

Communist Manifesto

PREFACE.

The "Manifesto" was published as the platform of the "Communist League," a workingmen's association, first exclusively German, later an international, and under the political conditions of the Continent before 1848, unavowedly a secret society. At a Congress of the League, held in London, in November, 1847, Marx and Engels were commissioned to prepare for publication a complete theoretical and practical party-program. Draws up in German, in January, 1848, the manuscript was sent to the printer in London a few weeks before the French revolution of February 24th. A French translation was brought out in Paris shortly before the insurrection of June, 1848. The first English translation, by Miss Helen Macfarlane, appeared in George Julian Harney's "Red Republican," London, 1850. A Danish and a Polish edition has also been published.

The defeat of the Parisian insurrection of June, 1848—the first great battle between Proletariat and Bourgeoisie—drove again into the background, for a time, the social and political aspirations of the European working class. Thereafter, the struggle for supremacy was again, as it had been before the revolution of February, solely between different working class was reduced to a fight for political elbow room, and to the position of extreme wing of the middle-class Radicals. Wherever independent proletarian movements continued to show signs of life, they were ruthlessly hunted down. Thus the Prussian police hunted out the Central Board of the Communist League, then located in Cologne. The members were arrested, and, after eighteen months' imprisonment, they were tried in October, 1852. This celebrated "Cologne Communist trial" lasted from October 4th till November 12th; seven of the prisoners were sentenced to terms of imprisonment in a fortress, varying from three to six years. Immediately after the sentence the League was formally dissolved by the remaining members. As to the "Manifesto," it seemed therefore to be doomed to oblivion.

When the European working class had recovered sufficient strength for another attack on the ruling classes, the International Working Men's Association sprang up. But this association, formed with the express aim of welding into one body the whole militant proletariat of Europe and America, could not at once proclaim the principles laid down in the "Manifesto." The International was bound to have a program broad enough to be acceptable to the English Trades Unions, to the followers of Proudhon in France, Belgium, Italy and Spain, and to the Lassalleans in Germany. Marx, who drew up this program to the satisfaction of all parties, entirely trusted to the intellectual development of the working class, which was sure to result from combined action and mutual discussion. The very events and vicissitudes of the struggle against Capital, the defeats even more than the victories, could not help bringing home to men's minds the insufficiency of their various favorite nostrums, and preparing the way for a more complete insight into the true conditions of working-class emancipation. And Marx was right. The International, on its breaking up in 1874, left the workers quite different men from what it had found them in 1864. Proudhonism in France, Lassalleism in Germany were dying out, and even the Conservative English Trades Unions, though most of them had long since severed their connection with the International, were gradually advancing towards that point at which, last year at Swansea, their president could say in their name, "Continental Socialism has lost its terrors for us." In fact, the principles of the "Manifesto" had made considerable headway among the working men of all countries.

The "Manifesto" itself thus came to the front again. The German text had been, since 1850, reprinted several times in Switzerland, England and America. In 1872 it was translated into English in New York, where the translation was published in "Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly." From this English version, a French one was made in "Le Socialiste" of New York. Since then at least two more English translations, more or less mutilated, have been brought out in America, and one of them has been reprinted in England. The first Russian translation, made by Bakouline, was published at Herzen's "Kolokol" office in Geneva about 1863; a second one, by the hero Vera Zasulich, also in Geneva, 1883. A new Danish edition is to be found in "Socialdemokratisk Bibliotek," Copenhagen, 1885; a fresh translation in "Le Socialiste," Paris, 1890. From this latter a Spanish version was prepared and published in Madrid, 1886. The German reprints are not to be counted, there have been twelve altogether at the least. An Armenian translation, which was to be published in Constantinople some months ago, did not see the light, I am told, because the publisher was afraid of bringing out a book with the name of Marx on it, while the translator declined to call it his own production. Of further translations into other languages I have heard, but have not seen them. Thus the history of the "Manifesto" reflects, to a great extent, the history of the modern working-class movement; at present it is undoubtedly the most widespread, the most international production of all Socialist literature, the common platform acknowledged by millions of working men from Siberia to California.

Yet, when it was written, we could not have called it a Socialist Manifesto. By Socialists, in 1847, were understood, on the one hand, the adherents of the various Utopian systems: Owenism in England, Fourierism in France, both of them already reduced to the position of mere sects, and gradually dying out; on the other hand, the most multifarious social quacks, who, by all manners of tinkering, professed to redress, without any danger to capital and profit, all sorts of social grievances, in both cases men outside the working class movement, and looking rather to the "educated" classes for support. Whatever portion of the working class had become convinced of the insufficiency of mere political revolutions, and had proclaimed the necessity of a total social change, that portion, then, called itself Communist. It was a crude, rough-hewn, purely instinctive sort of Communism; still, it touched the cardinal point and was powerful enough amongst the working class to produce the Utopian Communism, in France, of Cabot, and in Germany, of Weitling. Thus, Socialism was, in 1847, a middle-class movement. Communism a working-class movement. Socialism was, on the Continent at least, "respectable"; Communism was the very opposite. And as our notion, from the very beginning, was that the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself, there could be no doubt as to which of the two names we must take. Moreover, we have ever since, been far from repudiating it. The "Manifesto" being our joint production,

I consider myself bound to state that the fundamental proposition which forms its nucleus, belongs to Marx. That proposition is: that in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) the history of these class struggles forms between exploiting and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinctions and class struggles.

This proposition which, in my opinion, is destined to do for history what Darwin's theory has done for biology, we both of us, had been gradually approaching for some years before 1845. How far I had independently progressed towards it, is best shown by my "Condition of the Working Class in England." But when I again met Marx at Brussels, in spring, 1845, he had it ready worked out, and put it before me, in terms almost as clear as those in which I have stated it here.

From our joint preface to the German edition of 1872, I quote the following: "However much the state of things may have altered during the last 25 years, the general principles laid down in this Manifesto, are, on the whole, as correct today as ever. Here and there some detail might be improved. The practical application of the principles will depend, as the manifesto itself states, everywhere and at all times, on the historical conditions for the time being existing, and, for that reason, no special stress is laid on the revolutionary measures proposed at the end of Section II. That passage would, in many respects, be very differently worded today. In view of the gigantic strides of Modern Industry since 1848, and of the accompanying improved and extended organization of the working-class, in view of the practical experience gained, first in the February revolution, and then, still more, in the Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months, this program has in some details become antiquated. One thing especially was proved by the Commune, viz. that 'the working-class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes.'" (See "The Civil War in France," Address of the General Council of the International Working-men's Association," Chicago, Charles H. Kerr & Co., where this point is further developed). Further, it is self-evident that the criticism of Socialist literature is deficient in relation to the present time, because it comes down only to 1847; also, that the remarks on the relation of the Communists to the various opposition-parties (Section IV.), although in principle still correct, yet in practice antiquated, because the political situation has been entirely changed, and the progress of history has swept from off the earth the greater portion of the political parties there enumerated.

"But then, the Manifesto has become a historical document which we have no longer any right to alter."

The present translation is by Mr. Samuel Moore, the translator of the greater portion of Marx's "Capital." We have revised it in common, and I have added a few notes explanatory of historical allusions.

FREDERICK ENGELS.

London, 30th January, 1888.

"The Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Florence K. Wischniewsky—London Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been derided as communistic by its opponents in power? Where the Opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

I. Things result from this fact.

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European Powers to be itself a Power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the Spectre of Communism with a Manifesto of the party itself.

To this end, Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following manifesto, to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages.

I. BOURGEOIS AND PROLETARIANS.

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes.

In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome, we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the middle ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journey-men, apprentices, serfs, in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society, has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones.

Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.

From the serfs of the middle ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burghers the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonization of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, under which industrial production was monopolized by close guilds, no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle-class; division of labor between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labor in each single workshop.

Meantime the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, modern industry, with its factories and its industrial middle-class, by industrial millions, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeoisie.

Modern industry has established the world-market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.

Each step in the development of the bourgeoisie was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. An oppressed class under the sway of the feudal nobility, an armed and self-governing association in the medieval commune, here independent urban republic (as in Italy and Germany), there taxable "third estate" of the monarchy (as in France), afterwards, in the period of manufacture proper, serving either the semi-feudal or the absolute monarchy as a counterpoise against the nobility, and, in fact, corner stone of the great monarchies in general, the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world-market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern State is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part.

The bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left remaining no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, then callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless unfeeling, chartered freedoms, has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation.

The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-laborers.

The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.

The bourgeoisie has disclosed how it came to pass that the brutal display of vigor in the Middle Ages, which Reactionists so much admire, found its fitting complement in the most slothful indolence. It has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former Exoduses of nations and crusades.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. Conservation of the old modes of production in unaltered form, was, on the contrary, the first condition of existence for all earlier industrial classes. Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are destroyed by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations; by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations. And yet, in material as well as in intellectual production, the intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures there arises a world-literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarous, nations into civilization. The cheap price of its commodities is the heavy artillery with which it bat-

ters down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In a word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idleness of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralized means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralization. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together in one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier and one customs-tariff.

The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam-navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labor?

We see then: the means of production and of exchange on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organization of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to burst asunder; they were burst asunder.

Into their places stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted to it, and by the economical and political sway of the bourgeois class.

"By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labor. By proletariat, the class of modern wage-laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor-power in order to live.

"That is, all written history. In 1847, the pre-history of society, the social organization existing previous to recorded history, was all but unknown. Since then, Haxthausen discovered common ownership of land in Russia, Maurer proved it to be the social foundation from which all Teutonic races started in history, and by and by village communities were found to be, or to have been, the primitive form of society everywhere from India to Ireland. The inner organization of this primitive Communist society was laid bare, in its typical form, by Morgan's crowning discovery of the true nature of the gens and its relation to the tribe. With the dissolution of these primitive communities society begins to be differentiated into separate and finally antagonistic classes. I have attempted to retrace this process of dissolution in "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State." (Chicago, Charles H. Kerr & Co.)

"Guild-master, that is a full member of a guild, a master within, not a head of, a guild. "Commune" was the name taken, in France, by the nascent towns even before they had conquered from their feudal lords and masters, local self-government and political rights as "the Third Estate." Generally speaking, for the economical development of the bourgeoisie, England is here taken as the typical country, for its political development, France.

(To be Continued)

The Revolutionary Flame In Old Ireland

By Elizabeth Gurley Flynn in Solidarity.

The class struggle has struck the battle hour in the Emerald Isle. A week-old strike involving thousands of street car workers in Dublin, Ireland, is challenging the attention of the world of labor. The leader of the strike, Jim Larkin, was spoken of by Tom Mann on his recent visit to New York, as "the Irish syndicalist leader and through his continual propaganda the unskilled are organizing a militant working class spirit as distinguished from the older, vague, nationalistic spirit, and a unity between the Irish and English proletarian, have been created. Too long the Irish worker has lost his class identity in a burning zeal for his country's freedom from the English government while the Irish capitalist had no scruples against maintaining commercial relations, helping him exploit his impoverished country for their mutual pocketbooks. "Ireland for the Irish," is to be realized by the Irish toilers organizing to crush their masters, regardless of their nationality. It is certainly gratifying to know that these Irish workers in their home country are not of the same calibre as the Irish politician, police and detectives we are unfortunately so familiar within the United States; that in the hearts of these Dublin strikers burns the same fires of revolt as animated their brothers during the recent street car strike in Milan, the miners' strikes of South Africa and Michigan, the silk strike of Patterson, New Jersey.

The strike against the Dublin Tramway Company was precipitated by discharge of 200 men for membership in the "Irish Transport Workers Union." The union responded by a general strike demanding the re-instatement of their fellow workers. Discrimination was a last resort after all other means of smashing the union had failed. William Murphy, president of the company, is one of the biggest capitalists in Ireland. He owns street car and electric lighting systems, railroads, hotels, steamships, and two Dublin newspapers. Posing as an Irish patriot, he nevertheless accepted a knighthood from the English King. Recently, he held a special midnight meeting of all his employees. He promised them a day's pay for their attendance, and 25 cents increase a week, served them with supper, provided special cars to take them home and finished with the announcement that the directors of the company had voted \$5,000,000 to "smash Larkin and his union." But the special cars were not used. The men remained in the hall to attend a meeting arranged by Larkin, and

there enthusiastically decided to take all Murphy would give but to stick to the union.

The strike produced intense police persecution. "Just like America," they comment. Keir Hardie, the Labor member of Parliament, is quoted as saying: "It is a form of action against trades unionism common in America, but I did not expect in any law abiding country like our own, that the anarchist precedent of the United States courts would have been followed." While it is remarkable that a so-called socialist expects justice from a capitalist government, nevertheless this is an unconscionable humorous commentary on "Free America" and our boasted "superiority."

In the agitation prior to the strike, our friend and comrade, James Connolly, editor of the "Harp," author of many pamphlets and well-known in America, was arrested and sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

A meeting was arranged for Sunday August 31, at Sackville Street, a prominent Dublin thoroughfare, to protest and to enlist general support for the strike. It was prohibited by the police on the grounds of "sedition." On Friday at the strikers' meeting Larkin burned the proclamation of prohibition and announced that the meeting would be held. A warrant was issued against Larkin for "seditious language."

On Sunday a white bearded old man who had driven up to the Hotel Imperial a few minutes before, stepped out on the balcony and jerking off his beard announced himself, "I am Jim Larkin. I said I would be here and here I am."

The police rushed to disperse the cheering crowd and a wild fight followed. Men and women were beaten and trampled on, blood curdled the streets, five hundred were so badly hurt they had to receive hospital treatment, one man was mortally wounded and has since died, and another was killed outright, his skull broken by the blow of a policeman's club.

Larkin was arrested in the hotel, which is owned by Murphy. Cars were wrecked in all parts of the city and police and scabs were stoned from the houses. The attack on the good natured crowd was wholly unexpected and not at all in Ireland where the English government has lately made strenuous attempts to conciliate the people of Ireland.

It marks August 31 as "the bloodiest day in the history of Dublin."

The victim of the riot, Nolan, was accorded an impressive burial. Strikers and sympathizers followed the hearse in a procession. The description reminds us forcibly of the scenes in Paterson during the funerals of Valentino and Modestino.

This violent attempt to break the workers' spirit was followed by a lockout of all the members of the Transport Workers' Union in the employ of the Coal Merchants' Association. Other marine transportation companies such as the Carrier's Association are threatening a similar lockout, involving 30,000 men, so a complete tie-up of transportation is probable. This has served to add numbers and determination to the strikers' ranks. They have voted to pay no rents until the strike is over. Committees have been appointed by the British Trade Union Congress to visit Dublin and offer assistance. While no practical service will probably be rendered, except publicity, it will serve to cement the bonds of fraternity and is a unique event in the history of two hitherto hostile nations—the workers refuse to recognize the old barriers and join hands across the waters.

It occurred only once before, during the British Transport strike of two years ago when the Irish dockers joined under Larkin's leadership.

Larkin, "the man of the hour" in Ireland, has led a busy and adventurous life in the cause of labor. He is the nephew of an Irish rebel who was hung as a leader in the movement by the English government. He is proud of his family tree, "a man hung in every one of four generations as a rebel."

Three years ago he was sentenced to three years in jail as a result of agitation against the Cork Shipping Company, but was freed after three months, through widespread agitation. On his release he was given \$2,000 by the dockers of Dublin, which he refused to accept and turned it over to the organization.

Aggressive and active, he is hated and feared by all middle class, landowning and capitalist Irish, denounced by priests and ministers, but is loved devotedly by all the toilers for his speaking and writing in their behalf.

So here's success to our brave fellow workers across the sea and a speedy liberation to their spokesman, the daring rebel and good fighter—Comrade Jim Larkin.

WAR.

The war is for the patriot.
The worker pays the cost;
The death is for the soldier;
Be the battle won or lost.
The widow and the orphan
Get almost all the woe,
The general gets the glory
Of conquering the foe.
The fighting nations, weakened,
Lose what they've battled for,
By stronger neighbors gobbled,
And that, my son is war!

—Chicago News.

In the old days the slaves were sold with the estate. When the slave owner sold his plantation he sold the slaves along with it. Today the masters do the same thing only many of the workers do not seem to realize it. The workers go into a factory and produce profits for the owners of the factory. The owners sell the factory to another set of capitalists. The same set of workers go into the same factory and produce the same amounts of profits. The only difference is different capitalists receive the unearned revenues. The capitalist buyers get the same benefits the old slave buyers got, which is all the wealth produced by the workers above what it costs the workers to live.

Although the prohibition areas are being increased, more alcoholic beverages are being consumed than ever. The present system wears men out. It makes them worry. It makes them work beyond their strength, on the side, and on the other it heaps vast unearned revenues into idle hands. Both conditions cause people to seek artificial stimulants and the whiskey trade increases. Change the system to one where the needs of all will be provided for by the lightened labor of all, and the liquor question will be largely solved.

Statistics show that the mining industry in Canada is carried on at a greater cost in life and injury than in any other country. This is the statement which appeared in the newspapers. Never mind your workers. Your employers are drawing nice fat dividends out of most of you and you should be willing to die in order to make them rich and happy.

If the capitalist class find it worth while to own the state and the politicians, the workers should find it worth while to take the control away from them.