



MY

"POSISH"

=

We were asked, "How do you stand on centralization?"

Now, although we are not much of an organizer, the question comes under the head of things that we have an opinion on.

We are a centralizer—55 per cent.

We are a decentralizer—45 per cent.

That makes 100 per cent.

But we are not an extreme "centralist," like capitalism.

Our reason for this is in the fact, that (as we think) the capitalist's system, when fully centralized, will be unloaded into a garbage dump. *Its "center" won't save it.*

(Note: The question is not How to handle capitalism?—at least not yet. The question is How can we organize working class power?) A. F. of L. is highly centralized—it's centrifugal force was in the person of Mr. Samuel Gompers, now dead—that is, in a sense.

Now that my position is clear I will apologize for assuming that I have a right to support centralization or decentralization—so long as I'm honest about it—and don't exceed the four-bit limit.

*Mankind first must learn to act*

*Before it can tribute exact.*

Still being apologetic, I may as well be blunt—if not dull:

I'm not a thorough-bred centralizer.

I'm not a pure blooded one—a mosquito bite causes my pedigree to fluctuate and I grow flexible, in the swatting-arm.

But I'm better than a half-breed—about 11-16 central and 5-16 "dissent."

I'm out of order—the thing is a very minor question, and fully settled; since nobody seems to know where decentralization ends and where centralization begins—draw a line between them and we'll take sides, we will do an Anna Held "split"—like sheol we will!

I speak for "specification." Let us discuss things on their merits, not by generalizations.

\* \* \*

The Legion Fund Quota.

The business-men of Minneapolis have donated \$22,077.67 to the American Legion—money to be sent east. The business men collected this money, in the regular manner, from their customers and employes.

The merchants are quite liberal with other peoples' money.

The Legion is seeking \$5,000,000.

In connection let's suggest that we, the workers, approach the boss for a little something extra and donate it to our papers.

\* \* \*

I have in my pocket one of those little red cards—you've seen them. On the front page among other things is written:

Agriculture—Department.

Farming—Industry.

Laborer—Occupation.

Now, I take exceptions to that word laborer. I am not a member of the Industrial Laborers of the Earth.

I'm simply a worker—an unassuming member of the Industrial Workers of the World. I recognize no craft—skilled or non-skid. I don't want the word "slave" put in my book in place of "laborer"—worker is better, holy as the name labor is.

What's the matter with the words:

Exploitee.

Employee.

Wage-earner.

Producer, etc.

Note—My reason for "kicking" is in the fact that the word LABOR implies a WHOLE of USEFUL PEOPLE, but "Laborer," on the other hand, insinuates there is an assortment of disunited "grades"—establishing a division of labor—creating "differences"

We're a One Big Union of Workers.—  
(T-b. S.)