

## Nature

By Lily Sarnoff

Things natural are so simple—that is why, perhaps, the primitive man's life was simple. He had only to satisfy his elemental wants. A cave or cove served for his shelter, and with some food and drink and perhaps a skin to shield him in inclement weather, no further thoughts troubled him. With us it is harder to get these same elemental wants appeased though we do not have to hunt for bears for our food, nor to construct our shelters with our bare hands.

Mother earth—only one who can love it truly can feel the joy of working on it, or may truly feel that he is living life fully; for happiness consists not in possessing but in living fully, of enjoying each simple thing. There is a delight in picking berries for one's own food, of cultivating a garden, working on the soil. A feeling of calm happiness pervades one that cannot come when dealing with the artificial works of man in stupid offices, in tiresome shops, in ugly mills. Nature's happiness comes only when both body and mind are attuned to the same note, and respond alike.

Yet this cannot come to him who has reached satiety, or to him who does not need the things he grows; for half the appreciation of the things is lost then. Nor can it come to him whose senses have been dulled by too great needs or by avarice; who receives not in working the feeling of creating, of kinship with Nature; who does not feel the sort of beautiful rhythm that encompasses all the earth and the living things upon it.

Nature may be cruel yet kinder still than the intentional cruelty of man to man; but how weak is man compared to the strength and simple city of Nature. Always there is an underlying harmony and lovely melody. There is rhythm even in the storms and tempests.

"Come, spend a little time with me, just half a day. You will feel new surges of happiness, and lose that serious look for a while, as if all the world and its sorrows weighed upon you. You are beautiful, and I love you; but forget yourself, forget the world of men, and come with me into my little garden." So one friend pleaded to another—and arm in arm the two set out.

"Here is my garden; do you not love this wide expanse, these living, growing things, these sweet delicate flowers? See this running, laughing brook, this cool dell around it. Here daily I watch many vari-colored birds singing and flying from limb to limb, from tree to tree. Here are my plants; come you and I shall work a little. My tomatoes are sick. We must take out the sick ones and bury them deep in the earth; then trim the bushes, and the plants will bloom and flourish yet anew. See how simple that is." The two friends work, kneeling on the soft earth and glad to be there. "Is it not too bad that in man's world things cannot be dealt with as simply? No, there when one is diseased, he struggles and all struggle with him; he bears more offspring and they too suffer; and so disease is always there and never quite wiped out. But here a snip of the scissors, and off—"

The sun shone warmly on their backs, the tomato-plants gave forth their pleasant, peculiar fragrance. "I love it, don't you?" When all was done they stood back and noted how much better the bushes looked, shorn of all the bad ones and the ungainly scared yellow leaves at the bottom. "Now let us wash and pick some berries for our meal, right here in the nearby woods. You must be hungry."

As they were across the gurgling brook and in

the patch of briars and blackberries. "See how many, how luscious and black they are; their bright heads seem to be calling to us 'take me, take me.' I can almost see their merry eyes winking at you. How sweet thus to live, to get the food from the earth, while the birds carol to you, and an air of mystery and beauty surrounds and at times almost awes you."

Quickly their pans were filled. "We can run and have our cold showers, and feast on our berries and home-made bread and raw milk. There, even Thorau would have had no objection to such a fine meal."

The supper over, the dishes were replaced clean and shining upon the little shelves. "Now let us sit awhile within this little shelter and rest and dream." And even as they rested and talked in low tones, the sun disappeared and dark clouds were gathering fast. Soon faint, then louder thunder roared, while the distant lightnings flashed nearer and nearer. "A storm is brewing, let us light this lamp, shut these wooden doors and be comfortable." And within the cosy shack they listened to the loud thunder and saw the lightning light up the nearby woods and the vista beyond.

"But this, this way of life cannot solve man's problems? No, perhaps not; but if men could thus find happiness, and themselves stop seeking empty things—wealth, honor, glory, fame—stop hating each other, trying to get the best of one another in the struggle to attain any of these things, men would come nearer to happiness, to life's fulfilment." Truly we cannot love all men; but neither should hate and littleness destroy our conception of our fellow men. Life is so short a span—oh, that we lived it fully—yet more tranquilly."

Quickly the storm passed, but still the wind stirred the leaves and branches of the trees, and the gentler rain kept falling, making a soft pitter-patter on the wooden roof. The many insects resumed their chirping in complete harmony with the evenings hushed tranquility. Only the occasional whirr of motors passing overhead broke the calm silence and spoke of the modern machine world and man with all his inventions and struggles and woes.

"I thank you for your presence—the night is calm once more—and since you wish to go, I cannot hold you more. And so, good-night, my friend." The friend departed home and the remaining one went to the night's repose.

Soon the darkness without blended with the darkness within, and all lay enwrapped in quiet serenity.

### Comrades: Anarchists of all countries:

It is of transcendent importance to have an International Conference in order that an International Federation of Anarchists shall be formed.

What is your opinion regarding such?

In what country shall the congress take place?

What region?

What are the paramount subjects that should be discussed?

When is the best time for the conference?

We must find a way to work together to present a solid front against our common enemy. We must be prepared for the coming war; to fight against it with all our weapons, for the revolution already in gestation, work for it, triumph, or die in the battle like men. It is infamous and servile to remain indifferent to the martyrdom of our comrades the world over.

Respond, comrades; write your opinions.

Louis Raymond

## The I.W.W. and Anarcho-Syndicalism

By ONOFRE DALLAS

In the October 4th issue of *The Industrial Worker* there appears an editorial containing statements which denote that the editor is not up to date on the anarcho-syndicalist movement in Europe, and especially in Spain.

He says that the European anarcho-syndicalists and the I.W.W. differ considerably in more than one particular, which is largely true, although he fails to specify clearly where they differ, being satisfied with general statements which reveal a lack of knowledge of the development of anarcho-syndicalism.

The editorial in question implies, as I understand it, that the anarcho-syndicalist unions are only fighting organizations, for the present struggle, but that they have nothing concrete to offer for the future when capitalism will be a thing of the past. In other words, that when capitalism is overthrown the anarcho-syndicalist union will have no longer any reason for existence. It says, further, that "the I.W.W. is the structure of the new society both as regards production and administration."

I say that when anarcho-syndicalism is viewed in the light of present day interpretation, in the light of the probable future, anarcho-syndicalism is the structure of the new society both as regards production and administration.

If you will read the anarcho-syndicalist periodicals and other literature issued by the Spanish anarcho-syndicalist unions you will see that the labor union is featured as the future unit for production, distribution and exchange. In this connection, may I refer you to the book "Los Sindicatos y la Revolucion Social" by Pierre Besnard, translated from the French by Felipe Alaiz, editor of the anarcho-syndicalist daily "Solidaridad Obrera" of Barcelona, official organ of the Nation Confederation of Labor (anarcho-syndicalist) and issued by that organization. In the three hundred pages of that excellent and comprehensive book, there is amply discussed the role of the revolutionary syndicalist unions both as fighting units and as the nucleus for the structure of the economic life during and after the social revolution. Many chapters are devoted to discussing the role of shop committees, stressing the importance of gaining the goodwill of the technicians, urging the workers to get better acquainted with the technical side of manufacturing, to form statistical groups to study the sources of raw materials; the cost of production and distribution. In a word, the author recognizes the fact that the workers must begin now to learn how to run industry so that when the time comes for them to be their own masters they will be fully prepared. The great majority of the leaders and rank and file of the anarcho-syndicalists recognize this also, as did the last National Congress of the C.N.T. which decided to adopt industrial unionism as the system of organization, and to recommend that a thorough study be made of national economy, industry and so forth. In other words, the anarcho-syndicalist unions are entering a new phase of development, in which they view the near future with scientific eyes rather than with sentiment, feeling that they will soon be called upon to manage industry and the economic life of the country. Let me remark in passing that in addition to the committees appointed by the last Congress to study these questions, there are the union of Intellectual Workers and the union of Technicians, all of which are cooperating with educational bodies in the preparation of statistical data and the study of the economic life of the country.



"The I.W.W. concept of the general strike differs almost as much from that of the anarcho-syndicalist as from that of the political or craft unionist," continues the editorialist. Now, I have read quite a bit of the I.W.W. literature as well as of the anarcho-syndicalists, but I fail to find where that difference lies. The anarcho-syndicalists wield the general strike weapon as a means of protest for political, social or economic purposes, and look to it as the weapon to use when the overthrow of capitalism shall be attempted. If the I.W.W. have in mind some other uses for the general strike, or have any objections to the uses made by the anarcho-syndicalists, I should like to know in what they consist.

There is another point in the editorial in question, with which I disagree. It says that "The I.W.W. is more all-sufficient, more mature and more modern than any of its anarcho-syndicalist predecessors." I will agree that the I.W.W. is more all-sufficient, for the I.W.W. would make of the labor union the all-embracing, all-controlling unit for practically everything, whereas the anarcho-syndicalists are more flexible, allowing more latitude of action in the control of things. They see the role of the unions as mostly economic. They regard the unions very highly and would let them have a say in most important things especially in the economic field, but also think that life is not all economics and that there are many things that can not, or should not, be done through the unions. Therefore, as far as all-sufficiency is concerned, the statement is correct, but, I can not agree as to the maturity, if by that is meant that more complete or more comprehensive plans for social rebuilding and service after the overthrow of capitalism have been worked out by the I.W.W. than by the anarcho-syndicalists. If I am correct, such plans and projects must be in the minds of the I.W.W. theoreticians, because I have never seen them in print or heard them in speech. There is nothing in the I.W.W. literature approaching in scope and richness of detail the book by Pierre Besnard. This is all-comprehensive and covers all the activities one may possibly think of in connection with revolutionary syndicalist unions, from the cultivation of the fighting spirit of the newly organized masses and the teaching of factory control and share-administration in capitalist-owned industries up to the taking of the unions as the units of control of production, distribution and administration in the new society.

The great difference between the I.W.W. and the anarcho-syndicalist unions is that the former is centralized in character, the latter federalist. The anarcho-syndicalist "aims at the establishment of anarchist-communism," whereas the I.W.W. is rather vague on that point, no book that I know of explaining just what is meant by "Industrial Democracy." Whether the confederated system of the Spanish anarcho-syndicalist is better or worse than the centralized system of the I.W.W., or whether or not it will work in this country, I shall not discuss here. At any rate, it appears that in Spain at least—I speak mostly of Spain because I am best acquainted with the movement there, and it is there that anarcho-syndicalism has developed furthest—the anarcho-syndicalists have succeeded fairly well in combining freedom with efficiency, eliminating the likelihood of the growth of bureaucracy and tyranny which are the usual corollaries to centralization.

[The purpose of this article is to try and have an intelligent dispassionate discussion on the question of anarcho-syndicalism and Industrial Unionism, their similarity and dissimilarity, and if nothing else comes of it, I hope, to acquaint the revolutionary workers in America with the inspiring liberating movement the Anarchists and Syndicalists are carrying on in Spain. O. D.]

## The Ideal and the Revolution

By F. URALES

Must we expect doctrine to bring the revolution, or the revolution to create the doctrine? The question is of first importance, like that other—Which comes first, form or matter?—and equally unanswerable. Matter can not be conceived of without form, nor revolution without the idea that inspires it.

The evolutionists believe doctrination comes first, revolution after. Some who call themselves revolutionists think likewise. It takes little effort to call oneself a revolutionist without planning the bringing about of the revolution. That is what the social-democrats do. They consider themselves revolutionists because they make propaganda before the revolution, propaganda afterward, propaganda all the time—nothing but propaganda.

If we consult history we find that the socialists do not continue to expound their doctrine after they have achieved power. We have seen them in control preoccupied exclusively in maintaining it, and we have seen them in the opposition castrating their own revolutionary ideas and delaying the coming of the revolution for the sake of personal interests. Having brought about their own revolution they propose all sorts of palliatives and situate themselves comfortably in bourgeois posts.

Now then, if the bourgeois do not give the people a truly scientific education, but, instead, one designed to maintain the idea of privilege; and the socialists delay for the sake of so-called ideal preparation for the revolution, side-tracking by their acts its actual fulfillment, when will the moment come for action?

Never! When in power the socialists have never done anything but attempt to intrench themselves, forgetting to practice and to propagate their doctrine. In Spain, particularly, their principal objective has been, since they could not throw old employees out of their places in municipalities and cabinets, to create new posts in which to place their coreligionists: for socialism in the hands of these leaders is more bureaucratic than the Monarchy or the Republic. The Socialist Party aspires to live in the State. All those who find themselves in a position to live at the expense of the public administration join the Spanish Socialist Party while the people labor to produce.

The state communists believe that before the idea comes the Fact, after that the doctrine. But, though this is their avowed purpose, it has completely failed in practice. In Russia a revolution was made that later was unable to put the doctrine into effect. A revolution was brought about to establish communism, and yet communism has not been established. It has limited itself to creating a Communist Party to render the advantages of power to the communists. The communist revolutionists in Russia have done the identical things the socialists have done in Spain. They have combatted their enemies and used repressive measures to strengthen themselves in power, but they have not preoccupied themselves with Socialism nor communism. Was it not possible? Let us admit such an excuse, then they should not be in power, but in the opposition until they can govern in a socialist or communist manner. If they were not prepared to establish socialism or communism they should have remained in the opposition and meanwhile have prepared their doctrine.

How do the socialists prepare themselves? In their papers we see no signs of socialism, merely politics, with no object other than that of occupying governmental posts. The state communists have better intentions, but are more fanatical. They made a revolution with the idea of transforming the Russian

people into communists, but have not succeeded. And one must believe that under the circumstances they could not. The Russian Revolution when it started suspended the ignorance of the people. Since then it has created no doctrine, and considering the years it has been in existence seems unable to do so. The revolution alone, then, is not enough, nor is the doctrine. Too much doctrine without revolution is dead doctrine; too much revolution without doctrine is monopolized revolution, that in order to maintain itself will use the same measures and tactics of power as the reaction it overthrew.

A political revolution, which has not yet taken place in Russia, but still remains to take place, was represented by Kerensky. Kerensky's idealism, less energetic perhaps than Lenin's, could have been more liberal, for it was much nearer to the people and the Russian intellect. Another power that might have been maintained in a democratic power, always nearer to freedom than a dictatorship. It would never have had so much need of power, but have been able to allow more freedom—that freedom of which Lenin did not know the need, since freedom would have meant his political death. The concept that he maintained, that the people need no freedom, is a theocratic concept even if sustained in the case of communism. That concept has crushed the Russian Revolution as well as the Social Revolution.

A social revolution, to sustain itself, with the principles and objectives implicit in it, needs freedom; if you take that away you take away its essence, its reason to be. The Russian Revolution has no revolutionary essence, and wherever that type of revolution may be brought about it will be a revolution more reactionary in its nature than the program of the bourgeois left wing. Russia finds itself now without communism, and without freedom. This is because the communists do not understand the importance of freedom and because they believe that an economic revolution can be brought about before the political and religious revolutions.

Translated by Louis Raymond

## Revolutionary Spain

By M. OLAY

### II

We are so used to seeing, from time immemorial, most important things done by or through the state that we can not conceive of doing those things ourselves, without it. After all, who are the men who make up the state? Aren't they men of the same intellectual calibre, of the same capacity, as the average man outside the state? As a matter of fact, don't the greatest men do their best work outside the sphere of government? If the state can perform a certain task, an independent organization composed of men of the same intellectual capacity will do it just as well, or better, and probably more efficiently and cheaply.

The Spanish anarchists intend to organize society without the state. "But they need organization, and anarchists are against organization," some of you will say. Yes, indeed, they need organization, and as far as I know no anarchist is against organization as such. There are some who may be against certain kinds of organization, which is not at all the same thing. One may be opposed to the American Federation of Labor, which does not mean that he is opposed to the organization of labor. The anarchists may be against the ruling class in Russia, which does not mean that they are against the Russian people