Laurance Labadie
Is Credulity Sweeping the World?
1937

Retrieved on 5/6/25 from https://c4ss.org/content/60239
Originally published in Vol. 1 No. 6 of Labadie's own publication *Discussion: A Journal of Free Spirits*. Brackets used to mark small grammatical and spelling corrections where possible.

theanarchistlibrary.org

Is Credulity Sweeping the World?

Laurance Labadie

1937

Somewhere in his book, *What is Property[?]*, Proudhon tells of a Parisian of the 17th century who heard it said that in Venice they had no king. This struck him as so absurd and ridiculous that he nearly killed himself from laughing. He wondered, I suppose, what sort of chaos existed in that king-forsaken city.

We of today are apt to also laugh at that simple-minded Parisian. For we know that it is possible to get along with but a president, or perhaps only a fuhrer, a duce, or a comrade. But after all, what is the difference? Have we really advanced at all over the credulous Frenchman?

I have just received an eight page folder gotten out by the National Association of Manufacturers in which a half-dozen of our liberals bemoan the increasing enhancement of the Roosevelt dictatorship. Take a look at their names: Hugh S. Johnson (‼), Frank R. Kent, David Lawrence, Walter Lippmann, Westbrook Pegler, and Dorothy Thompson. Reading over the sapient remarks of this imposing array of national talent, I gather that the government is going a little bit too far, at least quite too fast. Hugh Johnson! Well,

I'll pass him up. You may have my share of this gentleman. Miss Thompson thinks we should not "take steps which never again can be retraced," evidently unaware that the nature of government itself is to enhance its power at the expense of the governed. That we should *take* steps, indeed, as if the very inauguration of government was not the first step and as tho the process of federal enhancement of power hasn't continually accelerated since that time!

Lippmann of course believes we ought to talk it over more, not so fast, not so fast. Kent and Lawrence see plainly that we are heading toward the fascist state, which is not so good. And the doughty Pegler saves his shafts for the CIO. All good enough stuff, if one cares for the milk and water variety. But while the communists wail at *our* economic dictatorship, and the liberals at our political dictatorship, we are merrily "on our way"—into the abyss of totalitarianism. We await the dawn of the idea that dictatorship is dictatorship irrespective of whether it is "political" or "economic." For property and control are synonymous; and our whole social policy is steeped in a misuse of the property principle. But who says anything about that?

Property and control synonymous! What difference is there, I ask, between Proprietor Ford and Dictator Stalin? Would it make any difference if Mr. Ford said to his workers, "All this is yours, I am merely directing it for you"; and Mr. Stalin said, "All Russia is mine."? They are both running the works, aren't they? What has the worker to say in either event? We see the delegation of control in both cases. And how about the disgruntled, have they the opportunity to secede and go on their own, independently? Well, fortunately, in America they have some option in the matter. Mr. Ford has competitors and respects them; But there is only one dictator for the [B]olshevist totalitarian State.

The delegating of control, over the involuntary—that is the essence of the governmental superstition. It is deeply ingrained in us that the idea of a non-governmental society seems as absurd

as a no-king society did to the Frenchman. From the cradle to the grave the exploits of rulers are dinned into our heads as very important concerns. Conventional history is but a record of those in command of the State. And we argue, not about whether being kicked about is a good thing or not, but over *who* is going to do the kicking, and *how*. I see by the papers that the great city of New York is about to have another election. I expect the people therein will soon make much ado over who is to be the next mayor. Rather let them squabble over who's going to be the next gang to mulct New York's populace. If all the political maneuvering means anything more than a scramble over who are to get soft berths in the new regime, I'm greatly mistaken. And those naive dupes of their own ignorance, the socialist and communist politicians, will do their utmost in trying to climb on the bandwagon. (Did you ever notice that the more ignorant one is the more eager he is to "fix" things?)

I've often wondered what was the origin of the political superstition, read books about it, I guess it happened just about like this. Before man had progressed to the tool making age—when he just *took* for a living—and when nature at times furnished not enough for all—life was often pretty precarious. Men soon found out they could take from one another. But there arose a natural enmity between the taker and the takee, and taking was found to proceed better by ganging up. The successful takers became the bosses, the aristocracy, and the losers did the work. Society became divided into the rulers, the fighters, and the workers. And it still is!

What is the State today but an evolution of violent parasitism? How can this parasitic organization exist without the credulity of its dupes? Slaves having been bossed about for ages—how can they conceive of a condition wherein there is no one to tell them what to do, what they may do and what they may not. Tell such a man that you do not believe in a governmental society and he will think you're crazy. Indeed, 'tis likely that he will think you're dangerous and might like [like] to bash your head in for wanting to do away

with what he believes he cannot live without—dictators and rulers. Such are the poor wretches who think Comrade Stalin is a hero, as well as [our] patriots who whoop for "100% Americanism." And I doubt not that most of the liberals aforementioned are just as solicitous about saving "our form of government."

Does Society need the State to settle its difficulties? Answer: Yes; just like a drowning man needs a glass of water.