

The Worker. AN ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT 184 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK...

TERMS TO SUBSCRIBERS. Invariably in Advance. One year, \$3.00; Six months, \$1.75; Three months, \$1.00...

Address all business communications, and make money orders, checks and drafts payable to The Worker. Communications for the editor should be addressed to the Editor...

Entered as second-class matter on April 6, 1901, under No. 10, Post Office at New York, N. Y., Post Office No. 3601.

THE SOCIALIST VOTE. The Socialist Party has passed through its third general election. Its growing vote is indicated by the increase of its vote:

The more the capitalists despise and outrage constitutional government, the more their spokesmen pay lip-service to the Constitution.

It seems hardly probable that the government at Washington will be so stupidly defiant of popular feeling as to hand over to the Tsar's agents the alleged revolutionist, Gaidais, who is now held in the Tombs on a demand for extradition.

"May Operate on United States Senator," was a big headline in the papers a few days ago. It was only a removal of the vermin appendix that was contemplated, and no amputation at the neck, which is the only operation that could satisfactorily improve the members of the Millionaires' Club.

Justice Gildersleeve of the New York Supreme Court tells H. H. Rogers of the Standard Oil Company that he need not answer questions put by Attorney-General Hadley of Missouri if he does not wish to. We note that it was this same Gildersleeve who issued the injunction against the Typographical Union.

"Roosevelt Believes His Fight Won" and "President Sanguine of Enactment of Rate Bill," say the daily headlines. Very well. But what difference will it make to the working people of the country if that bill is passed? Or even if it should be enforced? Not a bit. By big capitalists or by little ones, they will be exploited anyhow.

As we expected. Two employees of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company have been held for trial on account of the fatal wreck on January 19, but the directors and officers of the company who, for profit, maintained what they knew to be dangerous conditions, go scot free. One more reason why we should have Socialist coroners and judges, to conduct such investigations and trials according to rules of common sense and justice, not with the "sacred rights of property" ever before their eyes.

In the seven districts where the British Social Democratic Party put candidates in the field, this year it boasts an increase in its vote from 10,272 to 27,355 since the last election. Not a bad ratio, that. The only one S. D. F. candidate goes into the Commons, its influence will be felt, we may be sure. And another election is coming—probably much before the maximum time prescribed by the law—when it will again be our innings.

A Washington dispatch says: Those interested in promoting labor legislation in Congress admit there is no hope of passing either the Anti-Injunction Bill or the Employers' Liability Bill, both of which are being strongly urged by the unions. One or both measures may pass in the House, but the friends of the labor bills, after consulting the Senate, are satisfied that neither measure can pass that body, where there is disappointment. Petitions from labor organizations do not seem to have the effect on Congress they formerly did. The Anti-Injunction Bill is declared especially distasteful to the Senate Committee on Judiciary and will not even be reported.

the House, and elect workmen to the Legislature to send workmen to the Senate, and elect workmen to the judicial bench to uphold the laws that workmen in the Legislatures and Congress enact? That is what the Socialist Party proposes. What do you think, Mr. Gompers?

The Berlin dispatch of last Friday, reporting that the head of the banking firm of Mendelssohn & Co., has received many threatening letters from Russian revolutionists for loaning funds to the Russian government, "the last being a sentence of death, signed with a skull and cross-bones," is sheer poppycock. Our Russian comrades do not indulge in this comic-opera business of letters written in blood, pictures of skulls, coffins, and the like. They are too much in earnest for such nonsense. It is possible that Banker Mendelssohn has really received threatening letters; but if the account is true, they undoubtedly came from cranks or blackmailers, not from Russian revolutionists. Certainly a Jew who would lend money to the Tsar at this juncture, with the atrocities of Gomel just repeated by the Tsar's agents, would not deserve much sympathy if he did get taken off. But such as he are not the game our comrades of the Russian movement are looking out for.

ON WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY. Within three months The Worker and "Volkszeitung" will have to remove from the building which they have leased and occupied for so many years. A new skyscraper, we understand, is to take its place.

This creates a real emergency for our papers. To move a printing office is an expensive business in itself. But, in addition, we wish to take advantage of this occasion to install a new press in place of the antiquated machine which we have been using. The new press will make possible a long desired change in the form of the papers and will open the way to several mechanical changes which will greatly increase their attractiveness and accordingly, their efficiency for Socialist propaganda.

All this will take money—say \$10,000. The press done will cost over \$8,000. Ten thousand dollars is a lot of money for a labor organization such as the Socialist Co-operative Publishing Association. But a Socialist organization is never appalled by difficulties of that sort.

So far, within about three months past, our German comrades, readers of the "Volkszeitung" and German trade unions and other labor societies have raised over \$4,800 for the Press and Moving Fund. They will keep on sending in their contributions. They will do their share and more, as usual. English-speaking comrades who wish to make donations to this fund organized by the comrades may send them to Ernst Hamm, 546 E. Eighty-ninth street, New York City.

But it is not our purpose here, and it is not our intention, if we can avoid the necessity, to appeal to the non-German comrades for donations. Later, we shall have something to say to them on another line.

For the present, we address only the comrades and sympathizers of Greater New York and vicinity.

For many years it has been customary to hold a festival in the Grand Central Palace on Washington's Birthday for the benefit of The Worker and the "Volkszeitung." Each year from \$400 to \$1,000 has been netted for the benefit of our papers. But this year, in view of the special exigency, at least \$1,000 more than usual ought to be cleared. This time there will be two such festivals on Thursday evening, February 22, one in the Grand Central Palace, New York, and the other in the Brooklyn Labor Lyceum. They will be enjoyable affairs, with vocal and instrumental music, dramatic and athletic exhibitions, moving pictures, and other attractions, closing in each case with a grand ball, with good dance music and, of course, with the opportunity for solid and liquid refreshments "on the side." No one need be afraid that if he induces a friend to come he will be disappointed. The halls are large. Big crowds ought to be present at both places.

So we take this occasion of reminding all our non-German readers in New York and neighboring places that on February 22 they have an imperative engagement to have a good time and spend a couple of dollars each for the benefit of the press—and that each of them can bring at least two or three non-Socialists along, giving them an opportunity to learn that Socialists are not a bad sort, after all.

Let us have a big turn-out at Grand Central Palace and at the Brooklyn Labor Lyceum. Let us help on that day, to the end that our papers may come out from their new home in better form than ever before.

Gorki remarks that "for the bourgeoisie, even God exists only as a guardian of property." These are hard words, but not far from the truth. Observe how your typical bourgeois gentleman can work himself into a frenzy of "high morality" over anything that disturbs business property, but remains cool as a cucumber when one speaks of the hideous conditions in

the tenements, of the deadly labor of children in the glass factories and cotton mills, or of the appalling death-rate among workmen in the steel mills and coal mines and on the railways; these latter he regrets, but he can be very philosophic about them—for profit must be balanced against them. Or, to take quite another illustration: Observe how easy it is to work up sympathy for a brutish murderer condemned to speedy and painless death, and with what calmness the respectable world reads of a sentence to half a lifetime of imprisonment on a poor devil of a thief. Property is sacred; so much is sure. As to life-working folks' lives—that is a doubtful question.

A "WATERLESS" TRUST. The Populists and "radical" Democrats make a great point of the real or alleged over-capitalization of some of the trusts. To "squeeze out the water" is the height of their ambition. What will they say to the Interborough Metropolitan Company controlling properties worth hundreds of millions, but capitalized at only \$15,000? We quite understand why certain capitalists—the "honest investors"—should object to the over-capitalization resorted to by promoters in certain cases. But we never have been able to see what the question of "watered stock" had to do with the interests of the working people. The Standard Oil Company pays 40 or 50 per cent dividends on a capital of \$100,000,000. Another company, with properties no more valuable, may pay 4 or 5 per cent on a capitalization of a billion. To the workers employed by the two companies and making their profits for them it is all the same. It seems to us that this ought to be clear. But the new traction trust in New York City surely makes it evident that over-capitalization is a matter of no importance to those from whom the trust makes its profits. This trust is under-capitalized to a remarkable degree. But its profits will be none the less for that. What counts is the ownership and control of the means of production and transportation, not the number and denomination of the stock certificates by which that ownership is recorded.

The Southwestern Townsite and Colonization Company, incorporated under the laws of Oklahoma, closed a deal last week by which it acquires 175,000 acres—275 square miles—of land in the state of Tamaulipas, Mexico. This little item of business news is significant as showing both how the ownership of land is being concentrated these days and how capitalists of the United States are getting control of the material resources of our Southern neighbor. It is but one instance among many. Almost every week comes news of some step in this direction—the acquisition of large quantities of Mexican land, mines, railways, or other properties. The fact that the Diaz administration has been an active partner in this process explains the unstinted praise given the Mexican President in the capitalist press of this country, while such men as Castro of Venezuela, who try to oppose the economic conquest of their country by capitalists of the United States, are maligning in the most shameful fashion.

THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG. There is a familiar phrase of British constitutional law—"The King can do no wrong"—which, it seems, ought to be imported and revised for use at Washington. But the interpretation as well as the words would need revision. Contrary to popular conceptions, the English phrase never meant that the monarchy was, or was supposed to be, infallible in its moral judgments. The King can do no wrong because, in fact, the King can do nothing at all; his ministers act in his name, and they are quite capable of doing wrong; if they do, they are held responsible; if they do right, courtesy gives their figurehead master credit for it. At Washington it is different. Theodore the First can do things; to doubt it were "majestätsbeleidigung" of the grossest sort. But when insurance companies are held up for unlawful campaign contributions, you are assured that it was Cortelyou's act alone; when queer letters are written from the White House to Colonel Mann, you are to understand that it is Loeb's fault, not the President's; when a woman is chucked out of the Executive Mansion in a manner that makes the Madison Street police turn green with envy and that excites the admiration of expert "Bovary bouncers," you must remember that it was Barnes who did it, quite unknown to the President, who sat in the next room innocent and unconscious. The President can do no wrong, because his private secretaries are there to act as scapegoats when he wants something disgraceful to be done. Also, there is another difference. When the British King's ministers do wrong in his name, they are kicked out of office; when the President does wrong in his private secretaries' names, the private secretaries are promoted, in due time, to the Cabinet.

ONLY FOUR YEARS BEHIND. Some four years ago, when the Civic Federation was first formed, The Worker and other Socialist papers raised their voices against it. We declared that it was a snare set for the feet of Labor, that under the pretense of harmonizing interests that were actually not harmonizable its real purpose was to corrupt the leaders and confuse the rank and file of the labor movement in order to deliver it over to the mercies of the capitalist class.

We were rightly denounced for our "intolerance," our "impracticableness," our "narrowness," our "bigotry," our "sectarian spirit," and so forth. We were accused of wishing to perpetuate war between the classes when peace, so our accusers said, could be established by the methods outlined by Messrs. Hanna, Cleveland, Eliot, Belmont, Gompers, and the rest.

The accusations did not come from the capitalist side alone. Labor leaders hurled their anathemas at us—any number of them—but we survived it. Some of the men who were crying "Down" or "national assembly—"

scheme in which the workingmen and the poorer peasants, no matter how numerous, could never get a number of representatives equal to those of the rich landholders and merchants and manufacturers—and to call attention to the further fact, shown in the dispatches of January 29, that even this misrepresentative assembly would, under the present plan, be little more than an advisory body. These dispatches say:

"The project places legislative power in the hands of the Duma, the Council of the Empire, and the Emperor, no law being valid without the assent of all three. A bill vetoed by the Emperor cannot be reintroduced at the same session. The Emperor may prorogue the Duma at any time, but elections must be held within four months and the Duma must reassemble within six months after its prorogation."

It is very doubtful if even the Liberal bourgeoisie will be pacified by such a parody of representation as this. As for the oppressed classes, it offers them in effect nothing but a right of petition which, for the matter of that, they had assumed for themselves a year ago, without His Majesty's gracious permission. Any of them who should be satisfied with such "reforms," even to the extent of postponing violent action "in order to give the government a chance to show its good faith," as is sometimes urged, would prove themselves most glibly fools. The Tsar's government has had long years in which to show its good faith, and has shown nothing but the basest perfidy and cruelty and rapacity and corruption. Only under stress of fear does it even promise reform, and as soon as that pressure is withdrawn for a few months it throws its pledges to the winds. It is too late for the government at St. Petersburg to purchase domestic peace at any price but that of "unconditional surrender," complete abdication in favor of a constituent assembly elected by universal, equal, direct, and secret suffrage, as demanded by the Social Democrats.

With rattlesnakes and tigers and tears and such-like enemies of mankind there is no practicable middle course—it is either destroy or be destroyed. The Russian comrades know this, having had the lesson written out in great letters of blood for their personal, many and many a time. And we must sustain them in the only safe course, that of uncompromising opposition to the whole existing government.

Comrades, followers, malingerers in the rear—which will you be? Choose. And remember who it is that leads and who that follows.

THE CONSTITUTION. We observe that a number of the good capitalist dailies are moved to write wildly intemperate or tearfully regretful editorials over the reported exclamation of Jack London at a recent Socialist meeting—"To hell with the Constitution!"

As a matter of fact, London did not say just that. He truly quoted an officer of the Colorado militia—engaged in putting down a miners' strike, having his salary paid by the Mine Owners' Association, and having his acts approved by these same capitalist dailies explicitly—and by President Roosevelt tacitly—London correctly quoted this officer as saying, "To hell with the Constitution!" when it was pointed out to him that his treatment of strikers was unconstitutional. And London also intimated that under certain circumstances—the Constitution being systematically violated by the capitalists and their political tools and systematically used against the workingman—the workingman likewise would at last come to say "To hell with the Constitution!"

And London was quite right. Maybe it would be very naughty for a workingman to say such a thing—not having either a military commission or a bankbook as license. But he is very likely to say it, if his masters give him occasion—and to act accordingly. The typical workingman is the most sincerely law-abiding and constitution-worshipping creature imaginable, so long as he can stand it. But even he loses patience in time, throws down his idols, and declares that "constitutions are made to serve men, not men to serve constitutions."

And while the subject is up for discussion, let us ask London's critics whether they are prepared to apply to those two great men of the Abolition movement, William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips, the same harsh condemnation they have meted out to this Socialist. In view of the fact that the Constitution sanctioned chattel slavery and that all criticism of slavery was denounced in those days as an attack on the Constitution, Garrison described that document as "a league with death and a covenant with hell." And when a pro-slavery fanatic once interrupted Phillips in the middle of a speech with the cry, "God bless the Constitution!" that brave champion of liberty just waited for silence and then calmly replied: "God damn the Constitution!" Has history condemned Garrison and Phillips? Has it not again justified them and condemned Judge Tamm?

It was Charles Sumner, we believe, who said: "Anything for human rights is constitutional." Anything, mind you—even to arrest a whole Legislature, as Lincoln did; even to divide a state against the will of the majority of its legal voters, as Lincoln did; even to ignore writs of the Supreme Court of the United States, as Lincoln did. It is not recorded that John Brown or Patrick Henry or Samuel Adams ever said, in so many words, "To hell with the Constitution!" But they acted it, without saying it. Were they wrong?

We Socialists wish to abide by laws and constitutions and amend them by lawful and constitutional methods. We will suffer much—nay, we have suffered much—in order to avoid the use of violence. But we know enough of history and of human nature to know that parchments and traditional phrases will not and ought not to succeed in barring the course of social progress. If the capitalist class, in the fullness of time, prevents the due transformation of society by peaceful and constitutional means—so much the worse for the capitalists and their constitutions.

is constitutional." Anything, mind you—even to arrest a whole Legislature, as Lincoln did; even to divide a state against the will of the majority of its legal voters, as Lincoln did; even to ignore writs of the Supreme Court of the United States, as Lincoln did. It is not recorded that John Brown or Patrick Henry or Samuel Adams ever said, in so many words, "To hell with the Constitution!" But they acted it, without saying it. Were they wrong?

Two sermons preached in this city last Sunday deserve to be noted. Rabbi Silverman spoke truly and bravely about child labor, deplaring it a form of slavery that "casts a stigma on our claims to civilization" and calling on his hearers to combat both the profit-interest of employers and the shortsighted selfishness of parents who are accomplices to this crime. In contrast with his thoughtful and sympathetic words we must observe the utterances of Minot J. Savage, a typical bourgeois liberal—a trimmer and double-dealer in social as well as in religious questions. He took time by the forelock and preached against the coal miners, in case they strike for a restoration of wages. Alleviating that they have a union fund of \$5,000,000—which is a gross exaggeration; but if it were true, it would only mean some \$17 per union member—he argued that the miners are really not so very bad off. Of course, he would be glad to see them get better wages—who wouldn't? If the mine owners saw their interest in getting better wages, the Rev. Mr. Savage would be sedately and decorously pleased. But if the "operators" refused, then it would be very wicked of the mine workers to strike, for there is "the third party"—the dear, good, old "disinterested public"—who would suffer. Also, the union interferes grievously with individual liberty—the precious liberty of the unorganized individual to take his choice between starving quickly in idleness or starving slowly on scab wages, and tyrannously imposes upon him the rule of shorter hours and higher pay. In true bourgeois fashion, Dr. Savage concluded by "waving the bloody shirt"—predicting a civil war for this same individual liberty as against the wicked labor organizations.

In the Chicago "Socialist" of Feb. 3 Comrade Debs answers an anonymous correspondent who asks him to explain "why the press of the Socialist Party is so friendly to the Gompers unions that are opposed to Socialism and so bitterly opposed to the I. W. W. that is in favor of Socialism." In replying, Comrade Debs quite rightly defines the attitude of the party, which has declared itself in favor of unionism but has refused to commit itself to certain unions in opposition to others in its international fight; and he concedes the right of Socialist papers to hold varying views, while reserving his own right to think some of them mistaken. So far, good. He says some other things with which we might quarrel, if we were looking for a quarrel; but we are not; we are busy with our fight against capitalism. But we have one question to ask. We do not ask it of the anonymous correspondent; that would be ridiculous. We ask it of Comrade Debs, because, in his reply, he accepts as correct the statement of alleged fact embodied in the anonymous correspondent's question. The question is this: Which Socialist papers (by name) are friendly to the Gompers unions and bitterly hostile to the I. W. W.? We might also ask whether every union not affiliated with the I. W. W. is necessarily a "Gompers union." To the first question, at least, we await a direct answer.

We are not definitely informed of the facts on which Local Yorkers base their resolutions against the People's Forum of that city, elsewhere reported. We wish to state, however, that the Worker often announces and sometimes reports public meetings which are not held under Socialist auspices, and that it seems to us wise to do so, for more than one reason. Sometimes Socialists may learn by listening to speakers who are not Socialists—even Socialists can learn, if they are wise ones. Again, Socialists may join in the discussion which is permitted at many such meetings, and do good work for the cause by frank but courteous criticism of the lecturer. Finally, it sometimes happens—once in a while—that there is a meeting organized by persons quite apart from our movement, to whose purpose, however, the principles of our movement require our support. So much by way of explanation. Let it be quite well understood that the announcement of a meeting in this paper does not imply approval of the views held by the speaker at that meeting, unless such approval is distinctly expressed.

A JUDICIAL OPINION. "Judge," said Mrs. Starvoet to the magistrate, "I have recently come to hear with me, 'The best way to do about it is to wait for the children to grow.'"

"I have tried it," replied the magistrate, "and my decision is that the children have proved an abill." Philadelphia Press.

is constitutional." Anything, mind you—even to arrest a whole Legislature, as Lincoln did; even to divide a state against the will of the majority of its legal voters, as Lincoln did; even to ignore writs of the Supreme Court of the United States, as Lincoln did. It is not recorded that John Brown or Patrick Henry or Samuel Adams ever said, in so many words, "To hell with the Constitution!" But they acted it, without saying it. Were they wrong?

Two sermons preached in this city last Sunday deserve to be noted. Rabbi Silverman spoke truly and bravely about child labor, deplaring it a form of slavery that "casts a stigma on our claims to civilization" and calling on his hearers to combat both the profit-interest of employers and the shortsighted selfishness of parents who are accomplices to this crime. In contrast with his thoughtful and sympathetic words we must observe the utterances of Minot J. Savage, a typical bourgeois liberal—a trimmer and double-dealer in social as well as in religious questions. He took time by the forelock and preached against the coal miners, in case they strike for a restoration of wages. Alleviating that they have a union fund of \$5,000,000—which is a gross exaggeration; but if it were true, it would only mean some \$17 per union member—he argued that the miners are really not so very bad off. Of course, he would be glad to see them get better wages—who wouldn't? If the mine owners saw their interest in getting better wages, the Rev. Mr. Savage would be sedately and decorously pleased. But if the "operators" refused, then it would be very wicked of the mine workers to strike, for there is "the third party"—the dear, good, old "disinterested public"—who would suffer. Also, the union interferes grievously with individual liberty—the precious liberty of the unorganized individual to take his choice between starving quickly in idleness or starving slowly on scab wages, and tyrannously imposes upon him the rule of shorter hours and higher pay. In true bourgeois fashion, Dr. Savage concluded by "waving the bloody shirt"—predicting a civil war for this same individual liberty as against the wicked labor organizations.

In the Chicago "Socialist" of Feb. 3 Comrade Debs answers an anonymous correspondent who asks him to explain "why the press of the Socialist Party is so friendly to the Gompers unions that are opposed to Socialism and so bitterly opposed to the I. W. W. that is in favor of Socialism." In replying, Comrade Debs quite rightly defines the attitude of the party, which has declared itself in favor of unionism but has refused to commit itself to certain unions in opposition to others in its international fight; and he concedes the right of Socialist papers to hold varying views, while reserving his own right to think some of them mistaken. So far, good. He says some other things with which we might quarrel, if we were looking for a quarrel; but we are not; we are busy with our fight against capitalism. But we have one question to ask. We do not ask it of the anonymous correspondent; that would be ridiculous. We ask it of Comrade Debs, because, in his reply, he accepts as correct the statement of alleged fact embodied in the anonymous correspondent's question. The question is this: Which Socialist papers (by name) are friendly to the Gompers unions and bitterly hostile to the I. W. W.? We might also ask whether every union not affiliated with the I. W. W. is necessarily a "Gompers union." To the first question, at least, we await a direct answer.

A JUDICIAL OPINION. "Judge," said Mrs. Starvoet to the magistrate, "I have recently come to hear with me, 'The best way to do about it is to wait for the children to grow.'"

"I have tried it," replied the magistrate, "and my decision is that the children have proved an abill." Philadelphia Press.

WATERLESS TRUST. The Populists and "radical" Democrats make a great point of the real or alleged over-capitalization of some of the trusts. To "squeeze out the water" is the height of their ambition. What will they say to the Interborough Metropolitan Company controlling properties worth hundreds of millions, but capitalized at only \$15,000? We quite understand why certain capitalists—the "honest investors"—should object to the over-capitalization resorted to by promoters in certain cases. But we never have been able to see what the question of "watered stock" had to do with the interests of the working people. The Standard Oil Company pays 40 or 50 per cent dividends on a capital of \$100,000,000. Another company, with properties no more valuable, may pay 4 or 5 per cent on a capitalization of a billion. To the workers employed by the two companies and making their profits for them it is all the same. It seems to us that this ought to be clear. But the new traction trust in New York City surely makes it evident that over-capitalization is a matter of no importance to those from whom the trust makes its profits. This trust is under-capitalized to a remarkable degree. But its profits will be none the less for that. What counts is the ownership and control of the means of production and transportation, not the number and denomination of the stock certificates by which that ownership is recorded.

THE KING CAN DO NO WRONG. There is a familiar phrase of British constitutional law—"The King can do no wrong"—which, it seems, ought to be imported and revised for use at Washington. But the interpretation as well as the words would need revision. Contrary to popular conceptions, the English phrase never meant that the monarchy was, or was supposed to be, infallible in its moral judgments. The King can do no wrong because, in fact, the King can do nothing at all; his ministers act in his name, and they are quite capable of doing wrong; if they do, they are held responsible; if they do right, courtesy gives their figurehead master credit for it. At Washington it is different. Theodore the First can do things; to doubt it were "majestätsbeleidigung" of the grossest sort. But when insurance companies are held up for unlawful campaign contributions, you are assured that it was Cortelyou's act alone; when queer letters are written from the White House to Colonel Mann, you are to understand that it is Loeb's fault, not the President's; when a woman is chucked out of the Executive Mansion in a manner that makes the Madison Street police turn green with envy and that excites the admiration of expert "Bovary bouncers," you must remember that it was Barnes who did it, quite unknown to the President, who sat in the next room innocent and unconscious. The President can do no wrong, because his private secretaries are there to act as scapegoats when he wants something disgraceful to be done. Also, there is another difference. When the British King's ministers do wrong in his name, they are kicked out of office; when the President does wrong in his private secretaries' names, the private secretaries are promoted, in due time, to the Cabinet.

ONLY FOUR YEARS BEHIND. Some four years ago, when the Civic Federation was first formed, The Worker and other Socialist papers raised their voices against it. We declared that it was a snare set for the feet of Labor, that under the pretense of harmonizing interests that were actually not harmonizable its real purpose was to corrupt the leaders and confuse the rank and file of the labor movement in order to deliver it over to the mercies of the capitalist class.

THE CONSTITUTION. We observe that a number of the good capitalist dailies are moved to write wildly intemperate or tearfully regretful editorials over the reported exclamation of Jack London at a recent Socialist meeting—"To hell with the Constitution!"

As a matter of fact, London did not say just that. He truly quoted an officer of the Colorado militia—engaged in putting down a miners' strike, having his salary paid by the Mine Owners' Association, and having his acts approved by these same capitalist dailies explicitly—and by President Roosevelt tacitly—London correctly quoted this officer as saying, "To hell with the Constitution!" when it was pointed out to him that his treatment of strikers was unconstitutional. And London also intimated that under certain circumstances—the Constitution being systematically violated by the capitalists and their political tools and systematically used against the workingman—the workingman likewise would at last come to say "To hell with the Constitution!"

And London was quite right. Maybe it would be very naughty for a workingman to say such a thing—not having either a military commission or a bankbook as license. But he is very likely to say it, if his masters give him occasion—and to act accordingly. The typical workingman is the most sincerely law-abiding and constitution-worshipping creature imaginable, so long as he can stand it. But even he loses patience in time, throws down his idols, and declares that "constitutions are made to serve men, not men to serve constitutions."

And while the subject is up for discussion, let us ask London's critics whether they are prepared to apply to those two great men of the Abolition movement, William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips, the same harsh condemnation they have meted out to this Socialist. In view of the fact that the Constitution sanctioned chattel slavery and that all criticism of slavery was denounced in those days as an attack on the Constitution, Garrison described that document as "a league with death and a covenant with hell." And when a pro-slavery fanatic once interrupted Phillips in the middle of a speech with the cry, "God bless the Constitution!" that brave champion of liberty just waited for silence and then calmly replied: "God damn the Constitution!" Has history condemned Garrison and Phillips? Has it not again justified them and condemned Judge Tamm?

It was Charles Sumner, we believe, who said: "Anything for human rights is constitutional." Anything, mind you—even to arrest a whole Legislature, as Lincoln did; even to divide a state against the will of the majority of its legal voters, as Lincoln did; even to ignore writs of the Supreme Court of the United States, as Lincoln did. It is not recorded that John Brown or Patrick Henry or Samuel Adams ever said, in so many words, "To hell with the Constitution!" But they acted it, without saying it. Were they wrong?

Two sermons preached in this city last Sunday deserve to be noted. Rabbi Silverman spoke truly and bravely about child labor, deplaring it a form of slavery that "casts a stigma on our claims to civilization" and calling on his hearers to combat both the profit-interest of employers and the shortsighted selfishness of parents who are accomplices to this crime. In contrast with his thoughtful and sympathetic words we must observe the utterances of Minot J. Savage, a typical bourgeois liberal—a trimmer and double-dealer in social as well as in religious questions. He took time by the forelock and preached against the coal miners, in case they strike for a restoration of wages. Alleviating that they have a union fund of \$5,000,000—which is a gross exaggeration; but if it were true, it would only mean some \$17 per union member—he argued that the miners are really not so very bad off. Of course, he would be glad to see them get better wages—who wouldn't? If the mine owners saw their interest in getting better wages, the Rev. Mr. Savage would be sedately and decorously pleased. But if the "operators" refused, then it would be very wicked of the mine workers to strike, for there is "the third party"—the dear, good, old "disinterested public"—who would suffer. Also, the union interferes grievously with individual liberty—the precious liberty of the unorganized individual to take his choice between starving quickly in idleness or starving slowly on scab wages, and tyrannously imposes upon him the rule of shorter hours and higher pay. In true bourgeois fashion, Dr. Savage concluded by "waving the bloody shirt"—predicting a civil war for this same individual liberty as against the wicked labor organizations.

A JUDICIAL OPINION. "Judge," said Mrs. Starvoet to the magistrate, "I have recently come to hear with me, 'The best way to do about it is to wait for the children to grow.'"

Current Literature. John Spargo's pamphlet, "A Socialist View of Mr. Rockefeller" (Kerr, 5 cents), is a very good exemplification of our philosophy as applied in making personal judgments of the men who, as a class, we attack and seek to overthrow. It is worth having at hand to give either to the man who thinks that the wickedness of the Oil King is the source of all the people's woes or to the other who reproaches us for the vehemence of our attacks upon Rockefeller and his like.

Reports at the stockholders' meeting of the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Co. showed an increase of 103 in the membership during the year; receipts for books and pamphlets amounted to \$10,587.37; the "Review" \$2,359.87, and donations \$1,096.33; the interest-bearing debt was wisely wiped out, and for the first year in its history the receipts of the company from sales exceeded its expenses. Raymond Stearns was elected as secretary and director, and C. H. Kerr and A. M. Simon were elected to the presidency and vice-presidency.

The English firm of T. Fisher Unwin has issued a translation of Leonidas Andreou's "Das Rote Lachen." "Justice" says of it: "The Red Laugh is a sort of hideous nightmare, depicting the horrors of war, rather in their psychological than their physical attributes, yet all the more hideous, perhaps, for their phantasmic, ghostlike presentment than if they had been depicted with every realistic detail. The story, shadowy, fragmentary, indefinite as it is, is that of two brothers, Hektor and Mancharion, driven mad by the horrors of the Mancharion campaign. It shows war for what it is: monstrous, grotesque, hideous, mad, abstrusly horrible—a Red Laugh! The sufferer from a bad attack of jingoism or afflicted with dreams of military glory might find a useful corrective in this book." The English translation is not yet obtainable in this country. The book may be had in German (paper bound) at this office; price, 40 cents; postage, 5 cents extra.

Longmans Green & Co. have issued an English translation of Baroness Bertha von Suttner's great anti-militarist book under the title "Lay Down Your Arms!" It can be had of the Socialist Literature Company for 75 cents (cloth); postage, 5 cents extra. This company can also supply "Die Waffen Nieder" in German (paper) at 35 cents a copy; postage, 5 cents extra.

To readers who have asked us what they should read to get a good idea of the labor movement in this country we recommend Hilgitt's "History of Socialism in the United States"; Ely's "Labor Movement in America"; Adams and Summers' "Labor Problems"; and Commons' "Trade Unionism." These four books ought to be in the library of every local or branch that has a library, and comrades ought to see to it also that they are in the public libraries of their respective cities or towns.

Morrison I. Swift has started a little periodical entitled "Revolution" to be published "at intervals" from Boston, Mass. The price is one cent a copy. We quote from the first number:

Why do you fear these little impotent dynasties, the Rockefeller-Morgan dynasty? There are only 4,000 of the bandits to reckon with, but we are 5,000,000. The cause of our trance and terror is the belief that property has power. But it has really none; it has only the power that you believe in. This means that your imagination is the only power. You may say that is nothing but a superstitious strength. It is nothing but a belief. You may fancy that you can kill an ant, and that fancy may prevent you from stepping on it; then you can not kill it—because you are in a trance, a state of false belief. There are in the state of Massachusetts toward the little tribe of Property Bandits under the chieftainship of Rockefeller and Morgan. Not one of these men has any more strength than any other single American of the eighty million. Say these bandits number 4,000; then there are 20,000 Americans against each one of them. It is a comparison of a man against an ant; weak—it is at least 50 men against one ant.

Yet these ants rule us, rob us, work us to death, despise us, flout us, exploit us, torture us, murder us, dare us to attack them. And we actually fear to do it. It is not because we have not 20,000 times their strength, but because in imagination we have transferred our strength to their property. . . . When we recognize this, our belief is broken. We see that their property-strength is a bubble. Rockefeller became a mere Jim Smith, Morgan a Mike Adams—just one petty impotent man each against 20,000. This exposure comes from stripping them of their humping property fetish. That fetish was wholly our thought, and that thought means our cowardice.

BOOKS RECEIVED. Science and Revolution. By Ernest Untermann, I. Kerr, 50 cents. The End of the World. By M. Wilhelm Meier, Kerr, 50 cents. The Cost-Mine Workers. By Frank Julian Ware, Longmans, \$1 net. The Greatest Trust in the World. By Charles E. Russell, Ridgeway-Thayer Co. The Menace of Privilege. By Henry George, Jr. Macmillans. The Cost of Competition. By Sidney A. Reeve, McClure Phillips & Co. \$2 net.

ONE OF OUR NEGLECTED HEROES. Friday, Jan. 20, was the thirty-eighth anniversary of the death of Ernest Jones, the great Chartist leader. It is but fitting that we should pay a tribute to one of the noblest men who ever lived, a comrade and co-worker of Karl Marx, a man who spoke so clearly and bravely on behalf of the oppressed that a saintly and "progressive" Liberal Government had to close his mouth by sending him to prison—and while there endeavored to murder him. Ernest Jones was born in Berlin. Some poems by the boy were published at Hamburg, when he was about ten, and at the age of eleven he tried unsuccessfully to escape from home to join the Polish insurgents. His poems were Chartist in character, which was to influence years of editing and lecturing, at the age of twenty-seven. His election fights were unsuccessful, but he would in all probability have won a seat at Manchester had he lived a few weeks longer. His poems and other writings are of exceptional beauty and strength, and of genuine interest to the working class.—Justice.

BRITISH WORKING CLASS AWAKING.

The significant feature of the elections so far is the big vote polled by Socialist and Labor candidates...

That is the one gratifying feature of the present election campaign...

It cannot be claimed, however, that the many successes which Labor has actually achieved at the polls are really representative of the new party...

Of our nine candidates six have been defeated, one has been successful, and two are still engaged in the fight...

It is the necessity of a private property, business government to start the wild horses of greed and rivalry along the highways of society...

THOUGHTS FOR THE MAJORITY.—V.

By Peter E. Burrows.

It is the necessity of a private property, business government to start the wild horses of greed and rivalry along the highways of society...

In society there is no ocean out to which our severs run. There is no tire pit outside the city where we can burn up the offal of our crimes...

In our time haply the active moralities of the world are compelled to lean upon no abstractions, no occult revelation, no barbarous old book...

History and evolution, out of the struggle of the classes, have epitomized the whole range of morals scientifically and plainly in the issues taken between what is to-day capital and labor...

As we grow in the social grade of a united consciousness we approach a glorious joy, the impelling desire of all creation...

In a state of war there is no morality; for, whether martial, commercial, legal or theological, all strife, for any other purpose than the unity of man, is abhorrent to morality.

Go to your class law courts, and study the rule and methods of prosecuting evidence. A trained lawyer cajoles a man to let him look into his books or into his mind that he may hand him over to his adversary...

gle between good and evil, but between the evils, and judgment goes to that evil nearest of kin to the class behind the bench.

By observing society's wisdom in dealing with the crime of murder we may get a line upon the moral integrity of our times...

The nearest approach we can make to the termination of crime is to terminate a few criminals whose crimes are not the same as ours...

Every deed done, every thought uttered, goes on interminably with its own results; only this happens; and only this we know...

I can obtain such collective desire and perception of the social whithering of my choice and thought and used as to become an evolutionary artist...

WHY RIFLES DESERTED.

By Harry Irving Green.

There can be no morality but that which is able to vindicate itself and which invariably does so...

Morality, being the experience, interest and wisdom of the whole, cannot be scooped up in the hollow of one hand...

I suppose the righteousness of the middle class must feel scandalized by the physiological arrangement which places the heart so near the stomach...

We can only think privately as we do publicly and we can only do privately according to the direction of the public mind...

And they are usually down for keeps when they do a fall like that! Rifles paused, and sat looking at the dirt on his hands...

"By and by I stuck out my hand and 'zee-e' something, yeat by my ear, and I could hear it screeching off down the road after the musket had banged...

I believe the race of mankind will one day become a unit, and that it will never perish off the earth...

Since we never can reduce nor burn up our sins, but must keep them, and by recompensation wear them back into public wisdom...

Strictly speaking, there is no other morality possible to us in a class ridden country but that which regulates the rider. Rigidity is the backbone of sin and evil...

As we grow in the social grade of a united consciousness we approach a glorious joy, the impelling desire of all creation...

Go to your class law courts, and study the rule and methods of prosecuting evidence. A trained lawyer cajoles a man to let him look into his books or into his mind...

The Socialist philosophy has this, therefore, among its foremost claims to revolutionism, that it changes the

and I knew the way well enough, so I went. I could not bear to go back to the place...

"What was the trouble at home, Rifles?" I inquired. He told the whole story in one word: "Booze."

Doran heard the word also, and stuck his head inside the tent. He saw nothing and so he went away.

"They are coming after me," said the deserter, his face getting a little grayer. "I'll never see Janet again."

"Rifles!" I cried, as I rose and stood at attention. "Tell me where she is—give me some word for her—some keepsake—something that I may send to her with a letter."

"The largest, most beautiful and best equipped park for festivals, picnics, excursions, etc. Reasonable conditions. STRICT UNION PARK. Visiting committees will be gladly received by JOE KOJE, Lessee."

Recommendations of an excellent selection of TRUSSELS, BRACES, ABDOMINALS, SUPPORTERS, ELASTIC STOCKINGS, EXAMINATION FREE. Work guaranteed. Mail order a specialty. LADIES' DEPARTMENT. Telephone, 3333-79th.

Now! Now!! Now!!! THE JUNGLE. Author of "Manasseh," etc. I never expected to read a serial, I am reading "The Jungle," and I should be afraid to trust myself to tell how it affects me...

It comes nearer than any book yet published in this country to being the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the social tragedy of our great cities.—Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

"The Jungle" is a great book, the greatest Socialist novel ever written. It will convert thousands to Socialism.—Gaylord Wilbur.

It is the most powerful and terrible stories ever written. As a portrayal of industrial conditions, it has never read anything in literature that equals it.—Robert Hunter.

It comes nearer than any book yet published in this country to being the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the social tragedy of our great cities.—Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

"The Jungle" is a great book, the greatest Socialist novel ever written. It will convert thousands to Socialism.—Gaylord Wilbur.

It is the most powerful and terrible stories ever written. As a portrayal of industrial conditions, it has never read anything in literature that equals it.—Robert Hunter.

It comes nearer than any book yet published in this country to being the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the social tragedy of our great cities.—Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

"The Jungle" is a great book, the greatest Socialist novel ever written. It will convert thousands to Socialism.—Gaylord Wilbur.

It is the most powerful and terrible stories ever written. As a portrayal of industrial conditions, it has never read anything in literature that equals it.—Robert Hunter.

It comes nearer than any book yet published in this country to being the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" of the social tragedy of our great cities.—Thomas Wentworth Higginson.

PUBLICATIONS. IF THERE ARE ANY GERMANS in your neighborhood, be sure to send their names and addresses at once to "Vorwärts"...

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS. Standing advertisements of Trade Union and C. P. Societies will be inserted at this heading at the rate of \$1 per line per annum.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

LABOR SECRETARIAT. Office, 220 Broadway, Room 101; office hours on week days from 9 a. m. to 5 p. m. Delegate meetings every last Saturday of the month at 10 p. m. at 8 p. m. of the month of the month at 220 Broadway, Room 101.

