANAMA CANAL.
Though silent as a clam on the great land struggle in Mexico, Marion Reedy, editor of "The Mirror" and noted Single Taxer, is at least alive to the iniquitous manner in which American plutocracy is trying to corner the Panama Canal. That is pregnant with international complications of the gravest kind, and is connected most intimately with the Mexican Revolution; for Mexico has the profoundest distrust of United States capitalism and is swinging into line with her the entire Latin race. That strengthens the revolution, which, thank you, is already fairly strong. Here are certain recent Reedy extracts:
"We are to hog the Panama Canal from other nations by favoring our own ships. This means that we are to subsidize certain shipping companies. Subsidy means graft."
"As to the Panama Canal, the last word of the United States Senate is: 'I'll hell with the Hague tribunal! Which is linguistic atrop of bad faith as to treaties.'"
"Some United States folks are to be permitted to use the Panama Canal, and some are not. But all of us built it with the money of all of us."
"If the Panama Canal bill goes over to the next session of Congress, nothing will be lost but much will be saved to the national honor. The bill was an attempt to violate treaty obligations, a scheme to give a disguised ship subsidy on the one hand, and on the other to rip open certain railroad systems with shipping connections."
National honor! Treaty obligations. Those are disposed of with ease by the "Los Angeles Daily Times," which cuts the knot thus, in characteristically military fashion:
"It is a part of the law of nations that a change of sovereignty—whether by conquest or peaceful cession—carries with it an abrogation of any and all treaties between the extinct sovereignty and all nations, and the new sovereign is not charged with any obligations incurred by the old sovereign."
So, all one has to do, in order to get out of awkward contracts, is to swipe a weaker country. Fine morality! Great civilization! Long live the dove of peace!

HOW THEY MUST LOVE US!
The terms of the treaty granting the Canal Zone to the United States are broad enough to legally permit our government to juggle with Panama as it pleases, and even to swallow it whole.
Besides granting to the United States possession of the ten-mile-wide canal zone, the treaty specifically states that American troops may be moved anywhere in the republic merely by serving notice of intention. It further provides that should the United States deem the possession of any territory anywhere in the republic needful for the interests of the canal it may take it. Any measures thought necessary for sanitation or protection may be enforced in Panama and Colon, the principal cities of the republic, despite objection of the municipal authorities.
With these broad powers the hand of Uncle Sam rests heavily on the land, and his word is law. ("Los Angeles Daily Times.")

NO HALF-TRUTHS FOR US.
Darrow says that "in its last analysis trade unionism is self-defense," and that is true. But the mischief is that it is only half a truth, and, like half-truths, extremely dangerous. The half-truth, most persistently implied, is that Labor can save itself by standing on the defense. The whole and real truth is that in doing so it is merely prolonging the life of the present system, which it must attack at the very roots. Defense alone will avail it nothing.
Darrow tells his audiences that trades unionism is a makeshift which must be employed until universal brotherhood becomes a living fact. I think he should tell his audiences also, and most insistently, that we are cursed with institutions which render the practice of brotherhood as impossible as would be jumping to the moon. Those institutions the workingman must attack and overthrow. Every one of them is summed up in the word "monopoly," and Darrow, as it seems to me, should tell them that.
Until Darrow, or others, make that clear we shall have trades unionism and capitalism cutting each other's throats indefinitely; each doing to its very utmost the thing that shoves human brotherhood into a distance more and more remote.
What has the Labor Temple crowd to say, for example, on the question of land monopoly, which holds every one of them enslaved, as Darrow, the Single Taxer, knows? Nothing, absolutely nothing. At heart it is as monopolistic as John D. Rockefeller, and its own paper boasts of the unearned income it has pocketed by buying real estate that has risen in value.

VOTE! VOTE! VOTE!
Vote for Wm. I. Taft, that he may govern you for the good of the Republican machine.
Vote for Woodrow Wilson, that he may govern you for the good of the Democratic machine.
Vote for Theodore Roosevelt, that he may govern you for the good of the Progressive machine.
Vote for Eugene V. Debs, that he may govern you for the good of the Socialist Party machine.

Vote for—there are several others, but we have forgotten their names and the story is the same.
One is free in proportion as one is strong; there is no real liberty save that which one takes for one's self. (Stirner.)

Economic Aims of Struggle Finally Acknowledged

"To understand the present situation it must be kept in mind that the revolution in Mexico has been a double-barreled affair. In short, two revolutions instead of one. Orozco in the north has been a representative of the old system, and merely the leader of one of the factions into which the old governing class of Mexico was broken up by the revolution which overthrew Diaz.
"Zapata, on the other hand, represents an idea. He is the champion of the peons, of the victims of the schemes carried out by those in power in the Diaz administration. He derives his strength from the agrarian troubles in Mexico. He is the leader of those who would divide up the great estates among the peons and make Mexico a republic of small, land holders. The fact that Zapata has attracted the peon class to his standard and that the great landlords and their friends are arrayed against him makes the situation perilous.
"It is a real conflict between the classes. There is more of a real revolution about the Zapatistas and their movement than there is to the other uprising; and there is less of real brigandage about it." ("Los Angeles Daily Times.")

The "Los Angeles Daily Times" tribute to the strength of the Zapatista branch of the Revolution, and the ideas that permeate it, is placed at the head of this column and given the honor of a box because it is a tribute from the enemy. Ideas require time in which to clarify themselves, but as time passes it is becoming self-evident to all the world that the Mexican Revolution is not one of those played-out struggles to substitute Jones for Brown, but a most persistent and heroic effort by the disinherited to recover that from which monopoly has ousted them. "Regeneration" has insisted unwearingly that in the North the movement has been weakened greatly by the intrusion of political elements, whose object was place and power, but that in the Southern and Central States it has been, from the first, almost purely economic. The Northern States, lying nearer the border and having attracted American investors more readily, have received the almost exclusive attention of the United States press. In reality, however, it is in the Central and Southern States that the outcome must be decided.
Despatches to the "Times," "Herald" and other papers continue to raise alarms as to the safety of Mexico City. As the first-named puts it: "Slowly, but surely, the Zapatistas are crowding into the State of Mexico." The telegram from which this is taken stated also that "all the government employes tonight enrolled as volunteers and asked to be sent to the front to battle against the triumphant Zapatistas." The government employes!
Foraging for Powder.
Under date of Aug. 27 the "Times" again reported tense anxiety in Mexico City, but the actual news was little beyond the fact that large bands of rebels were in the neighborhood of Santa Fe. That is a suburb of Mexico City, and the government maintains a large powder factory there. Telegrams of Aug. 25, from the State of Mexico, reported numerous towns and more than a hundred ranches as having been taken by the Zapatistas, who appear to be now firmly entrenched in the State wherein the capital city is situated.
The New York special dispatch to the "Times" of August 28 runs in part: "Reports from South Mexico, so alarming as to make the danger of American intervention in that country greater than ever before, have been received in Washington. So the press. Taft, that in discussions with members of the Cabinet and others recently has expressed the warmest feelings of necessity for far more drastic action on the part of the United States than has yet been taken in Mexico. It is stated that, while the operations of Gen. Orozco and his men in Northern Mexico near the United States border are exasperating to a degree and injurious to American interests, the most serious phase in the situation lies in the conditions existing in Southern Mexico."

TOO, TOO BAD!
"Postoffice used as the vehicle for Socialist doctrines. The destructive theories of Ricardo and Enrique Flores Magon have been circulated in large packages, throughout the Republic." Under this alarming head "El Imparcial" of August 10 contains the following melancholy article:
"By mere accident the General Postoffice has found out that, for some weeks past, big packages, which apparently contained postal cards, have been entering the country by way of the northern frontier. In one instance the wrapping gave way, and it was discovered that it enclosed pamphlets, bound in red, well printed and coming from San Antonio, Texas.
"Each of these packets was directed to some person resident in one of the interior States, assuredly with the intent that he should distribute the contents."
"We have had one of the pamphlets in our hands. It contained a complete Social program, signed by Ricardo and Ricardo Flores Magon. No doctrines could be more subversive, for the signers advocate the repudiation of all property, the running of all industries for the benefit of those actually engaged in them, the expropriation of all lands and the seizure of grain and all other articles of prime necessity, with a view to forming an immense deposit from which each shall take what he needs for his own sustenance. Everything so deposited, says the pamphlet, should be inventoried by men of good faith, who should be willing to render that service to their fellow-citizens."
"Several clauses in the pamphlet are very destructive. The whole, as is declared in a phrase, is directed against capital, against authority, against the church."
"El Imparcial" occupies in Mexico very much the same position as does the "Times" in Los Angeles and evidently the Junta of the Mexican Liberal Party has been getting unexpected aid in securing publicity for its manifesto. It seems to us also that the joke is on the Mexican postal system. Of course, theoretically, the Mexican postoffice, like our own, is supposed to distribute all literature, regardless of whether it agrees or does not agree with the opinions therein expressed.

POSTAL CENSORSHIP.
The postoffice was designed as simply a public utility, not as a censor and intruder into private affairs. Claiming a monopoly in the transportation of correspondence, it is guilty of the rank abuse of opportunity and of confidence when it undertakes to harass citizens by a system of sneaking espionage. We are fast coming to the point when personal liberty shall have totally ceased to exist in this country. By what right is issued this latest impudent ukase that young women shall not be allowed to receive mail at the general delivery windows in their home towns? It is a piece of naked and arbitrary tyranny. . . . It is high time that notice were taken of the persistent encroachments of the Postoffice Department on the rights of the people, and that Congress took action to bring the jacks-in-office at its head to a realization of the fact that they are not trusted with administrative work in order to assume the functions of Oriental despots. (James F. Morton, in "The Truth Seeker.")

The fact is, and we should face it, that the United States is today one of the least liberty-observing and financially unscrupulous countries in the world. It is precisely because we are all well aware of that ill-smelling fact that we are afflicted with these never-ending appeals to "Patriotism," for always the lady who delights to sin insists most strenuously on her unsullied virtue.
In politics all is notoriously corrupt. The press universally admits it and laughs cynically. To say of any one that he is "a regular politician" is to imply that he is hopelessly dishonest, and the man in the street invariably so understands it.
In the administration of affairs by these corrupt politicians the vital principle of individual liberty is the last thing that enters into anybody's head. It "pays" the policeman and the country constable to make arrests. It "pays" the prosecuting attorney and justices to secure convictions. It "pays" government to extend its functions by trampling on individual rights; for thereby the power of the politicians is increased and their machine made more omnipotent. It "pays"—pays us, the people for the moment in power—is the only argument that can get a hearing.
In business our wholesale manufacture of millionaires and the methods by which they have acquired their wealth are so notorious that it is needless to demonstrate that honesty is practically extinct. Thus the one great bond that can hold a society together—mutual confidence—has been cut into a million fragments.
We have had an enormous and most fertile country to develop; and for that development we have had at our command all the resources that human ingenuity has elaborated in untold centuries of ceaseless toil. Never did any people come into so rich a heritage, and we have used it as a grab bag. The very existence of those resources, and the fact that our population, speaking an infinite variety of tongues, has been incapable of combining for defense, has rendered the United States the happy hunting-ground of the financial pirate and the political assassin.

This world is full of thoughtful people, and it will be hard to find any among them today who are not predicting for the United States colossal smash.
SAME OLD DEBS.
In his speech of acceptance, Debs, Socialist Party candidate for President, calls Roosevelt "the most dangerous man in America." Naturally, because Debs is a politician fishing for the vote, which Roosevelt threatens.
If Debs were what he ought to be, an honest educator, he would welcome Roosevelt, since the latter is scattering broadcast the very doctrines Debs professes.
Both men want to increase the powers of the central government inculpably; both want to render it practically omnipotent, by making it the center of the nation's industrial life; both, for this reason, are the very bitterest foes the workingman can have, because the stronger the government the more difficult will it be for the workers to rebel.
Roosevelt and Debs are peas out of the same pod, but Roosevelt is the sounder. He at least spits out his thought, whereas Debs is a finished Jesuit who conceals his tyrannical ambitions under a torrent of fair-sounding words.
LINCOLN OUT OF DATE.
"Inasmuch as good things have been produced by labor," said Abraham Lincoln, "it follows that such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others, without labor, have enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his toil, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government."
So said the great emancipation president; nevertheless you will notice that the wrong he declared "should not continue" has done so, and in an increasing ratio, during the fifty odd years that have elapsed. Pious sentiments alter nothing, and Lincoln's speeches on the labor question were nothing more. He believed "Government" could and would put Labor in possession of its own. Since then we have learned better.
Surrender your individual right of revolt into the hands of the local majority, who will hand it on to the majority of the local committee, who will hand it on to the majority of the local district committee, who will hand it on to the majority of the national committee, who will hand it on to the inside ring that actually turns the trick. Good God! What a philosophy on which to build a revolution!

Whoever will be free must make himself free. Freedom is no fairy's gift to fall into any man's lap.

reported as having been involved, of whom 102 were killed, according to the newspaper reports.
According to all accounts, August 23, Orozco was hemmed in beyond possibility of escape. It is now admitted universally that he, Campos, Salazar, Rojas, etc., are working their way steadily west, and that the scene of fighting in the North has shifted to Sonora and Sinaloa.
The suspension of constitutional guarantees went into formal effect August 25. Technically it permits the immediate execution of all prisoners of war. Practically it places the lives of all at the mercy of military commanders.
"Ideas y Figuras" of Buenos Aires, has published a large sixteen-page pamphlet entitled "La Revolucion Social de Mexico" which is well got up and most admirable in all respects. Under the head of "Those who are directing the revolution" it says: "As for the Flores Magons and the other members who are at the head of the Mexican Liberal Party, we ought to say that their work is distinctly as important as that of Zapata and the other chiefs who are directing action on the field of battle. The purely anarchist theories of these men have cleared the road in such a manner that the consciousness of most of the revolutionists has been prepared to the point at which they no longer believe in the promises of any government. The hundreds of Anarchists who are preaching by word and deed on the battlefield have formed themselves under the influence of the valiant publishers who direct the course of 'Regeneration' and if today they are combating Madero and his followers with so much ardor, tomorrow they will redouble their energies to annihilate Orozco, Vasquez Gomez or Zapata himself, if they should alter their conduct toward the people."
"El Imparcial" reports that Zapata is suffering from a tumor or abscess, resulting from a wound received in battle, but says that his activity shows no sign of flagging. Felipe Neri, another noted rebel leader, has been wounded seriously.
Expects Intervention.
From his prison cell in Barcelona, Tomas Herreros, one of the directors of "Tierra y Libertad," sends us a long clipping from what he terms a Spanish "capitalist" paper, but unfortunately he fails to give its name. We have read no better review of the Mexican situation. The author begins by warning his readers not to expect that the defeat of Vasquez Gomez or Orozco will have any effect on the revolution, for it is a contest between "Land and Liberty" and two billion dollars' worth of foreign investments. He shows that for centuries the people of Mexico have always considered land common property, and that every revolutionary leader, including Madero, has been compelled to recognize the agrarian question as paramount. He punctures Madero's proposals for buying out certain land monopolists and selling their holdings to the public. He points out that the capitalist conception of property, prevalent in the United States and other so-called "advanced" countries, is directly opposed to every Mexican tradition; that American investors see their Mexican holdings in danger, and that this fact, coupled with an intuitive ambition for still further national expansion, is inspiring them with a longing to annex Mexico. He thinks this will be no easy task, but believes capitalism will be forced to make the venture, and concludes with the remark: "If some day you hear that American troops have crossed the Rio Grande, do not be surprised." The article is signed "H. Longerock."
"El Ahuizote," the noted comic weekly of Mexico City, has a cartoon representing the horror of the Minister of the Interior at the discovery that one of his soldiers is studying "Regeneration."

THEIR CLOTHES FIT HIM.
Roosevelt has swiped a good half of the Socialist Party platform—swiped it almost verbatim; body, soul and breeches. Naturally there is a terrific howl, and the Socialists are hurling at him all the various synonyms for thief. Who is the real scoundrel? We say, unhesitatingly—"the Socialists."
Roosevelt has stood, openly and from the very first, for State Socialism; for government taking over the lands, streams, forests, etc.; for the government increasing its powers and authority in every possible direction. He has been perfectly frank about it, and he could not do otherwise than copy the greater part of the Socialist platform; for he wants what they want.
On the other hand, the Socialist have not been frank, but unspcakably deceitful. Finding the public afraid of this enormous increase of governmental power; finding the people dubious as to the wisdom of handing over additional authority to the corrupt politician and the heartless official, they have veiled their designs by raising innumerable side issues and employing a phraseology carefully calculated to confuse the ordinary man. Roosevelt—whom, as the best type of State Socialist, we abhor—is doing fine propaganda work by tearing off the veil.
Roosevelt wants government officials to have their finger in every pie. So do Berger, Debs, Harriman and all the rest of them.
Roosevelt holds that only by making the State the one monopolist can you bring private monopoly to terms. So do Berger, Debs, Harriman and all the rest of them.
Roosevelt would bring into existence an army of official Czars. So would Berger, Debs, Harriman and all the rest of them.
Roosevelt is, at least, outspoken. Berger, Debs, Harriman and all the rest of them are not.
None of them is honest enough to admit that individual economic liberty—gained by the abolition of the land and money monopolies, on which all the lesser ones depend—would render private monopoly impossible and save us from jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire.

DEBS—FIFTY CENTS.
Eugene V. Debs will show at the Auditorium, Los Angeles, Sept. 6. Admission fifty cents. The price asked, obviously cuts out the proletariat, but vaudeville is in considerable demand at present and doubtless the management knows its business. We learn that about a thousand Mexicans had intended to be present, since they want specific information on certain points. As it will cost them five hundred dollars they may change their minds.
By virtue of ordinance several hundred thousand and something, the front portion of each Los Angeles street car is reserved for smokers. For that reason it is usually monopolized by women, so well-groomed and—apparently—smilable that no man ventures to disturb them. What a picture of the world at large, in which the very prosperity and smiling self-possession of the monopolist frightens the sheepish worker from claiming his seat!
I heartily accept the motto "That government is best which governs least," and I should like to see it lived up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe: "That government is best which governs not at all," and when men are prepared for it that will be the kind of government which they will have. (Thoreau.)
The Bethlehem charity institution, of this city, has sent us a circular, asking our aid. Its letter-head carries the quotation, "A Man's a Man for a' that." No, he isn't. A Man is a Man only when he occupies the position that becomes a Man. When he hasn't a single human right he dare assert; when he is a creature for whom bread and clothing and shelter must be begged, he isn't a Man at all. One does not know exactly how to describe him, for there is not another living thing in such a situation.
"That Roosevelt convention should be photographed."
"Probably it was."
"It will be a great curiosity."
"In what particular?"
"Sammy Gomper's was not there demanding a few crumbs for the laboring men." ("The Coming Nation.")

INTERNATIONAL BALL.
Don't forget the ball at Burbank Hall, Saturday, September 21. The objects are excellent and the attendance should be good. Tickets only twenty-five cents.
SEND US NAMES.
You can assist greatly by sending us the names and addresses of those to whom it may be worth while to mail sample papers and other propaganda matter.
"In the name of the workers of the United States we protest 0
0 against the use of the men and 0
0 money of this country for the 0
0 protection of the so-called 0
0 'American' interests in Mexico. 0
0 We assert that neither the gov- 0
0 ernment nor the people of the 0
0 United States have any property 0
0 interests in Mexico; that the 0
0 speculative Mexican ventures of 0
0 a ring of American industrial free- 0
0 booters give us no warrant to in- 0
0 terfere with the political destinies 0
0 of the country, which they have 0
0 invaded upon their own individ- 0
0 ual responsibility."
(Extract from official protest 0
0 tion in Mexico, issued in March, 0
0 1911, by the National Executive 0
0 Committee of the Socialist Party. 0
0 Victor Berger, one of the sign- 0
0 ers, subsequently denounced the 0
0 Mexican rebels as "bandits" and 0
0 the party as large did its best to 0
0 boycott the revolution.) 0