

WHY?

A Bulletin of
Free Inquiry

Vol. III, No. 1 Apr.-May, 1944

IN MEMORIAM: May 1, U.S.A.

May first, the day that symbolizes the potential strength of the workers of the world, is a thing of the past. Once there were May Days when men and women put down their tools, left their machines, and came out from the factories into the streets imbued with a spirit of defiance. The political and economic masters of the world were told in prose and in verse, "today is yours, but tomorrow is ours."

Those were the days when people were still hoping and fighting for a better world. A world with all freedoms, not only four! They were fighting for a society in which "might would not be right". They were fighting for a new life.

Today, unfortunately, it is the odd one who dares to raise his voice above the chorus of universal submission and dares to voice his opposition to the present day organization of society. We do not come out openly like the Haymarket Martyrs did in 1886 and proclaim to the world our ideas of social and economic change. A mass meeting similar to the one that took place in Haymarket Square, May 4, 1886, is hardly conceivable today in the United States.

Yet the development of the organized labor movement in this country was given impetus by that fight for an eight hour day. Unionism meant the solidarity of all workers for a common cause. The issues were clear cut and there were no political entanglements to divert and dissipate the energies of the workers. The people were militant; furthermore, they were idealists and were willing to die for their beliefs.

Out of this struggle came May First. And from 1887 on each succeeding May Day presented a tremendous threat to the existing scheme of things. Each May First was really a prelude to the ultimate general strike which will be the turning point for all the workers of the world. This will be the moment when all the human parasites will be dispossessed and society will be rearranged by its members for the benefit of all.

Well, let us not fool ourselves. The preludes have temporarily ceased. Tradition has been broken. Very good! May First was beginning to mean nothing but a fanfare and a grandiose display of the Communist Party and all its satellites. The Communist Party did a thorough job of corrupting the meaning and purpose of May Day. One year Red Flags swung in the breeze on May Day and the next year "Old Glories were up there"; one year the Yanks were not coming and the next year they were already "over there". The Communists did to May Day what they did to every other decent working class institution: they exploited it for the sole benefit of the Soviet Union.

It is time that we all started anew to build the type of world that the original May Firsters attempted to inaugurate; a world without economic, social or political classes. A truly classless society! And as our eyes turn to the May Firsts of the future we do so with a fervent hope that the beginnings of a new social order will somehow arise from the ruins of the post-war world.

Labor in the Post-War World

"Outstanding representatives of labor and industry joined yesterday in declaring that the free enterprise system constitutes the base of the democratic way of life, and advocated voluntary cooperation by industry, workers and agriculture, with government acting only as an umpire, as the most desirable method for achieving the greatest possible measure of post-war prosperity.

Agreement on this policy was expressed by William Green, President, and George Meany, Secretary of the American Federation of Labor; Eric Johnston, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Robert Gaylord, president of the National Association of Manufacturers."

(New York Times, April 14, 1944)

The above quotation is illuminating in so far as it reveals the position of the A.F. of L. on two important questions. First, class collaboration, and second, capitalism. The A. F. of L. reiterates that it adheres to the policy of collaboration between master and slave. When the leaders of the A. F. of L. talk of this collaboration as being necessary for "... capital and labor", they mean that they cannot stay in power unless they defend the bosses upon whose good-will they depend. When the capitalist, as represented by the National Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, talk of cooperation with "labor", they mean that they cannot function properly unless they can command the aristocracy of labor (leaders) to keep the workers docile and to prevent strikes. To the A. F. of L. and their capitalist allies, "... achieving the greatest possible measure of post-war prosperity" simply means that things shall be as they have been in the past. The union members will pay their dues (via the check-off system), work like hell, while the employers and the yes-men of the labor bureaucracy will rake in the shekels.

Why, however, should the A. F. of L. insist on having government act only as an "umpire" between capital, labor and agriculture? Why should the A. F. of L. endorse the system of "free enterprise" capitalism? The answer to these questions can be found in the whole history of capitalist development in America. The A. F. of L. is a form of labor organization based on private competitive capitalism. Its craft union structure paralleled the pre-trust organization of industry. A strongly entrenched bureaucratic labor regime ruled the A. F. of L. They were able to keep their post by cooperating with the capitalist against the unruly elements in or outside the A. F. of L. The downfall of free capitalism is a catastrophe of major proportions not only to the National Asso-

ciation of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, but also to the leaders of the A. F. of L., whose continuance in office depends on free enterprise capitalism. They meet on common ground. They do not want the government to "horn in" on their racket. The government bureaucracy is ever more inclined to take over privileges and functions of the free enterprise capitalists.

In the war between free capitalism and emerging state capitalism, the latter favors the C. I. O. The C. I. O. is a form of so-called industrial unionism ideally suited and geared to government controlled industry and to the administrative mechanism of fascism. This explains in great part the help the government has given in establishing the C. I. O. in its present position of power by enacting legislation favorable to its growth. The rivalry between the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. reflects the struggle between the *laissez-faire* capitalists and those who, together with the now expanding government bureaucracy, are erecting state capitalism. The post war world, the "century of the common man" as seen by the leaders of the C. I. O. will be the cooperation of "labor and government". The big shots of the C. I. O., well paid and pampered, will keep the workers from upsetting the state capitalistic apple-cart; and should they be unable to control the workers the government will step in and take over.

In this struggle of divergent tendencies the workers, as usual, are the victims. They have the delightful alternative of being sold out by the A. F. of L. class collaborationists, or of being delivered, by the C. I. O. government collaborationists, to be exploited and regimented by state capitalists.

As it becomes more and more apparent to the workers that they are left "holding the bag", they are showing their discontent. They want to know why the hourly increase in wages, according to Mr. Roosevelt, amounts to less than one and a half percent, while the cost of living, according to George Meany (A. F. of L.) and Philip Murray (C. I. O.) has gone up forty three percent. The rank and file of both organizations are putting the pressure on their "leaders" to either get them more wages or decrease the cost of living. Since the "leaders" can do neither, the workers are threatening to rescind the no strike pledge and to get what they want by the use of their own economic power.

TO THE BOILING POINT

Wild-cat strikes are on the increase and are wide spread. According to the **Industrial Worker**, the past week has seen strikes in Chicago, Illinois; Birmingham, Alabama; Detroit, Michigan; Paxon-goula, Mississippi; Breckenridge, Pennsylvania; Hartford and New Haven, Connecticut. This is only a partial list.

The post-war period will find existing grievances aggravated by the stoppage of war production. We can look for a resurgence of militancy by the workers. The simmering discontent with their union leadership, now held in check, will flare up. Finding themselves jobless and betrayed, they will be ready for action. They will look for a solution of their problems.

What the so-called friends of labor will have to offer them can easily be ascertained from their present attitude. The literature of the liberals, social-democrats, communists and other "progressive" elements is full of advice to labor. Some favor more government collaboration, others are for a "labor party." Some, like Max Eastman and John T. Flynn, are aware of the danger of state capitalism. However, they are very vague when it comes to the question of what is to be done about it. They seem to see the solution of the tragic dilemma of the workers only within the limits of the present system of society. They do not suggest that no equitable solution is possible under the existing social order. The advent of war and fascism, and the failure of the New Deal have further confused the already muddled host of non-revolutionary, socialistic and liberal elements.

We feel then that the time has come to reiterate some old-fashioned and long forgotten truths. No solution of the social problem is possible under private or state capitalism. The emancipation of the working class can only be accomplished by the workers themselves. This can be done only when the workers use direct action and mobilize their economic powers for the overthrow of statism and capitalism. The workers must not rely on self appointed or state appointed leaders to do this for them. **Socialism without freedom is slavery!**

These truths must be made clear to the exploited in all lands. The true character of the C. I. O. and of the A. F. of L. must be exposed. In the post-war world labor will have to face the same old problem, the destruction of the existing system of society and the building of a new world in which freedom and humaneness will permeate all social undertakings. What is needed is the establishment of a new revolutionary labor movement, capable of meeting this heroic task.

—Charles Storm

On the long voyage towards home it was a relief on arriving in Scotland to stop over and visit some fellow workers in Glasgow. They are really a fine bunch of young fellows that any libertarian in the world would be proud of. They are all energetic and active rebels, practicing what they preach. Take young Alan Burnett, for instance: he told me he was going to have something to say when he appears for medical examination for preinduction into the army. Boy, did he say plenty! "I refuse to be pitchforked or led into slaughter like so much human manure, or to be duped into the lunatic butchery of my comrades and fellow workers of other geographical spheres who are likewise enslaved in a system of organized misery imposed upon them by their respective ruling classes."

In my estimation, it requires more guts to take such a stand than to consent to become so much cannon fodder. If the slaves the world over would bethink themselves and instead of slaughtering one another would each take a tool of war and return to his own dwelling such an act would mean the greatest victory they have ever achieved.

But how silly of me to talk like that! What would happen to the Four Freedoms? What four freedoms, one asks? Oh, well, the freedom of the Italian masses to live under their beloved king and Badoglio, the freedom of thousands of real fighters for liberty who are languishing in fascist concentration camps to be barred admission to these United States, and many other freedoms that aren't worth anything.

* * *

How is it easier to die? Joseph Djughashvili better known as Stalin has nothing over Schickelgruber when it comes to killing. Hitler's Gestapo kills and tortures opponents to death for being jews and marxists, while Stalin and his N.K.V.D. (formerly O.G.P.U.) tortures and kills opponents for being Trotzkyites, mad-dog fascists and Hitler agents. Would it have been harder for the two Jewish Labor leaders, Alter and Erlich, to die as jew marxists under the axe of Hitler than as fascist traitors before Stalin's firing squad?

—Lead Line

(Ed. Note. With the above we welcome back Lead Line after a long absence on the high seas)

THEY CALL IT

We hear a lot of talk about free enterprise, nowadays. The Western Democracies, we are told, are out to make the world safe for free enterprise. "Substantial" people, the mouthpieces of big business, have no use for such slogans as "world democracy", "the common man", liberalism and progressivism. For twenty years they have looked up to fascism and nazism as their great hope for continued rule in the future. Then they reluctantly consented to wage a halfhearted war against the Axis — and mainly against the Oriental end of the Axis — on this condition: that no starry-eyed ideology should be allowed to take form anywhere in the world liberated by the United Nations, and that peace should be founded on the time-proved bulwark of free enterprise.

For this reason has the direction of the total war against the fascist Axis been allowed to remain in the hands of so many past admirers of fascism.

The architects of the future world peace have well advanced plans to this effect. The Russian Government itself has renounced its former designs of universal bolshevism and lately paid its respects to the shining myth of free enterprise. In the "liberated" countries free enterprise is respected to the point of giving fascist and nazi thieves and speculators the maximum freedom to operate the public and the black markets.

In the United States a few weeks ago Messrs. Baruch and Hancock presented the President and the country with a plan for the demobilization of war industries, which was immediately accepted by the Administration. "Businessmen have slept easier" — wrote a conservative newspaperman from Washington — "since the Baruch report came out and the White House moved to put it into effect in toto. Mr. Baruch, a staunch disciple of free enterprise, built his program for reconversion and re-employment around conservative established business principles".

Thus we shall have — if the planners succeed in their endeavour — free enterprise both at home and abroad.

But what is meant by free enterprise?

Enterprise is used here in the sense of undertaking in the economic field. Free enterprise means, therefore, an undertaking in the economic field which is not coerced by any extraneous force or power.

In plain words, free enterprise should mean that any one who is willing to work shall have the means to do so — that is: a place to work at, tools to work with, raw materials to work on. For the

raw materials he works on he can give compensation with his finished product, therefore, he needs also the opportunity to dispose of his finished or processed commodities.

But there is no one entitled to compensation for the space or tools he needs. Space is given by nature to all men with no preference whatever; tools are the accumulated knowledge and labor of all the past generations and no one has any particular moral right to appropriate them to the exclusion of others and exact a price for them.

Free enterprise supposes therefore free land — space, soil, natural resources — and free capital — tools, machinery, etc. Unless these conditions exist, free enterprise is impossible.

Of course, these conditions do not exist in modern society anywhere in the world, and, of course, they are not contemplated in the Baruch report, nor by the official and private architects of the future order. In fact such promoters of free enterprise are very well determined that they shall never exist.

What they mean by free enterprise is the capitalist system of private monopolies — free from Government control. "The less Government in business the better" — says Mr. Baruch, the venerated disciple of free enterprise.

Now Government in business is certainly a calamity. It is bad enough to have the Government in its traditional roles of policeman, judge, hangman and tax-collector. Should it add to all these unpleasant functions the roles of master of economic resources and universal employer of its subjects, it would be a boss who has the power to make its own laws and execute them. Should mankind accept such a system, it would go back to ancient forms of slavery. State power would have no limit, it would have absolute control over all phases of individual life.

But how free is the capitalist system, uncontrolled by Government?

In the capitalist system all economic freedom — without which civil liberty and political freedom are mere hopes and illusion — is denied to the overwhelming majority of the people. Land and natural resources and capital are privately owned. This means they are subject to the private monopoly of a minority of men and women who exact from society a tribute in order to let them be em-

FREE ENTERPRISE

ployed. And this means again that in order to cultivate the soil of the earth, to use the cumulative knowledge of mankind for the purpose of producing all the things that are necessary to satisfy even the most elementary needs of life, humanity lets itself be blackmailed by the few monopolists who have appropriated what should rightfully belong to all.

Even if the practical effects of this colossal blackmail were not visible to every one in every day life, it should not be hard to understand that the private monopoly of all the land, of all natural resources, of all the capital accumulated by the unceasing effort of thousands of generations of toiling men and women, must create such a colossal power that nothing can resist, since humanity itself has been forced from time immemorial to surrender to its cant. How then is it conceivable that Government — which is but a partial expression of human energy — will ever be in a position to control or limit the "freedom" of such economic power?

Plainly, it is impossible. When the schemers of capitalism speak of free enterprise they must mean something else, for Government cannot threaten the economic power of capitalism.

In fact Government is never free from the power of capitalism. In fact, Government — even in its more democratic forms — is always subservient to it.

About thirty years ago an American scholar, Gustavus Myers, wrote several books relating the "History of the Great American Fortunes", wherein the story of the birth and development of Capitalism in America is told. "The great fortunes — he says — are the natural, logical outcome of a system based upon factors the inevitable result of which is the utter despoilment of the many for the benefit of the few". Following the rise and development of capitalism in the U.S., G. Myers was bound to discover its relations to the Government; and in a subsequent book, "History of the Supreme Court of the United States", he states that this history "reveals the true sources of primitive accumulation of wealth which necessarily beginning with the appropriation of land and dispossession of the workers, have extended to the elaborate and conjoined forms of capitalist power subsisting today." Capitalist "free enterprise" thinks and designs its frauds, its usurpations, its monopolies;

but they do not become "legitimate" until the Government has sanctioned them. "Probably — the late Mr. Myers continues — "a dominant class must have some supreme institution through which it can express its consecutive demands and enforce its will . . . In the United States, the one all-potent institution automatically responding to these demands and enforcing them has been the Supreme Court of the United States." The Justices of the Supreme Court are not necessarily rogues and thieves. He vouches that most of them were personally honest. But — concludes Myers — "Under these circumstances a great succession of privileges and powers are given gratuitously, and class corruption appears as honest conviction because of absence of personal temptations and benefits on the part of the Justices. In this deceptive and insidious guise supreme judicial acts go forth to claim the respect and submission of the working class against whom the decisions are applied."

The Supreme Court is the highest of all governmental institutions to which private monopoly goes for the sanctification of its more or less ill-gotten privileges, but it is by no means the only one. Before they reach the Supreme Court, the acts of Government pass through the legislative stage, then through the executive bureaus. Each member of Congress, each bureau of Government, each branch of the judicial organization is constantly besieged by representatives of the vested interests seeking sanction to a privilege, encouragement or protection to a particular deal or set of deals. In a series of essays on the "Invisible Congress" (The New Republic, March 20, 1944) Helen Fuller states that "there are now, in this country, more than one thousand trade associations, and it is considered highly unlikely by those who know that any one of them is now without a Washington agent of some kind." She relates that the Clerk of the District of Columbia now says that "The last time we started to count (lobbyists) somebody got above 10,000 before he got tired and quit. I figure there's between 10,000 and 15,000 here now." "Big business and big farmers know what they want and have laid down a line of action for their agents to follow in getting it."

That their agents know how to get it is proved beyond a shadow of a doubt by the success of lobbying as a career. It is proved, furthermore, by the way the capitalist class of the United States — which has long admired fascism — has taken up the direction of the war economic mobilization within the offices of the Administration. It shows that capitalism considers war and peace-making as

(Continued on page 10)

ANARCHISM

Part III.

ANARCHISM AND VIOLENCE — The Jurassic, the Spanish, and the Italian federation and sections of the International Working Men's Association, as also the French, the German and the American anarchist groups, were for the next years the chief centers of anarchist thought and propaganda. They refrained from any participation in parliamentary politics, and always kept in close contact with the Labor organizations. However, in the second half of the '80s and the early '90s of the 19th century, when the influence of the anarchists began to be felt in strikes, in May-day demonstrations, where they promoted the idea of a general strike for an eight-hour day, and in the anti-militarist propaganda in the army, violent prosecutions were directed against them, especially in the Latin countries (including physical torture in the Barcelona castle) and the United States (the execution of five Chicago anarchists in 1887.) Against these prosecutions the anarchists retaliated by acts of violence which in their turn were followed by more executions from above, and new acts of revenge from below. This created in the general public the impression that violence is the substance of anarchism, a view repudiated by its supporters, who hold that in reality violence is resorted to by all parties in proportion as their open action is obstructed by repression, and exceptional laws render them outlaws. (Cf., *Anarchism and Outrage*, by C. M. Wilson; and *Report of the Spanish Atrocities Committee*, in "Freedom Pamphlets"; *A Concise History of the Great Trial of the Chicago Anarchists*, by Dyer Lum (N.Y. 1886); *The Chicago Martyrs: Speeches*, etc.).

Anarchism continued to develop, partly in the direction of Proudhonian "Mutuellisme", but chiefly as Communist-anarchism, to which a third direction, Christian-anarchism, was added by Leo Tolstoi, and a fourth, which might be ascribed as literary anarchism began amongst prominent modern writers.

The ideas of Proudhon, especially as regards mutual banking, corresponding with those of Josiah Warren, found a considerable following in the United States, creating quite a school, of which the main writers are Stephen Pearl Andrews, William Grene, Lysander Spooner (who began to write in 1850 and whose unfinished work, *Natural Law*, was full of promise) and several others, whose names will be found in Dr. Nettlau's *Bibliographie de l'anarchisme*.

A prominent position among the individualist anarchists in America has been occupied by Benjamin R. Tucker. His journal *Liberty* was started in 1881 and his conceptions are a combination of those of Proudhon with those of Herbert Spencer. Starting from the statement that anarchists are egotists, strictly speaking, and that every group of individuals, be it a secret league of a few persons, or the Congress of the United States, has the right to oppress all mankind, provided it has the power to do so, that equal liberty for all and absolute equality ought to be the law, and "mind everyone your own business" is the unique moral law of anarchism. Tucker goes on to prove that a general and thorough application of these principles

would be beneficial and would offer no danger, because the powers of every individual would be limited by the exercise of the equal right of all others. He further indicated (following H. Spencer) the difference which exists between the encroachment on somebody's rights and resistance to such an encroachment, between domination and defense: the former being equally condemnable, whether it be encroachment of a criminal upon an individual, or the encroachment of one upon all others, or of all others upon one; while resistance to encroachment is defensible and necessary.

For their self-defense, both the citizen and the group have the right to any violence including capital punishment. Violence is also justified for enforcing the duty of keeping an agreement. Tucker thus follows Spencer, and, like him, opens (in the present writer's opinion) the way for reconstituting under the heading of "defense" all the functions of the State. His criticisms of the present State is very searching, and his defense of the rights of the individual very powerful. As regards his economical views B. R. Tucker follows Proudhon.

The individualist anarchism of the American Proudhonians finds, however, but little sympathy amongst the working masses. Those who profess it—they are chiefly "intellectuals"—soon realize that the individualization they so highly praise is not attainable by individual efforts, and either abandon the ranks of the anarchists, and are driven into the liberal individualism of the classical economists, or they retire into a sort of Epicurean amoralism, or super-man theory, similar to that of Stirner and Nietzsche. The great bulk of the anarchist working men prefer the anarchist-communist ideas which have gradually evolved out of the anarchist collectivism of the International Working Men's Association. To this direction belong — to name only the better known exponents of Anarchism—Elisee Reclus, Jean Grave, Sebastien Faure, Emile Pouget in France; Errico Malatesta and Covelli in Italy; E. Mella, A. Lorenzo and the mostly unknown authors of many excellent manifestos in Spain; John Most amongst the Germans; Parsons, Spies and their followers in the United States, and so on; while Damela Nieuwenhuis occupied an intermediate position in Holland. The chief anarchist papers which have been published since 1880 also belong to that direction; while a number of anarchists of this direction have joined the so called syndicalist movement—the French name for the non-political Labor movement, devoted to direct struggle with capitalism, which has lately become so prominent in Europe.

SCIENTIFIC ANARCHIST-COMMUNISM. As one of the anarchist-communist direction, the present writer for many years endeavoured to develop the following ideas: to show the intimate, logical connection which exists between the modern philosophy of natural sciences and anarchism; to put anarchism on a scientific basis by the study of the tendencies that are apparent now in society and may indicate its further evolution; and to work out the basis of anarchist ethics. As regards the substance itself, it was Kropotkin's aim to prove that Communism—at least partial—has more

By Peter Kropotkin

from Encyclopedia Britannica

OFF THE PRESS

chance of being established than collectivism, especially in communes taking the lead, and that free, or anarchist-Communism is the only form of Communism that has any chance of being accepted in civilized societies; Communism and anarchy are therefore two terms of evolution which complete each other, the one rendering the other possible and acceptable. He has tried, moreover, to indicate how, during a revolutionary period, a large city—if its inhabitants have accepted the idea, could organize itself on the lines of free Communism; the city guarantees to every inhabitant dwelling, food and clothing to an extent corresponding to the comfort now available to the middle classes only, in exchange for a half-day's or a five hours' work; and how all those things which would be considered as luxuries might be obtained by every one if he joins for the other half of the day all sorts of free associations pursuing all possible aims—educational, literary, scientific, artistic, sports and so on. In order to prove the first of these assertions he has analysed the possibilities of agriculture and industrial work, both being combined with brain work. And in order to elucidate the main factors of human evolution he has analysed the part played in history by the popular constructive agencies of mutual aid and the historic role of the State.

Without naming himself an anarchist, Leo Tolstoi, like his predecessors in the popular religious movements of the 15th. and 16th. centuries, Chojecki, Derrek and many others, took the un-anarchist position, as regards the State and property rights, deducing his conclusions from the general teachings of the Christ, and from the necessary dictates of reason. With all the might of his talent he made, (especially in "The Kingdom of God in Yourselves") a powerful criticism of the Church, the State and law altogether, and especially of the present property laws. He describes the State as the domination of the wicked ones, supported by brutal force. Robbers, he says are far less dangerous than a well organized Government. He makes a searching criticism of the prejudices which are current now concerning the benefits conferred upon men by the Church, the State and the existing distribution of property, and from the teaching of Christ he deduces the rule of non-resistance and the absolute condemnation of all wars. His religious arguments are, however, so well combined with arguments borrowed from a dispassionate observation of the present evils, that the anarchist portion of his works appeal to the religious and the non-religious reader alike.

It would be impossible to represent here, in a short sketch, the penetration on the one hand of anarchist ideas into modern literature and the influence, on the other hand, which the libertarian ideas of the best contemporary writers have exercised upon the development of anarchism. One ought to consult the ten big volumes of the "Supplement litteraire" to the paper the "Temps Nouveaux" which contain reproductions from the works of hundreds of modern authors expressing anarchist ideas, in order to realize how closely anarchism is connected with all the intellectual movement of our times. J. S. Mills, "Liberty". Spencer's "Individual versus the State", Marc Guyau's

We have available for those interested a few copies of each of the following books and pamphlets:

| | |
|---|-----|
| NOW | .50 |
| A publication of a series of occasional volumes of social and literary writings. | |
| Trade Unionism or Syndicalism? | |
| by Tom Brown | .10 |
| The British General Strike by Tom Brown..... | .10 |
| Vote, What For? by Errico Malatesta | .10 |
| Anarchy by Errico Malatesta | .10 |
| Selections from Political Justice | |
| by William Godwin | .10 |
| The Russian Myth, Freedom Press | .10 |
| The Kronstadt Revolt by Anton Ciliga | .10 |
| Slaves to Duty by John Badcock | .10 |
| The State: Its Historic Role by P. Kropotkin..... | |
| Abridged: | .05 |
| Unabridged | .25 |
| Revolutionary Government by P. Kropotkin | .10 |
| The Wage System by Peter Kropotkin | .10 |
| Peter Kropotkin: His Federalist Ideas | |
| by C. Berneri | .10 |
| Kropotkin: Selections from his Writings | |
| by Herbert Reade | .65 |
| Cooperative Decentralization | |
| by James Peter Warbasse | .10 |
| New Life to the Land by George Woodcock..... | .10 |
| Railways and Society by George Woodcock..... | .10 |
| The Struggle for Liberty in Spain | |
| a Free Italy Publication | .10 |
| Social Reconstruction in Spain | |
| by Gaston Leval | .10 |
| Three Years of Struggle in Spain 1936-1939 | |
| A Freedom Press Publication | .05 |
| The March to Death by John Olday | .35 |
| In a series of satirical drawings, John Olday has exposed in an uncompromising fashion, the hypocrisy and the sham of modern war. | |

"Morality without obligation or Sanction", and Fouille's "La Morale. L'art et la religion", the works of Multatuli (E. Douwes Dekker), Richard Wagner's "Art and Revolution," the works of Nietzsche, Emerson, W. Lloyd Garrison, Thoureau, Alexander Herzen, Edward Carpenter, and so on; and in the domain of fiction, the dramas of Ibsen, the poetry of Walt Whitman, Tolstoi's 'War and Peace', Zola's 'Paris' and 'Le Travail', the works of Merezhkovski and an infinity of works of less known authors, are full of ideas which show how closely anarchism is interwoven with the work that is going on in modern thought in the same direction of enfranchisement of man from the bonds of the State as well as from those of capitalism.

—(P.A.K.)

RALPH BOURNE: Idealist

Political claptrap aside, America does have a heritage of freedom, of fighters for freedom, men whose minds turned upon the ideal of uplifting their fellow-men from the level of cattle to the stature of free individuals. Such men as Tom Paine, Henry Thoreau, Josiah Warren, and Herman Melville are all proof of this heritage. Of course, few Americans can recall who they were, let alone what they stood for. Our state system of education has either ignored them or, worse, buried their genius under the cobwebs of juiceless biographical facts. But for those who believe in freedom, not as a word but as an actuality, the lives of our truly great figures can act as a restorative to sane thinking and, perhaps, courageous action.

One such figure is Randolph Bourne, one of the few intellectual heroes of the last war. During that period of radical backsliding, almost as blatant as nowadays, this heroic hunchback, forsaken by his intellectual set (John Dewey and the "New Republic" crowd), held on firmly in his opposition to the sickening slaughter and the political and economic madness responsible for it. Completely dependent for his bread on what he wrote, Bourne's opposition was all the more heroic in that he had no political group where he might find comradeship and shelter. Alone with his convictions, this deformed dwarf was left to wander the streets of downtown New York until he died of a lung disease three days before Christmas, 1918.

Bourne left a number of books, most important the posthumously published fragments, *Untimely Papers* and *The History of a Literary Radical*. Though well worth the reading (if just for the deadly ironic twist of his style), his writings do not present an all-embracing system of thought like Aristotle, Marx, Pareto or Dewey. Scornful antagonist of anything that smacked of omniscience, Bourne suspected all dogmas whatever their humane pretensions. To hell with the dry rot of doctrinaires; if just the actual facts of poverty and political slavery didn't want to make you blast existing authority to smithereens, then no credo would, no matter how dialectically deft.

To Bourne, Man himself was the end, the individual, not any system or group which masks its

opportunism as the "majority." He would have valued the pious principles of present-day governments for what they're worth: a cruel hoax to ensure the continuance of special privileges, cartels and imperialism. While the people are lulled by talk of "four freedoms", the State follows its natural course of consorting with the enemies of freedom (Badoglio, Franco and what-have-you). For, in his view, the State and the people are indisputably separate, their underlying interests always in conflict.

Bourne saw in War the fundamental division between the people and the State. The people do not make wars, they only lose them. Whether the State conquers or is conquered, the people are always vanquished—by bullets, disease, inflation and the eventual strengthening of the State's authority.

In his *Fragment on the State*, Bourne demonstrated that the American Constitution was a coup d'état against the people, a doctrine framed by men whose first interest was toward property rights. Such a government could act no different than, say, its French colleague in "republicanism," always ready to sell the common man down the river whenever he began to attack property rights (Thiers and the Communards, recent French authorities and the Nazi-enslaved masses). On its side, the American government's crimes against the people have numbered the legal murders of the Haymarket Anarchists, John Brown, Sacco and Vanzetti, Odell Waller and the countless victims of strikes and wars.

Bourne's essay on the State was left uncompleted with his untimely death. But in it and in his letters, his thought was progressing from an uncompromising liberalism to an equally uncompromising revolutionary fervor. In a preface to a new—and shallow—biography by Lewis Filler, Max Lerner, that learned nincompoop, deploras Bourne's tendency toward anarchism, a marked contrast with his own idolization of the "paternal" State.

With the towering crimes of centralized authority as evidence, it is obvious that Randolph Bourne's spirit is as much alive today as the minds of the totalitarian lickspittles are dead.

—W. O'C.

AND IT CAME TO PASS

And it came to pass, in the days of the twentieth century, when the slaves of many lands started beefing and squawking against their masters, that in many a land the slaves were betaken and charmed by certain witch doctors, who taught the slaves many mysterious signs of outstretched arms and clenched fists, of sickles and hammers and swastikas.

And the witch doctors were very sly men.

They kept the slaves' noses to the grindstone and their minds on parades and circuses.

And there was beating of drums and beating of gums.

And when the circuses and parades were at an end, the slaves were told to go back to their tents and report to work on the morrow.

But, behold! Many of the slaves asked: "All well and good, but when do we eat?"

But the witch doctors were very sly men. So were the ju-jus and yahoos, who were well known throughout the land for living off the fat of the land.

They said unto the slaves: "Verily, verily we say unto you, you asked, 'when do we eat?' A very good question. Then we say unto you, 'purge thy ranks of jews and radicals and porkchops will come from ersatz!'"

And in another land, their chief ju-ju said unto them: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, purge thy ranks of Trotskyite-fascists and after five years you will have socialism three times a day."

And purges started in these lands.

Every man who asked again, "when do we eat?", was purged as a killjoy or a saboteur of the great plan.

And there were purges to the left and purges to the right! And there was cannon and thunder!

And the slaves in other lands observing what was happening to their brethren in the lands ruled by the witch doctors, said unto one another: "Rejoice and be exceeding glad that we still live under democracy."

And they rejoiced throughout the lands.

But then again it came to pass that the cry; "When do we eat?" was on the lips of the slaves in all the lands. But apparently the slaves were either very stupid or cowardly, because all the time they were the ones who baked the bread and raised the food to eat, but they handed it over to their masters who rationed out enough to the slaves to keep them alive and working.

It is also known that the masters and witch doctors had control of certain powerful medicines consisting of giggle-water or hootch, and another

potent medicine called propaganda consisting of mularky and hot air.

And when the slaves were charged up, especially with the hot air medicine, they became possessed of evil spirits called nationalism and patriotism.

And the slaves in one land began to hate their brethren in another land.

And behold! They also called one another names, such as dirty jew, wop, limey, heinie, etc.

And they even descended upon one another with thunder sticks and slaughtered one another.

Yet, when one questioned each of the slaves in any one of these lands as to why he is killing his own brethren, each swore, by the bottom of his belly-button, that he is a peace-loving man, but that is was dirty son of a hun who started it all.

Verily this was the truth, for the sons of the tribe of the hun were given an extra shot of hat vicious medicine called nationalism, after which they became raving mad about lebensraum and about heads rolling in the sand.

And all this time the witch doctors, their yap-yaps and their masters laughed in their whiskers and rejoiced and said unto one another, "Verily, verily, brother it is wonderful. We can clip dividend coupons and watch our shares rise, while our slaves are busy bashing one another's kokos, ravaging one another's dwellings, and soaking the good earth with their own blood."

Now it came to pass that there dwelt amongst the slaves in these various lands certain men and women of honesty and righteousness who advised the slaves to desist from their evil ways; and instead of murdering their own brethren, to smite and drive away the witch doctors and masters, and eradicate the evil spirits of nationalism and patriotism from their midst, and then live in brotherly love ever after. In fact as Micah of old put it:—

"Beat your swords into plough-shares and your spears into pruning-hooks. For nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; but they shall sit every man under his own vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid."

But witch doctors and their yap-yaps called those honest, good people, star gazers, utopians and anarchists whose ways are without wisdom and not wise. They urged the duped slaves not to lend their ears to the words of wisdom.

And so, many a moon passed and many a season changed, but the slaves in all the lands are still maiming and butchering each other, ravaging and burning according to the international law of warfare.

—Lead Line

FREE ENTERPRISE *(Con't. from page 5)*

its private business, means to attend to it directly and not to leave it in the hands of "inexperienced" or dreaming professors or jurists. Its leaders are very high in the capital's bureaus and in the nation's leadership.

Nor do the enterprising capitalists limit their activity to the National Government. Their stakes are world wide. They certainly control the foreign policy of the Government, but they have a foreign policy that is all their own. Their business connections with the Axis trusts, before the war and up to Pearl Harbor, have been revealed. It has been revealed also that those connections were planned to be resumed immediately after the war. Undoubtedly the leaders of capitalism will see to it that they are resumed.

And here we have another meaning of free enterprise. Politicians, crack-pots and demagogues may give expression to any "sentimental" or ideological interpretation of the war against fascism; but capitalists are not swayed by rhetoric. They want capitalism to emerge triumphant from the war, even in Germany and Italy and Japan, even if it be nazi, fascist or samurai capitalism; and they intend to co-operate with it as soon as the bloody mess is over.

International cartels are to be resumed, according to plan. They have never been really broken. Some of their clauses may have been suspended due to the war, but relations between United Nations' capitalists and Axis capitalists have been going on and are continuing. Plutocracy's peace plans have to be designed by the plutocrats of the whole world before they are enforced through Government. And cartels are the foundation itself of the future rule and exploitation of all natural and human resources of the world of to-morrow.

This is the real meaning of free enterprise. A monster which is undoubtedly enterprising in a racketeering sort of way, but is certainly not free, because it deprives the overwhelming majority of mankind not only of their economic freedom but also of the means to a decent life; and also because, to insure the profits of capitalism, it restricts industrial progress, and ties the capitalists themselves to each other's jealousy and fear.

Whatever freedom it may possess, it is the freedom of the ancient pirates and the modern racketeers, chained together by the anti-social character of their calling — and the deserved hatred of their fellow men and victims.

—MAX SARTIN

War and Ideals

What should our attitude be toward the war? As anarchists and rebels, we are not for the wars of the capitalist governments that exploit us to the last drop of our blood. Wars, throughout history, were waged to enrich the rich and to extend the powers of the powerful. Their interests in wars are not for the emancipation of the masses, but their interests lie in the world markets and in the exploitation of the technically backward areas of the world.

Their cry of patriotism and nationalism is but a front to spur humanity on into the butchering arena so that they, the capitalists, may cover their bodies with the wealth and power brought to them by the dead and disabled. One other thing is certain, that wars undoubtedly take place when a country is going through a period of social unrest and social revolt. This is done to create a rival interest to distract the peoples' attention from what has become a threat to the power and wealth of the ruling class.

This war is no different from the other wars. We are not fighting fascism nor are we preventing fascism from spreading by participating in the war. The elements of fascism are already at work here. The Allies are not as interested in abolishing fascism as they are interested in maintaining and extending their over-all control. To prove this point we have but to look at the work of AMG in the "liberated" territories of Italy. They have done nothing to replace the fascist leaders and small politicians in these territories. Is this the way to abolish the fascists?

In the first place, the development of fascism was aided by the Allies. In 1919, the movement in Italy was organized to counteract radical tendencies. Now that the fascist powers are threatening the markets of the world, the Allies step forth and declare war. Therefore, we can clearly see that the destruction of fascism is not the aim of the Allies. For in the occupied territories instead of sweeping the fascists out, AMG is still keeping them in power. Furthermore, the United States, England and Russia recognize the legitimate rulers Badoglio and Victor Emanuel, who are the instigators and defenders of this degenerate system. Must we defend such a cause?

Fascism must be destroyed and with it all the totalitarian tendencies existant in the present world order. This cannot be brought about by a

ELIZABETH BYRNE FERM

On April 12th last, Elizabeth Byrne Ferm died at her home in the Ferrer Colony, Stelton, New Jersey, at the age of 86.

Mrs. Ferm was one of the early advocates of progressive education and she developed many methods which have since become accepted practice in progressive schools. She had studied Froebel's "Education of Man" and noted that he said that, "education in its first principles should necessarily be passive, following (only guarding and protecting), not prescriptive, categorical, interfering." However, these principles made little impression on her mind, since she had been taught the prevailing methods and these methods she wished to try out. This she proceeded to do at her first educational appointment in the Brooklyn Guild Settlement, where she took charge of the Kindergarten. She soon noticed that under these methods the children were not really doing anything themselves, but were merely following directions. She turned again to the "Education of Man" for guidance, but such terms as "self activity," "initiative" and "creative activity" were new to her and only added to her puzzlement. Her keen observation of the children's reaction to her proscribed

military victory. It can only be accomplished by the revolutionary action of an aroused united working class.

During the last World War there were more revolutionary activities here, there were many more publications and speakers who spoke against participating in a capitalist war, there was Emma Goldman, Berkman and Galliani, not to mention the many others, regardless of the consequences. They were deported, but their voices could not be silenced; they carried on the fight in Europe.

Charles A. Breckridge, states, "collectively, the working class has in its power to stop war when it chooses. The logical reply of the workers to militarism is organization along class lines. If workingmen refused to produce the implements of war, war would come to an end. If workingmen declined to transport soldiers and supplies, war would be impossible. A general strike, consciously declared by workingmen who refused to be embroiled in disputes with which they were not concerned, would be an invincible argument against war."

C. B.

methods soon caused her to relax some of the directions. For example, she allowed the children to choose their own colors of wool for working designs on the sewing cards. The results were so startling that she soon gave them freedom in all their work and play. She put her newly conceived ideas into practice in every phase of her contact with the children and soon, instead of followers and imitators, the little ones became creators under freedom. She taught them tolerance of one another's activities and wishes, and gradually the obligations of community living came into their lives. It was not a lesson learned from a book, but was the outgrowth of the experiences of the children with the teachers.

She met opposition, of course; she permitted too much freedom and noise, and was accused of turning out anarchists when she herself knew nothing of anarchism or its philosophy. Mrs. Ferm carried on her work at the kindergarten for eight years before the opposition made it necessary for her to terminate her connection.

She and Alexis Ferm decided to open a free school and carry out their own ideas of education. Their experiments included, "The Playhouse" in New Rochelle, a summer camp in New Jersey and another "Playhouse" on Madison St. in New York City. These experiments had to be temporarily shelved on account of the poor health of Alexis Ferm. The years from 1913 to 1920 were spent on a farm in Connecticut.

In 1920, Harry Kelly told Elizabeth Ferm of the Modern School at Stelton. She found, there, children who needed attention. So she and Alexis left their farm and became co-principals of the Modern School. They took over the boarding house, renaming it the "Living House", and started the school in the old barn. By 1925 both Living House and School had been brought into good condition, both financially and educationally under the able guidance of these two believers in free education. They then resigned to allow others to take over this work. But in answer to many requests they returned to Stelton in 1934 to resume the principalship of the Modern School.

Death has dissolved this partnership of a lifetime. But Alexis Ferm is still carrying on the work with the help of a small, but able and devoted, staff.

ALEXIS FERM

Do we want Work?

As Proudhon states, the call of the slaves in Rome was for bread and circuses, but now in this enlightened era all the slaves demands is work, and when his master hears him shout for work he knows that his own dominion is assured.

Prior to 1939 the Communist renegades had the workers begging their masters for work—hunger marches, heavy drawers in the winter, etc.—and now they have got it. The only work the capitalists will ever be able to find them—work for the mutual destruction of themselves. From day to day, week to week, year to year, giving all their ability, energy, life, they are on a merry-go-round. When unemployment was two-and-a-half millions, slave camps were started where men dug holes and filled them in again. Now they build bombs and blow them up—work for everybody is the order of the day. We are living in a fool's paradise, where one is only supposed to talk of inanities, rather than insanities. In the looney hatch there is told the story of the lad who filled the pail with no bottom in it, and that is what we are doing to-day, but never mind—it is work! In Scotland there are buildings that have taken thousands of man hours to build, with toil and sweat, and they are not to be opened. The greatest insult a slave gives a slave is to accuse him of not looking for work. Yet when he sees his boss all dressed up and going to play he thinks nothing of it. The nation has never worked harder in its whole history as in the last 4½ years, yet it has only worked itself into debt. The interest on that debt will have to be paid to the lenders, the lenders being the bosses. So the government will tax the workers to pay the non-workers—then you say we want work. To-day all work emanates from the government, who place the orders to the best known firms. Then the firms look for workers, who work at least a week without payment (even a horse won't work if he doesn't get his oats, but we are clever), when they get their bits of paper. The government takes some back and calls it taxes (when the boss does it it's a reduction in wages). Then when the iovernment gets it back

they give it to the boss, who gives it to the workers, after he deducts 10% of the whole—the more workers the more per cent. Then you say we want work! Unfortunately in a class-ridden society the propertyless class must always beg of the propertied or owning class, and yours truly is not of the latter. So by necessity he too has to exercise the strong back, and the weak mind, but in his saner moments he asks, "What's it all about?"

Once having mooted the question, we find that the persons who own and don't work, in peacetime they follow the sun, go to garden parties, own race-horses, get divorces, drink cocktails, drive motor cars, write books, sponsor boxing tournaments, and they are so ignorant they have to stay at school till they are about 24. The persons who don't own and do work, rarely see the sun, get skinned backing horses, can't get a divorce, drink beer, repair and build autos, haven't time to read a book, and get knocked punch drunk in their spare time, but are so intelligent they leave school when they are 14. The persons who don't own and don't work ain't quoted.

In wartime the first named change their routine. They follow the safe areas, go to hotels, become generals, give each other medals, make speeches, and accuse the workers of slacking. While the non-owners become military objectives, are bombed, bayoneted, bludgeoned, rationed, robbed, again divided into workers and soldiers, and the latter (who don't own and don't work) just ain't quoted, and you say we want work.

The answer I find is that we shall all have to own—to do this the means of production will have to be socially owned, by the producers—then the produce will have to be divided among the consumers, who of course will be the producers, but maybe this is too sensible. However, I'll be back again. I want my bed. In the meantime read the *A.B.C. of Anarchism*.

—EDDIE SHAW

(Reprinted from War Commentary).