

the ROAD to FREEDOM

VOL. I—No. 6

APRIL, 1925

PRICE 5 CENTS

The Evolution of Anarchist Theories

WE shall attempt to review in this brief sketch the theoretical development of Anarchism by describing the ideas whence Anarchist thought originated and the manner in which the various modern schools of Anarchism gradually developed. We shall therefore leave out of consideration all general historical discussions, biographic and literary data, and the external history of the movement.

There never lacked men to advocate subtle projects of governmental organization and regulation of production and consumption—so-called Utopians, the forerunners of modern State Socialism, which is still retaining in all its essential characteristics the stamp of its source.

But there were also those who cherished liberty above governmentally organized happiness. They were not terrified by the thought of a society in which individual tendencies and inclinations have full sway, relying on liberty to serve as a safety valve in maintaining social equilibrium and individual welfare.

It was but natural that these thinkers should strenuously emphasize the standpoint of Individualism—personal liberty and autonomy—without attempting to formulate finally the economic bases of that liberty. Thus we find William Godwin, in England (1793); Josiah Warren, Stephen Pearl Andrews and others, in America, at the end of the 20's; Proudhon, in France, in the 40's, and Max Stirner, in Germany (1845)—all original representatives of Individualist Anarchism, each advocating—in his own manner and quite independently of the others—a system of individual sovereignty, of mutualism, of egoism. They reject all political systems based on majority rule—so-called democracy—as well as Authoritarian Communism based on State, or public ownership of the land and means of production, now generally known as State Socialism. They want production to be freed from the fetters imposed by economic monopoly and maintained by governmental vio-

lence: rent, interest, profit, and taxes. They demand freedom of production for the individual and for the voluntary groups in unrestrained competition in the open market. The principle of the "full product of one's labor" is maintained by securing to each, as his inalienable private possession, all that he is able to gain by competing against the whole field. The restrictions enforced in present society by monopoly—aided by its tool, the State—being eliminated, the equal opportunity of all must result in the equitable exchange of equal values. Nor does this system necessitate exclusive individual production, as its opponents claim; on the contrary, it leaves full scope for unlimited free co-operation with its resulting advantages. The principle of free competition between the various co-operative groups remains intact.

The deep significance of the ideas advocated by Godwin, Warren, Proudhon, and Stirner, consisted in their opposition to the authoritarian and religious Communism of their time. The tendency of the latter was manifest in State Communism, regulating by law and rule every detail of private life, or in monastic Communism rooted in mere sentimentality; added to this was the spirit of political, centralized Jacobinism; only occasionally did the spirit of liberty manifest itself, as in Owen's advocacy of voluntary Communistic commonwealths, or in the far-reaching principles of Fourier. Under such conditions the severest criticism and condemnation of authoritarianism and the emphasizing of individual freedom were in themselves a liberating act, no matter as to the tenability of the temporary economic standpoint. For it is only liberty—untrammelled free development—that can serve as a safe foundation for further progress. That is far more important than mere economic conditions on which so much stress is usually laid. Liberty is the vital principle of every phase of our life, the economic included; conditions founded on compulsion cannot endure—no matter what the force that maintains them for the time being.

The further development of Anarchist theories therefore centered around the problem of harmonizing economic conditions with the basic principle of a free society. The idea of equitable and direct exchange repeatedly sought practical expression, as in the London Industrial Fairs, also in America and France. Similar ideas are still championed by the American, English, and Australian Individualist Anarchists, as well as by some followers of Proudhon and Stirner. Our modern attitude, however, is opposed to these ideas on the ground that the requirements of competition would nullify the liberty of the producers; it is inevitable that producers, living under comparatively more favorable conditions, should gain an advantage over their competitors, thus laying the foundation of inequality; thence it is but a step to law and authority, to maintain—forcibly if necessary—advantageous inequality.

The next step was the recognition of the collective ownership of land and the tools of production, as well as of the "full product of one's labor"—Collectivist Anarchism, as it is even now predominant in Spain. Originating in Switzerland and Belgium, this idea reached its highest development in the *Internationale*, during the latter part of the 60's and the beginning of the 70's. Its chief exponents were Bakunin, Guillaume, de Paepe, Warlin, and others. The most inspiring period of the young labor movement in the Central and Southern States of Europe (Germany and Austria excepted) was closely connected with the development of this new tendency. In the middle of the 60's the *Internationale* was composed of Proudhonists (Mutualists), State Socialists (the then few personal followers of Marx), Bourgeois-Socialists (as we may call the Geneve politicians who dealt in ballots and compromises), Trades Unionists (in England), and of a certain really promising element, on which the future of the *Internationale* depended. This young element, believing to have found in Collectivism the long-looked for economic foundation of Mutualism, carried the

gospel of Collectivist Anarchism and of the *Internationale* into the Jura, Southern France, Spain, Italy, and among the youth of the Slavic countries. In this they were greatly aided by Bakunin, whose wonderful ability as an agitator helped them to gain numerous adherents in Southern Europe, from Spain to Russia.

It is unnecessary to record here the bitter opposition, full of lies and intrigue, with which these young propagandists met. Not only were they fought by the bourgeoisie, but still more venomously by the State Socialistic, political, Marxian Social Democracy. It was a struggle between the ideas of Federation, Collectivism (in the sense of that epoch), and Anarchism on one hand, negating bourgeois politics and propagating revolutionary methods, as against Centralization, State Ownership, and Authority, on the other, with their political, corrupting tactics. Only in Germany and Austria was the latter tendency temporarily successful. In the other countries, especially in Southern Europe, the Marxians soon became thoroughly discredited owing to the indescribably perfidious means of combating the Anarchism of the *Internationale*.

The theories of collective ownership admit of various conceptions. Is the community of a certain trade, or the directly producing group to own the tools of production? The manner of determining the "full value of one's product" is also an uncertain problem. Is the decision to be left to the majority vote of the whole community, or to that of the group, to the producer, or to free competition? According to individual inclination and conception, the above possibilities can be variously combined, and hence result different systems, some favoring State Socialism, others more akin to Individualist Anarchism.

The possibility of competition among the various groups, to the advantage and ultimate monopoly of the better situated ones, constitutes a danger which can be obviated by liberty alone; that is to say, by the complete freedom of joining any group, thus reducing—by the fact of enlarged membership—the superior advantages accruing to the individual members of a better situated group. But the principle of the "full value of one's product" necessitates competition, either through regulations and laws, or by direct coercion. Therefore the next evolutionary step

of Anarchism is the repudiation of this principle and the declaration in favor of collective ownership, not merely in the tools of production, but also in the products of labor: Anarchist Communism.

The latter—which had already previously found its individual representatives, such as, for instance, Joseph Dejaque—began to be systematically propagated, since 1876, in the Italian *Internationale* and in Genf, gradually displacing the former Collectivist tendencies in Switzerland, France, and Italy. Its chief theoretic and literary exponents are Cafiero, Malatesta, Kropotkin, Reclus, and others.

It is fruitless to seek a standard for the distribution of products, one to be equitable to all. A measure founded on the labor performed would be as unjust to the individual as impossible in its social application. Unjust to the individual, because such a standard would mean inequality for everyone. Impossible of social application, because the value of a product does not depend on labor alone, and cannot therefore be thus exclusively measured. The only possible standard is division according to individual need; that is, free consumption. This alone takes into account the differences of individual tastes and needs, the consideration of which is socially imperative. Free use, as the basis for consumption, coupled with the freedom of joining any group, as the principle of production, can alone guarantee liberty in the economic sphere. Though this position does not mark the finality of Anarchist evolution, it characterizes the modern attitude of Anarchist Communists.

Let us yet note in what direction this theory is being further developed. Foremost stands the growing assertion of the individual, of personality. Indeed, our chief aim is to create conditions under which the problem of life, of the mere necessities, should not monopolize all one's time. The purpose is to afford the individual scope and opportunity for untrammelled development, to which free and rational co-operation is but a means. Collective production must therefore not be permitted to become the main object, to fill man's whole life, its mechanism affecting all his activities. On the contrary, it should serve but to create worthier and more human conditions, giving the individual opportunity for further development. Only on such a foundation—when the free use of shelter,

food, apparel, etc., has become as much a matter of course as is to-day the use of the streets or of the air (though even these the poor cannot freely enjoy)—only then could really free beings develop, emancipated men and women, able to appreciate in their proper light the teachings of a Stirner.

A further evolution of Anarchist thought concerns the tendencies manifest in the development of modern industry along these lines. Anarchism reaches the conclusion that production, in the future, will become decentralized and local. Naturally such a conception excludes the possibility of State Socialism. The Marxians, witnessing the gigantic modern combinations of capital, conclude that gradual centralization of industry will finally become concentrated in the hands of the State. In this, however, they confound the effects of capitalism and State-protected monopoly with the real development of production. In reality, however, industrialism is in a process of constant growth in the most distant lands, the tendency of individual countries, provinces, cities and towns to produce independently becoming daily more apparent. With the abolition of financial monopolies, stifling this development, the gradual equalization of industrial effort would receive a tremendous impetus. Equally so will the exhaustion of the recklessly exploited great industrial countries (America, Australia, etc.) result in the possibility and necessity of local, intensive agriculture. The larger population of the more fertile localities will tend to minimize individual advantages, which circumstance must necessarily lead to a more general application of agrarian chemistry and other scientific methods in the cultivation of the less productive districts. In this manner all essential differences will be gradually equalized; the most necessary things will be produced on the spot, and the people will grow to realize the absurdity of artificial centralization and regulation of local production.

It is not amiss to mention that modern Anarchist views are in harmonious accord with science, literature, and art, and have found in these appropriate expression. It is also interesting to compare this significant fact with the entire barrenness of the Social Democracy along these lines. Indeed, the Socialist atmosphere of authority, bureaucracy, and political corruption kills every idealistic and spiritual aspiration in its very inception.

The question of the methods towards the realization of our aims we have not yet touched upon. They, too, have undergone a long process of evolution. Some of its more important phases are still a matter of lively discussion. The Anarchist attitude towards politics, the rejection of the ballot, and its propaganda of revolutionary activity, are known to most people. But one most first become familiar with the true essence of Anarchism, in order to qualify for intelligent participation in such discussions.

Compare this evolution of Anarchism towards a social organization guaranteeing ever greater individual liberty, with the Social Democracy and its complete demoralization into a middle-class, democratic, palliative, political State Socialism. Such a comparison cannot fail to accentuate the beneficial influence of liberty, on the one hand, and the corrupting effect of authority on the other. The question as to which of these tendencies will triumph can safely be left to the future.

Self-made Men

By J. A. PEREZ

IT IS said very often that foreign working men, as soon as they get into this country, desert the proletarian ranks, deluded by the fallacy that "there is an opportunity for everybody in this country." As this is true to a certain extent, let us examine the matter in the light of the capitalist arguments.

They tell us that opportunity presents itself, but only for those who have the wit to discern, for those who possess energy to seize it, while the dull and the indolent let it pass by, missing their chance in society. These opportunities, capitalists claim, are to be found everywhere. Here we have D'Alembert, for instance, French scientist, who with no help whatsoever, became the greatest mathematician of his time. Then comes Herbert Spencer, he who by the power of his genius, has built a famous philosophy of his own. And now they introduce to us Pierre Laplace, Astronomer and Physicist, reaching those high positions without knowing how.

When we turn to America, the number of men of this class is endless, especially in statesmen and financiers; this country is the nursery of self-made men.

If we now make an inquiry regarding these so-called self-educated men, we

come to know that: D'Alembert's mother was a novelist, who gave him some education; that his father insured for him an income of 1,200 pounds. In reference to Spencer, he was the son of a professional teacher, surrounded by educational influences. As to Laplace, we can only say that he has kept in secret his career; however we don't ignore that his prodigious memory and very favorable circumstances were a powerful aid to him.

In dealing with American geniuses, we see that all the noise is made over a comparatively small number, consisting in perpetual repetition about the same men: Rockefeller, Ford and Edison.

But what of the thousands who pass by unknown?

Think of the millions endowed with prodigious gifts by nature, of whom the world has never heard, simply because no one happened to give them an opportunity. What opportunity has the toiler of the soil, the worker buried in the mine, or the laborer plunged twelve hours in the workshop? For these there is no door to knock at, nor gate to enter, nor window to escape from.

There is no more pernicious notion afloat, than that one is prepared to get up in the world with nothing but the rudiments of an education. The wage-earners haven't even those rudiments. They take away our education and leave us toil, guns, and penal colonies.

No genius can succeed without a favorable environment. Had D'Alembert been a dig-miner had Spencer gone into the chimney-sweeper business; had Laplace been assigned to agricultural labors, what would their talents have availed?

It is worth noting, on the other hand, that the man who has accomplished something, is not the most rewarded. The reverse is the truth. Those who have achieved nothing, are the ones who have drawn the utmost profit.

Speculators encourage us to rise in the world, not for our benefit, nor for the welfare of society, nor for the interest of our own class, but for their insatiable greed. They know that the laborer, the miner, the operator, are the necessary human raw-material for exploitation; likewise they are aware that skilled men, trained mechanics, professional engineers are more efficient, more valuable to them.

Granted it were so easy to grope to those positions, what would our fate be? If we cast a glance at the conditions in

which salaried professionals are, we can readily see that their position is far more onerous than that of the working class. Capitalists have enslaved the teacher, the engineer, the lawyer, under such oppression, that many of them haven't even the right of the poorest proletarian: the right to rebellion. Not having the courage of creating a union of their own, being ashamed to join the workers, the intellectuals are an easy prey of the ruling class, who compel them to perform dirty work and very often they are driven against the wage-earners.

This being the case, we workers do not want to be promoted to that humiliating condition. We are rather glad to stand in our humble position, but with the right to revolt against the serfdom of humanity. We refuse to rise from slaves to slave-drivers. If superiority in society is given to us to subjugate our fellow-men; if after so great a struggle to rise upon the average men, are you going to lash the face of the weary toiling class; if you propose to us to desert our ranks and to serve the plutocratic oligarchy, perpetuating thus the capitalist system, we say to you, that we prefer a thousand times to be where we are.

Our aim is greater, nobler than that. We demand the abolition of all privileges, casts, exploiters and rulers. Our purpose is no other than to establish a social equalization of humanity, putting on the same foot all men, in order that they might exercise their natural faculties to the full measure of their powers.

LECTURES

Arranged by the

ROAD TO FREEDOM GROUP, N.Y.
AT THE WORKERS' CENTRE
219 SECOND AVENUE NEW YORK CITY

Wed., April 1st D. ISAKOVITZ:
"WM. GODWIN AND HIS WORK"

Wed., April 8th THOMAS WRIGHT:
"JOSEPH PIERRE PROUDHON AND
HIS WORK"

Wed., April 15th HIPPOLYTE HAVEL:
"MICHAEL BAKUNIN AND HIS WORK"

Wed., April 22nd F. KRAEMER:
"PETER KROPOTKIN AND HIS WORK"

Wed., April 29th SH. MARCUS:
"MAX STIRNER AND HIS WORK"
(The Closing Lecture of the Season)

Questions and Discussion

Admission - - - - FREE

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM

A Periodical of Anarchist Thought, Work,
and Literature

Published by the
ROAD TO FREEDOM PUBLISHING
ASSOCIATION
at Stelton, N. J.

HIPPOLYTE HAVEL, Editor

Subscription, One Dollar a Year
Single Copies, Five Cents

Address all Communications and make all
Money Orders payable to
ROAD TO FREEDOM, Stelton, N. J.

To Readers in New York and Vicinity

COMRADES AND FRIENDS:

ALMOST all radical publications are compelled to do a lot of begging among sympathizers in order to exist. The cost of printing under the present economic arrangements is enormous for radical literature. Our complex capitalistic system involves even the smallest effort of social rebels, to spread their ideas through printed word, at great expense.

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM is the only publication in English with the mission to propagate the ideal of perfect freedom in America—Anarchism. Being neither subsidized nor having a party backing the publication is living from hand to mouth. Only through self-sacrifice of a few comrades are we able to publish the paper each month. The usual effects of summer months will make it even harder for us.

In order to raise a sufficient sum of money to be able to publish THE ROAD TO FREEDOM during the summer, without being forced to appeal to our comrades for financial help, we have arranged A COSTUME BALL—for SATURDAY, APRIL 4th, at the HARLEM CASINO, Lenox Avenue and 116th Street, New York City.

We hope that all comrades and friends—from all language groups—will appear at the affair and help us to make it a grand success.

We get letters a-plenty congratulating us since we started our exponent of Anarchism, but these letters do not help us to pay the printer's bills. It is not our intention to appeal to our readers in each issue of THE ROAD TO FREEDOM. If you have any understanding of our situation now is the time to assist us in our work, and to do your bit for the publication. We count on your participation on April 4th. Let us make it a real international gathering.

Comments

JAY FOX announces in the February issue of the *Workers' Monthly* his conversion from Anarchism to Bolshevism. On another page of THE ROAD TO FREEDOM friend Kelly dissects Fox's tragic journey to Canossa. What strikes me as significant in Fox's conversion to Dictatorship, Militarism and Wage System is his fathomless ignorance of Anarchist theory. He accomplished a remarkable feat; he remained for three decades in the Anarchist movement without having the slightest understanding of Anarchism. As to his poison attack against Emma Goldman he only repeats the tragic story of all renegades; he spites venom against his former friends and comrades.

Fox's apology for his conversion to State Capitalism starts with a lie, is sprinkled with Billingsgate and ends with sentimental balderdash. "The continuous attacks of Emma Goldman against Soviet Russia impel me"—begins Fox's article. Now Emma Goldman never attacked Soviet Russia. What she did and still does, is to attack an unscrupulous tyranny of a small sect which destroyed the Soviet idea of revolutionary Russia and suppresses every manifestation of the Soviet spirit in Bolshevik Russia. The entire Anarchist movement all over the world agrees with her criticism of the Bolshevik Fascism. Fox calls Emma Goldman a traitor. Traitor to what? Is he a traitor who remains true to his ideal, or is not rather he the traitor who gives up his libertarian past and goes over to the authoritarians? Fox does not seem to comprehend that in the controversy between Bolshevism and Anarchism two opposite theories of life are being fought out—the difference between liberty and authority.

In introducing the latest recruit to their ranks, the Chicago Bolshevik Junta epimotazises Jay Fox as "the principal leader of the Anarchist movement in America for the last 30 years." Alas, poor Yorrick! To my knowledge Jay kept his "Anarchism" carefully hidden whenever there was a chance to get a job in the Federation of Labor. The sooner the Anarchist movement gets rid of "leaders" the better for Anarchism.

SOME say ideals do not pay. If we happen to possess any remnants of old convictions, we should put them on the shelf with other bric-a-

brac, to be occasionally admired in a pensive mood.

Is it not a proof of a "fine soul" to talk of the asinities of one's youthful days? When business is slack, it is rather pleasant to recollect "those wild things." Of course, one must not forget himself so far as to call back to life old ideals and, perchance, become active in their behalf.

Thus philosophise the "wise," the "practical," the matter-of-fact people; they shrug their shoulders, assuring us that life must be taken as it is, not as it should be. But what is life? Life spells hypocrisy; the world is peopled with sneaks, renegades and cowards. A few thousand more or less of this calibre—what does it matter?! The competition among them is constantly growing more intense; soon the ex-idealist realizes that he has been doubly cheated—he has bartered the best part of himself for profit, and now he finds himself sadly disappointed in his expectations.

JOHAN L. LEWIS, president of the United Mine Workers, and Warren S. Stone, president of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, have a controversy in the columns of *The Nation* concerning the Coal River mines owned exclusively by members of the Brotherhood. Stone, president of the Brotherhood, is chairman of the board of directors of Coal River Collieries, and as such he is responsible for the labor policy of the company. Mr. Stone insists upon acceptance by the miners of a rate of wages that would not only further impoverish those workers but would demoralize the entire coal industry.

In a joint conference of miners and operators from the central competitive field, composed of western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, held in Jacksonville, Florida, in February, 1924, an agreement was reached which extended the then existing wage agreement until April 1, 1927. Immediately, Coal River Collieries, whose mines are in the non-union territory of southern West Virginia and northeastern Kentucky, joined with the non-union coal companies in an assault upon the Jacksonville agreement. Up to that time Coal River Collieries had employed union miners and paid the union scale in the West Virginia mines, but had operated its Kentucky mine non-union. The latter mine is still being operated non-union.

Mr. Stone, like other non-union operators, demanded that his employees take a reduction in wages. The United Mine Workers of America refused. Mr. Stone closed down his West Virginia mines rather than pay the union scale. He threw hundreds of men out of work, knowing that unemployment meant starvation and suffering for their families. Next, Coal River Collieries imported strike-breakers from the non-union fields of Virginia, Kentucky, and Alabama to take the places of the union miners. Then the union miners were evicted from their homes. Their families and belongings were thrown out upon the roadside or hillside in the dead of winter, with no place to go. One hundred and three families were thus evicted last month, when the weather in the West Virginia mountains was bitter cold. The company refuses to permit these union miners to work in its mines unless they accept the reduced scale of wages.

As a result of these evictions the United Mine Workers of America has been compelled to spend scores of thousands of dollars in building houses and barracks for these unfortunate families and in supplying them with food, clothing, fuel, medical attention, and other necessities. This union has paid the undertakers' bills for burying the children of these men that have died since this thing happened. The United Mine Workers of America has made not only repeated but continuous efforts to adjust this matter with Mr. Stone and his company, but it has met with the same identical refusals and opposition that it has many times experienced with cold-blooded, hard-boiled non-union coal companies.

Stone's answer to Lewis' expose is in harmony with a statement of Mr. Baer, the late president of the Coal Trust—the workers be damned. He writes under his signature:

There is no trouble of any kind existing between the company and the employees. The only trouble that has existed at any time was due to the work of professional agitators *who were sent into the fields to create trouble.*

Stone is a perfect specimen of an American labor leader. He is the wise guy who started the idea of Labor Banks, a marvelous graft providing jobs for pie-card artists in the labor movement.

* * *

SAYS Georges Sorel in "Reflections on Violence": . . . It must be noticed that our Latin countries

present one great obstacle to the formation of social peace; the classes are more sharply separated by external characteristics than they are in Saxon countries; these separations very much embarrass Labor leaders when they abandon their former manners and take up position in the official or philanthropic circles. These circles have welcomed them with great pleasure, since it has been perceived that the gradual transformation of trades union officials into members of the middle classes might produce excellent results; *but their comrades distrust them.* In France this distrust has become much more definite since a great number of Anarchists have entered the Syndicalist movement; because *the Anarchist has a horror of everything which recalls the proceedings of politicians*—a class of people devoured by the desire to climb into superior classes and having already the capitalist mind while yet poor.

* * *

AT Easter time the legend of the martyrdom of Jesus is very much in evidence, hawked about at every street corner. "Jesus died for me," for "all humanity." And "all humanity," whether it wish it or not, is made responsible for this martyrdom. Well might mankind ask to be let alone, to take care of its own "sins." What profit it the wounds and scalps of Christ and the numerous other saviors?

What a blessing it would have been, had Jesus remained on that alleged Good Friday in his grave, and gone the way of all that is earthly. If in that way the salvation mania could be cured, we would have long since been rid of the nuisance of earthly saviors and divine idolatry. There would then be no more need of calling upon humanity to emancipate itself from its saviors, and to dethrone heaven, that the earth be made a fit place to live. But the apostles and the disciples, and no less the priests, had great need of the resurrection of the Lord. The miracles had to be performed, that man be forced to his knees, that he adore and pray, and be meek and obedient. The Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the Annunciation to boot! A veritable monster show a la Barnum.

Our Easter and our resurrection does not rest upon the hope of a savior. We the proletariat of the world will unite shall hail it as the resurrection when in common cause and realize that land and liberty is the inalienable inheritance of all men.

From Anarchism to "Communism" (State Socialism)

By HARRY KELLY

THE first question one puts to oneself after reading the article by Jay Fox in the February issue of the *Workers' Monthly* is, how could a man call himself an anarchist for nearly thirty years when he understands so little of its principles. Then one is impressed with the age old truism that none are so bitter as the apostate. After that one reads the editor's introduction and says—save us from our friends.

In introducing Fox to the readers of the *Workers' Monthly*, the editor has the following among other things to say: "Jay Fox was the principle proletarian leader of the anarchist movement in America for the past thirty years. . . . Emma Goldman represented the petty bourgeoisie wing, and in recent years devoted herself merely to lecturing upon sex, the drama and such subjects." *Such subjects is good!* "In recent years he took an active part in the I. W. W., the Syndicalist League of North America, the T. U. E. L., and the Farmer-Labor Party. He joined the Workers' Party in 1924."

Those familiar with the career of Jay Fox know that while calling himself an anarchist for many years he was at best never more than a Syndicalist and this article proves it beyond any serious doubt. Still it was a bit unkind of the editor to tell us that an anarchist "leader" was a member of the Trade Union Educational League and the Farmer-Labor Party before joining the Workers' Party. The first is the wing of the so-called Communist Party of this country which has been busily engaged for the past few years in trying to disrupt the trade unions of this country. The Farmer-Labor Party is—well—it is just the Farmer-Labor Party—that's all. So after skating around for a number of years trying to find where he belongs, brother Fox lands with both feet in the "Workers'" Party, which like all political parties is composed of doctors, lawyers, dentists and small business men as well as workers.

It sounds strange to hear a man who was a Syndicalist, a man who read Kropotkin's "Conquest of Bread," wherein certain definite methods of organization were laid down for organizing produc-

tion and distribution *after* the revolution, ask "how once the workers got control of industry, how was the revolution going to protect itself against the counter-revolution from without and within would set upon it?" For a man claiming to know the function of trade unions this question should answer itself. But then if the trade unions are to be the defenders of the revolution, where would Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev and the other bosses of the party in Russia come in. They are not members of trade unions and have done everything possible to destroy them and failing that make them subordinate to the State. Is it possible Fox has never read the speech of Kollantay, suppressed in Russia, but published here by the I. W. W. where she sets forth the idea of the role the unions should play in reconstructing Russian industry and Russian life. Her advocacy of Syndicalism under the name of Communism got her nowhere and she was banished in approved imperialistic fashion by being made Ambassador to Norway.

"My experience as a trade unionist had taught me that men must have organization and leadership." Strange words these for a man whom the editor of the *Workers' Monthly* calls the "principal proletarian leader of the Anarchist movement in America for thirty years." Brother Fox has been hiding his light under a bushel for these many years in Home Colony, for many of us never heard of him leading anyone but himself—which by the way is as it should be. Let a man lead himself with credit and he may become an inspiration to others. But then Jay believes in leadership, so it would seem that after many peregrinations in the I. W. W., Syndicalist League of North America, T. U. E. L. and the Farmer-Labor Party, he has found a resting place at last.

"For the first time in the history of the world a group of workers came into their own." Answer: Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kameneff and other "Workers."

Louis Fisher, the pro-bolshevik correspondent of *New York Nation* recently wrote—everything published or written in Russia is, as is well known, censored, so Fisher's article represents the official point of view—that while the governing forces of Russia were considering asking the trade unions to co-operate with the government in developing industry, Syndicalism was anathema to them. Of course Syndical-

ism is *workers'* control and this is just what the present rulers of Russia don't want. Every impartial observer in Russia has stated that the so-called Soviets are a farce and the workers have no voice whatever in the management of the affairs of the country. Any man who does not know this should not undertake to write on Russian affairs. The Russian Government is a government of bureaucrats like any other government; they have introduced certain principles of State Socialism and those principles are working out as inefficiently and as despotically as the anarchists have always said they would. Without a single book, newspaper, pamphlet or publication issued in the entire country except under government control it is unthinkable that abuses or tyranny can be corrected and this patter about the workers coming into their own is stuff to feed babes and not adults.

"A study of the Russian revolution has been of infinite value to me as a revolutionist, and far from joining the reactionaries in the counter-revolution because some Anarchists were imprisoned, I raised my feeble voice in its behalf . . . then I did not know that if I and my comrades were at the helm we should not find our theories unworkable and be compelled to modify them in order to cope with the situation arising out of the conflict." No great harm has been done perhaps by a man advocating theories for thirty years without knowing if they would work, but for such a man to be held up as "the proletarian leader of the Anarchist movement in America" is really too much. No man should advocate a social theory if he has any doubts about it working.

The "Communist" International raises the cry: "All power to the Workers, and it has a most efficient program for the fulfillment of that aim." Yes, it raises such a cry and then denies the workers in the shops any voice or control in industry and again we refer to the speech of Kollantay published by the I. W. W. "Under capitalism political power is the watchdog of the exploiters . . . it suppresses strikes and all forms of discontent." Exactly and having learned that trick from the capitalists, that is just what has been done and is still being done by this so-called "Workers" government.

"The Communists propose the very practical and sensible idea of a united front. Why not all workers' organiza-

tions get together and agree upon a line of action wherein they can go forward in one solid phalanx to meet the united front of imperial capitalism." As a member of the late and much lamented Farmer-Labor Party, Fox should know why other organizations can not get together with these so-called Communists and Sidney Hillman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers knows it also. He should have known it three or four years ago, but better late than never. At least it is our sincere hope that this organization torn with factionalism may not be beyond recovery.

"The trade unions are the most important of all existing economic organization, in fact the only ones that can carry over into the new industrial society." Fox probably doesn't realize that men are in jail in Russia for saying this very thing. Of course it is good tactics to advocate Syndicalism before the revolution and put people in jail who try to practice it after the revolution. It has been said many times by different writers that to advocate Syndicalism is more dangerous in Russia than to advocate a return to Czarism. The latter is dead where Syndicalism has an appeal to the workers and must be suppressed by the bureaucrats first through the Checka and now the G. P. U.

"I have no fear that it—the Russian government which Fox calls the Workers' State—will imbed itself and become permanent." Such faith is really very touching but it is hardly the attitude for an anarchist.

"It grieves me to learn that Emma Goldman and other prominent Anarchists are among the worst enemies of the revolution." If Trotsky, Zinoviev and others who according to Alexander Berkman—a fairly good revolutionist and anarchist—caused the death of 14,000 persons in Cronstadt, many of them called previously by Trotsky, "the flower of the revolution," were *the* revolution, then god save us from the revolution.

"Emma Goldman will be written down in Labor history as a revolutionary scab." It depends on who writes the labor history. If it is an honest man or woman trying to present the facts fairly he will say here was a woman who all her life fought tyranny and oppression no matter under what name or label. When she saw men and women who had fought and suffered for the revolution thrown into jail because

they protested against the broken promises of the "leaders" and tried to apply the ideals they stood for, she protested as she had always protested and as such stood for the ideals she had always stood for. It is more than probable that brother Fox will be overlooked in that labor history he talks of, but if he is mentioned it might be something like this. Jay Fox, a man who advocated anarchism for nearly thirty years, but when the test came he spiked his guns and fled to the enemy. He deserted his comrades in their hour of need and in order to justify his desertion spatters them with mud.

Here are a few facts for Jay Fox, the apostate, to remember when next he writes.

A Soviet Government is a government based on the principle of industrial representation and no such thing exists in Russia as every intelligent student of Russian affairs knows. The government in Russia is precisely the same kind of government as exists in this country. It is a government based on party lines and those outside the party have nothing to say. It is State Socialism of the kind Kropotkin wrote about thirty years ago and the kind that Herbert Spencer had in mind when he wrote "The Coming Slavery," with its reptile press extolling every act of the ruling clique and denouncing every act that they think may imperil their power. The case of Trotsky, which by the way fails to move us to tears for he would do exactly the same if he were in power, is a case in point.

The opposition has been shot, imprisoned or deported in Russia and to add salt to the wounds of the sufferers they have been slandered in the vilest and most venomous manner. The capitalists of this country want the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti, but they do not want them to be martyrs, so they are trying to put them to death as bandits and not labor men. This is the method pursued by the so-called "Communists" who have stolen a name that Jay Fox once honored.

Paragraphing The World's Circus

THE shopmen strike of July, 1922 that has continued for more than two years has now been called off officially. The loss on both sides is estimated at \$200,000,000.

The strike as a whole, it should be admitted now, was a defeat for the workers. For this defeat the leaders

of the unions are more to blame than any other factor. They actually betrayed the men. Had the leaders appealed to the spirit of solidarity of the workers in all other industries, that spirit would have made itself felt. Likewise the individual road settlements were also a large contributing factor in the defeat. For the men of the railroads, and for that matter all other trade unions there remains only one hope: not to trust in any leaders or party to help them gain anything worth while. To solidify the ranks, to eliminate useless official jobs, replacing it by a shop steward (delegate) system; to bring about a genuine united labor movement of all industrial crafts, only such tactics can turn the temporary defeats of labor into victories.

The press of the entire country is in an uproar. "Outraged" public opinion is aghast. Preachers in the pulpits are delivering sermons. What is it all about?

A special senate "investigation" committee headed by Senator Couzens, disclosed the fact that Secretary of the Treasury Mellon defrauded the United States Government of \$7,400,000 in collecting taxes from the Atlantic, Gulf and West Indies Steamship Company, of which Mellon is a stockholder.

Secretary Mellon, in turn, makes the charge that former Secretary of the Treasury Carter Glass, has defrauded the government of about \$100,000,000 in collecting taxes from Senator Couzens.

One's imagination could easily foresee how "our" respectable upholders and defenders of the law and its institutions would appear if the truth regarding all of them and their deeds, or rather *misdeeds* would ever be fully revealed!

The *State* and all its institutions growing out of it, as all those it upholds are based on fraud, deceit and robbery. The above singular instance only illustrates the truth of it. Nor is there any one more responsible for the continuation of these outrages than the very press and pulpit that is always so busy making pretentious grimaces of anger whenever such frauds are revealed.

It will cost \$15,000,000 to erect the "greatest" cathedral in the United States. Some of the contributors so far are: John D. Rockefeller, \$500,000; Arthur Curtis James, \$150,000; E. S. Harkness, \$155,000; Ogden Mills,

\$100,000 and J. P. Morgan, \$100,000. —"News Item."

No more fitting monument to their own deeds as robbers of the enslaved could have been conceived. Nor could a more fitting place have been chosen than the place of Mammon's Hell city, where the "free" slaves are herded together—New York City.

The body of Samuel Pace, secretary of the Ewen colliery local union near Scranton, Pa., was found riddled with bullets on January 6, 1925. He was one of the 11,000 strikers for the last few weeks and was on his way home after attending a union meeting.—News Item.

We wonder what the "authorities" would have done, if the name of the murdered one had read, Judge E. H. Gary, President of the U. S. Steel Corp., instead of Samuel Pace, a mere secretary of a toilers' union? . . .

At a time when every ruling power (excepting the Bolsheviks in Russia), has already liberated every imprisoned political "offender," the greatest self-boasting democracy still keeps in jail 89 victims in California, 5 in Washington, 2 in Oklahoma, 1 in Kansas and 6 in Texas.

With Thomas J. Mooney and Warren K. Billings wasting their lives in San Quentin and Sacco and Vanzetti driven to insanity, this country's "democracy" has something to feel "proud" about. But labor, organized or unorganized, ought to feel ashamed that it cannot or does not release its faithful champions for a better life.

Why only Communists?

The Central, Labor Council of Seattle, Wash., recently ordered the expulsion of all trade unionists found to be communists.

Why not also throw out every trade unionist who happens to hold political and social points of view other than those held by the political hucksters and barterers now holding sway over the labor movement as Republicans, Democrats and Socialists?

In the *Liberator* the traditions of the once genuine free revolutionary organ, *The Masses*, were gradually extinguished until it became an unofficial mouthpiece of the Communist Party. *Soviet Russia* was pretending to be an impartial organ for gathering help for the Russian people and to reveal the true facts relating to the lives of the

people. *The Labor Herald* was presuming to be out to unite all revolutionary workers in the labor movement.

Whenever the real motives of these godly-trinity was questioned—nothing but abuse and slander was the retort. Yet, as the old saying goes—no one does more to break down gods than the gods themselves. So it is that we read this "cheerful" message in an editorial of the *Daily Worker*:

"There have been many heart-rendering pangs at the passing from the field of revolutionary magazines of the *Labor Herald*, the *Liberator* and the *Soviet Russia Pictorial*. Each one of these printed expressions of distinct revolutionary currents had its field and its friends, thousands of them. Today, with the announcement that the three are to be combined into one great periodical, the *Workers' Monthly*, these partisan hosts of the one or the other are suffering some anxiety."

The truth then as to who really controlled all those three magazines was at last revealed! And the Workers' Party daily organ asks the duped ones not to suffer from anxiety. Let's hope they won't. The breaking down of their gods ought to prove a great enduring lesson to them.

* * *

As it is in Russia.

If ever there has been a government ruling with iron claws upon the entire life of the country's toilers, it appears to be now the case with Russia. It takes from one to two years time before any definite information can be had, as regards to labor conditions there. According to the National Council of the Russian Trade Unions, (governmentally controlled) there were 466 strikes in 1922 affecting 192,000 persons and 384 strikes in 1923 affecting 165,000 persons. Only seven of these strikes were sanctioned by the unions, (meaning the leaders) . . . and this—in a land where the dictatorship of the proletariat is supposed to be reigning supreme! . . .

—FRED S. GRAHAM.

MONIES RECEIVED

Thos. Brothers \$2.00; A. Steinhauser \$1.00; C. L. Swartz \$1.00; J. Meltzer (per group) \$3.00; T. S. Wetter \$1.00; Van Huizen \$1.00; John Binnie \$1.00; Nic Di Domenico (per group) \$4.50; T. Zazzi \$1.00; Frank Guida \$3.00; G. Dimitroff \$1.00; John Rinkena \$1.00; J. Scarceriaux \$3.25; Russian Society for Self Education \$3.00; Joseph Spivaek (per group) \$5.00 and for the Kropotkin Museum \$5.00.

People and the Nation

By RABINDRANATH TAGORE*

YOU ask me to explain to you what are my ideas about the nation. Most people think that Nationalism is that principle of unity which binds together the people who acknowledge it. And yet you do not call the Jews a nation who have a stronger bond of unity among themselves than most other peoples, a bond that has not yet been dissolved under the stress of centuries of homelessness and persecution. The individual members of this community may even belong to two enemy nations fighting against each other and yet socially and culturally they still belong to the same original brotherhood.

The same thing holds good with regard to the Hindus, who are considered to be a community but not a nation, though a very strong and conservative spirit of fundamental unity has been keeping them together for ages against all the political vicissitudes that have passed over them. Therefore I divide the collective aspect of the different human races into two categories—the people and the nation.

I regard the difference between people and nation as the same as that between the natural and the professional man—that is between man the father, the husband, the friend, and man the physician, the lawyer, the soldier, or the man of business. We often find real and fundamental differences between these two aspects in the same individual, between the natural and the

*During his recent visit to Italy Rabin-drath Tagore had a long conversation in Milan with an Italian comrade, in the course of which the Indian poet explained his views on national megalomania.

professional. The one can be kind and hospitable, and so forth; the other grasping, deceitful, and cruel. So when I judge a people I judge them, not only from that completely human aspect, for as people they have their love of humanity and of nature, but also as a nation, for in their national aspect they can be selfish and cruel.

The man who is generally willing to help others at once becomes a different being when he puts on his professional personality. I find that this professional aspect in people has become predominant in the West, and their humanity has become subordinate. It is this professional aspect which is the national aspect. The people are naturally creative, from them come art, religion, poetry and song, but in their professional capacity only the machinery and the organization for producing things. They are constructive, mechanical, they must have their fees, they can cease to be living, and because they are mechanical the artificial side of their nature tends to assert itself and they can gradually lose the deeper love of humanity, of justice, and of truth. As their wealth increases their power increases.

It is very difficult for an idealist to prove in the terms of these professional men and by using their arguments that spiritual truth is really higher. I cannot say "You are losing your power and wealth in this way, by being merely professional." They answer, "What are you? Merely beggars, whilst we are powerful. The truth that you preach has done us no good." So I can't prove to them that through the cultivation of the nation they have come to something evil.

(To be continued)

THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH

JUST OFF THE PRESS

Published by Boni & Liveright

Alexander Berkman's Russian Diary

"THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH" is a diary kept by Alexander Berkman during his two years in Russia. So far as is known this is the first day-by-day record that any one has succeeded in getting out of Russia since the revolution.

With great simplicity but at the same time with terrible realism he presents his experience, his encounters with people of all classes, with the great on the one hand—Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and the other leaders—and on the other, with the humble, the work-a-day people. You see through his eyes the terrified bourgeoisie; the starving intelligentsia; you hear the factory worker speak; and the Red army man; and the Tchekist, frankly cynical; you get an insight into the psychology of the sincere Communists, now persecuted for their opposition to the prevailing party; he takes you into the huts of the Ukrainian peasant; into the Soviet prisons; he gives you a glimpse of the impending famine.

It is not rash to predict that future collections of the literature of the Russian revolution will be incomplete without this faithful and moving book by Alexander Berkman.

"THE BOLSHEVIK MYTH" is his first published book since "Prison Memoirs of An Anarchist," which has been compared with the writings of Dostoevsky.

Price \$3 per copy. Add 15 cents for postage.

M. E. FITZGERALD,

45 Grove Street, New York City.