

# Boris Pliński, the Greatest of Russian Writers

By VICTOR SERGE.

(Note: In a later issue of the Magazine Section of the Daily Worker we will print one of the most remarkable of the short stories by this writer, the Russian whom Trotsky rates as the greatest of the writers present in the Revolution. The story has been translated by Louis Lozovick who has an authority on the literature and literature of Soviet Russia and who will continue his series of articles in the Daily Worker.)

Pliński is decidedly the most characteristic and the most celebrated of the Russian writers of the first work appeared in 1920 in the Moscow state edition. He writes exclusively about the Revolution. He has written a novel called, "The Bare Year" as well as a couple of volumes of short stories. "Fishes from Petrograd," "Ivan and Maria," which embrace the whole of the Revolution.

Pliński's manner seems strange at first. But it is in absolute harmony with the spirit of the times. He writes as if he were a futurist painter. It would be impossible to describe the Revolution in his style. He writes of a Bolshevik describing the social and modern conditions in the country as well as with the utter indifference of the artist and perfection of style of the aesthetic artist. He writes of the whole of the detail—which we writers of the "Bare Year" and "Fishes from Petrograd" are incapable of doing as well as Pliński, who has done away with so many forms of the past, has also cleared up many a literary form.

It is hopeless to look for a political chief in his work. He writes in his work. The movement of the chief is not in his work. He writes in his work. The movement of the chief is not in his work. He writes in his work. The movement of the chief is not in his work.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

The Great Defender. The constitution for which he is an important cog in the lion's head. The law of the state has been considerably enhanced by his activities in his new role of defender of the state. He has not only been a member of the railroad, shipping and banking government against the attack of the Communist in America. This self-appointed savior of America has thus been a member of the Civic Federation and other organizations of employers as well as in white armor repelling the red hordes of Soviet propagandists.

How can we explain the confusion of faith in American capitalist institutions? America has established certain standards of life which are free from the influence of the Communist. The American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

These are the Bolsheviks. In the morning they used to meet in the convent (strange times indeed!) Men not unlike leather, in leather jackets, almost all of them had shaved heads, looking handsome and strong these are the dominant features of his literary form. We must not forget to mention the love of exact detail, of the minutest description of the emotions, the force of exact detail, of the minutest description of the emotions, the force of exact detail, of the minutest description of the emotions, the force of exact detail.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

however, sorrow was always followed by joy. They worked, love dream and fight. And their adventures end, as has often been the case, in a happy time. When the old emigre, Harry, asks for his share of the loot, he is refused to give it. Shots are fired in the night and several of the others no longer live. They are murdered the hands of the revolution. He is the woman who has tasted the bread of the revolution. The black banner turns to be the black flag of the revolution. The American Federation of Labor which he leads are part and parcel of the machinery of American capitalism.

We no farther than this and state that such policy as this officialdom has for its own guidance consists of aiding American imperialism in carrying out its strong reaction, in adopting the nationalistic viewpoint of American capitalism as its own ideal and attempting at all times to convince the masses of this country that American capitalism is a different and more altruistic brand than that in operation in other and less fortunate nations.

This means accepting American government and the beginning and end of all working class endeavor and it is on this premise that the American Federation of Labor and its members have been working. The truth of the assertion is that the American Federation of Labor is not a labor union but a labor trust.

This attitude naturally leads the American trade union movement into the hands of the American Federation of Labor. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

# Special Magazine Supplement THE DAILY WORKER

## The Sickle, the Hammer—and Gompers

By WILLIAM F. DENNE.

WE Communists contend that Samuel Gompers and the officialdom of the American Federation of Labor which he leads are part and parcel of the machinery of American capitalism. We no farther than this and state that such policy as this officialdom has for its own guidance consists of aiding American imperialism in carrying out its strong reaction, in adopting the nationalistic viewpoint of American capitalism as its own ideal and attempting at all times to convince the masses of this country that American capitalism is a different and more altruistic brand than that in operation in other and less fortunate nations.

This means accepting American government and the beginning and end of all working class endeavor and it is on this premise that the American Federation of Labor and its members have been working. The truth of the assertion is that the American Federation of Labor is not a labor union but a labor trust.

This attitude naturally leads the American trade union movement into the hands of the American Federation of Labor. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

SECOND SECTION February 16, 1924. This magazine supplement is published every Saturday in the Daily Worker.

program which Gompers claims his efforts alone have made successful. Since the investigation began the whole Gompers machine has been in motion to disintegrate the investigation and the members of the party of Russia and the Workers (Communist) Party of America are striving to entice the workers of the world and the American workers of this country.

Recognition of First Impression. There is no question in the whole field of international relations of more importance to American workers than the question of relations with the Soviet Union. Because the British Labor Party before it became the government announced that one of its first acts would be the recognition of Russia, the victory that followed brings to the attention of the workers of the world the tremendous achievement of the British workers and again his belief that his policies need to change the world map.

When the admitted leader of the organized workers of this country, Samuel Gompers, speaks of the American worker will be deeply interested in his official position he comes in contact with a movement that has been recognized and accepted of modern society—European Socialism. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the American Federalist for February, edited by Samuel Gompers, devotes approximately eight pages to these two events. Let us understand that in its loyalty to American capitalist institutions, the American Federation of Labor, as reported by Gompers, yields to none. Since the Russian revolution, Gompers has even gone one step farther and now considers himself and the trade union movement the especially appointed guardian of American capitalist government.

# People

By CARL SANDBURG

My people are gray, pigeon gray, dawn gray, storm gray.

I call them beautiful And I wonder where they are going.





# WHAT WAS BOLSHIEVISM?

By GREGORY ZINOVIEV.

This is the Preface to the first volume of "The History of the Russian Revolution" by Leonid Brezhnev's work.

A PART from the history of Bolshevism in its earliest stages—its origins and its first steps towards the formation of a Russian Social Democracy, some of Plekhanov's works, the old "Iskra," and especially the "Pravda" articles—on these aspects we cannot claim that we have written a new history. The main political current was born almost on the eve of the Revolution of 1905. The 2nd Party Congress, held in the summer of 1905, marked a mighty storm of revolutionary strike movements, which spread with ever-increasing violence over the whole of Russia. Bolshevism received its first baptism of blood during the first revolution in the year 1905.

But an ever more decisive trial followed. The Revolution of 1905 was suppressed, the working class thrown back to the slums of the greyed-out regime. Pain-hearted and agonized became everyday occurrences. Even the rights of the workers were infected with the shadow of death.

The question as to whether Bolshevism was a revolutionary movement which would withstand the fire of counter-revolution, was approximately decided during the five years which followed 1912.

The new contribution was made by Bolshevism in the sphere of political ideology? What fresh paths were opened up by the international Socialism? Of what was Comrade Lenin's discovery consist?

If we had to furnish an answer to these questions, we should reply as follows: Bolshevism was the first time in the history of international class warfare, has taken the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat as its only, and has done this by leading in practice paths which Lenin and Engels had merely established theoretically.

It is precisely because Bolshevism has opened up the question of the proletarian leadership as the principal question of the day, that, for the first time in the history of international Socialism, it has found an ally for the proletariat.

And here Lenin's great merit of Bolshevism—found this ally in the farmers.

In this sense it may be said, that Bolshevism "discovered" the role of the farmers, for it recognized the possibility for the proletariat to play his great part of emancipation in the world revolution.

Anyone who has followed the most important moments in the history of Bolshevism—from the first important actual political platform of Bolshevism in the year 1904 (Comrade Lenin's pamphlet on "Two Kinds of Tactics" dealing loudly with the question of the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship" of the proletariat and the peasantry), to the idea of the "Bolshevik alliance between workers and farmers," and finally to the "United Front" at the present time—whoever has followed all this will have arrived at the conclusion that Bolshevism has spoken its decisive word precisely in Comrade Lenin's discovery.

With regard to the question of the reciprocal relations between the proletariat and the farmers, the actions of Marx and Engels have only given us the most general formulae for the solution of this problem. The development of the political tactics of the proletariat in such a way as to insure the necessary alliance with the highest possible form of measure of "equal rights" between workers and farmers, and the development of the farmers in actually the followers of the proletariat, and at the same time "driving" the farmers to play the part of "reserve army of labor" in the development of the great historical mission—this has been the great question which Bolshevism has tried to answer successfully. And today it is perfectly clear that all the most important problems of the proletarian revolution on an international scale are solved in the same lines—those which Comrade Lenin has solved.

Russia during the last two decades. The tactics pursued by Bolshevism for this past decade—the reciprocal relations between workers and farmers—constitute a factor especially calculated to enhance the international revolutionary character of Bolshevism.

The reciprocal relations of the workers to the farmers—this is the most vital thing in Bolshevism. Those who are not in complete agreement with this view, and those who sincerely wish to become adherents of Bolshevism, must first of all understand the essential character of Bolshevism.

This is by no means asserting that Bolshevism has created, all at once, a completely unified tactical formula for the relations between the workers and the farmers. Two decades of profound political significance passed between the issue of the slogan of the "dictatorship of the workers and farmers," formulated for the first time by Lenin in the year 1904, and the slogan of the "United Front of workers and farmers" government, realized in Russia, and now proclaimed internationally by the Communist International.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

1901, commenced in such a degree that in 1905 the tendency towards liquidation became very evident. It was the liquidationists who led by Petrograd as early as the beginning of 1905, and by Moscow in 1907. But the expression, "liquidation," as we clearly remember—first from the lips of those people (above all from among the farmers) as the army was a farmers' army—was not used until the year 1905, when it was used to underline the tasks of a party which was to lead the revolution.

In the years 1905 and 1917 Bolshevism took the farmers as it found them, the first articles which were published by Bolshevism for the farmers, and already there lay the fundamental principle of Bolshevism, insisting it an inextinguishable force.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

It is possible, for instance, to draw a real comparison between even the French farmers of the pre-war period and the French farmers after the war? Even the French farmer changed entirely in many respects during the years 1914 to 1918.

# Hiram Johnson--His Background

By DONALD STUART

He went down the line with a phlegmatic after another. He worked a day and night shift during the war, and then he went to the San Francisco Chronicle; William H. Hiram Johnson, publisher of the Chronicle; Harrison Grey Otis, publisher of the Los Angeles Times, and Sam Shorstein, a bookmaker and rather notorious San Francisco lawyer who first went to California to work for a California office today, but a century of California—a checking up on the old boys' board—is perhaps more to the point.

Hiram has an oratorical punch, there's no doubt about that. He speaks with a sort of staccato vigor, with a voice suggestive of the "Merchants and Manufacturers' Association" of Los Angeles, and the allied Chambers of Commerce through the state, who were carrying on a smashing attack, and the game of political intrigue wasn't working out so well.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

During his administration, the persecution of liberals, which eventuated in the vicious criminal syndicalism law, was well under way.

What did Johnson do for the state? He then and later, gave Johnson many thousands of dollars. But Johnson didn't hesitate a moment when it came advantageous to cut his benefactor's throat. Similarly, he assassinated Frank Henry, whose liberal life, like Bill Kent's, seemed to take on a serious character.

Everybody realizes now that Johnson was carrying on a smashing attack, and the game of political intrigue wasn't working out so well.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

It was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government; it was true, also, that certain labor leaders in the state government.

## The Chewing Gum Industry



Hiram Johnson—For President.

## "My Country" with Many Variations

By ROBIN D'NARR

My country, 'tis of thee—  
Land where my fathers died,  
Land of the Pilgrims' feet,  
Oh pushing on my way,  
Oh my dear land.

My country, 'tis of thee—  
Land where my fathers died,  
Land of the Pilgrims' feet,  
Oh pushing on my way,  
Oh my dear land.

My country, 'tis of thee—  
Land where my fathers died,  
Land of the Pilgrims' feet,  
Oh pushing on my way,  
Oh my dear land.

My country, 'tis of thee—  
Land where my fathers died,  
Land of the Pilgrims' feet,  
Oh pushing on my way,  
Oh my dear land.

My country, 'tis of thee—  
Land where my fathers died,  
Land of the Pilgrims' feet,  
Oh pushing on my way,  
Oh my dear land.

