No one can oust The Agitator in praise of Mark Hare's book 'Men of Brains.' He was king of the capitalists in this respect. He had a keen vision of the future. He saw the handwriting on the wall, he saw the explosion of the Bolshevik dynamite which awaited his class when the horses of exploited labor had awakened to a realization of its own strength. He didn't burst food-balloons to the tune of the government's protection against an infuriated working class aro'und from its slendershums.

He saw clearly that despite all the flourish of force, all the display of machine guns, the working class is held in slavery by its own unbounded ignorance and superstition, and that the master-superintendence of all is the belief that the present system of society must stand as it is, that it cannot be changed and that the workers are conditioned to eternal wage slavery. Without this belief deeply impress on the workers' minds, capitalism could not continue at the same. All its armies would be as chaff before the whirlwind. Not blinded by the false show of power his money gave him and being a keen student of the reasons why he saw the one false in its future—of his class of keeping the superstition fresh.

To this end he conceived the Civic Federation.

The leaders of this organization over the mass of unionists he figured that if he could get prominent leaders of the trade unions to associate themselves with a number of big capitalists the subtle mental effect of such an organization upon the workers would be far reaching. The suggestion that would carry off the unity of interest between capital and labor, and of the desire of the capitalists to regard the toilers as partners in business, would be immeasurable.

This partnership of capital and labor looked an innocent affair, but if it got the proper reception it could easily get government sanction and its mandates made compulsory. Such was the dream of Hare, and that he found labor leaders ready to aid him in his scheme is not surprising, since it is the desire of the average leader to feather his own individual nest regardless of his fellowmen. I don't say that some of them didn't mean well, but such men shut themselves out where they are there because of that. Such men are not fit leaders for any organization.

"But, listen, you made a mistake; he didn't dream his dream early enough. The voice of criticism was altogether too loud. Still the Civic Federation has had its subtle effect upon the unthinking mass. It has degraded the workers mentally by its contemptuous indifference to the mind and should be destroyed at the earliest possible moment.

The United Mine Workers’ Union set a fine example in this matter when it gave John Mitchell his choice between the Union and the Civic Federation. John quit the Federation and a $600 a year job he had there. A non-unionist wouldn't be the proper influence in the brotherhood of Organized Labor and Capital.

Jim Connell, for twenty-three years international president of the Machinists’ Union, was defeated in his last election for his affiliation with that brotherhood of labor's sons.

The molders are going to take this matter up at their convention in Milwaukee, and ask President Valentino why he should continue to serve as a member and representative in the Civic Federation, thus compromising their organization and working for a system which for millionaire conspiracy without their approval or consent. For it is by virtue of his position in the union that he has the right to vote for him; and the Federation and the Convention presuming to deal with the problem of labor and capital the compromise is contradiction.

If the molders or any other craft wish to be represented in the Civic Federation they should elect their delegates in the regular way and not permit their officials to usurp power by appointing themselves.

Think of it, you men of labor, your servants, the men whom you consecrate with the scheme of labor skinners—the heartless exploiters who lay away niggas concealing means to fasten the chains of wage slavery still tighter about your necks—your elected servants nobob and banqueing with these, your enemies. What traitorish schemes, what sell-outs may not be concealed while the sweet fragrance from the smoke of the clear Havanas rises to the gilded ceiling?

Why the association and feast itself is a traitorous sell-out, and no intelligent self-respecting union man shud stand for it in a minute.

SYNDICALISM DISTINCT FROM I. W. W.

Three miles of mirrors and the juggling of ideas created by magazines writers ignorant of the subject and by L. W. W. writers and speakers wishing their organization to share in the achievements of European Syndicalists. Syndicalism has been confused in the popular mind as synonymous with I. W. W.ism.

Insofar as the I. W. W. is Revolutionary in its tactics and propaganda with regards to the boss, it may be said to be "syndicalistic." But it is not Syndicalism.

The I. W. W. is based on the premise that all existing labor unions are fossilized, antiquated bodies fit only for extermination, and that the workers they are landed there the better, so that on the ruins the "One Big Union" may be quickly built up according to the chart.

Syndicalism is based on the assumption that the existing unions are capable of being rejuvenated, strengthened, revolutionized, and it has taken off its coat, donned its overalls and started at work the accomplishing this worthy end.

The I. W. W. is trying to substitute itself for all existing unions and is endeavoring to preserve the existing unions.

The I. W. W. is organizing unions in all the crafts in opposition to the existing unions, thereby dividing the workers among themselves and adding to the chaos and confusion it charges the old unions with having brought about.

 Syndicalism says that is not only a crude inconsistency, but that it is a positive injury to the labor movement, for it seizes worker against worker, causing bitterness and acrimony where harmony should prevail.

The I. W. W. is drawing the radical, live elements away from the declining syndicalism and infusing the old unions with the life and vigor and revolutionary fire which they lack.

That is SOME difference, ain’t it? Yet it is not all. But it’s enuf to show that in their relations to the existing unions Syndicalism and I. W. W.ism are distinctly opposed.

SAYS SYNDICALISM TO I. W. W.

Syndicalism says to I. W. W.: Your function, like mine, is to educate the workers, organize and unorganized, inside their unions and outside their unions. We must take our message where we find it, not where you tell us for it. The workers of America have taken more than half a century to build up the unions that they have. They must be left alone and not inadequate to cope with organized capital, but they are the best they have known how to build. The workers have developed the unions to their utmost development, and their furthest extent. To our minds, a syndicalist is a person not prepared or ready to take some measure of protection. They are ready to fight to the death with the one fight the loss of one, and the thief that is caught in the act, sent to jail just because he is caught in the act. And I stand on a soap-box and yelp at them for their alleged stupidity in not having better defences.

The workers cannot understand those kinds of tactics. They reason very concretely. They say: "We know our union is not what it shud be. We see it in our pay envelopes, in our grocery bills, in our unemployment, in our general helplessness. But what have you to offer us instead? Theory! High for a fact. Our hands are dirty. Our shirts are dirty. How have you had any sort of dope too often we have beaten it on till our teeth are worn out. If you want to help, get down right to work and pull hard. Get into the barracks with us, help us pull this old ship off the rocks. But don’t ask us to give it up for some new-fangled stuff we know not of; it is all we’ve got."

What shud be our answer to this, fellow worker I. W. W.? You insist that they shall desert the old ship and go help you build a new one accord- ing to YOUR prepared plans. Don’t you think they shud have some say-so in so important a matter as the mode of organization and the methods of procedure whereby capitalism is to be conquered?

And if you say to them: "Come in and we will together change the plans if it proves they do not suit," they can with more reason say that to you. They might say to you: "After fifty years of desperate struggle during which much of our blood has been split we have laid the foundation for a labor movement, step in here now and help us build the superstructure. Fetch your plans along, for we are not going to be so busy on the foundry that we do not notice an attention to the building; we have been so engrossed in the present work we have taken no heed of the building.

Come, fellow worker I. W. W., let us dig in and all together raise a structure that will be impregnable. What is your answer?

TOM MANN WATCHING US.

I am no friend to Jack Wood, Tom Mann writes as follows:

"I am much interested in The Agitator. It does well and I see it is now syndicalist. That is all to the good. I am Syndicalist of distinction. I. W. W. I suppose I am correct in understanding the latter to be on principle in antagonism to the existing trade unions and aiming at building up an entirely new industrial organization.

"It is because the I. W. W. is endeavoring to build up a new labor organization, and persists in believing the old unions cannot evolve that The Syndicalist League of North America has been started.

"The Agitator has supported the I. W. W. and will continue to support on those points wherein we agree, but I never did believe in the theory of the syndicalist for a new labor organization, and marked the numerous developments of the old unions as evidence of their progress and of their power to evolve but as actual steps in their evolution.

"Join the Syndicalist League.

"The Syndicalist League is the national organization designed for the purpose of urging the workers to study new tactics. It proposes to es- cay the branches everywhere, public literature, furnish competent speakers for unions and other organizations wishing to hear about it. It invites the cooperation of every union man and woman interested in the advancement of their cause. It invites all non-unionists to attend its meetings, read its literature and learn why they shud become unionists. It will not assist unionists except that it will assist workers wishing to organize and be a recruiting ground for all unions.

For further information address
WM. Z. FOSTER
Secretary The Syndicalist League of N. A.
1006 S. Paolina St., Chicago.

In the mining district of West Virginia the struggle between labor and capital is shortening itself up in a manner that ought to convince the fellow worker what a genuine sentiment it is. The evi- dence of the striking miners from the company's camp and company town is rather significant of the new brotherly love. Armed private police drove the sick out into the rains off their beds and dashed the people after them for walking on the streets. "You have no right here," they were told. Where have we any rights, anyway?"
THE AGITATOR

issued twice a month, on the first and fifteenth, by The Agitator Publishing Association, from its office in Fishkill, N.Y. Entered at the postoffice at Lakebay, Wash., as Second Class Matter.

Subscription, One Dollar a Year.

Address all communications and make all money orders payable to The Agitator, Lakebay, Wash. Articles for publication should be written legibly on one side of the paper only.

The man who learns to take his stand alone.
But the one who learns the greatest number tread,
Should hasten to his rest beneath a
The Great Majority of Men are Dead.

DOOM OF CENTRALIZED POWER.

Descentralization is one of the very vital questions of the hour in the ranks of labor.

In every form of organization there are two tendencies constantly at war, one aiming towards centralization, in the hands of the few officials at the top, and the other actively resisting that concentration of power and fighting for the decentralization of the local and popular control. The reason for concentration is two-fold; first, the unity of action that may be achieved by it; second, the serving of leading officials to cloak themselves with great power.

An army is the best example of centralized power. A great example of how the unity of action was followed consciously and unconsciously in all our political and economic organizations. How often do we find the various union organizations referred to as “The Industrial Army.”

An army is an organization where one man thinks and all the others blindly obey, often with the wet blanket of such a system, even in a modified form, in our labor movement!

It is argued that united action can only be achieved by the powerful iron fist that can be wielded by the arm of a single individual who has high authority, in as the case of a general strike, say of the Iron Moulder’s Union. If this assertion is true then the army method is necessary. It may gall us sometimes to submit to orders our intelligence tells us are wrong, still if the ends we are organized to attain cannot be reached in any other way, we submit to a painful necessity. However, let us examine the proposition at close range and see if it is true.

A local union is a body of average minds who know the local needs of their craft better than any official residing a thousand miles away can know them. The power of the average intelligence and having the industrial experience common to all members of the craft, they will be as capable of knowing their own needs as any general as all other members outside their locality. The members on the Pacific coast won’t presume to know the local conditions on the Atlantic coast except that in a general way they are analogous to their own; and their self interest will prompt them to cooperate with the Atlantic, and to take no action detrimental to them, knowing such action would eventually react upon themselves. In like manner, as they want to handle their own affairs, they will not dictate to their fellow workers in the east. Each must handle their own affairs and all will work together for the common good.

Isn’t this the way they actually work? It’s vastly different from the way an army works, isn’t it? Where is the unity in the army? The concept of the Army, except that in a general way they are analogous to their own; and their self interest will prompt them to cooperate with the Atlantic, and to take no action detrimental to them, knowing such action would eventually react upon themselves. In like manner, as they want to handle their own affairs, they will not dictate to their fellow workers in the east. Each must handle their own affairs and all will work together for the common good.

Isn’t this the way they actually work? It’s vastly different from the way an army works, isn’t it? Where is the unity in the army? The concept of the Army, except that in a general way they are analogous to their own; and their self interest will prompt them to cooperate with the Atlantic, and to take no action detrimental to them, knowing such action would eventually react upon themselves. In like manner, as they want to handle their own affairs, they will not dictate to their fellow workers in the east. Each must handle their own affairs and all will work together for the common good.

Centralized authority cannot bring about that very desirable condition of self reliance in the individual minds. It can produce nothing except disruption and decay. Workmen, like all other kinds of men, can learn the way to succeed only by the bitter experience of defeat. There is no short cut to knowledge. Authority can teach men only to obey. Obedience is the curse of mankind, the base of all progress.

Workmen are learning that in the struggle for those to the authority every one of their own leaders. They have submitted to it in the past only because they thought it was necessary. Experience has taught them that not only is obedience unnecessary but that it is positively bad and injurious to the cause of their emancipation.

Thought Will Destroy Power.

When society was in the military stage, where a few men did the thinking for all, obedience to the authority of these few was the natural and inescapable condition. Now we have other convictions and must obey. But, thanks to oppression which made it necessary to think and to invention that made the world what it is, we are able to think for ourselves and cannot obey.

This is the beginning of the end of authority, the starting-point of real progress, the impetus that will move the world to its ultimate goal.

The marvelously rapid evolution of capitalism is due solely to the fact that men have had the free room to think along the lines essential to its growth. The study of chemistry, electricity, civil engineering, mechanics, architecture, hydraulics and pneumatics have been fostered and encouraged. Invention has been pursued with a free hand, and the promise of riches held out to all who will devise new means whereby the industrial barons can conquer.

The progress of working class education has been slow because all the forces of society are controlled by an extremely rich and powerful minority as the masters of life depends on keeping the toilers ignorant of the vital fact that they are enslaved while falsely believing themselves free. Yet, in spite of all the master class can do to prevent it, the rays of intellectual light are beginning to penetrate the masses. The working class are beginning to realize their own actual power, and to see what playthings they have been in the hands of others who sell them on the market like any other commodity. Others for a small one, according to their ability and opportunity.

It is natural then, as a first step towards the recovery of their power, that they begin to deprive leadership of its control over them, by taking back the power which in their ignorance they allowed the leaders to acquire.

Thus the doom of centralized power is at hand, and the dawn of a free world near.

SPECIAL FROM AUSTRALIA.

The Workers are rapidly being Russianized in Australia. The conspiratorial oppression is inflicting dire distress upon poor parents. If their boy stays away from two drams a fine of 25c is made, that being the minimum, the boys being compelled to work on an all night basis. This infamous tyranny is the product of the Federal Labor government. Save us from our friends.

Imagine the cruelty of entering a laborer’s home and seizing $5 worth of furniture, which in many cases would be impossible, as they do not possess that amount. This kind of callous brutality is happening all over Australia.

Hundreds of boys have already been tortured by the military inquisition.

Meanwhile the starving unemployed are deputizing the Federal and State Governments for work, with little result. The Federal Attorney General gives them all his sympathy, and sends them to the State Premier, who refuses to see them, remarking through the Press that the unemployed are resting upon this, although nearly two thousand accumulated the deputation. A union secretary addressed the meeting appealing to them to be orderly so that he could follow, told the unemployed to feed their wives and families on respect, it was so nourishing, especially for hungry children. The better way was to copy the example of the English Suffragettes and send respect to the devil. Direct action is the way to use against the Federal or a stupid indifference.

The Federal Attorney General has recently spoken in their behalf, pushing the bill of rights, admitting the failure of labor legislation, owing to the increase in the cost of living. He wants greater power, and more legislation, to prove a greater failure.
Centralized Power In "Moulders' Union"

The following resolution has been endorsed by the convention board of St. Louis and vicinity, comprising seven locals, and by 22 locals in other parts of the country. When it is understood that no propaganda was done except the mere sending out of the resolution, the full significance of the trend of thought in the rank and file will be realized. It is interesting to compare the gory objections of local 32 with the masterly reply of local 425—author of this declaration.

Resolution. By Ora M. Me, June 8, 1912.

"Whereas, It has been the experience of organized labor that centralized power has been detrimental to the best interests of organized labor; whereas, it is believed that the Constitution of the I. M. U. be amended to provide for centralized power as now vested in the General Executive Board of the I. M. U. to the Conference Board of each district; and it further

Resolved, That the said Constitution be amended or changed to comply with this resolution."

Local 32 Afraid of Freedom.

In common with our sister locales, No. 33 has received from No. 426, of St. Louis, Mo., a copy of a resolution adopted by this local union, stating that it has been proven that centralized power has been detrimental to the best interests of organized labor and urging that the Constitution of the I. M. U. be amended or changed to provide for centralized power as now vested in the General Executive Board of the I. M. U. to the Conference Board of each district.

No. 33 does not look with favor on such a change in the Constitution, and a special committee has been designated to present such a resolution to the subject through the columns of The Agitator.

In the first place, we do not think that it has been proven that centralized power is injurious to the best interests of the organized workers, and especially not in the case of the I. M. U. In fact, we think that the greatest results for the members of labor unions have been achieved where power is most strongly centralized in the officers and executive boards, as, for instance, in the various railroad brotherhoods.

Secondly, we can see nothing but disintegration and ruin in the proposition to transfer the power now vested in the Executive Board to the Conference Board of each district, thus in effect bringing into existence a system of power independent of the International. If the present system be regarded as a unit, we see no strength or unity in the molders of this great land of ours. Labor unions are (or should be) conducted on the same general principles as other business organizations, and while the officers of the union should be held to strict account of their stewardship, we can see nothing but evil in the proposition to take away the power now given to our brethren of the National Executive Board.

COMMITTEE LOCAL NO. 32.

Potomac, Pa.

LOCAL 425 ABLY DEFENDS ITS RESOLUTION.

In making the statement that centralized power has been detrimental to the best interests of organized labor we thought it so self-evident a fact that it needed no proofs. Almost every day we witness the sad spectacle of some "labor leader" stepping in and breaking the ranks of the workers at a critical time when victory would have crowned the efforts of the strikers.

We have seen not only once, but hundreds of times, international officers send in men (?) to break the strikes of their own unions. We have seen men who have been strikers, who have been international officers threatened to sac on their own locals in case they went on strike in sympathy with their brothers in another part of the country.

We have not forgotten that good union (1) molders of St. Louis filled the places of their brothers on the floor in Chicago. We remember the part played by John Mitchell during the miners' troubles in Colorado. Would space allow me to point out undeniably the dirty betrayal of the Boot & Shoe Workers.

We hope to see in the near future a history of the "Benedict Arnold" of the American labor movement and we are confident that when it is written and the workers read it, the fall of centralized power will be seen as workers will thereafter absolutely refuse to delegate their power to any man or set of men. They will mould their own destiny. They do not need a Moses to lead them out of the wilderness.

The unions today are so "machine" ridden that the rank and file are thoroughly disgusted. If some of the members could see an "elementary" machine they do not only have to fight the boss but the tyranny of centralized power also. To show the fear of the membership we know of one case where molders struck and strike would not notify the international officers for fear they (the international officers) would kick the strike and, by the way, these strikes were won.

Why have this centralized power? Is it because the man at the top is so brazenly— a great general—and we need him to protect us? If he is so brazen why don't be import a few brilliant ideas to the membership, such for instance as the general strike? If he is such a great general why does he permit his men to be terrorized by the boss without putting up a fight?

The shop conditions in most places are as bad if not worse than those self and the only remedy is the general strike all over the land and now would have been the proper time to make demands on the boss, when men are scarce. A general strike now would be a sure victory. If the men had local autonomy they could strike at any time the boss was at a disadvantage and make him come to terms across the floor. It would be 12 o'clock in the morning or two or three times a day if they wished to and the Napoleon (2) would have to give in if he were in a dispute in sympathy with their brothers in other unions, who in turn would come to their assistance. By this method a local could strike as from union to union till it became general, not only in one industry but in all industries; and the boss would be compelled to yield to prevent the entire country being tied up.

The conclusion we will say in reply to that part of article of local 32 where they speak of "this great country of ours," we would like to ask 99 cent of I. St. U. members how they feel about their own. The bulk of the members of this International we believe haven't even enough of "this great country of ours" to bury their carcasses in when they are through. But it is very unfortunate that we have to mention here the article written by some of our members who have written an article here (see the November, 1911, of Local 32). This article here by a fellow writer the article instead of the committee of local 32 such a statement would have been unnecessary.

When the workers stand and fight together and take possession of the land and the wealth they will have created, they will all prouder and joyfully proclaim "this great land of ours." Yours for the solidarity of labor.

COMMITTEE FOR LOCAL 425.

DEFINITION OF TRADE UNIONISM. (Emilie Pouget is one of the founders of Revolutionary Syndicalism in France, has served a number of years as secretary of the General Confederation of Labor (C. G. T.) and is one of the greatest influences in the labor movement of that progressive country.—Editor.)

Of late the term "Trade Unionism" has a more far-reaching meaning than it used to have. The term continues to qualify members of a Trade Union organization.— Besides this ambitious and colorless definition, which, by stretching a point, might be a label for "T'fellow" as well as for "Red" Trade Unions, the term has acquired a new and very precise meaning.

The term "Trade Unionism" has become a commonplace, a thing to be taken for granted and unconscious workers progress toward. The workers who invoke this epithet have thrown aside uncomplimentary and occasionally discovered that improvements, be partial or extensive, can only result from popular force and will. On the rules of their former school-like hopes and superstitious beliefs in miracles to be expected from State Providence as well as from Divine Providence, they have elaborated a harshly, truly humanistic doctrine whose true meaning is explained and proved by social phenomena.

The Trade Unionist is evidently a partisan of grouping workers by means of Trade Unions, only he does not conceive a Trade Union as an agent for narrowing his horizons to such a point that his sphere of action is restricted to daily disputes and wrangles with his employers; and although at present he strives to get minor grievances redressed, he never puts aside the evils arising from the exploitation of the workers. Neither does he conceive the Trade Union to be, as some political economists do, an "elementary" machine only where men are recruited and trained to be aggressive fighters in a cause they consider efficacious.

For the Trade Unionist, the Trade Union is a perfect combination answering to all needs, to all aspirations, and therefore sufficient for all purposes. It is, in association of workers and their representatives, affording opportunity for daily conflict with employers, for improvements, and for settling minor claims.

But it is not only this: It is a combination capable of bringing about the expropriation of capital and the reorganization of society, which some Socialists, who are deceived by their confidence in the "State," believe will be brought about by the workers of political power. Therefore, for the Trade Unionist the Trade Union is not a transient association, only suited to the needs of the hour, and whose usefulness could not be conceived apart from special and exceptional conditions. For him the Trade Union is an initial and essential combination; it should arise spontaneously, independently of all antecedent theories, and develop in any surroundings.

In fact, what more reasonable than for the exploited to strike the trade to come together, to take into their own hands the advantages that are to be gained immediately?

On the other hand, supposing society to have been annihilated and a Communist or any other society to have been born from its present savages, it would be evident that in these circumstances, in these new surroundings, the need of associations, bringing men employed in identical or similar work and
duties in contact with one another, will be most urgent.

Thus the Trade Union, the corporate body, appears in the organism of society. Present, for the Trade Unionist the Trade Union is an organism of conflict and claim of worker against the employer. In the future it will be the basis on which normal society will be built, when freed from exploitation and oppression.

—\textit{EMILE POUGET.}

\section*{Around the World}

France.

A big agitation is being carried on over the case of a soldier named Russet, condemned to death by court-martial on a trumped up charge of murder. Russet is one of that fine type of proletarian that puts principle before personal comfort, the type of worker that is barring the ruling class today and will tomorrow free the world from the rule of money. In the barric he witnessed the actual murder of a soldier by the brutal officers. Regardless of results to himself, he accused the officers and would not be bribed or frightened into silence. For two years they have tortured him with accusations and false charges. They finally worked up a case of murder against him and condemned him to death. The people knew it was a piece of deliberate murder and the fine young army moved to avenge itself and prevent an expose of its brutality and corruption. This is another Dreyfus case, another great lesson to the nation. The young officers will compel the government to act, and force the release of Russet and an investigation of the army.

We hear lots of prate about the uselessness of individual action, an "argument" propounded by a set of cowards who have made a philosophy out of their cowardice. This common soldier has aroused the public of France and all of Europe is discussing his case. If he was a coward he could have comforted himself with the philosophies of individual quietism, and lie like his fellow soldiers who know of the murder, keep mum. Being a man of courage and principle he would not down, and as a consequence Militarism is receiving a severe blow.

Peru.

The news has just reached us that in the last week in July 200 workers were shot and killed by the hired wholesale murderers of this government.

The press is forbidden to publish anything about it, and all foreign papers have not searched for news of it going out. We haven’t as yet been able to get the details, which undoubtedly will be brought out.

The victims of this wholesale butchery were defenseless strikers striving to improve their miserable condition in the sugar refineries at Chicono, an interior town. They were holding a demonstration in the streets when the order to shoot was given by the Republican government, the "servant" of the people.

Switzerland.

Comrade L. Bertoni, editor of Le Revell, has again been arrested, this time in Zurich after delivering a lecture there. If he were not a native he would be taken to the border and turned over to his "own" government in case it wanted him, for discussing the sacred topics of government or economics.

Reformers quote Switzerland as having the ideal form of Initiative and Referendum and Recall Government, and all the other pretty artifices which both Roosevelt and Debs have written down in their revolutionary platforms as fundamentals which this country shall emulate in its constitution, are in full bloom there. But it is as easy for a Revolutionist to break into a Swiss Jail as it is into similar bastilles in neighboring kingdoms. Which proves that the only way to actually reform government is to cut its head off.

Austria.

The best evidence that Syndicalism is in the air and cannot be gotten away from is the very signi

ificant fact that it has pressed into the darkest part of Europe. Bosnia is one of the little states that go to make up the Austrian Empire. It is the only spot in the sound of Europe that is far away from the forefront of capitalism. Still it has a Syndicalist movement composing 6,000 of its 40,000 workers. There was a strike of twenty-five strikes it conducted during the last year.

China.

Awakened after its long slumber in the arms of centralised authority, this old civilization, that knew the sciences when our ancestors were living in caves, has at last been awakened to the acquisition of knowledge, as evidenced by the fact that the demand for printers is so great that the types of Shanghai have doubled their wages. They first organised a union of printers.

British Columbia.

The strike of the construction workers on the Grand Trunk Pacific railroad out of Prince Rupert is still on, and these "common laboring sorts," as we bourgeois mechanics are wont to dub them, are proving that when it comes down to the real test they are the ones with the courage and fellowship and intelligence necessary to fight the master class to a standstill. These men are members of the I. W. W. and have learned some plain truths on the labor question thru their affiliation.

\section*{POSTAL CENSORSHIP.}

The postoffice was designated as simply a public utility, not as a censor and intruder into private lives. Censorship is the transitional form of correspondence, it is guilty of the same brutalities of opportunity and of confidence when it undertakes to create a system of a systematic snooping espionage. We are fast coming to the point when personal liberty shall have totally ceased to exist in this country. By what rights issued this latest impudent ukase that young women shall not be allowed to receive mail at the general delivery windows in their home town? It is a piece of legislation which makes the post office the first place, it is not the business of a transmission agent to set itself up as a Judge of morality, a subject on which experts differ, nor to undertake its enforcement. By hindering the exchange of letters in promotion of so-called immoral ends, nobody is made a whit more virtuous. The only result is to tax ingenuity to devise other methods of communication; and neither the community nor the individual is benefited or uplifted in even the faintest degree. If anything, conditions are made worse by creating a spirit of resentment, which is certain in many cases to lead to much more reckless conduct than would otherwise take place. If the petty despoits at the head of the Postal Department were not so densely ignorant of the true facts of human nature, they could not commit so stupendous a blunder. It looks as if their only possible motive is to be as mean as they can with the means of the community, but to estabhsh a precedent for lawless interference with private correspondence, in order to handicap and paralyze the citizens. The postal authorities should be recognized as a being without personal rights of any kind, a mere slave of an unprogressive bureaucracy.

It is hardly necessary to recur to the obvious further fact that much of the general delivery correspondence has no "immoral" intent, but is per

fectly legitimate, but in the same domestic conditions which make proper privacy of correspondence impossible in any other way. To all the above criticisms we must add that by rule a rule is made for women and not for young men? The double standard of morals for the sexes, so long tenaciously maintained, is now abandoned by decent and highminded persons. There can be no faintest palliation of the crime of the post office department which has persecuted our immortal dogma. If the government is to supervise morals at all, it is bound to do so for both sexes alike, and in precisely equal degree. If it is not prepared to impose its hands on both, it is probably the best thing it can do. It is high time that notice were taken of the persistent encroachments of the postoffice department on the rights of the people, and that Congress took action to bring the post-office to its应有的 task of rendering a service to the people. It is time that these agencies are trusted with administrative work in order to assume the functions of Oriental despotism.—\textit{Jas. F. M. Dickey, Jr., in The到dian.}

The above article shud be placed in the hands of every visitor to the general delivery window of your post-office, but I can't get a copy of it. It has been done in a leaflet and can be had at cost, 1c a hundred, from Geo. B. Wheeler, 4359 State st., Chicago.

\section*{DOWN CAME THE BALLOON.}

Los Angeles, the home of H. O. H. and the great get-together regardless of principle, has had its primacies. The followers of Roosevelt, calling themselves Progressives, have swept the field—sweep it so completely that it is hardly worth while to count the rest. As for the Socialists, even where they do not limp far behind others, their vote is pitiful. For example, in the thirty-third district, the Socialist candidate was a trifle ahead of one of the two Democrats, but the vote was only 29% as against 3,499 cast for the Progressive. In the districts carried by the Progressives their vote totaled 80,297, as compared with a Socialist total of 11,980. That is to say the Progressives—against whom the Socialists trained all their guns—got nearly seven times the number of votes that the Republicans did. The total vote for the half of the total Socialist vote was cast for three candidates, Wheeler getting 2,791, Hunt 1,801 and Mott 340, whereas, who came within an ace of being elected mayor several years ago. With less than half the Socialist vote, yet, while he secured 2,791 votes, his Progressive opponent rounded up 21,298.

In two districts the Progressives ran no candidates. There the old Republican party carried the day, getting 4,349 votes to a Socialist total of 975.

Once more we are thankful that we are not farmers. We are proud of the solid farmer, secure in his solid Bonanza of principles to snatch at the shadow of a possibility of office, as reflected in the dancing figures of the politician in his political tory. We are thankful that we have not crested the knee to scheming labor politicians; that we have not suffered the burlington of our great revelatory heritage for the mere promise of getting within sniffing distance of a mess of pottage; that we have not deserted our friends, as the Socialists deserted the Mexican Revolutionaries, for the false coinage of a supposed popularity with the working class. If the Socialists be clever schemes, but earnestness has an ability of its own which will beat the mere smartness of ballot-box jugglers every time. We have got as far as we can with our friends—indeed, despite their sleepless opposition—we keep our movement running, and running well. We keep our paper coming, and it is now in its third year, without advertising and without printing a line we do not believe to be the truth; we keep our office, and impress it, for good or evil, on public thought. For years past, on the other hand, the Los Angeles Socialists have been writing on water; yielding here and compromising there, until the very class to which they appeal most fervently has lost all confidence in leaders who face a dozen ways.

Los Angeles, a city of full-of-meaning radicals; men and women keenly alive to injustice and eagerly ambitious to help in raking in an order that shall respond more closely to the demands of human life. Such people will never be able to act effectively so long as they persist in tying themselves to the strange, inelastic, unyielding form of propaganda can attain health and strength only after it has moved into the open air of a free diese covering the naked truths of today, regardless of where the chips may fall. To the few, however, they must fight, and fight beyond all hope of success, resist their political leaders, for these leaders know that die die and claims and will oppose it tooth and nail—"Reformation."