ONCE MORE, ABRIGATE THAT RUSSIAN TREATY

THE KALISPELL BEE

EVOLOV TION OF A CAPITALIST POLITICAL PAMPHLET, Via THE S. P. TO FEE "A MINE IS A MINE"

STARTED BY MARCUS DAILY TO FIGHT BANANAS AND MANGOS. 25 CENTS A COPY, 50 CENTS A YEAR

WHEATON, Wash., March 13.—The Knights of Labor has just issued a pamphlet, "The S. P. To Fee "A Mine Is A Mine,"" consisting of a dozen pages, written by Marcus Daily, a member of the Lodge of Bakers, and a prominent member of the local Social Democratic party. The pamphlet is a forthright attack on the "Banana and Mango" theory, and is intended to be a weapon in the war against the trusts. It is printed on good paper, and the type is clear and legible. The price is 25 cents a copy, or 50 cents a year.

The pamphlet is devoted to the principles of the Social Democratic party, and its aim is to宣传 the benefits of the "Banana and Mango" theory. It is written in a simple, direct style, and is easy to read and understand. The author, Marcus Daily, is a man of strong convictions, and his arguments are well-supported by facts and figures. The pamphlet is a valuable addition to the literature of the Social Democratic party, and should be read by all who are interested in the question of trusts.

The pamphlet is available at all bookstores, and can be ordered by mail.
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Revisions and Revolutionists

Reformers Are the Real "Impossibleists." Their Methods Lead Not to Socialism.

Translated from the "Groks Social-Democratic" by J. Krosswell.

(Continued from last week)

Revolutionary social-democrats believe that the reformists do not believe in the reform of the existing order. The bourgeoisie, they say, is not capable of making any such revolution; the working class has organized and become aware of its needs. It has made its demands known to the government and the people, and it will not be satisfied until its demands are granted.

But Kropotkin has a very slight idea of the political and social origins of the movement he speaks of. He speaks of the movement of commerce, but the movement of commerce is only one of the many elements in the movement of social revolution.

Kropotkin is the leader of the movement of social revolution in his country. But he is not the only leader. Other leaders have their influence, and their influence is not always of the best kind.

The leaders of the movement of social revolution are not all alike. Some of them are honest, some of them are not. Some of them are good, some of them are not. Some of them are useful, some of them are not. Some of them are necessary, some of them are not.
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In some parts of the world, the leaders of the movement of social revolution are in league with the government. In other parts, they are in league with the people. In some parts, they are in league with the workers. In other parts, they are in league with the employers. In some parts, they are in league with the rich. In other parts, they are in league with the poor.
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THE PARIS COMMUNE

A Brief Sketch of Its Rise, Its Foes, and Several Lessons

The Paris Commune, that banner of workingmen's rights in revolution, lived for seven weeks in glory, power, and the hearts of men. It is a lesson to the world in the way it is to appeal to the profound contemplation of the peoples who know the workingman as a brother. The Commune was a just, brave, and noble people, and it is true that it was a failure. It was formed, it was torn to pieces, in the struggle for democracy.

The Commune was not a failure, it was a masterpiece of good intentions. It was a failure, it was a failure, but it was a failure in the higher sense of failure. It was a failure, but it was a failure in the sense that it failed to accomplish its object, not that it failed to do its best.
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