

Only From Struggle Can Liberty Emerge

While Hearst plies his congenial trade of gutter scavenger, the "Los Angeles Daily Times," always serious and now seriously alarmed, has been doing great value to the revolutionary movement. Naturally its motives are not ours. Naturally it published July 5, its "Special World-Turmoil-News Edition," as a call to arms by the employing class, and as a plea for policies of repression to be pushed, if necessary, to a point at which even the Roman Catholic Church, in its most inquisitorial days, might hesitate. All that is immaterial. The "Times" has laid before its readers information of a kind that "starts them up astounded from their trembling seats, until their heart, their coward heart, their traitor heart, in terror beats." It has awakened a curiosity which will not slumber, set in motion enquiries that will insist on satisfaction, and given the impetus to knowledge a tidal wave of discontent that, at no distant date, is destined to sweep everything before it.

Revolutionists are interested in two things above all else. First, universal recognition of the fact that existing conditions are hopelessly rotten, under every government and every flag. Second, in the widest of publicity being given to the fact that the disinherited everywhere are rising in revolt. Nothing is so contagious as the fighting spirit, with all the destructive qualities the fighting spirit fires. Nothing is so faith-inspiring as the news that at this, that and the other point the humble and down-trodden have produced heroes who have stepped from out the ranks, led the forlorn hope and moved recklessly to the attack. In all probability Christ was one of the greatest revolutionary geniuses ever born. He knew that until he had inspired his followers with faith in the triumph of his cause he could accomplish nothing. So also with Mohammed and all great leaders.

"Strife and turmoil all over the world. Men and women in every quarter of the globe involved. With militance menacing London, Mexico and Ireland occupy the center of the stage of war and warlike preparations. Uprising in India is feared. Albania and Nicaragua sore spots." So runs the "Times," main head. Study the full record, however, and you will find a much greater area covered. In Europe the Balkans are, of course, aflame, and in this country our 2,000,000 Hungarian immigrants are the targets of a vigorous propaganda of sedition against German rule. France is still fighting in Morocco, to the intense dissatisfaction of the French workers, as evidenced by such outbreaks as the recent postoffice employees' strike in Paris. In Italy the late strike, in which the veteran Anarchist, Malatesta, played so prominent a part, was largely revolution of the most outspoken type. For example, a Republic was proclaimed at Ancona, and the outbreak seems to have collapsed mainly because the rebels confined themselves to gaining control of unimportant districts and lacked the dash to attack the central government. How they wrecked their vengeance on Church property is now an old story. In far-away China the "White Wolf"—a figure beside whom Villa is a dwarf—threatens seriously the new-established dictatorship of Yuan Shi Kai. Turn where you will the mass is rising; blindly, saggingly, it is true, but rising. Nor can this country congratulate itself on having escaped the hurricane. The very issue under consideration chronicles the premature explosion of a bomb represented as having been intended for Rockefeller, the trampling of the Stars and Stripes by some seven hundred I. W. W.'s at Staten Island, N. Y., and the attempted assassination of the Socialist mayor of Burre, Montana. Other outbreaks of minor importance I omit.

Reverting, however, to the two main centers of revolt on which the "Times" lays special emphasis—Mexico and Great Britain—the trouble with the first is comparatively simple, for the peon is a simple man and clings tenaciously to his one dim-

inating thought, with all the strength that characterizes the simple mind. He wants the land, and fortunately has only the weakest of governments between him and his heart's desire. If he can stave off foreign intervention he will get the land, and the foreign Powers are finding their own domestic troubles greater with every day that passes. The army of the United States is practically all employed today on police duty, and will be so more and more. To embark on a new war of conquest we must have conscription and put the Dick Law into operation. That is an experiment from which even Roosevelt well might shrink just now, and even Ouis pleads that this country should not act single-handed. In a word, the menacing attitude of our own disinherited is the bulwark behind which the Mexican can work out his salvation.

Great Britain's problems are far more complicated, but Great Britain has—to her undoing—a powerful government and large military forces. Happily dissension has crept into the latter, and she faces the conflict between the Protestantism of the North of Ireland and the Roman Catholicism of the Central and Southern districts with an army which already has raised the standard of revolt. The land question is involved, but linked with it is also a conflict of religions, and beneath that the vital problem of whether the majority shall be allowed to hold the minority at its mercy. That is the great question Ulster raises, and it is vital for our entire system of democratic government rests on majority rule. It is the reef on which the United States is going all to pieces; the rock on which Socialism splits from tem to tern; the great revolt of individual life which is the heart of Anarchism and will lead it, after many a bloody field, to the conquest of Liberty for each and all.

Then there is the suffrage question—the indomitable struggle of a sex, which is bringing out all the great qualities of a fighting race—and in India the whole question of Government is coming up for settlement, on a colossal scale and in the most dramatic form—as it comes up in every conflict with the Church of Rome. As it is always with the Roman Catholic Church, so is it always with British rule in India; there must be unquestioning obedience to authority, or the whole fabric vanishes into thin air. The problem is complicated further by the fact that Hindus fleeing British rule find other gates barred against them; that Great Britain's own colonies will have none of them, and that the labor movement—international in theory but primitively local in practice—casts them out. In short, the world is in upheaval, and the "Los Angeles Daily Times" does royal service by setting out the facts unflinchingly. I am in hopes that even Germany, prostrate under the weight of that "scientific" Socialism which teaches that progress marks itself out automatically, may yet awake. I am even in hopes that United States Anarchists may discover that they are supposed to be enlisted in a world-wide fight against slavery; in a battle to the very death with Mammon and the Governments that police his shrines. That the Mexican Revolution has set the whole circus moving would be, I consider, a grossly-exaggerated claim. That it is helping I can have no doubt.

WM. C. OWEN.
Jack London's mission as correspondent for "Collier's" seems to have degenerated into doing yeoman's service for the jingoist and military bulldozers. One can hardly conceive how a man of brains and character can become instrumental in fomenting national hatred and turn lick-spittle for the army and navy without thinking that the qualities we admired most in his writings were merely creatures of our own fancy. Of late, it seems, that he parted company with John Barleycorn but he made up for it by swallowing his whole revolutionary program in one gulp.—"Why?"—Tacoma, Wash.

MEXICO'S APPEAL.
Reprinted in pamphlet form from "Regeneracion" and from "Land and Liberty," by the Land and Liberty Publishing Co., at the Bakunin Institute, R. F. D. 1, Hayward, Cal.—Price 5 cents.

Most of the people who are crying "On to Mexico" have no notion of going on themselves. "New York World"

THE FATAL LIE

The Socialist Press is compelled nowadays to pay attention to Mexican affairs. The Socialist press is compelled also to profess sympathy for the landless peon. There is nothing meritorious about it; great events have forced its hand and the thing is compulsory. But, like a woman convinced against her will, who is of the same opinion still, the Socialist press continues to misrepresent; continues to insinuate, as much as it dares, that this is at bottom a capitalist quarrel; emphasizes eternally the value of the Tampico oil fields, and suggests most slyly that if it were not for the intrigues of Rockefeller and Rothschilds there would be no trouble in Mexico. For example, the "Socialist News," a monthly published at Kelso, Washington, has as its leading editorial for June an article entitled "The Mexican Imbroglia," which, after implying that no one can make head or tail of the situation, continues:

"First class organs of public opinion such as 'Current Opinion,' 'Literary Digest,' 'London Times' and others, as well as the opinions of people from Mexico, seem to agree generally that the main trouble, the Real Economic Basis, of the turmoil lies in the fact that Mexico possesses some of the most valuable oil fields in the world. As yet, it is not recognized that the Panama Canal and the Frisco Exposition play no small part in the drama."

The article, by Dan Ronald, ends as follows: "Neither Huerta nor Villa would amount to much did they not have the secret support of European and American capital respectively." To any one who gives the matter a moment's thought it must be self-apparent that to take this attitude is to belittle the entire struggle beyond the Rio Grande; to drag it down from the lofty height of a people awakened to the first of all great rights, that of access to the land by which it must live, to degrade it to the mean status of a mere pawn in a capitalist game of chess. If that were true we should admit it without a moment's hesitation, sorry though the admission would have to be. But it is not true; and in the name of a humanity which is struggling desperately to rise; in the name of the great international conflict for human rights, as well as in the name of the Mexican people, we protest once more, as we have protested so often in the past.

The trouble is that the Socialist Party does not want to admit the truth. In the first place it is—essentially and above everything else—a political party, which is interested only in those factors of the revolutionary movement from which votes can be manufactured. Such an event as the Mexican Revolution is, therefore, to it an almost unmitigated nuisance, for it distracts attention from the domestic and local politics in which its interest lies. The party press discusses it, therefore, only because it has to. That the upheaval in Mexico is pointing the way to direct action and inducing thousands to discredit the much-advertised relief by the ballot, is well known to all the Socialist Party leaders, and they hate it accordingly. How could it be otherwise? The success of the peon, by the rifle route, will be the final discrediting of their own program.

In the second place, Socialist economics persistently minimize the power of landlordism, which they picture as playing a merely secondary part. Those economics have been manufactured to attract the vote of the mechanic, who is hypnotized by the machine to which his life is chained and ordinarily cannot see an inch beyond the job by which he earns his living. Like all economics manufactured for a special purpose—especially when that purpose happens to be the dirty one of politics—those economics are absolutely false. The man who owns the land owns the universal workshop, the supply depot from which come all the tools, the one storehouse from which everything comes. Give all men access to that storehouse and the whole program of Socialism would go up in smoke; there would be no need then for all this party voting, no need then for all this party discipline, no need then for all these restrictive regulations with which the Lilliputians are strangling Labor's natural strength, no need then for this indefinitely-prolonged period of education—which does not educate—and organization—which aims to destroy all other organizations—on which Mr. Debs, in his new "People's College" scheme, is insisting more strenuously

than ever. All these political and job-mongering schemes would go where the woodbine twineth if men could get free and equal access to the land, and thereby win that economic liberty which comes with mastership of the natural resources. And all this the Socialist leaders know as well as they know that two and two make four.

THE TROUBLE IN MEXICO.

What is the trouble in Mexico about? says Dr. Frank Crane.

Is it a struggle between ambitious rivals? Is it a general mix-up of Zapata, Huerta, Villa, and Carranza, to see who shall get the loot? It is not. These men are surface symptoms. The disease lies deeper.

You cannot understand Mexico until you put its history alongside the history of other countries. It is undergoing an evolutionary throes.

What is going on there is the birth-pang of democracy. The people, wronged, outraged, robbed for centuries, are rising.

In Mexican terms and Mexican manner, part Indian and part Spanish, there is taking place a French revolution, an English reformation, an American rebellion, a Garibaldiian revolt.

Since the Spaniard first set foot on Mexican soil the curse of the land has been absolutism.

The ancient fraud of absolutism is protean in its forms, but ever the same at heart; whether under Cortez, or the Inquisition, or Maximilian, or Porfirio Diaz.

It has used the same specious humbug that it uses today, to wit: That the people cannot govern themselves, democracy is impossible, the masses are too ignorant; hence we will govern them for their own good. Thousands, even intelligent people, believe this bunk today.

The result of it is uniform. It cornered the land into the hands of a few wealthy proprietors, and reduced the people to practical slavery. It made use of government to enrich the favoured ones. Little of the vast revenues of a fruitful country went toward the education and improvement of human beings.

The eggs of absolutism are famine, poverty, ignorance, superstition, and at last riot and revolution.

Mexico is reaping in the whirlwind what Diaz sowed to the wind. In a recent work by L. Gutierrez de Lara in this paragraph, which is luminous: "As a result of these vast land despoliations, the valley of Papantla, which once supported a population of 20,000 independent farmers, today belongs to one rich family. The entire State of Chihuahua belongs to three families, headed by a man who is reputed the largest single cattle owner in the world. In the State of Morelos—from which in recent times have sprung Zapata and his followers—four men, one of them the son-in-law of Diaz, own every inch of agricultural land, and 200,000 evicted farmers—now landless peons—till the soil for them at an average wage of 12½ cents a day."

The Mexicans, you will find when you brush aside all deceptive appearances and go to the root of the matter, are fighting for the same thing for which the people everywhere are fighting, in Germany, in Italy, in Portugal, in England, in China, in the United States; namely, for the right to a piece of land to work on, for the right to work at a living wage, for the right to govern themselves in their own way, and for the right to shake their masters off their backs.—("The Guardian"—Middleton, Eng.)

TO TEXAS WORKERS

There are moments in the lives of communities when all men and women, must show unanimous activity and, forgetting differences of opinion, unite solidly for the defense of the work.

Such a moment has now arrived in Texas, and it is now that the workers of that State, in view of the black persecution being conducted against their Mexican comrades by the authorities, must unite and decide to take up their defense, energetically and conscientiously.

In the prisons of Southern Texas are more than a dozen Mexicans belonging to the Mexican Liberal Party, who were arrested in the neighborhood of Carrizo Springs last September. These revolutionists are workmen who were on their way to Mexico, that they might fight for the cause of the workingmen; that cause which proclaims Land and Liberty

for all and seeks to make of all Mexican men and women, instead of being slaves and dependents on the master and official, as they are today, free masters of themselves, working their own land and running their own industries at their own will, and consuming at their own pleasure. These revolutionists are men who left their firesides, tore themselves from their families and despised a peace that would be infamous, that they might fight for the happiness of their race and of their class—that happiness which can come to the peoples of the earth only by the implantation of economic liberty.

These revolutionists are men of brave personality who, by their record in the past, by the sufferings they have undergone at the hands of the Mexican and United States authorities, which are opposed to the Mexican becoming free, and by their deeds, written in blood on Mexico's battlefields, have won for themselves a place in the hearts of their class. These men are not criminals. No! We repeat it still more loudly, they are not criminals; and if the government of Texas accuses them of murder it is due to the hatred with which all Mexicans conscious of their rights inspire them, and to the cause which continues society in its present state of corruption. It is due to that race prejudice against the Mexican which runs high in Texas; a race prejudice exhibited everywhere—in barber shops, hotels and restaurants; it is due to thirst for Mexican victims, to be immolated for the satisfaction of the cowboy's savage yell.

Rangel and the other comrades are not guilty. The lawyer for the defense declares that the authorities cannot find the revolutionists responsible for the crime of which they are accused, but that the juries are sentencing them against the law and against the evidence, owing to the influence exercised by the sheriffs of the different counties. And this is the crime we must prevent. Innocent men must not be made to stand on the scaffold or be sentenced to the penitentiary.

Workingmen of Texas! In exposing to you the facts as they actually are, we have no other motive than that of urging you to the defense of these men, of these comrades who find themselves today in the situation they occupy because they have been working not only for themselves, but for you.

Their defense will cost an enormous sum, and while hitherto we have been able to aid them to the extent of our ability with funds and publications devoted expressly to that purpose, we believe that you, resident in the State in which our comrades are being held prisoners, can do your part.

Dollars, half-dollars, quarters, dimes—they will all help toward meeting the expenses of the defense. Do your part! Remit your collections to Victor Cravello, Room 108, Labor Temple, Los Angeles, Cal.

What you do, workingmen, will be a duty; for, as we said at first, there come to every community moments in its life when it is necessary to unite for the defense of the weak whom the enemy is seeking to devour. What you do now will be proof of your solidarity of race and class.

Work! Comrade workingmen of Texas! and by aiding the defense save a phalanx of Mexican day-laborers who are guilty of no other crime than that of combating for the people's liberties.

From all Texas; from El Paso to Beaumont; from Amarillo to Laredo; from Texarcana to Brownsville, let this be the cry:—"Liberty for Rangel, and the other Mexican comrades!"

Let the day laborer in the cotton fields and the miner in the coal-bearing depths, the railroad section hand and the woodcutter in the mesquite, answer this appeal and show the public that the workingmen of Texas are defenders of their class.

(From the Spanish of Antonio de P Araujo, a former resident of Texas.)

"Some Socialists, convinced of the omnipotent wickedness of American capital, like to believe that the Mexican Revolution is at bottom a war between two rival oil corporations. Foreign capital, either American or European, has not initiated one of the various revolts of the past few years. The machinations of foreign concessionaires have complicated the situation, as have the personal ambitions of various leaders, but the struggle at bottom is and always has been a struggle between land monopoly and the landless."—(John Kenneth Turner, in "The New Review.")