

0-14

El libreto publicado por Mr. Arthur Thomson (634 Calle 13 Oakland, California, E. U. de N. A.) denunciando que existe una "Conspiración en contra de México" procedede un miembro de las clases organizadas de trabajadores de E. U. Resalta desde luego cierto encono en contra de los grandes capitalistas y al atacar la intervención armada por parte de los E. U. en los asuntos de México, hace un estudio concienzudo y basado en citas históricas que toma de publicaciones caracterizadas, tales como "México a través de los Siglos" "El Pueblo Mexicano, su lucha por la Libertad" de L. Gutierrez de Lara, "La Historia de México" por Bancroft, "La Vida de Juárez" por Gustavo Baz, "Porfirio Díaz" por Zayaz Enriquez, etc. etc. y describe, con gran claridad y en términos que van dirigidos al corazón de las clases trabajadoras de E. U. las diversas fases del yugo á que ha sido sujetado el pueblo Mexicano, y especialmente los jornaleros, desde la época colonial hasta nuestros días - ó sea al triunfo de la revolución Constitucionalista, - cuando el Constituyente de Querétaro formuló leyes tan favorables y avanzadas para la protección del proletario, que solo son superadas por los Soviets Rusos y de Hungría, las últimas de las cuales acaban de ser nulificadas por los Gobiernos despóticos de los Aliados, según Mr. Thomson.-

Ataca de una manera vigorosa y expone pruebas convincentes a la par que contundentes, de la participación que el Clero ha tomado siempre en cuestiones políticas encaminadas á obtener poderio y riquezas, teniendo como víctima expiatoria al pueblo bajo Mexicano, quienes en más ó menos diversidad de forma ó nombre, no ha sido emancipado aun. Entre otros cargos al Clero cita varias instancias en que éste ha hecho activa labor de propagando en pro de la intervención, denunciándolo como miembro de un triunvirato (El Clero, - el Militarismo y el Capitalismo representados por el poder Ejecutivo y su Camarilla) que han tratado de adueñarse de todas las riquezas de México, citando la corta administración de Juárez, como la única época en que México se ha aproximado á conocer la verdadera democracia liberal. Censura acremente á los Norte Americanos, que constantemente se refieren á Porfirio Díaz como al "Constructor de México" tildándolo con el epíteto de "el peor de los Dictadores" y hace una exposición de lo costoso que fué para el Pueblo Mexicano, la cantada Paz Porfiriana. Dice que las revoluciones que en México han triunfado, solo han introducido reformas de índole político, pero que el problema agrario jamás ha sido resuelto.

Cita nombres de los más connotados intervencionistas, tales como Doheney, Hearst, etc. etc. explicando en cada caso, los móviles que impulsan á cada uno de ellos y el interés material, cuya defensa buscan, haciendo uso de la sangre y energías del pueblo Americano. Se refiere al Presidente Carranza y su Mensaje al Congreso, diciendo qué, si como en E. U. Wall Street y su prensa, pretenden que se intervenga en México para proteger la vía á intereses de los Americanos, este país estaria mayormente autorizado para intervenir en los E. U. si se tomaran en cuenta las vejaciones y atropellos de que son víctimas los Mexicanos en E. U. si solo México contara con suficiente poder para hacerse respetar y que por otra parte, el número de Americanos que han muerto en México, no llega á la mitad de los ciudadanos que han sido linchados en E. U. sin contar con los muer-



THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST MEXICO

By ARTHUR THOMSON

3

THE CONSPIRACY
AGAINST MEXICO

By ARTHUR THOMSON



THE CONSPIRACY
AGAINST MEXICO
BY ARTHUR THOMSON

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST MEXICO

By ARTHUR THOMSON

That there is a conspiracy against Mexico is plainly evident to all who even in a very superficial manner have studied the facts. The cry of Wall Street and its kept press is for intervention by the United States and subsequent annexation to this country. The American financial powers are unanimous in demanding that the "unsettled state of affairs below the Rio Grande cease." Their representatives in Congress have voiced their opinions in no uncertain terms that intervention is necessary if American Big Business is to survive in Mexico. British oil and other interests are likewise of an opinion that United States troops must go into Mexico and clean up things so as to make it safe for Capital. The American oil octopus in Mexico has been plotting for some time and is still at it.

Now what are the facts concerning Mexico? Is it governed by bandits, as one paper says, and "devastated by the clashing interests of a half-dozen cut-throat leaders?" Are the people too ignorant and incapable of self-rule? Was the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz a blessing in disguise for the peons and a necessity under the circumstances? Is it necessary for the United States to intervene and either establish a "real government" or else annex the country? These are questions which are frequently discussed and which we propose to answer according to the facts made known by unbiased, truth-loving investigators and not according to the "facts" of petroleum-smelling and other propagandists with an axe to grind.

So that we may properly understand the events of recent years in Mexico, let us go back one hundred years or so to the time when Mexico, or Nueva Espana, as it was then known, was ruled by Spain.

MEXICO ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

Prior to its independence Mexico was ruled for three hundred years by Spain. "Society," say the writers of one book, "was divided into three strata. At the top stood the privileged Spanish class of big land-owners, comprising the Church and Aristocracy. This class dominated the entire life of the country, and used the government and army merely as a means to maintain their supremacy. Far below them lay the small and insignificant middle class of mixed Spanish

and native blood—the intellectuals, petty professionals, and merchants, who crawled at the feet of the wealthy in the ever-present fear of being trampled upon and flung into the common servitude. . . . Far below the middle class again, and in the deepest misery and degradation, were the toilers of the soil—the natives, Aztecs, Toltecs, Mayas, and other allied races—immensely outnumbering the two other classes, but powerless in their ignorance and disorganization.” (“The Mexican People—their struggle for Freedom,” by L. Gutierrez De Lara & Edgumb Pinchon.)

The land was in the hands of a very few. The Church of Rome was the greatest land-owner, with the Spanish landed aristocracy next. Bancroft in his “History of Mexico,” vol. 13. p. 704, says the clergy “made the natives toil for them without payment.” There were no schools for the peons. If ill “there were for them but two or three miserable hospitals in all Mexico, and in these they did but only die of starvation and mistreatment.”

THE REVOLUTION OF INDEPENDENCE

“By the year 1808 conditions in colonial Mexico had become so intolerable for the great mass of people that revolutionary symptoms began to appear simultaneously in all parts of the country” (“Mexican People”). On September 15, 1810, revolution broke out in Dolores, State of Guanajuato, headed by the revolutionary priest Miguel Hidalgo. It was “essentially an agrarian revolution.” For the peons it was a struggle for the ownership of the land and not merely for political change. As far as the peons were concerned the revolution failed. The trinity of privilege in Mexico—the Church, Army and Aristocracy—succeeded in sidetracking the agrarian revolution of the toilers of the soil and making of it one for mere political change. After ten years struggle Independence from Spain was accomplished, but instead of it being Independence and the Land, for which the peons under Hidalgo and Mcrelos had struggled, it became Independence and Privilege. The trinity of privilege still held the reins of power, and “in the fields toiled the peons, still tilling the land from dawn till dusk, under the lash of the master, still enduring the pangs of hunger and the darkness of ignorance—and now, sunk in unspeakable despair before the wreck of all their high hopes.”

“The Monitor,” official organ of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, in its issue of August 23, 1919, says: “Mexico has never been a real republic or enjoyed democratic institutions since the overthrow of the Spanish Government at the beginning of last century. It has experienced revolution after revolution and government by bandits during the last one hundred years. The only times of stable government were when autocrats like Diaz ruled with a rod of iron and kept the bandits down.”

CATHOLIC CHURCH INTRIGUES

Yes, for the last one hundred years Mexico has experienced revolution after revolution, but why? This organ of the Catholic Church neglected to tell its readers the part played by the clergy during that period. Nothing is said about the clerical intrigues for the establishment of a monarchy, after the war with the United States, the bringing about of which the Church played a leading part in Mexico. The intrigues of the Catholic Church in Mexico were also largely responsible for the Texas war in 1835. If the hand of the Church had been kept off the revolution in 1810 Mexico would probably not have “experienced revolution after revolution during the last one hundred years.” Study Mexican history for the last century and you will find the Catholic Church intriguing to establish a monarchy with Lucas Alamán, the “man of the black brains,” as the leader of the conspiracy. You will find the clergy inviting foreign intervention in order to hold their power over the peons. The French intervention of 1861-65 was partly on behalf of the Catholic Church. You will also find the clergy preaching sedition, intriguing in all manners to keep their power over the peons and to maintain the privileges of the Church, making and unmaking governments, and ever siding with the exploiters and oppressors of the working people. “Out of the cloisters sprang all the cuartelazos which had flayed the common people; out of the cloisters sprang all the misery and poverty of the common people, their degradation and national disgrace.”

The recent revolution in Mexico, 1910-14, was, as in the case of the Revolution of Independence, an agrarian revolution. The democratization of the land was its central purpose. In the recent revolution the peons called themselves Constitutionalist, that is, their plan was to restore the Constitution of 1857. This is one of the most democratic constitutions ever established in any country. It meant the emancipation of the peons and the end of exploitation and oppression of the Mexican toilers. A reading of its articles leaves one with a realization that those responsible for its formulation were anything but “ignorant Indians incapable of self-government.” Under Juarez this constitution was put into effect as fully as possible with an intriguing Church and other interests, both domestic and foreign, to contend with.

THE CONSTITUTION OF 1857

“The Constitution of 1857 is the exact expression of the aspirations of the Mexican people as distinguished from the Church, Army, and Aristocracy . . . It is the first Constitution of the People, the first expression of a pure democracy—as opposed to a bogus democracy, the first national enunciator of the principle that the foundation of all social institutions is the Rights of Man—as directly and unalterably opposed to the Rights of Property.” (Mexican People.)

In the first article of the Constitution the rights of man are set forth as the foundation of social institutions: “The Mexican people

recognize that the rights of men are the foundation and the purpose of social institutions. In consequence they proclaim that all the laws and authorities of the country must respect and sustain the warranties stipulated by this Constitution."

"In the Republic everyone is born free"—so reads the second article.—"The slaves who step into the national territory recover their liberty by this mere fact, and have the right of the protection of the law."

In Mexico at this time serfdom prevailed, and this article was framed to abolish serfdom and free the serfs who were virtually considered as property of the estates.

The second part of the article referred to the fugitive slaves from the United States. You will recall that chattel slavery prevailed at that time in the superior and enlightened Southern States, and this article was framed to grant freedom to the slaves who dared flee from their beneficent masters.

The third article declares all education to be free. Later it was amplified to make education "universal, free, non-sectarian, and compulsory." "The Catholic schools of Mexico were sorry institutions, and even such rudimentary education as they gave was restricted to the rich. For the poor there was nothing but the most complete illiteracy."

Article 4 reads: "Every man is free to adopt the profession, trade, or work that suits him, it being useful and honest; and to enjoy the product thereof . . ."

This article was framed with the view to breaking the bonds of peonage and recognizing the "right of the people to the enjoyment of the full product of their labor."

So terrible had been the experiences of the peons at the hands of their masters that the Constitution of 1857 was framed with the purpose of making impossible a repetition of those bitter experiences, and each article was written with the purpose of abolishing some evil that cursed the country or declaring some principle or right to be necessary to a just social order. In the fifth article we read: "No man shall be compelled to work without his plain consent and without just compensation. The state will not permit to become effective any contract, pact or agreement with the purpose of the curtailment, the loss, or the irrevocable sacrifice of the liberty of any man, may the cause be for personal labor, education, or religious vows. The law in consequence does not recognize monastic orders, and will not permit their establishment, no matter what may be the denomination or purpose for which they pretend to be established. Neither will be permitted a contract or agreement by which a man makes a pact for his proscription or exile."

"The monastic orders were suppressed because bitter experience had proved them to be an unmitigated evil, the breeding grounds of sedition, oppression, exploitation, and social depravity. The basic immorality of a parasitic life further undermined their common integrity and it was a normal consequence that the parasite and sexual

pervert should become the traitor and the intriguer." ("Mexican People.")

The right of free speech and press was established by articles 6 and 7. "The liberty of writing and publishing writings upon any matter in inviolable. No previous censorship nor imposition of bonds upon the writers nor the publishers for the purpose of curtailing the freedom of the press can be established by any law or authority, such freedom being restricted to respect of private life, morals, and public business." (Article 7.)

Article 13 reads: "In the Mexican Republic no one shall be subjected to private laws nor special courts. No man or corporation shall enjoy fueros nor receive emoluments unless they be a compensation for public services and already fixed by law."

In Mexico at that time the ecclesiastical and military authorities considered themselves immune from the civil law—and they acted accordingly. For forty-seven years previous to this time ecclesiastical and military fueros had cursed the country—hence this article abolishing them.

"No man shall receive emoluments," was written in this article in order to abolish the rents, tributes, tithings, and taxes which the clergy received from the poor and "also the universal practice of the clergy of extorting the last centavo from the dying peon and his superstitious relatives under threat of the law, and the still more terrifying threat of refusing the last unction."

By Article 27 the vast illicit holdings of the Church were put at the disposal of the people: ". . . Religious corporations and institutions, no matter of what denomination, character, durability, or purpose, and civil corporations when under the patronage, direction, or superintendency of religious institutions, or ministers of any cult, shall not have the legal capacity to acquire or manage any real estate except the buildings which are used immediately and directly for the services of the said institutions; neither will the law recognize any mortgage on any property held by these institutions."

Article 28 reads: "State and Church are independent. Congress cannot make any law establishing or forbidding any religion. . ."

PRIVILEGE AND THE CONSTITUTION

"From the moment when this Constitution was proclaimed the peons began to take full advantage of it"—and the Church and Army began to fight it. According to the Catholic historian Zamacois, "The Archbishop of Mexico, Don Lazaro de la Garza, announced in circulars sent to the bishops a few days after the order for the taking of the oath (Secretary of the Interior's order to all government employees

to take the oath of obedience) had been given, that since the articles of this Constitution were inimical to the institution, doctrine, and rites of the Catholic Church neither the clergymen nor laymen could take this oath under any pretext whatever. In view of this communication the bishops of all the dioceses sent circulars to their respective country vicars and the parish curates, and to the other ecclesiastics, informing them, First: That it was not lawful to swear allegiance to the Constitution because its articles were contrary to the institution, doctrine and rites of the Catholic Church. Second: That this communication must be made public, and copies of it distributed as widely as possible; and that they must notify the government of their action." (Zamacois, "Historia de Mejico.")

"To a devoutly Catholic population these orders were disturbing enough. Torn between their opposing political and religious beliefs, they hesitated and fell into the utmost confusion. Even so, political good sense undoubtedly would have won the day in the teeth of the Church had not a tremendous mandate come to them from the Pope of Rome, the vicar of Christ on earth, to disobey utterly and completely all the commands of the impious Liberal government. . . ." ("Mexican People"). This long document from Pope Pius IX concludes as follows: "Thus we make known to the faith in Mexico, and to the Catholic universe, that we energetically condemn every decree that the Mexican Government has enacted against the Catholic religion, against the Church, and her sacred ministers and pastors, against her laws, rights, and property, and also against the authority of this Holy See. We raise our Pontifical Voice with apostolic freedom before you to condemn, reprove, and declare null, void, and without any value, the said decrees, and all others which have been enacted by the civil authorities in such contempt of the ecclesiastical authority of this Holy See, and with such injury to the religion, to the sacred pastors, and illustrious men. For this we command that those who have contributed to the fulfillment of the said decrees by action, advice, or command shall seriously meditate upon the penalties and censures imposed by the apostolic constitutions, and by the canons of the councils against the violators of sacred persons and things, against the violators of the ecclesiastical liberty and power, and against the usurpers of the rights of this Holy See." ("Mexico a través de los Siglos," vol. 5, p. 226.)

"The papal mandate fell like a bomb upon the people of Mexico." "The Pope's mandate, as we have seen, was no half-hearted affair. On the contrary it condemned to destruction the whole glorious edifice of human liberty reared at the cost of such tremendous sacrifice in the Constitution of 1857."

The Constitution took effect on Sept. 16, 1857, and the "next day Felix Zuloaga, the commander-in-chief of the army, headed a powerful cuartelazo against the government, proclaiming that the constitution was not acceptable to the nation, and that it was therefore abrogated.

... The fight against the government forces raged for two days in Mexico City. "Then, as in the revolt of 1847, the friars patrolled the trenches of the revolting soldiery, exciting them to the fight; then, as in that other epoch, the clergy paid the wages of the troops, and their agents were bribing the officers of the government that swelled the ranks of the enemy. The city was deserted; at night time the only light was the blaze of the artillery fire and the sinister flashing of the bombs; in every street there were breastworks, and from every door came forth the groans of the dying and the moans of the wounded." (Gustavo Baz, "Vida de Juárez.")

"The reaction was victorious in the capital, and the wickedness of one man and the ambitions of others had provoked a civil war that was destined to last until the extermination of one of the contending factions. The joyous clamoring of the bells, the majestic music of the Te Deum, the rejoicing of the Clericals everywhere, and the drunkenness of the soldiery, welcomed that victory of fraud, ambition, and reaction. . . ." (Gustavo Baz.)

Shortly after this, however, Benito Juárez, the representative of the people as against the forces of reaction and privilege, was recognized by Congress as lawful President, he having been President of the Supreme Court and Vice-President of the Republic.

Now began again the struggle between the trinity of privilege and the masses; oppressor against oppressed. "On one side were the revolutionists armed with the buckler of legal power and ready to shed their blood for freedom of thought and speech, for the suppression of the monasteries, the confiscation of the ecclesiastical estates, the support of the civil power as the only recognized authority in society, and for the upholding of the complete equality of men and liberty and civilization of the Republic. On the other side were the Clergy and the Army banded together to re-establish a government born of treason and mutiny, to re-enforce all the abuses that were left as a legacy to Mexico by the colonial regime, and to proclaim as invulnerable and divine rights the rule of the clergy, the army fueros, and the inviolability of the Church estates, and damning as heresy the freedom of conscience and the equality of men.

"The revolution was a genuine social revolution; it was a struggle to overthrow many years of deeply entrenched interests, three centuries of prejudice, and ideas as old as the world, as old as fanaticism and liberty. The programme of the one element was to destroy in order to create; the programme of the other to conserve in order to destroy." (Gustavo Baz, "Vida de Juárez.")

In 1861 the Constitutionalist Army entered Mexico City and on January 11th of that year Juárez and his cabinet re-established constitutional rule in Mexico. And this in spite of papal bulls and ex-communications by the clergy!

But this young democracy was a challenge to the capitalism of the world—it had to be destroyed!

"On the 11th of June, 1861, Juarez was proclaimed constitutional President of Mexico, and on the 31st of October of the same year, France, England and Spain signed a contract in London pledging themselves to a joint invasion of Mexico for the purpose of overthrowing the constitutional government, and establishing in its place a monarchy, supported by bayonets." ("Mexican People.")

"On the 2nd of January, 1862, the fleets of the three allies entered the harbor of Vera Cruz." Finally, after Juarez had officially recognized the financial claims against Mexico by the allies, England and Spain withdrew from the intervention, but the French remained. Maximilian, an Austrian prince, was offered the emperorship of Mexico by Napoleon III of France, and on December 12, 1864, he entered Mexico City.

After playing into the hands of the trinity of privilege Maximilian was imprisoned and later shot on May 19, 1867. And on July 15, 1867, President Juarez, with his cabinet, entered Mexico City. Intervention was at an end, and now began the work of reconstruction.

PORFIRIO DIAZ—THE DESPOILER

Many eulogists of Porfirio Diaz and his system have sought to make the people of America believe that Diaz was the "Maker of Mexico," and the strong man needed to keep an ignorant Indian population in order. Under Diaz, they say, the country was at peace, the bandits were kept down, capital was safe, and the country prospered. Yes, but at what a price! Capitalism is materialism, and these worshippers at the shrine of mammon never for a moment consider the human side of the picture. Far from being the maker of Mexico, Diaz was its Despoiler. Under Diaz and his upholders, the same old trinity of privilege we have seen before, together with foreign speculators and concessionists, slavery thrived, and conditions for the peons were perhaps more intolerable than during the colonial period with its Inquisition and other horrors. But the country prospered, we are told! Capital was safe, and foreigners did not have to keep awake nights fearing that the coming of dawn would find them dispossessed. Now, let us look at the other side of the picture and see the condition of the toilers under this most beneficent regime of Porfirio Diaz.

After the Ayutla Revolution, which broke out in 1854, and which gave to Mexico the Constitution of 1857, many of the peons became independent farmers. During the agrarian democracy of 1867-76, a million peons became farmers upon their own land. Education was fostered. The building of the national railroads was started. Juarez "aimed at the national construction, ownership, and operation of all the means of transportation and communication within the country." That curse of modern Mexico, the foreign speculator and concessionist,

was shut out. Mexico was saved from the landed aristocracy, the military despots, and the clutches of the Catholic Church—for a time!

But what was the cause of the setback of this young democracy? Why did it not grow and thrive? Why were the high and noble hopes of the peons crushed? This young thing that had been inspired by the Spirit and religion of liberty, equality and fraternity, that had dared to stay the hand of oppression and exploitation, that had tasted the sunshine and glory of the new day, met with a violent death. To Diaz and his soldiery, representing international capitalism—American, British and French railroad and industrial speculators and concession-seekers—must be laid the responsibility for the death of the developing agrarian democracy.

Porfirio Diaz was a military officer under Juarez. Seeing that he would make a willing tool, those interested in exploiting the labor and resources of Mexico helped Diaz to overthrow the constitutionalist rule and establish himself as dictator of the country. In 1876 the Diaz cuartelazo took place and triumphed, not because of its strength or popularity, but because of the fear of the people of United States intervention. "Thus we have Porfirio Diaz President of Mexico by the grace of American Big Business through the immediate instrumentality of an unpopular army revolt, and as a direct result of the national fear of United States intervention. Consequently, from the day of his entry into Mexico City in 1876, to the day of his flight to Paris in 1910, thirty-four years later, Diaz was supported POSITIVELY by the psychological power of the clergy and the subsidized press, by the physical power of the Army, and by the economic power of the United States and Europe; NEGATIVELY by the impotence of the people in face of an ever impending United States invasion." ("Mexican People.")

During the dictatorship of Diaz the people—something like two millions—were evicted from their lands. Peonage was re-established and wage slavery was of the most abject character.

EVICTON OF THE SMALL FARMERS

Mexico certainly prospered under Diaz—for the few, the landowners, speculators and concessionists. The following paragraphs from "The Mexican People" illustrate the methods of Diaz and his soldiery in evicting the small farmers from their lands and turning it over to the big landowners and so making the country prosperous!

"One day (in 1885) a party of surveyors appeared in the valley (Papantla in the State of Vera Cruz) with their transits. The people knew only too well the meaning of this invasion, and, filled with foreboding, they protested to the surveyors that they had no desire to have their lands measured even if the government had ordered it, for those lands were their private property by the warranty of the Constitution. The surveyors persisted and the next day appeared with a posse of rurales. Again the people protested, but this time they were silenced

by force, and in the clash that ensued, several lives were lost on both sides.

"Four days later a force consisting of several thousand rurales and a division of the army entered the valley and began the systematic extermination of the population. How many were killed will never be known. About ten years ago in the course of our investigations we visited this valley and endeavored to elicit some details of the affair from the people. Neither man, woman, nor child could be induced to say a word, because already a number of them had met death, banishment, imprisonment, and flogging for even speaking of it. In spite of this dumbness of the people, however, we obtained independent proof that for fifteen days the slaughter never ceased, that not a man escaped alive, that only a remnant of women and children were spared, and that the task of burying the dead was so great that a month after the air for miles around the valley was unbreathable owing to the stench of the thousands of putrefying corpses. Today this whole region, where once twenty thousand peaceable, industrious folk obtained a prosperous living from the soil, belongs to a single rich family.

"In Nuevo Leon, one of those states which by reason of its great agrarian strength had managed to retain a certain independence, the local government endeavored to protect the people in the possession of their lands. The speculators, however, were not to be balked of their prey. Accordingly Diaz, at their behest, dispatched an overwhelming force into the state, overthrew the authorities and again accomplished the wholesale eviction of the people from their lands.

"The natives of Nuevo Leon, however—some of the best fighting stock in Mexico—violently resisted the government troops, and Diaz in order to quell them was compelled to resort once more to the threat of inviting United States intervention. The ruse was entirely successful. Washington dispatched troops to the border, and the people abandoned the fight, choosing to submit to wholesale eviction from their farms rather than incur a new violation of the fatherland.

"Following the dispossessions of Papantla and Nuevo Leon, the entire State of Chihuahua passed from the possession of hundreds of thousands of small farmers into the possession of two or three families under the leadership of one man—today (under Diaz) the largest cattle owner in the world. . . ."

The entire Isthmus of Tehuantepec under Diaz belonged to what was known as the Pearson syndicate, headed by Wheatman D. Pearson, now Lord Cowdray—probably knighted by the British Government for his great work of exploiting the resources and labor of Mexico!

"The clergy had a prominent position at the banquet. Indeed, never had the Church prospered as it had under Diaz. Not only were the clergy given a prominent share in the Mexican debt operations, and thus enabled again to possess themselves of vast land holdings, but immense concessions of the richest lands in Mexico were given them from time to time in such quantities, indeed, that the Church in Mexico owns more land today (under Diaz) than at any

time since the Conquest." ("Mexican People.") And this in spite of article 27 of the Constitution of 1857, which forbids "religious corporations or institutions, no matter of what denomination" from having a "legal capacity to acquire or manage any real estate except the buildings which are used immediately and directly for the services of the said institutions." The law of December 14, 1874, is also similar to this.

Says Enriquez in his biography of Diaz: "General Diaz is the head of the Freemasons in Mexico. He is of the thirty-third degree and Grand Commander for life. At the same time he is the invisible head of the Catholic Church, its arch-protector and its director, influencing indirectly the appointment of bishops and archbishops, and the creation of new dioceses of archbishops." (Zayas Enriquez, "Porfirio Diaz.")

To those who desire a first-hand inside story of conditions for the toilers in Mexico under Diaz just previous to the revolution of 1910, I recommend John Kenneth Turner's book "Barbarous Mexico." Says the author: "The real Mexico I found to be a country with a written constitution and written laws in general almost as fair and democratic as our own, but with neither constitution nor laws in operation. Mexico is a country without political freedom, without freedom of speech, without a free press, without a free ballot, without a jury system, without political parties, without any of our cherished guarantees of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It is a land where there has been no contest for the office of president for more than a generation, where the executive rules all things by means of a standing army, where political offices are sold for a fixed price. I found Mexico to be a land where the people are poor because they have no rights, where peonage is the rule for the great mass, and where actual chattel slavery obtains for hundreds of thousands." This was Mexico under Porfirio Diaz, "president" of Mexico—by grace of American Big Business! Do you wonder the slaves, the peons, revolted?

YUCATAN SLAVERY

During the dictatorship of Diaz thousands of Yaqui Indians of Sonora were evicted from their lands and transported to the slave pens of the Yucatan henequen, or sisal hemp, plantations. These plantations were owned by about fifty henequen kings and were worked by about one hundred and fifty thousand slaves, Yaquis, Koreans, and native Mayas, or as the planters called them to get around the law which forbade slavery, "laborers in enforced service for debt." "But the fact that is was not service for debt was proven by the habit of transferring the slaves from one master to another, not on any basis of debt, but on the basis of the market price of a man."

Writing in "Barbarous Mexico," John Kenneth Turner has the following to say about the slavery of Yucatan as it existed when Diaz was in power in Mexico:

"How are the slaves recruited? . . . 'It is very easy,' one planter told me. 'All that is necessary is that you get some free laborer in debt to you, and then you have him. Yes, we are always getting new laborers in that way.'

"The amount of debt does not matter, so long as it is a debt, and the little transaction is arranged by men who combine the functions of money lender and slave broker. Some of them have offices in Merida and they get the free laborers, clerks, and the poorer class of people generally into debt, just as professional loan sharks of America get clerks, mechanics, and office men into debt—by playing on their needs and tempting them. . . .

"These money-lending slave brokers of Merida do not hang out signs and announce to the world that they have slaves to sell. They do their business quietly, as people who are comparatively safe in their occupation, but as people who do not wish to endanger their business by too great publicity—like police-protected gambling houses in an American city, for example. . . .

"These men buy and sell slaves. And the planters buy and sell slaves. I was offered slaves in lots of one up by the planters. I was told that I could buy a man or a woman, a boy or a girl, or a thousand of any of them, to do with them exactly as I wished, that the police would protect me in my possession of these, my fellow beings. Slaves are not only used on the henequen plantations, but in the city as personal servants, as laborers, as household drudges, as prostitutes. How many of these persons there are in the city of Merida I do not know, though I heard many stories of the absolute power exercised over them. Certainly the number is several thousand. . . .

"Why do the henequen kings call their system enforced service for debt instead of by its right name? Probably for two reasons—because the system is the outgrowth of a milder system of actual service for debt, and because of the prejudice against the word slavery, both among Mexicans and foreigners. Service for debt in a milder form than is found in Yucatan exists all over Mexico and is called peonage. Under this system, police authorities everywhere recognize the right of an employer to take the body of a laborer who is in debt to him, and to compel the laborer to work out the debt. Of course, once the employer can compel the laborer to work, he can compel him to work at his own terms, and that means that he can work him on such terms as will never permit the laborer to extricate himself from his debt. . . .

"The slaves of Yucatan get no money. They are half-starved. They are worked almost to death. They are beaten. A large percentage of them are locked up every night in a house resembling a jail. If they are sick, they must still work, and if they are so sick that it is impossible for them to work, they are seldom permitted the services of a physician. The women are compelled to marry, compelled to marry men of their own plantation only, and sometimes are compelled to marry certain men not of their choice. There are no schools for the children. Indeed, the entire lives of these people are ordered

at the whim of a master, and if the master wishes to kill them, he may do so with impunity. I heard numerous stories of slaves being beaten to death, but I never heard of an instance in which the murderer was punished, or even arrested. The police, the public prosecutors, and the judges know exactly what is expected of them, for the men who appoint them are the planters themselves. . . ."

Now this is all changed. Slavery and peonage have been abolished in Yucatan by the people who rebelled against the tyranny of the wonderful "maker" of Mexico, and one of the most progressive governments in Mexico has been set up.

Those who defend Porfirio Diaz and his system don't tell you about these things. They don't speak of how the government of Diaz set about to exterminate the Yaquis of Sonora; of how the government deported them to Yucatan, and how the authorities utilized the money derived from their sale into slavery. No, Diaz, they tell us, was the maker of Mexico; the country prospered under him—and doubtless many of them wish another Diaz would come along and give them back privileges taken from them by the Constitutionalists.

John Kenneth Turner reports the following statement made to him by Colonel Francisco B. Cruz of Diaz's army relative to the selling of the Yaquis into slavery in Yucatan:

"In the past three and one-half years I have delivered just fifteen thousand seven hundred Yaquis in Yucatan—delivered, mind you, for you must remember that the government never allows me enough expense money to feed them properly, and from ten to twenty per cent die on the journey.

"These Yaquis sell in Yucatan for \$65 apiece—men, women, and children. Who gets the money? Well, \$10 goes to me for my services. The rest is turned over to the Secretary of War. This, however, is only a drop in the bucket, for I know this to be a fact, that every foot of land, every building, every cow, every burro, everything left behind by the Yaquis when they are carried away by the soldiers, is appropriated for the private use of authorities of the State of Sonora." ("Barbarous Mexico.")

Let it be understood that the slavery in Mexico under Diaz was not only the concern of Mexican landowners. Americans, and others, also were interested in slavery. "Americans work the slaves—buy them, drive them, lock them up at night, beat them, kill them, exactly as do other employers of labor in Mexico. And they admit that they do these things. In my possession are scores of admissions by American planters that they employ labor which is essentially slave labor. All over the tropical section of Mexico, on the plantations of rubber, sugar cane, tropical fruits—everywhere—you will find Americans buying, imprisoning, killing slaves." ("Barbarous Mexico.")

THE MEXICO OF TODAY

Now let us consider the Mexico of today. Having revolted and once more established constitutional rule, democratized the land, abolished slavery and peonage, and established freedom of press and speech, the people of Mexico once more find themselves face to face with threatened intervention.

One of the schemes of the interventionists is to try to make people believe that the present constitution of Mexico, known as the Constitution of 1917, is in no way related to the Constitution of 1857, but is a new one, framed mainly with the purpose of confiscating all property supposedly belonging to foreigners, Americans in particular. The Constitution of 1917 is an evolution of that of 1857; it is a modification and an enlargement of the Constitution of 1857. It was written with the blood and tears of the oppressed and exploited peons of Mexico, and it is without a doubt the most democratic and humanitarian document in the western hemisphere; in fact, outside of Soviet Russia no country in the world has taken such a step toward real liberty.

The principal articles of the Constitution of 1917 are similar to those of the Constitution of 1857. What should especially interest the workers of this and other countries, aside from the principal articles, is the great attention given to labor and social welfare by the 1917 Constitution. Under Article 123 we find the following:

"I—Eight hours shall be the maximum limit of a day's work.

"II—The maximum limit of night work shall be seven hours. Unhealthy and dangerous occupations are forbidden to all women and to children under sixteen years of age. Nightwork in factories is likewise forbidden to women and to children under sixteen years of age; nor shall they be employed in commercial establishments after ten o'clock at night.

"III—The maximum limit of a day's work for children over twelve and under sixteen years of age shall be six hours. The work of children under twelve years of age cannot be made the object of a contract.

"IV—Every workman shall enjoy at least one day's rest for every six days' work.

"V—Women shall not perform any physical work requiring considerable physical effort during the three months immediately preceding parturition; during the month following parturition they shall necessarily enjoy a period of rest and shall receive their salaries or wages in full and retain their employment and the rights they may have acquired under their contracts. During the period of lactation they shall enjoy two extraordinary daily periods of rest of one-half hour each in order to nurse their children.

"VI—The minimum wage to be received by a workman shall be that considered sufficient. . . to satisfy the normal needs of the life of the workman, his education and his lawful pleasures. . . .

"VII—The same compensation shall be paid for the same work without regard to sex or nationality.

"XI—When owing to special circumstances it becomes necessary to increase the working hours there shall be paid as wages for the overtime one hundred per cent more than those fixed for regular time. In no case shall the overtime exceed three hours nor continue for more than three consecutive days; and no women, of whatever age, nor boys under sixteen years of age, may engage in overtime work.

"XII—In every agricultural, industrial, mining or similar class of work employers are bound to furnish their workmen comfortable and sanitary dwelling-places for which they may charge rents not exceeding one-half of one per cent per month of the assessed value of the properties. They shall likewise establish schools, dispensaries, and other services necessary to the community. . . .

"XIII—Furthermore, there shall be set aside in these labor centers, whenever their population exceeds two hundred inhabitants, a space of land not less than five thousand square meters for the establishment of public markets, and the construction of buildings designed for municipal services and places of amusement. No saloons nor gambling houses shall be permitted in such labor centers.

"XIV—Employers shall be liable for labor accidents and occupational diseases arising from work; therefore employers shall pay the proper indemnity. . . .

"XV—Employers shall be bound to observe in the installation of their establishments all the provisions of law regarding hygiene and sanitation and to adopt adequate measures to prevent accidents due to the use of machinery, tools and working materials. . . .

"XXII—An employer who discharges a workman without proper cause or for having joined a union or syndicate or for having taken part in a lawful strike, shall be bound, at the option of the workman, either to perform the contract or to indemnify him by the payment of three months' wages. . . ."

Now, where in these enlightened United States will you find a state that has laws on its statute books that can favorably compare with the above provisions of the Mexican Constitution of 1917? You can't find it. Where is there a state in the Union that has the eight-hour law on its books? Where is there one that gives the woman worker the deal that the oft-time despised and "ignorant" Mexicans give her? Tell me where in this country above the Rio Grande a woman worker gets equal pay for equal work with a man. You can't

do it. Thousands and thousands of women in the United States are occupied in similar work as men—and are they getting equal payment? Most decidedly not. That is why they are oftentimes employed—they can be worked cheaper.

I am not claiming perfection, or anything resembling perfection, for the Mexican Constitution, nor would any intelligent Mexican claim such, but I do claim, and I think intelligent and fair-minded Americans will likewise claim, that the downtrodden, exploited peons of Mexico have produced a document written with their blood and bitter tears that surpasses anything and is a greater step towards real liberty of the People than anything produced by any country on the American continent. In fact, as mentioned before, Soviet Russia, and also Soviet Hungary (which was crushed by those who battled for five years to make the world safe for democracy—the imperialistic Allied Governments)—these workers' Soviet republics are the only countries that have produced Constitutions of the People, as have also the Mexican Revolutionists, though not as far advanced as the European Revolutionists. If the Mexican Constitution has not been put wholly into effect the cause lies more above the Rio Grande than below it. It even might have been worded stronger and made more really mancipating if the Colossus of the North had not been in the minds of the framers. If hands are kept off Mexico real social and economic justice will develop, with the control and ownership of the means of production in the hands of the workers—all industry in the hands of those who do the work, for the benefit of all, not a few—society being of such an order that the Rights of Man are supreme and not those of Property. This the upholders and disciples of capitalism in America can see, and that is one reason why they demand intervention. **Anything that threatens the Profit System must be crushed!** Plutocracy, both European and American, has been touched at its pocket nerve—the reaction from which frequently causes the plutocrat to see red.

There is an organization of exploiters of Mexican labor and resources, with headquarters in New York City, known as the National Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico. This association, which should be called the Association for the Spreading of Lies about Mexico and Preaching of Intervention, issues a bulletin filled with carefully selected articles of misrepresentation, often unsigned, and deliberately published with the purpose of inflaming the people's minds and "educating" them to intervention. This bulletin they spread broadcast, and their organizers go about the country getting new members—chiefly from the ranks of the capitalists and their retainers—and pouring their poisonous virus into the minds of the unwary and those unacquainted with the facts regarding Mexican affairs.

I have before me a list of members of this association and on the executive committee we find, among others, the following: Edward L. Doheny, president, Pan-American Petroleum and Transport Co.; Amos L. Beatty, general counsel, The Texas Co.; Walter Douglas, president,

Montezuma Copper Co.; Thomas W. Lamont, member of J. P. Morgan & Co.; Chester O. Swain, general counsel, Standard Oil Co. of N. J.

In groups the active members run as follows: agricultural and cattle; banking and security holders; commercial trading; industrial; mining and smelting; petroleum and petroleum refining; and the "general interest" group, which is composed of the El Paso Chamber of Commerce, Houston Chamber of Commerce, and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the last mentioned being the most notorious group of labor-haters and exploiters in America.

This is certainly a fine crowd to entrust the welfare of Mexico and its people to! This is the group of labor exploiters who are so concerned about carrying democracy to the downtrodden peons who are crying out for a deliverer, to hear this association tell it.

American "rights" in Mexico—that means capitalist or property rights. You don't hear anything about American workers' rights in Mexico—the noise is all about property rights. There is also some noise about personal rights of Americans, but this is merely a scheme to hide the real issue. But where did these Americans who are making all this noise about their property rights get these so-called rights from? Who gave them these rights? How did they come into possession of all this property, in the interest of which they are so anxious to have American workers drop their tools, shoulder guns and fight the Mexican workers? Do you suppose these Association for the Protection of American Rights in Mexico people would cross the Rio Grande, in the event of intervention, and bleed and die for the sake of their property rights in Mexico? No! They want the people who have no property in Mexico—the workers of America—to do the dirty work for them, while they sit back and urge the people on in the name of patriotism and democracy!

Yes, where did they get these "rights" we are hearing so much about? Most of the American concession-holders and property-holders in Mexico got their "rights" from Porfirio Diaz. And where did Diaz get them from? He stole them from the people—the peons, the small farmers. He gave concessions often where he had no right to give concessions. Many an American and British capitalist has made a fortune from these concessions. Diaz destroyed the existing agrarian democracy when he came into power in 1876, a democracy that doubtless would have developed and blossomed into genuine industrial democracy founded on social and economic justice, and in its place he planted a despotism held together by bayonets, at the shrine of which American, British and other concession-seekers and speculators worshipped and grew fat at the expense of the toilers of the mines and the mills and the peons of the soil. If an investigation were made, it would probably be found that many of these so-called American property rights in Mexico are resting on a pretty slim foundation. Anyhow, even though we grant them all their "rights," have not the people of Mexico a perfect right to determine how the property rights of the country shall be administered, and just what "rights" property has? If the Mexicans determine that all property of a public

nature—such as the land, the mills, the mines, the oil and other mineral deposits—shall be nationalized or socialized, have they not a perfect right to do so? However they determine the land or oil deposits, for instance, shall be worked or controlled, is their right. If the Mexican Government determines that the interests of the people demand that the oil deposits shall be nationalized, it has a right to go into the oil district of Tampico and tell the American, British and other oil producers that from such and such a date the oil wells will be operated by the people for the benefit of all and not merely for the benefit of a few millionaires and their families, none of whom live in the country but are residents of other countries, busy in exploiting the people of those countries as they are those of Mexico. If the people of Mexico determine that the big landed estates shall be taken from the holders—who in the majority of cases got the estates illicitly and by eviction of the small farmers from their land—they have a right to do so.

Speaking of American rights in Mexico reminds me of Mexican rights in the United States. Down along the border Mexicans, working men and women, are continually suffering from abuses of their rights as men and women at the hands of Americans, some of whom are probably loudest in the cry for American rights in Mexico. In Southern California Mexican children were so discriminated against in certain public schools recently that one Mexican consul was forced to protest to the Governor of California. As Linn Gale, American editor of Gale's Magazine (published in Mexico City) says, "President Carranza in his message to the Mexican Congress a few days ago showed that Mexico has as much reason to 'intervene' in the affairs of the United States—if it were big enough—as the United States has to interfere with the government down here and more. The list of crimes committed against Mexicans north of the Rio Grande is an indictment against the American Government that is considerably harder to explain away than any complaint that has been made against the Carranza Administration. The American Government, considering the wealth, education and opportunities in the United States, has a record black as midnight compared with that of the young, immature, but honestly struggling Government of Mexico."

We are told that Mexico is overrun with bandits. We won't deny that there are bandits in certain parts of Mexico, but if it were made as difficult for the bandits to get firearms and ammunition as it is for the Carranza Government, probably the banditry would soon be a thing of the past. American ammunition is invariably found on captured bandits—who knows but that is part of the plot to force intervention to supply these bandits with ammunition, and even to make bandits?

Speaking of bandits—do you know that American and British oil producers in Mexico employ a bandit band to "guard" their property? So as to keep the Carranza Government out of the Tampico oil district the bandit Pelaez is paid a large sum monthly. L. J. de Bekker, writing in "The Nation" of July 12, 1919, makes the statement that

he "had been told by the American Embassy in Mexico City that the oil men paid Pelaez, for guarding their interests, \$200,000 a month." This has been denied by the Association of Oil Producers in Mexico in a letter of reply to "The Nation," July 14, 1919, in which they said that "Pelaez never got one-sixth of that amount for any month from the oil companies." So, you see, we have their own word for it that this bandit did receive money from them. And that he is guarding their interests is made evident by the following paragraph of the same letter: "The article says: 'King Pelaez of the oil fields considers it a patriotic duty to blow up any rolling stock belonging to the Government.' None of Pelaez's men operate anywhere near any railroad. It is true bandits, or 'patriots,' are continually blowing up cars between San Luis Potosi and Tampico, but 'King' Pelaez troops are operating in the oil fields only, far from any railroad, for the reason that the Government is attempting to confiscate their oil values."

The statement that "Pelaez's troops are operating in the oil fields only, far from any railroad" is proven false by Mr. de Bekker who says, "I have photographs of some of the Pelaez bandits swinging from telegraph poles, where they were hanged by Mr. Carranza's soldiers. These photographs, being taken from the car windows, show them to have been pretty close to the track."

HEARST AND INTERVENTION

The hypocritical Hearst press, which has been engaged for a number of years in misrepresenting the Mexican revolution and squealing eagle fashion for intervention, makes much of the fact that Americans have been killed in Mexico. The country, say these people with an axe to grind, must be cleaned up and responsible, orderly government established, or better still annex it to the United States.

Now, before the United States undertakes to "clean up" Mexico, how about cleaning up at home first? What about the recent race riots in Washington and Chicago? How about the lynchings of the enlightened South? (I just picked up a paper and read: "Five dead in Knoxville race riot." We sure ought to restore order in Mexico, all right!) As "The Nation" remarks in its August 23rd issue, "there have been 217 Americans killed in Mexico since 1911 and 544 Americans lynched within our borders within that period (we have no record of the number of those killed in strikes and other disorders)."

There is a reason for Hearst's cry for intervention—and it is not the one he tells his readers. The Mexican Herald, August 24, 1908, published the following information, which throws a light on the Hearst screeching for intervention: "With over a million acres of the finest agricultural and grazing land, with large herds of blooded cattle, horses and sheep, roaming over this vast domain, the big Hearst cattle ranch and farm in Chihuahua is the peer of any such estate in the world whether it lies in the green corn belt of Illinois or Kansas, or stretches for miles across the wind-swept prairies of Texas and Oklahoma. Two hundred and fifty miles of barbed wire fence enclose a

portion of this vast ranch and within the enclosure graze 60,000 thoroughbred Herefords, 125,000 fine sheep, and many thousand head of horses and hogs." This land Hearst is "generally credited with securing from the Mexican government (Diaz's) for nothing or practically nothing." Now, the Mexican revolution of 1910-14 was, as I stated before, an agrarian revolution and you don't have to stretch your imagination very much to see what would happen to such estates as Hearst's if the full purpose of the revolution were put into effect.

Another eagle screecher for intervention is the Los Angeles Times. Why? The same reason—another million acres of land.

Some of the Catholic clergy also want intervention—to get back the Church's lost power in Mexico. Some Catholic prelates and politicians in America have worked and agitated for intervention ever since 1910. It has been said that Felix Diaz's counter-revolutionary activities were backed partly by Catholic gold, and he is known to have received "through an American prelate, a check for one hundred thousand dollars, with which Don Felix was to go to Havana to rally his followers and begin his preparation to start a new revolution." This was made known by a Mexican Catholic and ex-federal officer, S. Augusto Zubieta and an affidavit, written and sworn to by him, as to the counter-revolutionary part played by many Catholic institutions in America, follows: "I, Salvador A. Zubieta, do hereby declare that on or about December, 1914, and January, 1915, I had occasion to meet Cardinal _____, and talking over the Mexican situation, we discussed several questions of importance, among them the alleged actions of Carranza against the Catholic Church, and he confided to me that the Catholics in this country were disposed to back a new revolution, of which Felix Diaz was to be the head. The instigator of this movement is the well-known murderer, Cecilio Ocon, who seems to have gained the ear and the confidence of Cardinal _____; the said Cardinal having believed unquestionably all the false representations made by this unscrupulous murderer. The Cardinal also asked if I would help in this, probably because he thought my family connections in Mexico and the fact of my being a Catholic, would gain some advantage to the cause. Cardinal _____ also stated that many Catholic institutions in this country were ready to back this movement with about ten million dollars.

"(Signed) SAL. AUGUSTO ZUBIETA.

"New York City, Feb. 27, 1910.

"State of New York }
County of New York } SS.

"Sworn to before me this 27th day of February, 1915, (Signed) W. J. Berow, Notary Public, New York County No. 374, New York Reg. No. 5255.

"(Seal) WILLIAM J. BEROW, Notary Public, New York County."
(This affidavit is copied from a pamphlet by Dr. A. Paganel, of

Mexico City, entitled "What the Catholic Church has done to Mexico.")

The following letter published in "Pueblo," Vera Cruz, March 26, 1915, and signed by a number of Catholic priests in Mexico, should be of interest to these militant trouble-makers in the United States who are agitating for intervention:

"To Don Venustiano Carranza, Chief of the Constitutionalist army and in charge of the Executive Power of the Union: We the undersigned Catholic priests of the Archbishopric of Mexico, take pleasure in stating that it is with regret and disapproval that we have seen a number of Catholic refugees in foreign countries, acting on the advice and under the influence of an association which with the pretext of protecting the Catholic cause, has long been trying to interfere in our national affairs, address a petition to a foreign government for the protection of the Church in Mexico. We protest to you that none of us have taken part in these measures which we consider anti-patriotic an unnecessary. . . ." (Signed) Dr. Antonio J. Paredes, Vicar General of the Archbishopric of Mexico; Jose Cortes, rector; and a number of other Mexican and Spanish priests."

U. S. GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE

Ever since Porfirio Diaz was driven out of power in 1910 the United States Government has threatened intervention and has even gone so far as to send expeditions into Mexico after bandits supplied with American arms and ammunition. President Taft mobilized troops on the border as a sinister hint, it seemed, to the revolutionists and to strike terror into their hearts. The present Administration's actions are well known. One day President Wilson is for a thing and the next he changes. In Indianapolis, Jan. 8, 1915, he said: "Until the recent revolution in Mexico eighty per cent of the people never had a 'look-in' in determining what their government should be. . . . It is none of my business and it is none of yours how long they take in determining it. It is none of my business and it is none of yours how they go about the business. The country is theirs. The government is theirs. Have not European nations taken as long as they wanted, and spilt as much blood as they pleased, in settling their affairs? And shall we deny that to Mexico, because she is weak? No, I say!"

But in a note to Carranza, June 2, 1915, President Wilson has evidently experienced a change of heart: ". . . I, therefore, call upon the leaders of Mexico to act. . . If they cannot accommodate their differences and unite for this great purpose within a very short time, this Government will be constrained to decide what means should be employed by the United States in order to help Mexico save herself and serve her people." We know how Mexico would be helped!

While the present Administration has not actually intervened by force of arms it has prevented the Carranza Government from carry-

ing out all the reforms of the Revolution by its protests and threats to Carranza whenever his Government contemplated putting into effect those reforms. Says John Kenneth Turner, in the "Liberator" of June, 1919, of the policy of the Wilson Government: "Agrarian reform was opposed always. Representations were made against Carranza's original land decree, at the beginning of 1915, and a warning entered against its application to foreigners. Confiscations of vast holdings for non-payment of taxes, non-compliance with the terms of concessions, or for other reasons, met with repeated objection. Even expropriation of the estates of counter-revolutionary plotters evoked protests against 'any action that savors of confiscation.'"

"From the beginning, also, representations were made against every measure seeking to conserve the oil and other mineral deposits for the Mexican people, or even to tax oil or mineral properties, adequately."

"In the unending stream of representations appeared numerous direct threats and ultimatums, while resort was made to various forms of coercion, including naval and military demonstrations. Hardly an item of domestic policy escaped interference, which was invariably on behalf of special privilege."

"Finally, the army of the 'punitive expedition' was held in Mexico for nine months after the Villa chase was definitely abandoned, nine months after General Scott, acting for the United States, had signed a memorandum to the effect that the dispersion of the Villa bands had been completed. Meanwhile, Franklin K. Lane and his associates on the American-Mexican Joint Commission, were attempting to browbeat the Mexicans into yielding the guarantees demanded by the Rockefellers, the Guggenheims, the Dodges and the Dohenys. Although, in explaining the expedition, the President had declared that the troops would not be used in the interest of 'American owners of Mexican properties' 'so long as sane and honorable men are in control of the government,' the public statement of Lane, issued at the end of November (1916), after a long interview with the President, was nothing more nor less than an acknowledgment that the troops WERE being held in Mexico for that purpose and for no other, and a threat that they would remain there until an agreement was reached regarding such little matters as oil and mining taxes."

HANDS OFF MEXICO

Now, as I said at the beginning, the cry of Wall Street and its kept press is for intervention; capital, both American and British, is for intervention. The concessionists, the owners of large estates, the mining, oil and railroad interest, all want a government established in Mexico that will enable them to exploit the country and its labor to their heart's content. If the United States did intervene, then probably the cry would go up for annexation. For the profitmonger knows no limit.

The Mexican people will solve their problems if outside governments keep their hands off. Let it be the business of American Labor, of all lovers of freedom and fair-play to keep hands off Mexico. Let the servile press howl for intervention as it will, nothing else can be expected of it. It is capitalism's mouthpiece and a fawning, corrupt thing!

Remember the noble words of William Lloyd Garrison: "My country is the world; my countrymen are all mankind." The cause of the workers of one country is the cause also of the workers of the rest of the world. Those striving for Liberty, Equality, Fraternity in Mexico, those striving for the emancipation of Labor, with all that that means, and those serving their fellowman in the country below the Rio Grande deserve the respect and help of the workers in this country above the Rio Grande. Let your voice be heard in unmistakable terms: **HANDS OFF MEXICO!**



(For information about this pamphlet address Author, 634 13th St., Oakland, Calif.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The University of Michigan will have been founded for a century and a half on the 10th day of October, 1817. It is the oldest and largest of the public universities in the United States. It is the only one in the West. It is the only one in the North. It is the only one in the South. It is the only one in the East. It is the only one in the world.

The University of Michigan is a public institution of higher learning. It is a non-sectarian institution. It is a non-profit institution. It is a non-partisan institution. It is a non-racial institution. It is a non-ethnic institution. It is a non-religious institution. It is a non-political institution. It is a non-ideological institution. It is a non-ideological institution. It is a non-ideological institution.



The University of Michigan is a public institution of higher learning. It is a non-sectarian institution. It is a non-profit institution. It is a non-partisan institution. It is a non-racial institution. It is a non-ethnic institution. It is a non-religious institution. It is a non-political institution. It is a non-ideological institution. It is a non-ideological institution. It is a non-ideological institution.



