

The Facts About Mexico

By Robert H. Murray

(Mr. Murray was for ten years a resident correspondent in Mexico City for the New York World and in charge of the Mexican section of the U. S. committee on public information during the world war. For his brilliant service to this country and the allies, he has been decorated by Italy and recommended for the United States distinguished Service medal.)

NEW YORK, Aug. 28.—What are our commitments in Mexico? To what extent are we responsible to our own people and to the rest of the world for policies that stretch of the Central-South American belt? What have we left undone in Mexico that national honor and dignity required should be done? What ought we to do now?

Once, a long time ago, I asked Porfirio Diaz why Mexico had not gone into the big navy game, like Chile, the Argentine, Brazil. The old gentleman smiled a slow, sage smile and said: "Mexico needs no large and expensive navy! The Monroe doctrine is Mexico's navy."

Meaning that under the Monroe doctrine in American navy, if emergency required, would throw up a steel wall around Mexico to protect her from European aggression. Which would be fine for Mexico, but what about us?

The Monroe doctrine, if it is more than the dusty, effete, archaic document which many persons—especially Central and South America—commencing to think it is, bears for us responsibilities besides those of shielding kings, princes and potentates away from setting up shop on this hemisphere. It also makes us the guarantor for the good behavior of the peoples to the south of us. That is serious.

It can hardly be doubted that empire-building England, or the ambitious and predatory Germany that was, or perhaps France, would have undertaken before 1914 to have given Mexico a sound shaking and cuffing and sat her down hard if it hadn't been for us and our fetish of a Monroe doctrine. For both England and France have suffered as much, if not more, in Mexico than the United States has.

Before we go any further on this track, a few words on the subject of Americans who have been murdered in Mexico since 1910. No adequate excuse or apology can be advanced for these outrages. They should have been taken place in the score of American dead in Mexico has been exaggerated for propaganda purposes. If we could sift the facts the lies, probably would shrink by a third, perhaps a half.

I find, for instance, that a general impression prevails that scores of Americans were killed in Mexico City during the "Decena Trágica" in 1913 when Madero and the rebels were fighting. Exactly three Americans lost their lives. I am thus specific, not to make these deaths, but to offer facts to offset hysterics.

In a majority of cases, too, Americans have not been killed because they were Americans. Some of the instances, because they were foreigners who happened to be in Mexico. Had the circumstances been similar they probably would have died had they been British, French, German, Spanish, Italian.

All who have lived for any length of time in Mexico, and who will tell the truth, will agree with me that the Mexicans do not "hate" Americans with any irreconcilable, intense, blood-hatred, such as legend has it that they cherish toward us. Did they, all of us in Mexico would have had our throats slit long ago. There is racial antagonism, like that between most other peoples of different strains and languages.

If the Mexicans, the masses, really dislike to an approximation of hatred any foreigners domiciled among them it is the Spaniards, "gachupines" or "land-robbers," as they are popularly termed there. Antagonism is a heritage of the Conquest.

All this, as I said before, is not offered in excuse, or extenuation, but to clarify the situation and to give and get the record straight. Besides it was Taft who first virtually proclaimed open season for Americans in Mexico by ordering them to get out, which was the same as saying to the Mexicans that we had withdrawn the protection of the United States from our nationals in Mexico. Anyhow, that is the way the Mexicans figure it, regardless of the meaning and intent of the step.

Before the revolution it used to be loosely stated and believed that we had more than 50,000 nationals domiciled in Mexico and above one billion dollars invested. Wild shots, both.

When the last Mexico census was taken, in 1910, when the foreign population was at flood, there were less

than 25,000 Americans in the republic. If we had half a billion dollars in Mexico that was easily ten figures. The railroads, most of them, were projected and built by Americans. But the bulk of the capital came from England, France, Belgium and Germany. From whence came the capital of the great banks, the Banco Nacional and the Banco de Londres and Mexico, or examples? Principally from France.

British mining investments are as big as Americans. Britain probably has as much invested in agriculture developments. The great dry-goods and jewelry shops are French. The Germans had almost a monopoly of the hardware trade. The textile works are British, French and Spanish. The powerful tramways and electrical system of the City of Mexico are British-owned, but an American protected and built it. American capital was and is heavily represented in mining, some agriculture and, at present, it is deep in petroleum. But the British and Mexican interests are not far behind in that, even.

Totaled, the European stake against Mexico is greater, far greater, than ours. Don't forget that, the next time an impatient congressman asks some of the politicians who sedulously vet-nurse it, and occasionally give it a surreptitious pinch to make it yield when they want the voters to think that the Old Flag is in danger.

What should we do? That is easy. We should provide ourselves with a policy. Not merely with what we have to ten years called a policy. Saying and maintaining that we do not want to, nor will we, intervene in Mexico is not a policy, any more than two feet of catgut can be called a fiddle. A policy without detail, plan, limits, purpose, continuity and—these words should be printed in circus-type— vigor and constructive force has proved to be bad for both Mexico and us. And it is not a policy. It is a mess.

Probably it wouldn't be a bad notion to set down justly, unequivocally, fully and in business-like terms our irreducible minimum of what we expect from Mexico. Then talk it over with the new elements in government here.

Why not get down to brass tacks? Give Mexico time to turn herself. With the best disposition in the world it is not to take more than 15 minutes for the Mexicans to prove by works the faith we may have in them.

Diaz used a quarter of a century in making Mexico fit for polite international society. When he started in the country wasn't half as disheveled as it is now. But he enjoyed the advantage of not having any hurt feelings, pounds, francs and marks yipping at his heels.

Not long ago an esteemed, but atrocious friend of mine abandoned Mexico to be safe, because things down there weren't going to suit him, and wrote a piece about it which he called "Is She Worth Saving?" So hear as he could make out after clawing one's way through the oily smelling folds of a friend figured that she is, but that we must lick her first.

Setting aside, as immaterial, perhaps, that in my respectful judgment my friend's opinions were dictated by his liver rather than by his head, it still remains certain that Mexico, far, doesn't require any saving. What she needs is help. It isn't now necessary, and probably will not become so, that any punitive processes should precede the helping. Or the saving, if it comes to that. Or, of course, there is no telling what bungling will lead up to.

It is difficult for us, in the United States, to tell exactly how bad things in Mexico really are. The telling of the tale, sticking closely to the bare facts, is hard enough, without lying or exaggeration.

The only source of information available to the majority are the newspapers and contact with persons living in Mexico. Much as it grieves me, a practical newspaper man for more than 25 years, to say this, it is unfortunately true that the Mexican notices printed in the papers of the United States afford about the worst possible index to what really is the state of affairs in the southern republic.

Financial Mexico did not furnish an item a month on the average. We all know what her news output has been since then.

EXPECTING THE WORST. We—read that includes newspaper men and editors—have grown into the habit of expecting the worst of Mexico. We print the worst, we believe the worst when we see it printed, with gusto and incurious credence. One can easily set a series of articles describing Mexico in revolution, with all the opportunities for word-jazzing that the subject offers. Editors eat 'em up. So do readers.

But a set of truthful, conservative articles, telling something hopeful and hopeful—and there are plenty of things going on down there which prove that Mexico is holding her own surprisingly well in mining, petroleum, agriculture, fibers and other productive ways, and that general conditions aren't half as discouraging as most persons believe—about the country and the people? One might as well show at peddling those as one would have in trying to sell William J. Bryan as a case of prime old vatted Scotch.

Constructive and conservative news from Mexico has no more chance in the public prints here than a teardrop would have in a forest fire.

Unfortunately, revolution, destruction, killing, tearing down, especially in Mexico, is "news." Folks like to read those things. An editor can get a snappy first-page head out of them. Who, aside from a handful, gives a hang about Mexico rising to supremacy as an oil producer, that she is having this year the biggest crops of wheat and other grains in her history, or that her output of silver in ounces is greater than it ever was before.

It is all true. But, it isn't news. The news releases has left its mark heavily upon Mexico. But not iteratively. Mexico today is the richest undeveloped accessible country in the world. In development only one aspect has been scratched. Given not more than two years of good government, with accompanying order and other stabilizing elements, Mexico, economically, will be back where she was before the revolution.

When the revolution was at its worst, the people of Mexico were never in such straits for food as are today the wretched inhabitants of Poland, Austria, some of the Balkans or sections of Russia. Neither had the revolution taken the toll of deaths in Mexico more than a very small fraction of what war, revolution, famine, break-down of governments has from European peoples.

There is work aplenty for everyone in Mexico, in the fields, the mines, the factories, on the railroads. There always has been, a shortage of labor there.

Mexico today is not producing a title of what she should, especially in agriculture.

The land is there, as fruitful as ever, but tools, machinery, hands, protection from brigands is needed before cotton, millions of fat acres can be gotten back into production. Scores of mines, most of them small, but some of important magnitude, cannot be worked because of lack of protection, or of facilities, by rail or otherwise, to get in supplies, or to ship their product out.

Economically, the problem of railroad transportation is the most serious with which the country has to cope. The lines, many of which were in magnificent condition ten years ago, are shot to pieces.

Rehabilitation of the railways must be made in haste before there is any worth-while permanent relief from economic pressure.

Mexico is good for every dollar she owes, and for fifty times as much. Considering the size of her population and the tremendous potential value of her resources today Mexico is in far better financial condition than any of the European countries, big or little, that participated in the war. She is a better risk, too, when it comes down to estimating her ability to pay her debts.

Also, as I have previously mentioned do not let us forget the important fact that the bulk of what Mexico owes is every way—with the possible exception of damage claims arising from the revolution—she owes to British, French, Italians, Spaniards, Germans and Belgians, and not to Americans.

THE BANKS WILL NEED TO BE ENCOURAGED to resume operations, too, in order to get the business and credit machinery of the republic back into effective working order. Steps to this end are being taken. She must also be financed. We must do that. No other country is in a position to loan her what she needs to set up in business again.

In short, Mexico is not half as badly off financially, economically, or socially as one would conclude after a ten-year course of the newspaper and magazine jeremiads which have been fed out to us. Her condition is bad, but not so bad as that.

Financially, she is worth saving, to answer my atrabillous friend's question. But it is help and patience from her helpers—that is her greatest present need. Not that, if we do not help, and quickly, too, most likely she will require saving later on. But if it does come to saving, that will be our fault, as much as Mexico's.

Are those next people down there going to make it go? That is the first question one is asked about Mexico these days. Frankly, I do not know. The "new people" don't know themselves, probably. I

hope they will. I will go so far as to say that I believe they will. If they do not, it will be a case of "after the deluge, the deluge." As a matter of fact, it seems to me that they simply have got to make it go.

This is the situation, without blinking. Mexico has been in a disaster for a decade. She is, as I have said before, the richest undeveloped accessible country on earth. The world, however, is in the raw material, but in the work of reconstruction following the damage wrought during the war, has urgent need of all that Mexico can produce in the raw material, petroleum, fibers, cattle, timber and so on.

Mexico must get back into production, and on a scale of far more imposing magnitude than she ever has before attained. The needs of the world require it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

ECONOMIC QUESTIONS. By nature of the circumstances, the people of Mexico have no such much an economic one as anything. That is the hinge upon which the whole Mexican question swings. It is the economic factor which will decide in the settlement, whether the settlement is by the Mexicans, or someone else.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.

Whether "those new people" down there will make it go depends partly upon them and partly upon us, the United States. They cannot make it go, if they don't try. We cannot, if we don't help them. It appears to be only one alternative. That sums up the case as I see it.



New Arrivals of Fall Apparel

Daily arrivals of merchandise purchased by Mr. Lehman while East is making our stock complete with thrills of styles.

- DRESSES** Silk, Serges, Tricolette and Tricotine, each and everyone a work of art.
- COATS** of all the newest materials with fur and cloth collars. Plush all of the best salts plushes.
- SUITS** Gabardine, Tricotine, Serges, Velours and all other new materials.
- MILLINERY** All the newest conceits of styles for the children, misses and women. All this new merchandise is priced in keeping with the Leader's method of reaching the masses with popular priced merchandise.



protection is given to American lives. She must not only promise, but perform. She must come to some arrangement with the bankers for the resumption of her foreign debt service.

Is Lack of Iron in The Blood Making An Old Man of You?

Many A Man Still Young in Years Is Fast Growing Old—Wrinkled and Careworn. His Vigor and Energy Leaving Him, and His Memory Failing—Simply Through Neglect to Keep His Blood Rich in Iron.

Work, Worry and Nerve Strains of Modern Life Sap the Iron From the Blood, Says Physician

Who Tells How Organic Iron Like Nuxated Iron Helps Build Rich Red Blood, Strengthen the Nerves and Make Tired, Worn-out and Run-Down Men Look and Feel Years Younger.

He may be in his thirties or he may be close to sixty but no matter what his years, a man looks and feels old when the iron in his blood runs low. His strength slips away and his vitality dwindles. He no longer tackles his work with the old-time vim and energy, and he lacks the endurance to put in long hours. The lines of care and worry creep into his face, his skin loses its healthful glow and becomes sallow, sagging and wrinkled. To all appearances he is an old man though still young in years. Nature is giving him her warning signs that he lacks sufficient iron in his system to build fresh energy, strength and endurance, to keep his body healthy, his nerves steady and his mind clear and active unless he quickly replenishes the iron in his blood, he steadily becomes more nervous and weak until the final breakdown comes. How organic iron—Nuxated Iron helps build up red blood, strength and endurance and thereby keep a man from looking and feeling old before his time is explained by physicians in the following statements.

"My experience has taught me that many a man is aging too fast merely because his blood is starving for want of iron," says Dr. Ferdinand C. King, New York Physician and Medical Author. "Blood without iron is like a man without hands. The man cannot feed himself nor do his work, and similarly blood without iron cannot feed itself from the food passing through the stomach, nor can it carry the necessary oxygen, the breath of life, from the lungs to the rest of the body. The red corpuscles of the blood do this work; and iron is necessary to keep them in condition."

"If a man's red corpuscles lose their iron and he becomes pale, weak and run-down, I urge him to build up his strength with Nuxated Iron. Many a time I have seen patients through its use lose that aged careworn appearance and get a new grip on health in only two weeks. The patient stops worrying about getting old, because he no longer feels old."

Dr. James Francis Sullivan, formerly physician of Bellevue Hospital (Out-door Dept.), New York and the Westchester County Hospital, makes this statement: "For want of iron you may be an old man at thirty, dull of intellect, poor in memory, nervous, irritable and all run-down while at fifty or sixty with plenty of iron in your blood, you may still be young in feeling, full of life, your whole being brimming over with vim and energy. To make you strong, keen, red-blooded men and women there is nothing in my exper-

ence which I found so valuable as organic iron—Nuxated Iron. If you are not strong or well you owe it to yourself to make the following test: See how long you can work or how far you can walk without becoming tired. Next take two five grain tablets of Nuxated Iron three times per day after meals for two weeks. Then test your strength again and see how much you have gained."

MANUFACTURER'S NOTE: Nuxated Iron, which is recommended above, is a secret remedy but one like the other organic iron products it is easily assimilated and does not irritate the teeth, make them black, nor upset the stomach. Each tablet contains five grains of iron in a wrapped form and the whole Nuxated Iron is stamped into each bottle, so that the public may not be led into accepting inferior substitutes. The manufacturer guarantees successful and entirely satisfactory results to every purchaser of this well-refined iron. It is dispensed by all good druggists in tablet form only.

NUXATED IRON For Red Blood Strength and Endurance

SHERWIN-WILLIAMS HOUSE PAINT SWP

How SWP cuts painting cost

The only way to buy paint economically is to forget gallon price and figure costs by area covered and years of life.

SWP covers one-third more area than paints which are cheaper per gallon. It lasts twice as long without repainting, so requires half the material and costs half the labor price (for painting and repainting).

So price per gallon means nothing. Area covered, weather resistance, and years of life are the real things that determine price economy. On that basis SWP is the cheapest per-gallon outside paint you could buy.

SWP has been the leading prepared house paint for half a century. You will find a complete line of it at our store. Let us figure with you on your house-painting.

Wright's
A GOOD PLACE TO TRADE