

few "bees" "hogging" all the "honey," while the many were existing precariously and unpleasantly on New Orleans molasses.

But until the people of this country can be induced to take their own under the reasonable and rational system of land taxation let us have the inheritance tax proposed by Mr. Carnegie. Let us have any tax that will give the slightest relief from the present intolerable system that throws the burden on those least able to bear it and on those who receive the smallest benefits from government.

Every step that is taken toward the dispersion of over-grown fortunes brings us nearer to a fair and equitable distribution of wealth and that is the great problem to be solved.

\* \* \*

## POLITICAL PARTIES IN RUSSIA.

From an Interview with Professor Samuel N. Harper, as Published in the Chicago Chronicle of December 9, 1906. Professor Harper Has Recently Returned from Russia.

There are in Russia three general parties—a Reactionary, a Revolutionary and a Reform party. The last two are often confused or viewed as one, though their principles and policies are really radically different.

### Revolutionary Parties.

The Revolutionary parties are: The Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists, the Jewish bund and a few smaller parties. They are working for a democratic republic, a socialistic order. They believe that reforms can be secured only through revolution. They are propagating for an armed uprising of the peasants and workmen. They are trying to spread disaffection among the troops.

The Social Revolutionists admit terroristic acts as a temporary weapon of combat, but not as a principle. They are the revolutionists who killed Von Plehve, Sergius and the rest. But they do not recognize petty terrorism such as police murders and holdups for political purposes. The Moscow bank robbery and the attempted assassination of Stolypin were not their work, but that of a small group which had seceded from the party. They denied officially the Stolypin attempt, which had been laid at their door. They are much embarrassed by the uncontrolled development of terroristic acts due to their adopting this weapon for extreme cases.

The Social Democrats do not admit terroristic acts at all. The Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists do not work together harmoniously. They are always burying the hatchet, but the co-operation never lasts very long. The Social Democrats are themselves split up into two distinct factions which expend much of their energy in purely partisan polemics. To summarize the distinction between Social Democrats and Social Revolutionists in a single word, the former are more theoretical, doctrinarian socialists; the latter more practical, social and revolutionary workers. Both are antagonistic to the bourgeois reformers—the Social Democrats particularly.

These actual revolutionary workers are a small but most active minority. Their methods of combat, however, tend to give them a disproportionate prominence and they are rapidly gaining ground among the peasants. The workmen are already with them.

### Reactionary Parties.

The Reactionary parties are also not large. The official figures are several times larger than the opposition will admit. The opposition accuses the Government of supporting these reactionary organizations, of aiding them with funds, of allowing them privileges denied to others, such as freedom of meeting, etc. These organizations are held to be responsible for the policy of organized massacre. The official organs of some of these reactionary groups come out quite frankly with most insidious accusations against the Jews and liberal intelligence. They lay all the blame for this reform movement upon the Jews, thereby trying to arouse false sentiments of patriotism among the most ignorant classes.

Unfortunately there have been instances of the clergy preaching in this same tone. The creed of these reactionaries is "Russia for the Russians." They called themselves the "Union of Russian Patriots," the "League of Sincere Russians," etc. They support an autocracy—a firm sovereign authority. They are now urging a change in the electoral law which shall insure against a second Douma of the radical character of the first.

### Reform Parties.

The Constitutional Democrats, Professor Milyoukov's party, present the type of the Reform organizations. Their name indicates their program. They hope to bring about reforms by legal measures. The extent of protest to which they will go is indicated in the passive resistance policy they advocated in the Viborg appeal, but admitted that the program of passive resistance, especially the refusal to give recruits, could not be applied at the present moment.

They demand more concessions than the Government has consented to give, especially insisting upon ministerial responsibility. The Cadets, as the Constitutional Democrats are called for the sake of brevity, are accused of not drawing a sufficiently clear line of distinction between themselves and the revolutionists. Perhaps during the Douma session they gave way too much to the influence and pressure exerted by the radical groups. Their excuse, however, was the necessity of maintaining the support and co-operation of radicals in order to control and direct them. As I shall try to explain later, it is this care to win over the support of the people that dictates in a large degree the policy of all these three tendencies.

The other Reform parties are the Octobrists and the Party of Peaceful Regeneration. The latter was organized out of the former by Count Heyden assuming a more definite and radical liberal tone. The Peaceful Regenerationists refused to participate in Stolypin's ministry.

The Octobrists, so called because they have taken the manifesto of October, 1905, the manifesto which was the promise of a constitutional form of government, as their policy, are the only reform party

which is supporting the government at the present time. They are under the leadership of M. Guchkov.

**All Parties Face the Agrarian Problem.**

As I said before, all these parties are working for the support of the people—that is, the workmen and the peasants. The peasants are 90 per cent. of the population. This without commentary explains why the dominating factor in this whole crisis is the agrarian problem. It is an economic and social as much as a political crisis. The peasants are in a pitiable condition; there is an insufficient amount of land in their actual possession; the standard of cultivation is very low; the price of land to be bought or rented is very high. The peasants' poverty reflects on industry because there is no home market. The peasants were still subjected to class instructions and administrative tutelage until a few weeks ago, when a ukase gave them equal rights.

The Revolutionist and Socialist demand for the peasants the forcible expropriation without recompense of state, church and even private lands. The watchword of the Revolutionist propagandists is "land and liberty." The Social Revolutionists demand the abolition of all private property—the forming of a national fund of land to be leased to all who wish to till it, with the establishing of an elementary form of land tenure.

The Constitutional Democrats demand also expropriation of crown lands and forcible expropriation of private lands with just compensation. It is this clause in their program which is the most radical—more radical than many of its members like. It was inserted in order to get the support of the peasants.

Even the Octobrists admit the necessity of expropriation. But five months ago the Government in the declaration to the Douma said emphatically that no expropriation could be permitted. This was the beginning of the conflict between the Government and the Douma which led eventually to the latter's dissolution. The immediate cause of the dissolution of the Douma was the passage of a resolution interpreted by the Government as an appeal to the people, in which the Douma stated that it had decided upon a certain amount of forcible expropriation, and asked the peasants to wait peaceably and quietly until the Douma could formulate its definite agrarian bill. This resolution was put through by the Constitutional Democrats alone. The radicals abstained from voting. They could not accept the two expressions, "expropriation with just compensation" and "wait peaceably."

Since the dissolution of the Douma the government has transferred large tracts of appanage and crown land to the Peasants' bank, to be offered for sale to the peasants. This would seem to be an absolute change of policy, for these sales imply an admission of the principle of expropriation. The Liberals and Revolutionists say quite frankly that the Government could have stopped the present political movement by solving the agrarian problem two years ago. The steps taken now are considered insufficient. The agitation has increased the demands and hope of the peasants. The competition for land has raised the price enormously. The Peasant banks have been mere speculative institu-

tions, and have contributed largely to the abnormal raising of prices.

**The Government Attitude Toward the Different Parties.**

What, now is the position of Stolypin among and toward these three tendencies—Revolutionary, Reform and Reactionary?

In the first place, he has sent instructions to all government employes forbidding them to belong to any of the Revolutionary parties, or parties which by their acts (the signing of the Viborg appeal, for instance) are working against the Government. This includes the Constitutional Democrats. Stolypin promised to allow all freedom to the expression of public opinion as long as this freedom was not used for revolutionary propaganda. He refused to allow the Constitutional Democrats to hold a congress. They were obliged to hold it in Finland.

On the other hand, Stolypin is combating the Reactionary parties, censuring in several instances a too enthusiastic expression of patriotism. But he has not been firm enough in this course to avoid being charged by the opposition with openly fostering reaction.

Stolypin holds that there must be order before there can be reform. The opposition insists that there can not be order until there is reform.



**A DREAM.**

For The Public.

"Prepare for rhyme—I'll publish, right or wrong:  
Fools are my theme, let satire be my song."—Byron.

Lyceum statesmen flayed the tramps,

Not very long ago;

Since then I've dreamed of other scamps,

A dream you ought to know.

I dreamed one night that it was day,

And I, with line and hook,

Had gone to wile an hour away.

Down by the babbling brook.

While wandering along the banks,

I heard familiar chatter:

"Is it," said I, "our Lyceum cranks,

Or just the babbling water?"

"Oh, no! The water makes no stir,

So dried up is the stream,

But mulletheads are talking, sir,

And 'floaters' are their theme—"

So spake a turtle, and 'twas so;

Then slipping from the stone,

He dove into the pool below

And left me there alone.

Then gazing in the pool I saw

What I shall ne'er forget—

A lean fish laying down the law;

I see him at it yet.

He stood upright on forked tail;

All confident was he

That homeless fish belonged in jail,

Or else in Kankakee.

This closed the opening speech, and then

All fish-fins flapped applause;

Then gars and tadpoles urged, like men,

"Enforcement of the laws."

At last a mountain trout thus spake—

No mullethead was he: