Monarchical absolutism is unspeakably clumsy, stupidly exposing itself to rebellion and uprisings. But the ballot box is the most potent factor for well-ordered oppression and exploitation. It hypnotizes its victims into the belief of political sovereignty and independence, while at the same time still firmer riveting the chains of bondage. - Emma Goldman

"I hate to brag, but I am the state."
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This year's annual Soil of Liberty picnic was called to observe the 50th anniversary of the execution of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti. On August 22nd, some 40 people gathered and Tom Copeland gave the following talk.

Welcome and thanks for coming to this anarchist picnic. Anarchist picnics are a tradition around the world, occasions used by anarchists to enjoy each other's company, to develop solidarity around political activities and to raise money for anarchist causes. Many anarchist picnics were held across this country during the 1920's to raise money for the defense of Sacco and Vanzetti. It seems appropriate, therefore, that our picnic today honor these two men.

This coming Tuesday marks the 50th anniversary of the execution of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti by the state of Massachusetts. They were electrocuted August 23, 1927. I have read and studied their case over a number of years. I've been interested in the cases' enormous influence and in the monumental legal injustice done to them. As a future anarchist lawyer, I am particularly concerned about the legal issues of the case. A special significance for me is that my birthday falls on the same day as Sacco and Vanzetti's execution, August 23rd. This gives me a sense of a special bond with them.

Sacco and Vanzetti were born in Italy and immigrated to this country around the turn of the century. They were unskilled laborers working long hours for little pay. Sacco eventually became a shoemaker and Vanzetti a fish peddler. Both were radicals and well known public speakers involved in local strikes and anarchist activities, hard-working members of the rank and file anarchist movement. They fled to Mexico during World War I to escape the draft.

In 1920 a pay master and his guard carrying a $15,000 payroll were killed and robbed in Braintree, Massachusetts. Shortly thereafter, Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested and charged with the two murders. In 1921, a jury found them guilty and they were sentenced to die. The political climate in America at this time had a great impact on the Sacco-Vanzetti case. The radical movement had reached a peak immediately following World War I. There were large organizations of Socialists, Wobblies, Communists and Anarchists.

It was the Bolshevik Revolution caused many US radicals to believe that an American revolution which would overthrow capitalism was just around the corner. 1919 brought a national steel strike, the Seattle general strike and the Boston police strike. The courts experienced a wave of bombings supposedly by anarchist and radical groups. The power of labor and the strong influence of radicalism displayed themselves massively.

This political upheaval struck fear into the hearts of powerful business interests and the state and federal governments. The media became gripped in an hysterical passion of anti-radicalism. Congress passed the Sedition Act, which provided for the deportation of aliens who held objectionable economic or political views. In 1920, the federal government conducted a nationwide round-up of radicals. Coordinated by J. Edgar Hoover, these "Raids", as they were called, netted 10,000 arrests in New York alone. In Boston, 500 men and women were marched through the streets in chains. Over 10,000 people were arrested across the country. Membership in a radical organization was the only evidence against these people. Their civil rights were completely ignored. Many were arrested in the middle of the night without search or arrest warrants. 700 aliens including anarchists Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were deported. The law they were deported under remains in effect. Today alien anarchists can still be deported for their beliefs.

It is with this background in mind that the Sacco-Vanzetti case is best understood. The government was spying on the anarchist organizations around Boston and looking to frame some radicals as scapegoats for the Braintree killings. When arrested, Sacco and Vanzetti were armed and carrying anarchist literature.

Their trial was a farce. Feelings ran high against radical and foreigners. They were convicted on circumstantial evidence, unreliable testimony by the prosecution's witnesses, and on what the prejudiced Judge called a "consciousness of guilt." The testimony of numerous defense witnesses giving alibis for the defendants was discounted by the Judge and Jury because the defendants' Italian and spoke with thick accents. After their conviction the Judge said to a friend, "I'd give anything to have them for anarchist bastards!"

American legal system denied Sacco and Vanzetti due process of their guilt or innocence aside, the evidence presented against them should never have resulted in a conviction or execution. They suffered the agony of waiting in jail for over seven years while countless futile court appeals were tried. The legal system operated then, as it does now, on a perverse, inflexible logic system. A defendant cannot be innocent of the law will not free him. In this case, the appeals court for Sacco and Vanzetti only ruled on what they themselves was just. The courts were frankly unwilling to apply the facts of the case to free the two men.

The Sacco and Vanzetti case attracted a tremendous amount of support from labor and radical groups across the country. Thousands of dollars were raised at rallies and picnics like this one to fund the defense committee. It has become the most famous criminal case in American history. But despite the millions of people who believed in their innocence Sacco and Vanzetti were executed on August 23, 1927 in the Massachusetts State Penitentiary for the execution, millions demanding that they be freed. Over 250,000 people came out for their funeral in Boston.

Sacco and Vanzetti were killed for their anarchist ideas. They never would have been tried and convicted without the pre-
In 1920 a pay master and his guard carrying a $15,000 payroll were killed and robbed in Braintree, Massachusetts. Shortly thereafter, Sacco and Vanzetti were arrested and charged with the two murders. In 1921, a jury found them guilty and they were sentenced to die. The political climate in America at this time had a great impact on the Sacco-Vanzetti case. The radical movement had reached a peak immediately following World War I. There were large organizations of Socialists, Wobblies, Communists and Anarchists. In 1918 the Bolshevik Revolution caused many US radicals to believe that an American revolution which would overthrow capitalism was just around the corner. 1919 brought a national steel strike, the Seattle general strike and the Boston police strike. The courts and government responded with a wave of bombings supposedly by anarchist and radical groups. The power of labor and the strong influence of radicalism displayed themselves massively.

This political upheaval struck fear into the hearts of powerful business interests and the state and federal governments. The media became gripped in a hysterical passion of anti-radicalism. Congress passed the Sedition Act, which provided for the deportation of aliens who held objectionable economic or political views. In 1920, the federal government conducted a nationwide round-up of radicals. Coordinated by J. Edgar Hoover, these "Sea Raids", as they were called, netted 5,000 arrests in New York alone. In Boston, 500 men and women were marched through the streets in chains. Over 10,000 people were arrested across the country. Membership in a radical organization was the only evidence against these people. Their civil rights were completely ignored. Many were arrested in the middle of the night without search or arrest warrants. 700 aliens including anarchists Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were deported. The law they were deported under remains in effect. Today alien anarchists can still be deported for their beliefs.

It is with this background in mind that the Sacco-Vanzetti case is best understood. The government was spying on the anarchist organizations around Boston and looking to frame some radicals as scapegoats for the Braintree killings. When arrested, Sacco and Vanzetti were armed and carrying anarchist literature.

Their trial was a farce. Feelings ran high against radical and foreigners. They were convicted on circumstantial evidence, unreliable testimony by the prosecution's witnesses, and on what the prejudiced judge called a "consciousness of guilt." The testimony of numerous defense witnesses giving alibis for the defendants was discounted by the Judge and Jury because the American citizen and spoke with thick accents. After their conviction the judge said to a friend, "Did you ever do anything with those anarchist bastards?"

American legal system dealt Sacco and Vanzetti under the law of their guilt or innocence aside, the evidence presented against them should never have resulted in a conviction or execution. They suffered the agony of waiting in jail for over seven years while countless futile court appeals were tried. The legal system operated then, as it does now, on a perverse, inflexible logic system. A defendant can be innocent but the law will not free him. In this case, the appeals court for Sacco and Vanzetti only ruled on whether the trial was just. The courts were frankly unwilling to apply the facts of the case to free the two men.

The Sacco and Vanzetti case attracted a tremendous amount of support from both national and radical groups across the country. Thousands of dollars were raised at rallies and picnics like this one to fund the defense committee. It has become the most famous criminal case in American history. But despite the millions of people calling for their innocence Sacco and Vanzetti were executed on August 23, 1927 in the Massachusetts State Prison. The day before their execution, millions demonstrating that they be freed. Over 250,000 people came out for their funeral in Boston.

Sacco and Vanzetti were killed for their anarchist ideas. They never would have been tried and convicted without the pre-
valing prejudice against aliens and radicals. Vanzetti once said, "We call ourselves Libertarians, which means briefly that we believe that human perfectibility is to be obtained by the largest amount of freedom, and not by coercion, and that the bad in human nature and conduct can only be eliminated by the elimination of its causes, and not by coercion or imposition, which cause greater evil by adding bad to bad."

In another letter from prison in 1923 Vanzetti said, "The anarchist goes ahead and says: all that is help to me without hurting the others is good; all that helps the others without hurting me is good also, all the rest is evil. Anarchists look for their liberty in the liberty of all, for their happiness in the happiness of all, for their welfare in the universal welfare. I am with them."

That's the history of the Sacco and Vanzetti case. I think it's important for their story to be retold again and again to each succeeding generation. Their case is not an isolated example of American Justice making a mistake. Similar cases and current political trials familiar to us all indicate that these are not mistakes but rather systematic attempts by the government to stifle anarchist and radical dissent with state violence and official lawlessness.

We all are aware of continual government repression. At times maybe we're too preoccupied with the forces of authoritarianism. It's an immense task we face as anarchists in helping to create a free society. But let's not become cynical about our lives and ideals. Sacco and Vanzetti experienced the solidarity and love of millions of comrades around the world. They felt a joy in their own commitment to changing society. They had a great hope that their comrades would continue on with the work that was left to be done.

Two days before they died, on August 21st fifty years ago today, they wrote a letter to their defense committee from the death house of the Massachusetts State Prison. We are the descendants of those men and women who worked so hard in their defense and to whom Sacco and Vanzetti addressed this letter:

"Dear Friends and Comrades of the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee: After tomorrow midnight, we will be executed, save a new staying of the execution by either the United States Supreme Court or by Governor Alvan T. Fuller... We feel lost! Therefore, we decided to write this letter to you to express our gratitude and admiration for all that you have done in our defense during these seven years, four months, and eleven days of struggle.

That we exist and have to die does not diminish our appreciation and gratitude for your great solidarity with us and our families. Friends and Comrades, now that the tragedy of this trial is at an end, be all of us one heart. Only two of us will die. Our ideal, you, our comrades, will live by millions. Just treasure our suffering, our sorrow, our mistakes, our defeats, our passion for future battles and for the great emancipation.

Be all of one heart in this last hour of our tragedy. And have heart. Salute us all the friends and comrades of the earth. Long life to you all, long life to Liberty. Sacco and Vanzetti."

Fifty years later, we remember these two anarchists. I think their lives should give us a greater appreciation of the tradition of anarchism in this country. And I think that we all should take the time to spend together today to appreciate our own lives and the good work we all are doing. Let's celebrate and enjoy the afternoon.

Thinking Like A Woman
A Very Long Review

By Fluffy Gold

Whenever anyone makes any mention of the Women's Movement, I have to fight a nervous impulse to look over my shoulder. I'm not about to join the silly chorus of journalism which has blithely pronounced the Movement dead, especially when I remember that those reporters earning this week's salary writing obits for Women's Lib were the same ones who earned their bucks poking fun at feminism a few years back. I confess, though, to a certain sadness and confusion about a strong social movement which seems so diffuse and dissipated.

Actually, many women's projects have sustained themselves admirably over these last hard years--they grow and contribute a great deal to the alternative structure. What I miss is a more solidly organized political objection to the recent wave of conservative legal decisions (abortion restrictions for poor women, no maternity benefits at GE, strict name-change regulations) and the tightening of the screws in child care and welfare budgets. I also fail to find much that's lively coming out of the feminist presses. My hunch is that there's a direct link between the lack of any good new books and the general feeling of malaise with which most women I know view the woman's movement.

Leah Fritz's collection of essays, Thinking Like A Woman, looked to me more sprightly than anything published in the last year or two. Fritz has written for WSA, a pacifist, libertarian magazine, for years. I figured that at least I wouldn't waste any reading time getting heated up over more militarist crap in the name of defending the matriarchy and/or the revolution. (Last summer, I found a pamphlet at Mayday Books called Women and Guns. What next--Our Bodies, Our Bombs?)

Her approach to feminism is witty, irreverent and earthy. For the most part, she's mature without being ponderous in her reflections on political problems. Unfortunately, her essays reflect how a woman thinks in what are, stereotypically, the best and worst ways. She's warm, insightful and democratically patient. But the value of her wit is diminished by her messiness. The essays often trail off or seem to have little to do with the topic as originally stated. Lively insight which is not disciplined by the writer's own sense of the limits of her task quickly becomes an indulgent generalization, offering neither practical political suggestion nor moral depth. The most depressing thing about Fritz's thinking is that her glibness and tendency toward ti-trad and movement cliche increase in direct proportion to the development of her "feminist consciousness."

Feminists have criticized, and rightly so, the whole cult of logic for being cold and anti-human. But comes a time when it's necessary to build a better mouse trap or think one's way strategically through a maze of false reasoning and bureaucratic bullshit, then women had better know how to think logically. Even the construction of a modest political essay requires a careful logic to hold together the anger and concern which motivate radical action and to lead to some constructive suggestion.

......

The essays are divided into three sections. The first, "The Poetry of Politics" is an attempt to connect political concerns with other matters--sex and art
valuing prejudice against aliens and radicals. Vanzetti once said, "We call ourselves anarchists, which means briefly that we believe that human perfectibility is to be obtained by the largest amount of freedom, and not by coercion, and that the bad in human nature and conduct can only be eliminated by the elimination of its causes, and not by coercion or imposition, which cause greater evil by adding bad to bad."

In another letter from prison in 1923, Vanzetti said, "The anarchist goes ahead and says: all that is to help me without hurting the others is good; all that helps the others without hurting me is good also, all the rest is evil. Anarchists look for their liberty in the liberty of all, for their happiness in the happiness of all, for their welfare in the universal welfare. I am with them."

That's the history of the Sacco and Vanzetti case. I think it's important for their story to be retold again and again to each succeeding generation. Their case is not an isolated example of American justice making a mistake. Similar cases and current political trials familiar to us all indicate that these are not mistakes but rather systematic attempts by the government to stifle anarchist and radical dissent with state violence and official lawlessness.

We all are aware of continual government repression. At times maybe we're too preoccupied with the forces of authoritarianism. It's an immense task we face as anarchists in helping to create a free society. But let's not become cynical about our lives and ideals. Sacco and Vanzetti experienced the solidarity and love of millions of comrades around the world. They felt a joy in their own commitment to changing society. They had a great hope that their comrades would continue on with the work that was left to be done.

Two days before they died, on August 21st, fifty years ago today, they wrote a letter to their defense committee from the death house of the Massachusetts State Prison. We are the descendants of those men and women who worked so hard in their defense and to whom Sacco and Vanzetti addressed this letter:

"Dear Friends and Comrades of the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee:

After tomorrow midnight, we will be executed, save a posthumous stay of the execution by either the United States Supreme Court or by Governor Alvan T. Fuller.

We feelless! Therefore, we decided to write this letter to you to express our gratitude and admiration for all that you have done in our defense during these seven years, four months, and eleven days of struggle.

That we test and have to die does not diminish our appreciation and gratitude for your great solidarity with us and our families.

Friends and Comrades, now that the tragedy of this trial is at an end, be all as of one heart. Only two of us will die. In our stead, you comrades, will live by millions. Just treasure our suffering, our sorrow, our mistakes, our defeats, our passion for future battles and for the great emancipation.

Be all of one heart in this blackest hour of our tragedy. And have heart. Salute for us all the friends and comrades of the earth. Long life to you all, long life to liberty. Sacco and Vanzetti."

Fifty years later, we remember these two anarchists. I think their lives should give us a greater appreciation of the tradition of anarchism in this country. And I think that we all should take the time to spend together today to appreciate our own lives and the good work we all are doing. Let's celebrate and enjoy the afternoon.

Thinking Like A Woman
A Very Long Review

By Fluffy Gold

Whenever anyone makes any mention of the Women's Movement, I have to fight a nervous impulse to look over my shoulder. I'm not about to join the silly chorus of feminism which has blithely pronounced the Movement dead, especially when I remember that those reporters earning this week's salary writing obits for Women's Lib were the same ones who earned their bucks poking fun at feminism a few years back. I confess, though, to a certain sadness and confusion about a strong social movement which seems so diffuse and dissipated.

Actually, many women's projects have sustained themselves admirably over these last hard years— they grow and contribute a great deal to the alternative structure. What I miss is a more solidly organized political objection to the recent wave of conservative legal decisions (abortion restrictions for poor women, no maternity benefits at GE, strict name-change regulations) and the tightening of the screws in childcare and welfare budgets. I also fail to find much that's lively coming out of the feminist press. My hunch is that there's a direct link between the lack of any good new books and the general feeling of malaise with which most women I know view the women's movement.

Leah Fritz's collection of essays, Thinking Like A Woman, looked to be more sprightly than anything published in the last year or two. Fritz has written for WIN, a pacifist, libertarian magazine, for years. I figured that at least I wouldn't waste any reading time getting heated up over more militarist crap in the name of defending the matriarchy and/or the revolution. (Last summer, I found a pamphlet at Mayday Books called Women and Guns. What next—Our Bodies, Our Bombs?)

Her approach to feminism is witty, irreverent and earthy. For the most part, she's mature without being ponderous in her reflections on political problems. Unfortunately, her essays reflect how a woman thinks in what are, stereotypically, the best and worst ways. She's warm, insightful and democratically patient. But the value of her wit is diminished by her messiness. The essays often trail off or seem to have little to do with the topic as originally stated. Lively insight which is not disciplined by the writer's own sense of the limits of her task quickly degenerates into glib generalization, offering neither practical political suggestion nor moral depth. The most depressing thing about Fritz's thinking is that her glibness and tendency toward tedium and movement cliche increase in direct proportion to the development of her "feminist consciousness."

Feminists have criticized, and rightly so, the whole cult of logic for being cold and anti-human. But comes a time when it's necessary to build a better mousetrap or think one's way strategically through a maze of false reasoning and bureaucratic bullshit, then women had better know how to think logically. Even the construction of a modest political essay requires a careful logic to hold together the anger and concern which motivate radical action and to lead to some constructive suggestion.

The essays are divided into three sections. The first, "The Poetry of Politics" is an attempt to connect political concerns with other matters—sex and art
most particularly. Of these, the one I liked best was a lovingly detailed description of a Woman Strike for Peace demo in 1967. Fritz's alternative is a celebration of women activists and contains some splendid insights about the nature of activism and the relationships between demonstrators and police. Fritz loves women and the marvelous ways they look, act and react when they're together for such constructive and spirited purposes. Feminism is the motor force here, much gutsier than the later, more ideological sisterhood.

Other essays in this section suffer from her named hermaphroditism: the pages look lovely reflecting in any deep way about the consequences of one attitude upon another. She herself has been caught in her brainy cynicism and her abundant enthusiasm for all the best causes. Her comments on art are parties and unhelpful. She seeks to establish commercial art, by virtue of its accessibility (i.e., easily imitated or reproduced) as the cultural herald of true democracy: "Participatory art is replacing spectator art as participatory democracy seeks to replace spectator democracy." My objection is that much of what she cites as participatory art is art "stuff"—commodity more than creation. Embodiments of this participatory art are lovely and it's certainly a freeing experience to try one's hand at craft and decoration. Embodiments of this stuff up with street theatre, rock 'n' roll and modern dance and then pit them all against a "spectator art" which the bourgeoisie is an utter confusion of categories, the result of a self-defeating anti-intellectualism. If we are to deny our generation its witness to great art because of the social iniquities which surround it, then we only cut ourselves off from the little that is genuinely honorable in our history.

Fritz's muddled way of talking about art. Making a claim for the people's art as essentially informal, she then creates a polarity between the spontaneity of popular art and the formality of "high" art. The preconception necessary for the creation of formal art is seen as a characteristic which links that artist with the amoral, anti-human types who sit around planning wars and over- borrowing techniques. She concludes it's "more criminal to burn a Rembrandt or pay a million dollars for one while people starve!" Since both acts are stupid and unnecessary, why pose them as the only moral alternatives? "Surely, however, the artist should not specialize in art while the rest of the people live in envy and anger. I suppose this is a rather oblique capitulation to the vulgar Marxist claim that the artist is a parasite, a darling of the bourgeoisie, who paints or prints or paints or prints or starve or burn (adjust the stricto to the vehemence of the orator). Well, then, do we expect the hard-working orator to make art because the people live in envy and anger? I submit that he or she might not make a very glorious orator and that the whole purpose of the revolutionary project, for the libertarian, is not to make everybody be something but to clear the air so there's room to pat and build and sew and write in ways which are natural and useful and important for people involved in radical politics to be dismayed and bored by the vacuity and coldness of a high art. But the point is to criticize something within its own context, not by saying that it "lacks politics." Fritz also has a political sense in art screws up the gestalt just as surely as does lack of coherent form or purpose in the social. Fritz's careless, defensive relationship to art and art criticism is more than just sloopy, it's dangerous. As an art critic she's concerned that criticism, bound up as much as it is with the most conventional, restrictive standards, may discourage young, experimenting artists. Since she sees art as "a gift to the people," she concludes that it can not be bought; it shouldn't be criticized. Here she is, writing a whole book (which I bought), written a great part of her life in criticizing the American revolutionary effort, and she turns around and says we shouldn't criticize our art. This is a narrowly conceived concept of criticism and its signification of a politically correct attitude towards developing arts. It's certainly not shared by directly political art collections such as Minneapolis Circle of the Mitch who actively solicit criticism from their audiences. I think that the distinction between good and bad art is as important as the distinction between good and bad politics. Both reflect the society and both describe its present and predict its future. Conflating Rembrandt with body painting creates glib solidarity in much the same way that authoritarian leftists confuse dissent amongst their own numbers with reactionaries and reactionaries confuse protest with subversion. Less rigorous vigilance of a society's various arts only means that one thinks of them as secondary to politics. Many people do. Fritz didn't seem to be a member of that camp but the consequences of her logic live there.

She's not insensitive to the importance of language or to the various ways of using and abusing language, but she's naive in her notion that it's natural for people involved in radical politics to be dismayed and bored by the vacuity and coldness of a high art. But the point is to criticize something within its own context, not by saying that it "lacks politics." Fritz also has a political sense in art screws up the gestalt just as surely as does lack of coherent form or purpose in the social. Fritz's careless, defensive relationship to art and art criticism is more than just sloopy, it's dangerous. As an art critic she's concerned that criticism, bound up as much as it is with the most conventional, restrictive standards, may discourage young, experimenting artists. Since she sees art as "a gift to the people," she concludes that it can not be bought; it shouldn't be criticized. Here she is, writing a whole book (which I bought), written a great part of her life in criticizing the American revolutionary

"Our public schools must readers. See's fully hip to the fact that much of the appeal of Woman's Movement literature is that it's about sex. She notes, with her usual mushy wisdom, that the time spent covering the school scene, "was for me more deeply sensual than the heady days at Screw" (the yippy-political, dirty-picture magazine where several of her early essays were first printed). Now "sensual" is right down there with "relationship" and "sharing" and "cope" in my list of particularly general and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such a subject—a subject of the commercial abuse of recent years, is probably exactly the word to describe why the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp descriptions of the abuse of power and the need for over-simplify art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.

** The second round of essays, "The School Front" are the most non-ideological and politically practical in the book. Oddly enough, she thinks these might be less fun than the "good parts" which attracted
most particularly. Of these, the one I liked best was a lovingly detailed description of a Woman Strike for Peace demo in 1967. "The School Front" is a celebration of women activists and contains some splendid insights about the nature and journalism and the relationships between demonstrators and police. Fritz loves women and the marvelous ways they look, act and react when they're together for such constructive and spirited purposes. Feminism is the motor force here, much gutsier than the later, more ideological sisterhood.

Other essays in this section suffer from her damneddamneddamned conceits without reflecting in any deep way about the consequences of one attitude upon another. This is due partly to her hyper-cynicism and her abundant enthusiasm for all the best causes. Her comments on art are parties and unhypothetical. She seeks to establish commercial art, by virtue of its accessibility (i.e., easily imitated or reproduced) as the cultural herald of true democracy: "Participatory art is replacing spectator art as participatory democracy seeks to replace spectator democracy." My objection is that much of what she cites as participatory art is "stuff"--commodity more than creation. Embodiments of participatory art are lovely and it's certainly a freeing experience to try one's hand at craft and decoration. But, this stuff, which is stuff up with street theatre, rock n roll and modern dance and then pit them against a "spectator" who is, in this case, the bourgeoisie is an utter confusion of categories, the result of a self-defeating anti-intellectualism. If we are to deny our generation its witness to great art because of the social injustices which surround it--conceit--we only cut ourselves off from the little that is genuinely honorable in our history.

Fritz's scattered way of talking about art. Making a claim for the people's art as essentially informal, she then creates a polarity between the spontaneity of popular art and the formality of "high" art. The precondition necessary for the creation of formal art is seen as a characteristic which links that artist with the anvil, anti-human types who sit around planning wars and overseas trade policy. She describes this as "is it more criminal to burn a Rembrandt, or pay a million dollars for one while people starve?" Since both acts are stupid and unnecessary, why pose them as the only moral alternatives?

"Surely, however, the artist should not specialize in art while the rest of the people live in envy and anger. I suppose this is a rather oblique capitulation to the vulgar Marxist claim that the artist is a parasite, a darling of the bourgeoisie, who paints or prints to starve or burn (adjust the strotcity to the vehemence of the orator). Well then, if we expect the human being to face art because the people live in envy and anger? I submit that he or she might not make a very patternless world and that the whole purpose of the revolutionary project, for the libertarian, is not to make everybody something but to clear the air so there's room to sit and build and sew and write in ways which are useful and beautiful. And even natural for people involved in radical politics to be dismayed and bored by the vacuity and coldness of a whole commercial art, but the point is to criticize something within its own context, not by saying that it 'lacks'.

Fritz's careless, defensive relationship to art and art criticism is more than just sloppy, it's dangerous. She wonders if the political sense in art screws up up the gestalt just as surely as does lack of coherent form or language. Fritz's careless, defensive relationship to art and art criticism is more than just sloppy, it's dangerous. She wonders if the political sense in art screws up up the gestalt just as surely as does lack of coherent form or language. Fritz is trying to dictate what we mean and the result is a kind of totalitarianism. She's concerned that criticism, bound up as much as it is with the most conventional, restrictive standards, may discourage young, experimenting artists. Since she sees art as "a gift to the people," she concludes, "it can not be bought; it shouldn't be criticized." Here she is, writing a whole book (which I bought), devoted to a great part of her life in criticizing the American revolutionary effort, and she turns around and says we shouldn't criticize our art. This is a narrowly conceived concept of criticism and an unnecessarily defensive and self-righteous attitude towards developing art. It's certainly not shared by directly political art collectors and the "Spectator" of the Circle of the Arts who actively solicit criticism from their audiences.

I think that the distinction between good and bad art is as important as the distinction between good and bad politics. Both reflect the society and both describe its present and predict its future. Combining Rembrandt with body painting creates wondrous and indescribable confusion. But authoritarian leftists confuse dissent amongst their own numbers with reaction and reactionary right-wingers, protest with submission. Less rigorous vigilance of a society's various art only means that one thinks of them as secondary to politics. Many people do. Fritz didn't seem to be a member of that camp but the consequences of her logic leave her there.

She's not insensitive to the importance of language or of words. She's just unscrupulous and uses useful and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such an essay. In this very essay that demonstrates the commercial abuse of recent years, is probably exactly the word to describe why the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp description, a sensitivity of language, and a sense of the evasion of art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.

"Our public schools are just right there with 'relationship' and sharing and 'cope' with my life in particular general and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such an essay. In this very essay that demonstrates the commercial abuse of recent years, is probably exactly the word to describe why the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp description, a sensitivity of language, and a sense of the evasion of art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.

The second round of essays, "The School Front" are the most non-rhetorical and politically practical in the book. Oddly enough, she thinks these might be less fun that the "good parts" which attracted most readers. See's fully hip to the fact that much of the appeal of Woman's Movement literature is that it's about sex. She notes, with her usual mushy wisdom, that the time spent covering the school scene, "Was for me more deeply sensual than the heady days at Screw" (the yippy-political, dirty-picture magazine where several of her early essays were first printed). Now "sensual" is right down there with 'relationship' and 'sharing' and 'cope' with my life in particular general and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such an essay. In this very essay that demonstrates the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp description, a sensitivity of language, and a sense of the evasion of art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.

Our public schools are just right there with 'relationship' and sharing and 'cope' with my life in particular general and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such an essay. In this very essay that demonstrates the commercial abuse of recent years, is probably exactly the word to describe why the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp description, a sensitivity of language, and a sense of the evasion of art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.

The second round of essays, "The School Front" are the most non-rhetorical and politically practical in the book. Oddly enough, she thinks these might be less fun that the "good parts" which attracted most readers. See's fully hip to the fact that much of the appeal of Woman's Movement literature is that it's about sex. She notes, with her usual mushy wisdom, that the time spent covering the school scene, "Was for me more deeply sensual than the heady days at Screw" (the yippy-political, dirty-picture magazine where several of her early essays were first printed). Now "sensual" is right down there with 'relationship' and 'sharing' and 'cope' with my life in particular general and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such an essay. In this very essay that demonstrates the commercial abuse of recent years, is probably exactly the word to describe why the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp description, a sensitivity of language, and a sense of the evasion of art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.

"Our public schools are just right there with 'relationship' and sharing and 'cope' with my life in particular general and useless words so it wouldn't have occurred to me as a way of describing such an essay. In this very essay that demonstrates the commercial abuse of recent years, is probably exactly the word to describe why the "School Front" essays are so good and so consistently much better than the material which comes before and after. The motivating spirit is indignation, not the blind variety. Fritz's outrage is expressed through clear crisp description, a sensitivity of language, and a sense of the evasion of art criticism so that it won't conflict with a flower-child approach to revolution.
of the attempts to desegregate the New York schools are so welcome in contrast to the windy rage and rhetoric with which the Left surrounded the Boston school debacle.

The third section, "From Pussy to Person", chronicles Fritz's development under the "questioning discipline of feminism," an expression fraught with so much self-righteousness and potential self-dentality that it makes me ache. The title itself reflects an increasing tension between for-real language and political propriety. "Pussy" is one of those annoyingly expressive words, crudely reductive but based on the legitimate observation that a woman's private parts are warm and furry. A fairly harmless reference to any female crotch "Pussy." Like so many of our sex words, has the obnoxious potential to hurt or humiliate. Person, by contrast, is just plain dull. Replacing a specials epithet with a bland pronoun is just avoidance, no happy ending linguistically or culturally.

Isn't it possible that a woman might simultaneously be possessed of a warm cunt and an active brain? Must the sexual self (pussy) be left behind in order to claim any attention for the other selves (persons)? This is another of Fritz's unnecessary dichotomies and a particularly objectionable dichotomy that since it cramps any woman's style and reflects a narrowing of social choices open to feminists.

She declares a pacifist-feminist war on "bureaucracy, cant and thought-control" yet her own writing is increasingly weighted with a devotional feminism approaching cant. And her capacity for over-generalization increases in direct relation to her allegiance to feminism. This becomes a king of self-imposed thought-control.

Just as in the earlier essays, her first thoughts are more interesting than those which result from dwelling. My favorite essay in this last section concerns itself in a reasonable and decently brief manner with one of the big feminist grudges-organism. Her comments on coming are fairly snippy and direct. They make much more sense to me than the usual feminist approach which makes "achieving" orgasm sound like government-subsidized highway construction-a big, impersonal project. What she does with this topic, which is Fritz at her best, is to take such a personal matter and use her political insight, not to abstract the discussion, but to give it depth and to connect women with each other in a shared dilemma:

"As close to the truth as I can come is that we live in a world where all human enjoyment is thwarted by an accusative system forcing us to mollinger in the marketplace. All human beings must be more or less frigid in a robot-run society. If our bread and water and air are contaminated and our country earns its livelihood from genocide, past and present, and women are regarded as legitimate subhuman prey by male creatures who call themselves men, and colored peoples are used as beasts of burden by white creatures who call themselves human, then our loves and cannot be anything but grotesque shadows of what they should become."

Just two essays earlier, she objected to the "short-sightedness of each faction who would hope to participate in the whole revolution the world needs."

OK. So why the big surprise that the sexual revolution is and was largely hype and hardly a panacea? And why does this belated realization not promote the earnest search for a root cause, the original sin which cast our world into such cruelty and despair?

I think such a search, coming from someone who's shown some real maturity and wit in her writing, stems from the hasty and anti-intellectual way in which young American leftists fashioned their ideas about cultural revolution. I always thought the propaganda sounded a little phony and contrived but many of my friends, and evidently Fritz too, were dead earnest about developing a politics which would address all human concerns. I'm not arguing against the integration of art and psychology with politics but I am questioning what strikes me as a sloppy lip-service to "culture" which has nothing to do with integration but only subsumes everything into the "political Framework?"

My thought is that therapy is best done by carefully trained people, since troubled souls require both gentleness and lots of good hard pushes in order to get them out of their various ruts. Support groups or political "community" aren't adequate to take the place of therapy when organized by people with practical sense who also care about food and health. Anybody who troubled through the Coop Organization mania in Minneapolis knows that ideology won't keep a coop running. And I'll bet Fritz will have forgotten that the profundity and vision of the masters of real art has come from promise of individual genius, dedication and vision. Some art emerges in cooperative forms but the impulse is individual. Most "political art" is entertaining propaganda, fun and instructive when it's well done but not to be confused with other modes of art. All these pursuits are improved when the practitioners have some political wisdom. Most great writers have it and political passion which operates in conjunction with their other concerns. Therapists are trained to deal with the human psyche and political arrangements make people as miserable as...
of the attempts to desegregate the New York schools are so welcome in contrast to the windy rage and rhetoric with which the Left surrounded the Boston school debacle.

The third section, "From Pussy to Person", chronicles Fritz's development under the "questioning discipline of feminism," an expression fraught with so much self-righteousness and potential self-dentality that it makes me ache. The title itself reflects an increasing tension between for-real language and political propriety. "Pussy" is one of those annoyingly expressive words, crudely reductive but based on the legitimate observation that a woman's private parts are warm and fleshy. A fairly harmless reference to any female member of "Pussy". Like so many of our sex words, has the obnoxious potential to hurt or humiliate. Person, by contrast, is just plain dull. Replacing a spiritful epithet with a bland pronoun is just avoidance, no happy ending linguistically or culturally.

Isn't it possible that a woman might simultaneously be possessed of a warm cunt and an active brain? Must the sexual self (pussy) be left behind in order to claim any attention for the other selves (persons)? This is another of Fritz's unnecessary dichotomies and a particularly objectionable dichotomy that since it cramps any woman's style and reflects a narrowing of social choices open to feminists.

She declares a pacifist-feminist war on "bureaucracy, cant and thought-control!" yet her own writing is increasingly weighted with a devotional feminism approaching cant. And her capacity for over-generalization increases in direct relation to her allegiance to feminism. This becomes a king of self-imposed thought-control.

Just as in the earlier essays, her first thoughts are more interesting than those which result from dwelling. My favorite essay in this last section concerns itself in a reasonable and decently brief manner with one of the big feminist grudge-orgasms. Her comments on coming are fairly snotty and direct. They make more sense to me than the usual feminist approach which makes "achieving" orgasm sound like government-subsidized highway construction—a big, impersonal project. What she does with this topic, which is Fritz at her best, is to take such a personal matter and use her political insight, not to abstract the discussion, but to give it depth and to connect women with each other in a shared dilemma:

"As close to the truth as I can come is that we live in a world where all human enjoyment is thwarted by an acquisitive system forcing us to mallinger in the marketplace. All human beings must be more or less frigid in a robot-run society. If our bread and water and air are contaminated and our country wins its livelihood from genocide, past and present, and women are regarded as legitimate subhuman prey by male creatures who call themselves men, and colored peoples are used as beasts of burden by white creatures who call themselves human, then our lovesives cannot be anything but grotesque shadows of what they should become."

Returning to the subject of sex one year later, and again in WIN, Fritz gets more ambitious and much murkier. She announces that, in 1971, "It seems anachronistic to think of sex as central to anything..."

More directly, "Our sexual bigotry, repression and confusion may simply be more symptoms, along with greed and belligerence—of a still deeper problem of the human soul, one that may be insoluble. In other words, I no longer think of sex as the root problem.

Such pronouncement indicates that she once thought it was and that she still thinks there is a root problem. (The essay moves towards an increasingly grumpy vision of the human animal and a vague suggestion that genetic alteration might be the only real hope.) We all have our pet theories about what's really wrong with everything. They develop with cancerous rapidity during times of indecision and insomia. Some nights it's capitalism, some nights it's nookie.

Well, Fritz was thinking maybe it was nookie that was the real problem until she noticed that the "sexual revolution" had a greedy, commercial character to it and, "That it hasn't managed to get the human race out of the bind it's in, and just such a release could have been expected if sex were at the root of our problem." This is the point where I feel like I've just lost a friend or suddenly gotten very old, very fast. Here she's been insisting that she doesn't buy monolithic approaches to revolution, yet two essays earlier, she objected to the "short-sightedness of each faction who would hope to participate in the whole revolution the world needs." OK. So why the big surprise that the sexual revolution is and was largely hype and hardly a panacea? And why does this belated realization in no way promote the earnest search for a root cause, the original sin which cast our world into such cruelty and despair?

I think such a search, coming from someone who's shown some real maturity and wit in her writing, stems from the hasty and anti-intellectual way in which young American leftists fashioned their ideas about cultural revolution. Always thought the propaganda sounded a little phoney and contrived but many of my friends, and evidently Fritz too, were dead earnest about developing a politics which would address all human concerns. I'm not arguing against the integration of art and psychology with politics but I am questioning what strikes me as a sloppy lip-service to "culture" which has nothing to do with integration but onlysubsumes everything into the "political Framework."

My thought is that therapy is best done by carefully trained people, since troubled souls require both gentleness and lots of good hard pushes in order to get them out of their various ruts. Support groups or political "community" aren't adequate as they often work better when organized by people with practical sense who also care about food and health. Anybody who toughened itself through the Cooperative Movement, like those in Minneapolis who know that ideology won't keep a coop running. And I believe the product of individual genius, dedication and vision. Some art emerges in cooperative forms but the impulse is individual. Most "political art" is entertaining propaganda, fun and instructive when it's well done but not to be confused with other more fine art. All these pursuits are improved when the practitioners have some political wisdom. Most great writers have the product of personal passion which operates in confluence with their other concerns. Therapists are often the ones who these days political arrangements make people as miserable as
Havening been bombarded for quite some time by numerous "peace proposals" to end the bloody Palestine dispute, one could hardly sort out the relevant views without posing once again the crucial question: What is the underlying cause of the conflict? The coming to power of the right wing Likud Party in Israel and the analytical barrage that followed the recent Israeli election did little to clarify this situation.

The nicely garnished but bitter tasting vocabulary served to us by some "experts" in Middle East affairs does not even come close to tackling the basic question. The mish-mash of ideas such as "united Arab kingdom," "Arab Solidarity," "Geneva talks," and most importantly, the "two-state idea," whether in the form of a stage towards or the final solution, in fact diverts attention from the crucial question.

What is Zionism against which the Palestinian Arab people's struggle has been waged? Of course, one may cite quotations, resolutions and statements in order to uncover the mask from the face of this monstrous colonial creature. More specifically, one may refer to the resolution of the World Zionists, in the role of the Jewish National Fund, the Israeli Law of Return, and to the Defense (Emergency) Regulations, to mention just a few examples which are inherent in Zionism.

But the truth is that only a few Palestinian Arabs have ever read, or even cared about these documents. They do not need to read them. They have felt on their own flesh what Zionism really is. They have experienced the bitter taste of being a problem by having been born to non-Jewish mothers; by being an "uncivilized" population living for centuries in a country into which European "civiliza-

Yet, some so-called pragmatists, it seems, would like to be reconciled to the underlying cause of this reality. And in the process of Political maneuvering, which has been characteristic of every Political elite, and under the national and/or class banner, they are willing to betray large segments of the Palestinian Arab people, e.g., the refugees of 1948 and the Palestinian Arabs under Israeli rule since 1948, and in fact to forget the basic cause of the people's struggle—the struggle against colonialism.

A word must be said here about those from the different camps who aggressively advocate the two-state approach. Zionists have come to recognize personalities like General (Res.) Mattitiyahu Peled, who, in his bid for the hearts and minds of the recent Israeli election, adorned himself with his military uniform and appeared on Israeli TV explaining a military point of view. Israels should accept his views. Another is Arid Iliav who proudly announces that because he killed a Palestinian Arab when he was only sixteen years old, he can better understand the Arabs and therefore talk to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). These individuals and the Israeli Council for Israeli-Palestinian Peace which they represent, are the ones who, at the time of this writing, are still holding the "talking with PLO personalities among whom is Ismael Sartawi who in turn seems to report to a top PLO official." The Israeli Communist Party (Rakah), which was indirectly referred to in the fifteen-point resolution of the latest Palestine National Council as the "Jewish democratic and progressive forces inside and outside the occupied homeland," has also been involved in its own "peace" campaign. Although one must respect the work which this party has done throughout the years in providing the only legal political tool through which Palestinian Arabs in Israel could express their socio-political aspirations, one must not overlook some other significant points.

Rakah, for instance, is still committed to U.S. Security Council resolution 242 which does not recognize the Palestinian Arabs' peoplehood. The result of the negotiations between Rakah and the (Marxist-Leninist) Israeli Socialist Organization (Matzpen) with regard to what was supposed to be a unified demonstration on May Day this year is, therefore, not a surprise. In the preparatory meetings for the demonstration Rakah, for instance, was having a hard time accepting Matzpen's request to carry only red flags and not the Israeli Zionist flags to which Rakah is so accustomed. However, only after special efforts was Matzpen permitted to carry the slogan "The right to self-determination for the Palestinian people!" Out of a total of 10 slogans that Matzpen proposed to carry in the demonstration, seven were completely rejected by Rakah. Among those refused were:

"Against Zionism, Against Imperialism, Against..."
Towards A Free Peoples Society In Palestine

By Nadav Carmel-Katz

The root cause and the most fundamental aspect of the present-colonial-settler rule over Palestine, namely Zionism. The problem is not a "Palestinian Arab problem" as some have attempted to describe it, and therefore to "solve" it. The very existence of a people is not a problem. The indigenous Arab population of Palestine has merely been a victim of a problem and for years now has struggled to eradicate it. Nor is the problem the lack of a homeland for the Palestinian Arab people. Palestine, which stretches from the Jordan River westward to the Mediterranean Sea, has always been the homeland of the Palestinian Arab people. The cause of the dispute to which we must address ourselves is, therefore, Zionism.

Zionism, as the movement that decided to penetrate, and for disputing by their very existence the myth perpetrated by Zionism of "a land without a people." Zionism for a Palestinian Arab is not a theoretical phenomenon, it is rather a daily reality. It is a reality which has professed itself through "legal" and illegal confiscation and expropriation of his land and by so doing depriving him of his spiritual-cultural and material source of livelihood. Zionism is a reality of attempting to transfer a whole people. It has already succeeded in reducing a large portion of it into a status of a refugee society. Zionism is the force which protects murderers in the region when they are in the midst of massacring Palestinian Arabs, whether in Jordan or Lebanon, e.g. Hussein and Assad. Zionism for a Palestinian Arab still living in Palestine is a reality of daily harassment, of detentions, of blown up houses, of being beaten, tortured and killed.

Yet, some so-called pragmatists, it seems, would like to be reconciled to the underlying cause of this reality. And in the process of Political maneuvering, which has been characteristic of every Political elite, and under the national and/or class banner, they are willing to betray large segments of the Palestinian Arab people, e.g. the refugees of 1948 and the Palestinian Arabs under Israeli rule since 1948, and in fact to forget the basic cause of the people's struggle---the struggle against colonialism.

A word must be said here about those from the different camps who aggressively advocate the two-state approach. The "moderate" Zionists recognize personalities like General (Res.) Mattityahu Peled, who, in his book "in the heart of the mountain," made it clear that in the recent Israeli election, adorned himself with his military uniform and appeared on Israeli TV, explaining his military point of view. Israelis should accept his views. Another is Aridh Eliav who proudly announces that because he killed a Palestinian Arab when he was only sixteen years old, he can better understand the Arabs and therefore talk to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO). These people, and the Israeli Council for Israeli-Palestinian Peace which they represent, are the ones who, at the time of this writing, are still holding the "talks" with PLO personalities among whom is Issam Sarwati who in turn seems to report to a "top PLO official.

The Israeli Communist Party (Rakah), which was indirectly referred to in the fifteen-point resolution of the latest Palestine National Council as "the Jewish democratic and progressive forces inside and outside the occupied homeland", has also been involved in its own "peace" campaign. Although one must respect the work which this party has done throughout the years in providing the only legal political tool through which Palestinian Arabs in Israel could express their socio-political aspirations, one must not overlook some other significant points. Rakah, for instance, is still committed to U.N. Security Council resolution 242 which does not recognize the Palestinian Arabs' peoplehood. The result of the negotiations between Rakah and the (Mishal) Israeli Socialist Organization (Matzpen) with regard to what was supposed to be a unified demonstration on May Day this year is, therefore, not a surprise. In the preparatory meetings for the demonstration Rakah, for instance, was having a hard time accepting Matzpen's request to carry only red flags and not the Israeli Zionist flags to which Rakah is so accustomed. Moreover, only after special efforts was Matzpen permitted to carry the slogan "The right to self-determination for the Palestinian people!" Out of a total of 18 slogans that Matzpen proposed to carry in the demonstration, seven were completely rejected by Rakah. Among those refused were:

"Against Zionism, Against Imperialism, Against..."
Portugal: The Impossible Revolution by Phil Mawer, Free Life Editions, 1977; $5.95 pb.

Reviewed by Nhat Hong

The events following the defeat of fascism in Portugal on and after April 25, 1974 fascinated me, but I always felt at a loss for accurate information about it. The capitalist press which most of us have the easiest access to, seemed chock full of lies. It portrayed the whole upheaval in Portugal as a struggle between two state-capitalist parties trying to fill the "power vacuum" created by the ousting of Salazarism. The Socialists Party was presented as the good guys and all left activity was attributed to the Communist Party. I didn't believe that, given the same paper's complete hypocrisy and their pointed exclusion of anarchist activities there. So it was with some excitement and much gratitude that I began to read Phil Mawer's book, Portugal: The Impossible Revolution?

In many ways Mawer's account of the events in Portugal is depressing. Indeed, the power struggle was not merely between the Socialists Party and the C.P. Many, many groups were involved in the first week of political groups in the beginning of the book runs four pages and one has to keep turning back during the course of the book to find who ADU, ALM, AMI, ANOP, ANP, AOC, CAP, CCP, CDE, CDS, etc., are. But despite the plethora of particular groups and factions, it is in this that Mawer sees the tragedy of the "Impossible Revolution". To a party, the groups were all state capitalist in orientation (except the anarchists who were primarily older militants from Spain. They published a bi-weekly paper A Batalha with a press run of 10,000.) For all the talk of Popular Power in Portugal, the political scene was dominated by the police, the upper layers of the energies and imagination of a people in revolt.

There definitely was a revolutionary impulse emanating from the depths of Portuguese society. Portugal's colonial system was crumbling, hastened by direct attacks on it in Angola and Mozambique. Its economy lingered in the 19th Century. Agriculture remained a major employer (33%) of the country's workforce. As always, it was the working people who got squeezed the hardest as the system fell apart. The colonial wars took many of the young men each year and 49% of the national budget (1971) and in all the statistics analysts use to judge the quality of life, housing, doctor, population ratio, per capita income, literacy, etc., Portugal lagged so far behind its European neighbors that it could be said it wasn't really part of modern Europe at all. It was the people behind the forlorn statistics that really pushed Portugal to the brink of Social Revolution. But as Mawer makes clear, it was the parties--socialists, communists, anarchists, and fascists--who underestimated the people's efforts. But what efforts! People, leaving the parties behind them selled their factories and the land they worked. The state, unable to stop them, had all it could do to keep up by legal. Normally a race when the working people fought the government, the unions (CP dominated) and the CP. After a year and a half of inter-party squabbles and cynical manipulation of popular instinct and actions, workers in the fields and factories
Portugal in Revolt

The events following the defeat of fascism in Portugal on and after April 25, 1974 fascinated me, but I always felt at a loss for accurate information about it. The capitalist press which most of us have the easiest access to, seemed shock full of lies. It portrayed the whole upheaval in Portugal as a struggle between two state-socialist parties trying to fill the "power vacuum" created by the ousting of Salazarism. The Socialist Party was presented as the good guys and all left activity was attributed to the Communist Party. I didn't believe that, given the same paper's consistent efforts to point out the exclusion of anarchist activities there. So it was with some excitement and much gratitude that I began to read Phil Maller's book, Portugal: The Impossible Revolution?

In many ways Maller's account of the events in Portugal is depressing. Indeed, the power struggle was not merely between the Socialist Party and the C.P. Many, many groups were vying for power, the most powerful of which was the Cold War bloc of political groups in the beginning of the book runs four pages and one has to keep turning back during the course of the book to find who ADU, ALM, AMI, ANOP, ANP, AOC, CAP, CCP, CDE, CSV, etc. are. But despite the plethora of parties and conflicting ideologies it was in this that Maller sees the tragedy of the "Impossible Revolution". To a party, the groups were all state capitalist in orientation (except the anarchists who were primarily older militants from Spain. They published a bi-weekly paper A Batalha with a press run of 10,000.) For all the talk of Popular Power in Portugal, the political scene was dominated by the political parties cerebrating the energies and imagination of a people in revolt.

There definitely was a revolutionary impulse emanating from the depths of Portuguese society. Portugal's colonial system was crumbling, hastened by direct attacks on it in Angola and Mozambique. Its economy lingered in the 19th Century. Agriculture remained a major employer (35%) of the country's workforce. As always, it was the working people who got squeezed the hardest as the system fell apart. The colonial wars left many of the young men each year and 49% of the national budget (1971) and in all the statistics analysts use to judge the quality of life, housing, doctors, population ratio, per capita income, literacy, etc.) Portugal lagged so far behind its European neighbors that it could be said it wasn't really part of modern Europe at all.

It was the people behind the formal statistics that really pushed Portugal to the brink of Social Revolution. But as Maller makes clear, it was the parties--socialist, communist, etc. the activities of the parties that undermined the people's efforts. But what efforts! People, leaving the parties behind them seized their factories and the land they worked. The state, unable to stop them, had all it could do to keep up by depending on the police and the army. The working people fought the government, the unions (CP dominated) and the CP. After a year and a half of inter-party squabbles, electioneering and cynical manipulation of popular instinct and actions, workers in the fields and factories
had become distinctly anti-party, any party...but the damace had been done. Tired of their struggles being used, people hadn't the energy to stop the centrist Socialist Party on November 25, 1978 when it reassigned itself (and capitalistic democracy) in quashing a mythical coup attempt by the left.}

Phil Maller has not written the usual detached, historical account. While his research and writing are well grounded and "objective," he is also a passionate observer and participant. Besides imparting a lot of information to the reader, the book is very readable.

Reduced to its simplest, but none the less true, the lesson drawn from the book is one learned over many periods as well. That is, once the initiative and power is stolen from the workers, the revolution degenerates. Maller ends the book on this note:

"Hundreds of thousands of workers entered the struggle. But the enemy constantly appeared before them in unexpected garb: that of their own organizations. Every time they set up an organization they found it manipulated by so-called volunteers or leaders, who were more and more under control by the state, and understood little of why they were struggling. But even the groups which had paid lip service to a critique of the road did so because of their weakness. They were forced to support the base organizations. At the same time, some of those who had been the most militant, leant to a critique of state capitalism for their denunciation proved to be denunciation of particular sets of bureaucrats, not critiques of the system per se. The revolutionaries—or a grand scale of people found to be part of the problem, not part of the solution. In this the Portuguese experience may prove to be a pre-figure of revolutionary solutions to come. The lessons should be pondered while there is yet time. The alternative is clear. It was put concisely many years ago: "The liberation of the workers is the task of the workers themselves."

**LETTERS**

**Dear Fluffy,**

I liked very much your exchange of letters with Bob Davis of the Redwing Health Workers Organization (RHW). Your criticism of Davis' tract as being "dry," "unnecessary scientifically," and "filled with the business language of politics" is quite perceptible, for "style" is often revealing of underlying motives.

The whole approach of RHW is typical of the "libertarian" politician's conception of practice, completed with a notion of "style" as to how to relate to and gain the trust of "fellow workers." Thus we are assured of "a better relationship with all workers," etc., ad nauseam, one can win friends and influence people in the "libertarian" politics game (Dale Carnegie would have been proud!). Similarly, RHW has discovered that "good workers," who are also "active outside the home," are "more apt to respond to an organizing effort..."

While RHW attempts to organize people into capital, the real class struggle continues in such forms as (among other things) union unions, the desire to be defined as "worker," the rejection of sacrifice (notably in its political forms), and so on. Ideally, the problem comes from its failed practice that unions are "instruments of ideological control of the working class..." The scope of hope one feels towards the firm that their arrival at this conclusion is quickly extinguished, however, when we learn that they have ceased to see the future (or "non-revolutionary") by building revolutionary organizations and raising consciousness..."

-Yale, in his article "On Organization" (Fifth Estate, June 1977) points out that "libertarian" groups often "stress the need to create "conscience," and regard themselves as participants in activity which will supply a "missing link" in the revolutionary process..." Others, Jacobs notes, "offer correct leadership," they ('libertarians') offer "correct ideas." It should be no surprise that the people they address find it difficult to see the difference.

"This description is perfectly applicable to RHW and brings us back to our original reference as to their "style." As aspiring bureaucrats and thoroughgoing enemies of spontaneity, the RHW people find their highest realization in the technical jargon and "business language of politics" which they have so sensitively criticised.

For generalized creativity, Bob Brubaker for Aurora, PO Box 1165, Madison, WI 53701

**Friends,**

I hope you will find the enclosed article worthwhile to print. I started to work it out...after reading the interview with the hospital good guys (not RHW from Des Moines but the local fellow.) I think that interview is one of the best things I've read in a radical publication in several years. My only criticisms were that I wanted it longer and follow-up on a number of questions. I did take them to the hospital where I work.

Dear, Reading now the June issue, I realize Fluffy Gold's talk not only my language. (But I do read Ford's.) Nobody's perfectly perfect. Process, energy, continuum, effort; these are what I find important. Is it not just a matter of style? People of total commitment to continue and continue with full consciousness should be more than words on the page. We need to make their writing a bit more consistent. In particular, with Fluffy. Not to make Fluffy's language more consistent in particular, but to make it not only one's personal style, but a personal style."

"I myself think that RHW's thinking is going to be a bit mechanistic, except in letters. But where do you draw the line? Is it not just a matter of style? People of total commitment to continue and continue with full consciousness would easily agree with Fluffy about language. And there is not space in our movement for a multitude of "styles.""

And then there are "Central Committees" which talk with sparkles, workers' work etc., which I think are the best wishes, Seattle Cain, Cloquet, Minnesota

(Note: we did not have room this issue for "Sesame's "Technology and Freedom")

**Dear Anarchists,**

I was astonished by the number and vehemence of the responses to my exchange with Des Moines in the last issue. Two of the responses are printed here and I am not going to publish. Most of the discussion occurred in conversation, calls from friends and comments made by people at the SPA conference last summer. The most critical responses asked or enlarged the remarks made by Seasms Cain. Essentially, I found myself positioned as an Anarchist Miss Grundy, explaining over "style" while the real revolutionaries got on with business of facts and analysis. This is depressing and frustrating but it is so frequent that I'll try to continue to change the impoverished language of the left more seriously.

The way we say things has everything to do with the way things are understood. If we push up our remarks in a winding of abstraction and unnecessary scintilcts, we distance one of the basic tenants of anarchism—simply anything possible.

Science and abstraction have their place in the world of ideas and not everything important is particularly "fun" to read. But the Des Moines analysis was not so complex that it required the scientific jargon and "business language of politics.""

I suppose that rotten ideas can occasionally be shared up with fancy language although I don't think this is the case. I'm excluding slithery glibness.) Such a suggestion is really just being honest. I didn't request more elegance or grand, creative. All I said was that the piece would be better if it was simpler and more clearly written. And I stick to my observation that such useless jargon is tied up with a kind of formality 19th Century Marxism learned, as a matter of workers and the "stages" of organizing which is the bane of good organizing.

The bright and good-hearted people over the years who've told me that they think about politics and that they'd like to do things but they can't stand the rhetoric and heavily impressionistic tone (count the number of "shoulds" and "musts" in any political essay, mine included) of what passes for conversation amongst most activists.
had become distinctly anti-party, any party, but the damace had been done. Tired of their struggles being used, people hadn't the energy to stop the centrist Socialist Party or the Social Democrats on November 25, 1978 when it massed itself (and capitalist social democracy) in quashing a mythical coup attempt by the left.

Phil Malier has not written the usual detached, historical account. While his research and writing are well grounded and "objective," he is also a passionate observer and participant. Besides imparting a lot of information to the reader, the book is very readable.

Reduced to its simplest, but none the less true, the lesson drawn from the book is one learned over long periods as well. That is, once the initiative and power is stolen from the workers, the revolution degrades. Malier ends the book on this note:

"Hundreds of thousands of workers entered the struggle. But the enemy constantly appeared before them in unexpected garb: that of their own organizations. Every time they set up an organization they found it manipulated by so-called vanguard or leaders who were not only incomprehensible but who understood little of why they were struggling. Even the groups who paid lip service to a critique of this phenomenon did so because of their weakness. They were forced to support the base organizations. They were being judged a leninist for having a critique of state capitalism for their denunciations proved to be denials of particular sets of bureaucratists, not critiques of the system perse. The revolutionaries—or a grand scale—found to be part of the problem, not part of the solution. In this the Portuguese experience may prove to be a pre-figure of revolutions to come. The lessons should be pondered while there is yet time. The alternative is clear. It was put conclusively many years ago: "The liberation of the workers is the task of the workers themselves."

Dear Fluffy,

I liked very much your exchange of letters with Bob Davis of the Redwing Health Workers Organization (RHMO). Your criticism of Davis' tract as being too "dry," "unnecessarily scientific," and "filled with the 'business language of politics'" is quite perceptive, for "style" is often revealing of underlying motives.

The whole approach of RHMO is typical of the "libertarian" politician's conception of practice, completed with a misapplied formula as to how to relate to and gain the trust of "fellow workers." Thus we are assured by Dr. Davis, "being friendly with all workers," etc. As a hausmain, one can win friends and influence people in the "libertarian" politics game (Dale Carnegie would have been proud!) Similarly, RHMO has discovered that "good workers," who are also "active outside the home," are "more apt to respond to an organizing effort."

While RHMO attempts to organize people into Capital, the real class struggle continues in such forms as (among other things) union struggles, the refusal to be defined as "worker," the rejection of sacrifice (notably in its political forms), etc. So, in a letter, to a worker, a comrade from its failed practice that unions are "instruments of ideological control of the working class..." The Spaniards hope one feels towards the workers of his own class. The potential for building revolutionary organizations and raising consciousness...

J. Jacobs, in his article "On Organization" (Fifth Estate, June 1977) points out that "libertarian" groups often "stress the need to create 'culture' and to regard themselves as participants in activity which will supply a 'missing link' in the revolutionary process." "Others," Jacobs notes, "offer 'correct leadership,' they offer 'correct ideas.'" It should be no surprise that the people they address find it difficult to see the difference.

This description is perfectly applicable to RHMO and brings us back to our original reference as to their "style." As aspiring bureaucrats are thoroughly emasculated by spontaneity, the RHMO people find their highest realization in the technical jargon and "business language of politics" which they have so sensitively criticized.

For generalized creativity, Bob Brubaker for Aurora, PO Box 1163, Madison, Wis 53701

Dear Anarchists:

I was astonished by the number and vehemence of the responses to my exchange with Des Moines in the last issue of L. Two of the responses are printed here. Thank you for publishing. Most of the discussion occurred in conversation, calls from friends and comments made by people at the SFM Conference last summer.

The most critical response echoed or enlarged the remarks made by Seamus Cain. Essentially, I found myself positioned as an Anarchist. Miss Grundy, picking over "style" while the real revolution goes on, as "a method of business of facts and analysis. This is deceptive and counterproductive, but it is so frequent that I'll try to pay more attention to the impoverished language of the left more often.

The way one says things has everything to do with the way things are understood. If we push up our remarks in a winding of abstraction and unnecessary semantics, we distort one of the basic tenets of anarchism—simplicity whenever possible.

Science and abstraction have their place in the world of ideas and not everything important, I particularly "fan" to read. But the Des Moines analysis was not so complex that it required the scientific jargon and "trope" of the "heavy-handed pedantic analysis."

I suppose that rotten ideas can occasionally be shared up with fancy language although I feel bad when I read my own. [Note: see the last issue for that piece.]

J. Jacobs

[Note: we did not have room this issue for "Seamus' article, 'Technology and Freedom.')
Several people told me they didn't particularly disagree with what I said but that they didn't think it was a crucial enough issue to take up space in a political magazine. Here I take issue more each day. Until the American Left, Anarchist or otherwise, learns that its most imperative task is communication, we are doomed to irrelevance. The only people who'll tolerate the cluttered, archaic, mambo-jumbo of the kind I objected to in the Pastel piece are leftists. If that's all you expect of yourselves, fine. Do it on your own time. I want Soil of Liberty to be a forum for Anarchists with good ideas and useful projects, a place to tell what they know, not a place to practice revolutionarily double-talk. Yours in grumpy solidarity,
Fluffy Goted

In response to Bob Davis' June '77 article on union organizing, I want to relate the story of three years of organizing with the Guild of Taxi Drivers and Associated Workers. Our union struggle was divided into periods as well. First, our membership was made up of a similar hodge-podge of Marxists, Marxist-Stalinists, militant feminists, anarchist-communists and a couple of us industrial unionists.

The second period consisted of transition from these diverse classifications to something like a Marxist/Leninist/Maoist syndrome as the union became mechanical, i.e. tradition-bound and business as usual mentality which did not answer the needs of the workers. Yet there is an answer, I believe.

Our third period is where we are today, realizing that for all our shortcomings, 'there was' a union which was concerned with the workers' needs. We find ourselves developing as union members becoming more aware of our shortcomings and we continue organizing. What we do now is the company's failure to honor our contract.

So if you want to start a rank and file newsletter to rate worker consciousness, as we have done with our Hack News, then do, but don't set unionism aside for a class struggle alone or you'll find yourself using the boss' tactic of divide and conquer---in this case yourselves.

In solidarity,
Gregory McDaniel
Minneapolis

Dear Comrades,

With regards to Vol. 3, No. 2, I would like to offer the following clarifications and clarifications of the subject of Direct Action and Non-Violence.

In this issue, I would like to state that the use of Direct Action is not only a power-ful tool in confronting the political forces of the State but it is also the best tool that labor has in its arsenal against capitalism. The use of Direct Action--as opposed to the use of going through the labor bureaucracy or through the political system or parties--is the best way that labor can win both immediate and far reaching demands and control. Another words, "the secret of [workers] direct action is simple enough: if workers quit doing what they are told to do, and do instead what they have collectively decided to do, there isn't anything much that can be done to stop them". (Industrial Workers of the World, One Big Union, p. 23.)

Workers' Direct Action and the Social General Strike, are the only two weapons that can protect labor's collective interests. The workers can not expect to win their freedom through any other medium. Only through the direct struggle of the working class can the chains of wage and political slavery and domination be abolished. I feel that this spirit of the social revolution must be expressed as much as political and community Direct Action. Remember, without the coordination and Direct Action of both community and working class organizations, any sort of Social Revolution would be a complete failure.

As to the question of non-violence, one should not believe in the magical effectiveness of non-violent Social Revolution in this country will not be brought about through the use of some formal force to continue its suppression of revolutionaries. Contrary to the beliefs of Steve Chase and George Lakey, the government will use its repressive forces to the utmost. Even if a few good many soldiers of working class origins refuse to fire on their fellow workers, the State would most certainly be able to count on the remaining loyal forces of reaction (e.g. the secret police agencies, regular police forces and non-State combat reactionaries) to continue its brutal suppression of the revolution. Unfortunately, it is short sighted to proclaim that the capitalists and the State will give up without unmercifully destroying human life.

Concerning non-violence or revolutionary violence, the use of non-violence should be used to the utmost in both the industrial sector and the community. However, we should always keep in mind that one point in the Social Revolution revolutionary violence, or to clarify the issue, revolutionary self-defense will have to be used. By means am I advocating small-group guerilla tactics. However, I am suggesting armed committees to defend what the people have rightfully won for themselves. These defense committees, based on the Anarchist principles of federalism and individualism, should be dissolved once the reactionary State ceases to exist and when the people have socialized all means of production, distribution and community control. Therefore, in my opinion, we should not rule out, or condemn, the use of revolutionary violence if it is used in this manner.

Fraternally yours,
M.H. Miller
Buffalo, New York

Dear People:

As a long-time electronics enthusiast and Anarchist, I would like to comment on the article by Don Olson in your June issue. First of all, I couldn't agree more that some means needs to be found to break free from the monopoly control by power companies of electricity distribution. Transmission is not the waste through the earth in the manner described, is highly unlikely to be the method for doing anything, and is marred by ignorance, misinformation, over-enthusiasm and naivete.

The whole idea of making the earth oscillate is simplistic. Electrically, the earth has about as much chance of oscillating as it does physically by somebody stamping a huge weight up and down at some point, rhythmically, to the predetermined physical oscillating frequency of the globe. (Or, in the hackedneyed variant, 'If all the Chinese stomped their feet in unison, or jumped up and down, it would make earthquakes in America.') But this "theory" should be allowed to stand on its own merits, through testing, if somebody needs to test it (again). What I object to is the wrong information in the article, the lack of critical attention, the wide-eyed acceptance of laughable claims.

For the latter: According to Puriarich, the Russians teach Tesla like we teach Edison... in the physics laboratory of the National University in Peking, there are only two pictures of Tesla and Tesla's. All right, since when did "we" teach Edison? There's nothing to teach; Edison invented things rather than discovered them actual and there is no body of knowledge passed on by Edison, no theory or mathematics or anything for us to teach. Edison was a pioneer of electrical gaudy; so were the Wright Brothers, pioneers in aviation. But we don't teach Edison in electrical engineering classes (or anywhere else, either) anymore than 'we' teach students of aerodynamics about the profound knowledge passed on by Wilbur and Orville Wright. The analogy is exact, because in the two cases the pioneers of technology (and no body of theory for modern students to absorb. Finally, as regards the statement about Tesla's picture along with that of Mao: may I just laugh? THINK about that, will you? More wide-eyed, breathless reportage.

Then we learn that radar and "over-the-horizon communication" operate at 6 cycles per second. This statement is apparently founded on such a basis of ignorance that, to me at least, it is practically incredible. First of all, the introduction of the term "over-the-horizon communication" gives the impression that this is some kind of standardized terminology, whereas it is in reality almost meaningless. It is as if we read in some article by a Tibetan that Americans ride around in "explosion-powered scooters", as though this was a term current among us. While such a term could be construed to be true in a sense, it would indicate a rather fundamental ignorance.

"Over-the-horizon communication" necessarily includes all radio, and, to an extent, television. In Short, it includes electromagnetic radiation from sub-broadcast band frequencies of 400 kilocycles per second (400,000 cycles per second) up to the visible light through the microwave, which is to say, up through the short-wave bands, etc. to around 80 or 100 megahertz, or 80 - 100 million cycles per second. Tesla's "over-the-horizon communication" is 6 cycles per second that Olson says all "over-the-horizon communication" operates on, is so low a frequency that it is a mere 0.006 cycles per second. Olson's statement is incredibly ignorant gibberish.

Moreover, it is patently absurd to claim that "all" communication, whether over the horizon or not, is carried on at the same frequency. What does he think the tuning dials on radios
Dear Comrades,

With regards to Vol. 3, No. 2, I would like to offer the following: "...clarifications of the subject of Direct Action and Non-Violence.

In this issue I would like to state that the use of Direct Action is not only a powerful tool in confronting the political forces of the State but it is also the best tool that labor has in its arsenal against capitalism. The use of Direct Action--as opposed to the use of going through the labor bureaucracy or through the political system or parties--is the best way that labor can win both immediate and far-reaching demands and control. Another word, "The secret of [workers'] direct action is simple enough: if workers quit doing what they are told to do, and do instead what they have collectively decided to do, there isn't anything much that can be done to stop them."

(Industrial Workers of the World, One Big Union, p. 23.)

Workers' Direct Action and the Social General Strike, are the only two weapons that can protect labor's collective interests. The workers can not expect to win their freedom through any other medium. Only through the direct struggle of the working class can the chains of wage and political slavery and domination be abolished. I feel that this sort of Direct Action should be expressed as much as political and community Direct Action. Remember, without the coordination and Direct Action of both community and working class organizations, any sort of Social Revolution would be a complete failure.

As to the question of non-violence, one should not believe that a magnetic success of Social Revolution in this country will not be bought about through the use of some force to continue its suppression and elimination. Contrary to the beliefs of Steve Chase and Paul Buhle, the government will use its repressive forces to the utmost. Even if a good many of the workers of working class origin refuse to fire on their fellow workers, the State would most certainly be able to count on the remaining loyal forces of reaction (e.g. the secret police agencies, regular police forces and non-State combat reaction forces) to continue its brutal suppression of the revolution. Unfortunately, it is short sighted to proclaim that the capitalists and the State will give up without unmercifully destroying human life.

Concerning non-violence or revolutionary violence, the use of non-violence should be used to the utmost in both the industrial sector and the community. However, we should always keep in mind that in one point in the Social Revolution, revolutionary violence--or to clarify the term, revolutionary self-defense--will have to be used. By means am I advocating small-group guerilla tactics. However, I am suggesting armed committees to defend what the people have rightfully won for themselves. These defense committees, based on the Anarchist principles of federalism and voluntarism, should be dissolved once the reactionary State ceases to exist and when the people have socialized all means of production, distribution and community control. Therefore, in my opinion, we should not rule out, or condemn, the use of revolutionary violence if it is used in this manner.

Fraternally yours,

M.H. Miller

Buffalo, New York

Dear People:

As a long-time electronics enthusiast and Anarchist, I would like to comment on the article by Don Olson in your June issue. First of all, I couldn't agree more that some means needed to be found to break free from the monopoly control by power companies of electrical systems. However, transmission and distribution through the earth in the manner described, is highly unlikely to be the method for doing anything significant to the power system, is marred by ignorance, misdirection, over-enthusiasm and naivete.

The whole idea of making the earth oscillate is simplistic. Electrically, the earth has about as much chance of oscillating as it does physically by somebody stamping a huge weight up and down at some point, rhythmically, to the predetermined physical oscillating frequency of the globe. (Or, in the hackneyed variant, "if all the Chinese stomped their feet in unison, or jumped up and down, we would make earthquakes in America.") But this "theoriy" should be allowed to stand on its own merits (under testing, if somebody needs to test it again). What I object to is the wrong information in the article, the lack of critical attention, the wide-eyed acceptance of laughable claims.

For the latter, "According to Puharich, the Russian Teaching Treaty violators, "are'..."--it is not a fact, it is a jibe."

Concerning the "aural" communication, it is not a fact, it is a jibe. There is no power in the earth, and there is no body of knowledge passed on by Edison, no theory or mathematics or anything for us to teach. Edison was not an inventor of electrical gadgetry; so were the Wright Brothers pioneers in aviation. But we don't teach Edison in electrical engineering classes (or anywhere else, either) anymore than we teach students of aerodynamics about the profound knowledge passed on by Wilbur and Orville Wright. The analogy is exact, because in the two cases the pioneers of technology left no body of theory for modern students to absorb. Finally, as regards the statement about Tesla's picture along with that of Mao: may I just laugh? THINK about that, will you? More wide-eyed, breathless reportage.

Then we learn that radar and "over-the-horizon communication" operate at 6 cycles per second. This statement is apparently founded on such a basis of ignorance that, to me at least, it is practically incredible. First of all, the introduction of the term "over-the-horizon communication" gives the impression that this is some kind of standardized terminology, whereas it is in reality almost meaningless. It is as if we read in some article by a Tibetan that Americans ride around in "explosion-powered scooters", as though this was a term current among us.

While such a term could be construed to be true in a sense, it would indicate a rather fundamental ignorance.

"Over-the-horizon communication" necessarily includes all radio, and, to an extent, television. In short, it includes electromagnetic radiation from sub-broadcast band frequencies of 400 kilocycles per second (400,000 cycles per second) which comes up through the short-wave bands, etc. to around 80 or 100 megahertz, or 80-100 million cycles per second. It is a 6 cycles per second that Olson says all "over-the-horizon communication" operates on, so I'm not sure a few on the 6-cycles-per-second band is asBad. E-6. I'm sure there is some non radio frequency (and there is NO communication of any sort carried on at 6 cps--no more than six bits of information per second could be carried. Our voices alone operate in the HUNDREDS of cycles per second. Olson's statement is incredibly ignorant gibberish.

Moreover, it is patently absurd to claim that "all" communication, whether over the horizon or not, is carried on at the same frequency.

What does he think the tuning dials on radios
are for, or channel selectors on televisions? These are instruments for varying the resonance of the set to DIFFERENT frequencies.

Dolson speaks of radar and "over-the-horizon communication" in the same breath. Nothing could be more untrue. Radar is radio waves of very high frequencies (in the millions of microns) that can be reflected from objects at great distances and bounce off hard (in this case metallic) objects, thus returning to the receiving station where they are interpreted as blips indicating presence of craft or something metallic. Obviously these waves will not be able to penetrate conductors of electricity, like metal or the earth, and so they do not go much past the horizon unless they bounce off other layers of the atmosphere and the ground, alternately, to reach some more distant location. But to say "radar and over-the-horizon communication" together is to dismiss the dilatory facets of electromagnetic radiation that it is as if one said: "Engines in motor scooters and transcontinental ships..."

Look, I could go on. Do you know how you feel when you know a subject very intensively and thoroughly, and you hear someone authoritatively making a bunch out of it? I could write on for more pages, and use up more room rebutting specifics, but I have a feeling you don't have much more space left for me. So let me just say this: Please, let's not let our enthusiasm for the current kind of society than this one make us stray from the possible into the fantastic, from the factual to the constructed, and from the resonant fact to the wishful-thinking-masking-as-fact. Tesla certainly had some important contributions to make in the areas of polyphase transmission, but he most certainly did not possess the arcane knowledge that Olson and some other breathless reporters or mythologizers imagine. It is a disservice to Anarchism—and to Tesla—to give the impression that he did.

Yours fraternally, Lewis Howard

Tucson, Arizona

As I stated in the article, unless attributed to others, all the technical information came from the Bookchin-Skarzynski primer on the Tesla project. So I went to Sheldon to have him respond to this letter.

There is of course a difference between the earth resonating electrically and the earth oscillating mechanically. Sheldon claims that 50 miles down, the earth resonates regularly at the Schuman cycle of 6 cps. He said that Tesla resonated the earth in 1889 and that others have done it since. Sheldon claims, by the claim that Elon is taught as if he did it all, whereas all the basic patents on transmission and disruption come from Tesla. Certainly for the general public, people know Elon but not Tesla. As for the 6 cps, it is sub-radio communications, known as Extra Low Frequency (ELF) and sometimes known as Ultra-Low Frequency. The Navy wants to use ELF frequencies in its Project Seafarer in order to be able to communicate with its Trident subs to be sitting on the bottom of the earth, and the evidentiary evidence to as whether ELF poses any health or ecological hazards.

Although the Russian are supposed to be now transmitting electricity experimentally by this Tesla method, I know of no other tests of this system. Therefore, if you have been misled, you are perhaps you should send such information. The test being done by the Peoples Power Project approaches soon. The reception near Belgrade, Minnesota is completed and the transmitter at Timmons, Ontario is almost finished.

About the Mao and Tesla pictures, I [Don Olson] thought it was an interesting bit of information since China at the official level always seem to do things very deliberately. Maybe if I had referred to Mao as a socialist on TV, perhaps that would have suited your tastes.

While I did not attribute arcane (i.e. secret) knowledge to Tesla, there are electrical engineers who say that Tesla had much more to offer than just polyphase transmission.

Update on Powerline Situation

On Sept. 30 the Minnesota Supreme Court ruled against all nine cases presented by the farmer's lawyers. The farmers have vowed to keep fighting and have again been using obstructionist tactics against renewed surveying and construction by the power coops. Members of the movement for a new society conducted a workshop on non-violent tactics for some 80 farm people on October 8th.

There is support being mobilized in the Twin Cities. For more information, call 727-4995.

Don Olson

For several years anarchists in the Twin Cities have been setting up literature circles. Now we are offering literature through Solid of Liberty. Who knows, perhaps one day a bookshelf...

Gaston Leval - Collectives in the Spanish Revolution (Freedom) $6.00

Emma Goldman - Anarchism and Other Essays (Dover) $3.00

Sam Dolgoff - The Cuban Revolution: A Critical Perspective (Black Rose) $4.95

Carolyn Ashbaugh - Lucy Parsons: American Revolutionary (Kerr) $3.95

Sam Dolgoff - The Anarchist Collectives: Worker Self-Management in the Spanish Revolution, 1936-39 (Free Life) $3.95

Ida Mett - The Kronstadt Uprising (Black Rose) $1.45

Murray Bookchin - The Spanish Anarchist: The Heroic Years 1868-1936 (Free Life) $10.00

Richard and Anna Maria Drinnan (Eds.) - Nowhere at Home: Letters from Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman (Shocken) $6.95

Alexander Berkman - The Russian Tragedy (Cliefuegos) $3.00

April Carter - The Political Theory of Anarchism (Harper) $1.60

Harry Silverman (ed.) - American Radical Thoughts: The Libertarian Tradition (Heath) $5.95

Phil Meier - Portugal: The Impossible Revolution (Free Life) $5.95

Stuart Christie & Albert Meltzer - Floodgates of Anarchy $2.50

Collin Ward - Anarchy in Action (Harper) $2.45

George Woodcock - Pierre-Joseph Proudhon: His life and Work (Schocken) $3.95

Anthony Masters - Bakunin: The Father of Anarchism (Saturday Review Press) $4.50

Ursula LeGuin - The Dispossessed (Avon) $1.75

Abel Paz - Durruti: The People Armed (Black Rose) $5.95

Flavio Costantini - The Art of Anarchy (Cliefuegos) $8.00

Barbara Alpern Engel & Clifford Rosenthal, eds. Five Sides Against the Tapes: The memoirs of five young anarchist women of the 1870s (Knopf) hb (Reg. $8.95) $4.25

Camillo Berneri - Peter Kropotkin: His Federalist Ideas (Cliefuegos) $8.95

Bartolomeo Vanzetti - The Story of a Proletarian Life $4.44

Sam Dolgoff - The Relevance of Anarchism to Modern Society $4.99

Icarus (Ernst Schneider) - The Wilhelms haven Revolt: A Chapter of the Revolutionary Movement in the German Navy 1916-1919 (Cliefuegos) $1.04

The Cliefuegos Press Anarchist Review No. 1 - 1976 No. 2 - 1977 $3.00

Sample Issues: Zero: Anarchist/Anarcha-feminist monthly 54¢; Open Road 74¢; Synthesis 54¢; Fifth Estate 49¢; Freedom 39¢ Books are cover price or less and we pay postage. Pamphlets and magazines have been discovered to have zero postage.

Make checks out to Solid of Liberty Books

Mail to:
P.O. Box 7056
Powderhorn Station
Minneapolis, MN 55407
are for, or channel selectors on televisions? These are instruments for varying the resonance of the set to DIFFERENT frequencies.

Olsen speaks of radar and "over-the-horizon communication" as the same thing. Nothing could be more untrue. Radar is radio waves of very HIGH frequencies (in the millions of cycles per second), whereas the short waves do, and bounce off hard (in this case metallic) objects, thus returning to the receiving station where they are interpreted as blips indicating presence of craft or something metallic. Obviously these waves will not be able to penetrate conductors of electricity, like the metal of the earth, and so they do not go much past the horizon unless they bounce off ionized layers of the atmosphere and the ground, alternately, to reach some more distant location. But to "say" radar and over-the-horizon communication are the same is to disregard all the dissimilar facets of electromagnetic radiation that it is as if one said: "Engines in motor scooters and transoceanic ships....."

Look, I could go on. Do you know how you feel when you know a subject very intensively and thoroughly, and you hear someone authoritatively making a botch out of it? I could write on for more pages, and use up more room rephrasing specific if you have feeling you don't have much more space left for me. So let me just say this: Please, let's not let our enthusiasm for some current kind of society than this one make us stray from the possible into the fantastic, from the factual to the constructed; but consider the notion of polyphase transmission, but he most certainly did not possess the arcane knowledge that Olsen and some other breathless reporters or mytholozizers imagine. It is a disservice to Anarchism--and to Tesla--to give the impression that he did.

Yours fraternally, Lewis Howard
Tucson, Arizona

As I stated in the article, unless attributed to others, all the technical information came from the Technical Manual of the Tesla project. So I went to Sheldon to have him respond to this letter.

There is of course a difference between the earth resonating electrically and the earth oscillating mechanically. Sheldon claims that 56 miles down, the earth resonates regularly at the Schuman cycle of 6 cycles. He said that Tesla resonated the earth in 1899 and that others have done it since. Sheldon Atkins by the claim that Edison is taught as if he did it all, whereas all the basic patents on transmission and distribution are by Tesla. Certainly for the general public, people know Edison but not Tesla. As for the 6 cycles, it is sub-radio communications, known as Ultra Low Frequency (ELF) and sometimes known as Ultra-Low Frequency. The Navy wants to use an ELF frequency in its Project Seaclaw in order to be able to communicate with its Trident sub to be sitting on the bottom of the earth; but the radio-evident evidence as to whether ELF poses any health or ecological hazards.

Although the Russian are supposed to be now transmitting electricity experimentally by this Tesla method, I know of no other tests of this system and none by Tesla himself. You say there have been others, perhaps you send such information. The test being done by the Peoples Power Project approaches soon. The receivers near Belgrade, Minnesota is completed and the transmitter at Timmons, Ontario is almost finished.

About the Mao and Tesla pictures, I [Don Olson] thought it was an interesting bit of information since China at the official level always seem to do things very deliberately. Maybe if I had referred to Mao as a villain on TV, perhaps that would have suited your taste.

While I did not attribute arcane (i.e. secret) knowledge to Tesla, there are electrical engineers who say that Tesla had much more to offer than just polyphase transmission.

Update on Powerline Situation
On Sept. 28 the U. S. Supreme Court ruled against all nine cases presented by the farmers' lawyers. The farmers have vowed to keep fighting and have again been using obstructionist tactics against renewed surveying and construction by the power companies. Members of No Nukes conducted a workshop on non-violent tactics for some 80 people on October 8th.

Write to the electric companies and help support organizing in the Twin Cities. For more information, call 777-4985.

Don Olson

---

**Literature**

For several years anarchists in the Twin Cities have been setting up literature tables. Now we are offering literature through Soil of Liberty. Who knows, perhaps one day a bookstore.

Gaston Leval - Collectives in the Spanish Revolution (Freedom) $8.00

Emma Goldman - Anarchism and Other Essays (Dover) $3.00

Sam Dolgoff - The Cuban Revolution: A Critical Perspective (Black Rose) $4.95

Caroly Ashbaugh - Lucy Parsons: American Revolutionary (Kerr) $3.95

Sam Dolgoff - The Anarchist Collectives: Worker Self-Management in the Spanish Revolution, 1936-39 (Free Life) $3.95

Ida Met - The Kronstadt Uprising (Black Rose) $1.45

Murray Bookchin - The Spanish Anarchist: The Heroic Years 1868-1936 (Free Life) $10.00

Richard and Anna Maria Drinnon (Eds.) - Nowhere at Home: Letters from Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman (Shocken) $6.95

Alexander Berkman - The Russian Tragedy (Cliefuegos) $3.00

April Carter - The Political Theory of Anarchism (Harper) $1.60

Henry Silverman (ed.) - American Radical Thought: The Libertarian Tradition (Heath) $5.95

Phil Moller - Portugal: The Impossible Revolution (Free Life) $5.95

Stuart Christie & Albert Meltzer - Floodpates of Anarchy $2.50

Collin Ward - Anarchy in Action (Harper) $2.45

---

George Woodcock - Pierre-Joseph Proudhon: His Life and Work (Schocken) $3.95

Anthony Masters - Bakum: The Father of Anarchism (Saturday Review Press) $4.50

Ursula LeGuin - The Dispossessed (Avon) $1.75

Abel Paz - Durruti: The People Armed (Black Rose) $5.95

Flavio Costantini - The Art of Anarchy (Cliefuegos) $8.00

Barbara Alpern Engel & Clifford Rosenthal, ed Five Sisters Against the Train: The memoirs of five young anarchist women of the 1870s (Knopf) hb (Reg. $9.95) $4.25

Camillo Berneri - Peter Kropotkin: His Federalist Ideas (Cliefuegos) $8.99

Bartoledo Vanzetti - The Story of a Proletarian Life $4.4

Sam Dolgoff - The Relevance of Anarchism to Modern Society $4.99

Icarus (Ernst Schneider) - The Wilhelmshaven Revolt: A Chapter of the Revolutionary Movement in the German Navy 1916-1919 (Cliefuegos) $1.04

The Cliefuegos Press Anarchist Review No. 1 - 1976 No. 2 - 1977 $3.00

Sample Issues: Zero: Anarchist/Anarcha-feminist monthly 54¢; Open Road 74¢; Synthesis 54¢; Fifth Estate 49¢; Freedom 39¢

Books are cover price or less and we pay postage. Pamphlets and magazines have been designed to cover postage. Make checks out for Soil of Liberty Books Mail to: P.O. Box 7056 Powderhorn Station Minneapolis, MN 55407
their Dreaded quilts. And organizers organize and think better when they're in touch with their own psychological motivations.

Perhaps radicals just confuse themselves when they try to figure out how political activism can solve everybody's problems. I'm not arguing for some mono-minded economism, only noting that the basic idea of what radical political action is designed to do is to equalize economic arrangements with special concern for the minorities who have been most abused by capitalism and the sociocultural structures which it has promoted. This involves a great deal of empathetic response and a lot of attention to history in order to understand how a woman can or black or female or retired factory worker might differently understand his or her own deprivation. It shouldn't mean fashioning a new politics every time one realizes there is still another group of people (or "under-served populations" as the State Social service bureaucracy identifies them) whose common experiences and individual identities have never been screwed up, exposed or ignored by the social confusion called progress and the wizards who work in Washington.

I don't mean to diminish the importance of the insights of Reich who have been echoed and expanded by feminists. But, to each his or her real-ize more and more clearly that people who've had childhoods guided by heavy-handed paternalism and sex-repression have more closed, guarded characters and that they are not receptive to revolutionary, or even liberal, ideas. Working in a community organization which provides services to hundreds of people each month, I've learned that this kind of contact does not allow me to seriously affect people in any way, not in any way, not in any way, not in any way. It seems to me that what a community organizer can do is to suggest practical solutions to problems, stress the need for group (political) action to find solutions and encourage any tendency to work collectively. We can encourage that which is most spirited and revolutionary in people and then with whatever shades of political generosity we maintain to treat those with more conservative, cowardly or spiteful characters as decently as possible, understanding the forces which molded them.

Beyond that, I look to certain issues which come up in day-to-day community organizing to be more far-reaching since they support environments—structural and psychological—which allow for individual initiative, autonomy, and liberty. Any money which can be wrested away from the central planners and given to the community to be used for small schools, health clinics, child care centers and decent human-scale housing is worth the hassle. Many folks of many political stripes see this work as reformist and hopeless. What they fail to understand, I think, is their fervor for a more distinct and militant mass politics, is that at this point, any small, local and tangible projects may touch people who otherwise have given up hope of being touched. Involvement in these projects, even if they are funded by the feds and terribly vulnerable to political manipulation, gives people a branch to hang onto in that is rapidly becoming a torrent of anonymous and meaningless cultural waste and bureaucracy.

My point in this digression about organizing is that it is not just to talk both M-Ls and anarchist-feminist revolutionaries (as well as any one else who has irritated me lately) for ways in which they can at least not all be as hypocritical contributors to the sexual misery of women and the social, psychological and moral inadequacies of any ideology.

This problem becomes pronounced by Essay 12 called "Male Backlash". By this time, (it first appeared in M/4 in 1974) Fritz is understan-derable in the sense that all self-love—everybody questions of the kind popular in the letters pages of M/4 and she's standing up for her need to be a feminist and not apologize. Good. But can a feminist be a feminist and not (secretly, deeply, somewhere) hate men? Yes and no.

I think most men hate men and most men who hate women and women hate their mother's, at one level or another, there is always a sexual problem. Fritz says, "I think men in general are monsters, and I'm not afraid to say so. I think they're often monsters even when they're trying not to be."

I agree with her. It's a terrible situation. But I don't think the available reality of activist politics offers much of a solution. Women should stick up for themselves and tell men not to be shits, calling a halt to hierarchical macho posturing when it spoils the political project and makes the participants edgy and ineffective. If it gets too bad, then women should withdraw consent and work on their own. I'm not arguing for Radical Feminism which makes an elaborate world-view out of the decision to be away from men, only saying that it's what the situation calls for, then that's what should happen. It'll delay the United Front some, but from the looks of things, it's about as likely as the Second Coming. This fundamental dislike which most women, consciously or not, bear towards most men is a social problem, a problem of mass psychology. And it can poison radical politics and must be recognized by the people who say they've got ideas about how to fix things up. But the problem between men and women won't get fixed by socialism or anarchism or Fritz's brand of revolutionary feminism. It won't get rooted out in criticism/self-criticism sessions or conquered by separatist removal (which I see as a legitimate tactic but as hateful as any other ideology). Sexual antagonism is part and parcel of every social situation I can think of. We don't understand it very well. Feminist analysis has not really resolved many of the nature/nurture controversies. I can't say just what should be done with them I can't really grasp the enormity of what's gone wrong. The obvious suggestion is that we should chip away, support serious research and psychology, and give special attention to the sexual environment and education of our children.

Fritz's last and least popular essay, "Feminism vs. Socialism," serves to deepen the split between organized feminists and the Left without providing much practical guidance for those who seek themselves up (or down) in either camp. The essay was greeted with snarls and contempt when it first appeared in Liberation in 1975. I didn't mind it as much then as I do now because I was so bored with Socialist-Feminism's guilt reaction to women issues that I rather enjoyed the snit.
their Opal quilts. And organizers organize and think better when they're in touch with their own psychologies and motivations.

Perhaps radicals just confuse themselves when they try to figure out how political activism can solve everybody's problems.

I'm not arguing for some mono-minded economism, only noting that the basic idea of what radical political action is designed to do is to equalize economic arrangements with special concern for the minorities who have been most abused by capitalism and the social structures which it has promoted. This involves a great deal of empathic response and lots of attention to history in order to understand how a woman or black or poor or retired factory worker might differently understand his or her own deprivation. But it shouldn't mean rationalizing a new politics every time one realizes there is still another group of people (or 'under-served populations' as the State social service bureaucracy identifies them) whose common experiences and individual Identities have been screwed up, exploited or ignored by the social confusion called progress and the wizards who work in Washington.

I don't mean to diminish the importance of the insights of Reich which have been echoed and expanded by feminists. As such, I realize more and more clearly that people who've had childhoods guided by heavy-handed paternalism and sex repression have more closed, guarded characters and that they are not receptive to revolutionary, or even liberal ideas. Working in a community organization which provides services to hundreds of people each month, I've learned that this kind of contact does not allow me to seriously affect them or investigate the characters of the people I meet. It seems to me that what community organizers can do is to suggest practical solutions to problems, stress the need for group (political) action to find solutions and encourage any tendency to socialize with authority. We can encourage that which is most spirited and revolutionary in people and then with whatever shreds of pacifistic conscience we maintain treat those with more conservative, cowardly or culture characters as decently as possible, understanding the forces which molded them.

Beyond that, I look to certain issues which come up in day-to-day community organizing to be more far reaching since they support environments-structural and psychological-which allow for individual initiatives, autonomy and liberty. Any money which can be wrested away from the central planners and given to the community to be used for small schools, health clinics, child care centers and decent human-scale housing is worth the hassle. Many folks of many political stripes see this work as reformist and hopeless. What they fail to understand, I think, is their fervor for a more distinct and militant mass politics, is that at this point, any small, local and tangible projects may touch people who otherwise have given up hope of being touched. Involvement in these projects, even if they are funded by the feds and terribly vulnerable to political manipulation, gives people a branch to hang on to in what is rapidly becoming a torrent of anonymous and meaningless cultural waste and bureaucracy.

My point in this digression about organizing is to task both M-Ls and anarchist/feminist revolutionaries (as well as any one else who has irritated me lately) for ways in which they can at so many useful political projects. I think Fritz falls into this second bag more and more when she tries to nail lefties as hypocritical contributors to the sexual misery of women and the social, psychological and moral inadequacies of any ideology.

I think most women hate men and most men hate women and everybody hates their mother, at one level or another. So there is always a sexual problem. Fritz says, "I think men in general are monsters, and I'm not afraid to say so. I think they're often monsters even when they're trying not to be."

I agree with her. It's a terrible situation. But I don't think the available realm of activist politics offers much of a solution.

Women should stick up for themselves and tell men not to be shit, calling a halt to hierarchical macho posturing when it spoils the political project and makes the participants edgy and ineffective. If it gets too bad, then women should withdraw consent and work on their own. I'm not arguing for radical feminism which makes an elaborate world-view out of the decision to be men, only saying that if that's what the situation calls for, then that's what should happen. It will delay the united front some, but from the looks of things, it's about as likely as the Second Coming.

This fundamental dislike which most women, consciously or not, bear towards most men is a social problem, a problem of mass psychology. And it can poison radical politics and must be recognized by the people who say they've got ideas about how to fix things up. But the problem between men and women isn't getting fixed by socialism or anarchism or Fritz's brand of revolutionary feminism. It won't get rooted out in criticism/self-criticism sessions or conquered by separatist removal (which I see as a legitimate tactic but as hateful as any other ideology). Sexual antagonism is part and parcel of every social situation I can think of. We don't understand it very well. Feminist analysis has not really resolved many of the nature/nurture controversies. I can't say just what should be done but I can't really grasp the enormity of what's gone wrong. The obvious suggestion is that we should ship away, support serious research and psychology, and give special attention to the sexual environment and education of our children.

Fritz's last and least popular essay, "Feminism vs. Socialism," serves to deepen the split between organized feminists and the Left without providing much practical guidance for those who seek themselves up (or down) in either camp. The essay was greeted with snarls and contempt when it first appeared in Liberation in 1975. I didn't mind it as much then as I do now because I was so bored with Socialist-Feminism's guilty relation to women issues that I rather enjoyed the snit.

These days I find the essay to be a sad conclusion to an increasingly heavy-handed feminism which leans more and more towards dogma and less and less towards tolerance or practical political insight. Fritz thinks that one of the reasons Old Lefties are so unhappy about the independent women's movement is that they know that it took lots of comrades out of the ranks when the whole thing blew up in SDS in 1968.

Basically, she figures that the Left had it coming. There follows a funny but wildly over-simplified history of left theorist responses to The Woman Question. Speaking rather cavalierly of Marx and Jesus, she comments that "the assumption of eternal male leadership was built into both their programs" and that "neither Marx or Jesus analyzed his own patriarchal power trip. Freud comes in for an equally flip dismissal. She's back to hurrying Rembrandts, Jesus, Freud and Marx, between them, had some won-
derful ideas and some fairly bad ones. Their works—wild mixtures of genius, generosity, delusion and ferocity, have shaped much of the world as we know it today. But it is possible to know them, take them seriously and not become a disciple. Single-mindedness is always a drag and anyone who's primary identity is as Marxist, Freudian or Christian has gone in for some terrific self-limitation.

Fritz has decided to be a feminist more than a Whatever-it-wasist (Anarchist and Pacifist) and suddenly she's got this tremendous grudge against socialists. She's not about to 'march under the banner of socialism', no matter what Babel or Engels, two of her main targets, say about how it'll clear up your oppression. But they told everybody to march under the banner and lots of people refused for one reason or another. Since she's an anarchist, she should have figured that out a long time ago. I suppose that the whole tirade was brought on by the confusion raging amongst socialist-feminists as they attempted an uneasy reconciliation between a feminism committed to leaderless, non-hierarchical decentralized community with a socialism which generally requires leaders, centers and guns to get its way.

Since she's heard that 'no socialist insists on the elevation of the Left', Fritz finds this a perfect example of how manipulative the Left is. This is an example of how she's completely entrenched in the kind of thinking which she claims to oppose. The American Left mirrors the mentality of its own most hated empire builders wherever it issues dictums about what everybody everywhere else should do about everything.

Now, I'm not part of the female slaves in the Middle East as a requirement for leftist allegiance', Fritz finds this a perfect example of how manipulative the Left is. This is an example of how she's completely entrenched in the kind of thinking which she claims to oppose. The American Left mirrors the mentality of its own most hated empire builders wherever it issues dictums about what everybody everywhere else should do about everything.

Fritz would probably find my views detached and uncommitted. She's pissed and deeply disappointed in her fellows. She's beginning to think (along with Robin Morgan) that "the more profoundly women studied the world's problems, the more we were driven to conclude that feminism is indeed the revolution." Of getting up are going to be fairly fierce. In other words, the worse it's been for them, the harder they'll bite when they start fighting back and the more innocent bystanders you can expect to get trampled upon. The idea of a nation full of women creeping around in veils while their men are liberating the streets may seem a little contradictory—it is. But it just is. And bitching about it isn't going to raise anybody's consciousness in Iran since they've got other things they're worried about. Our job in relation to other peoples is to keep our own busyness greedy government from making things worse for them then is already the case. I couldn't agree less but I would like to say to most of my movement friends that I think it is larger, our notion practice which has driven bright, insightful people like Fritz into defensive corners. A commitment to feminism or anarchism or pacifism can make it virtually impossible to work in a broader social movement which treats its own people so badly and cots to business-as-usual politics too readily.

My sense of the Women's Movement is that it has become a provider of services and alternatives, creating havens for women which protect them from the worst physical abuse and places which allow them retreat from the harshness and coldness of daily experience. This includes day-to-day leftism. We're pushing nice people, trying to be right all the time and pitting ourselves against the meanest schemers in the business. Trying to understand the forces we're up against, we spend too much time out-scheming the schemers or trying to haul people along on our

rider without understanding what's not in it for most of them.

Many feminists do expressly or intuitively understand politics in a much more radical sense than 'just feminism' simply cannot or will not be part of projects which tear the woman away from herself or put her into the competitive, frustrating relationships most women experience on the Left. There it is. Understanding capitalism (sort of), we fail to understand ourselves or other people. We need to learn and re-learn the important practices of feminist groups which remind us that process, i.e. the way we treat each other, is part of the political statement.

A friend of mine once suggested that the slogan for her organization be "We're Right—You're Wrong." Her irony showed that she understood how our self-righteousness keeps us at each other's throats and away from our task as effective organizers of people and adversaries of big business and government. I'm suggesting that this tendency to oversimplify leads us also to divorce ourselves unnecessarily from each other. There's a great deal of tension and ambiguity which must be tolerated for feminists to work with men on Left projects. But it is possible. In Seattle, many of the Christian pacifists, the AIM defenders and the left weirdos have supported each other and worked it out during the various defense trials. Now if that's possible, surely some creative thinking and honest conversation will allow Fritz and the rest of us to think like women, i.e. keep track of intuitions and feelings and use them to improve the political style rather than having to defend our sensibilities against the assault of the radical mission.

Anarchist Publications

Every so often we like to run advertisements of other anarchist and like-minded publications.

Zero: Anarchist/Anti-Feminist Monthly
404/issue U.S.A. $1 air
182 Upper St. $1.50 surface
London N.1. England

Black Flag: Organ of the Anarchist Black Cross
Over the Water
Sundays, Orkney
$13 49/week 2BL

Freedom: Anarchist Fortnightly
96 - Whitechapel High Street
London E.1 7QX
England 50/year surface

Against the Grain: A libertarian socialist newspaper
PO Box 692
Old Chelsea Sta.
New York, N.Y. 10011
unpaid

Against the Grain: A libertarian socialist newspaper
PO Box 692
Old Chelsea Sta.
New York, N.Y. 10011
unpaid

Black Star: an anarcho-communist review
49/issue 12th year
P.O. Box 45
Milwaukee, Wis 53202

North Country Anvil
Box 37
$1/year

Millville, Minnesota 55957

Fifth Estate
4403 Second Av
$0/year

Detroit, Mich 48201

Synthesis: an anti-authoritarian newsletter of citizen-worker self-management ideas and activities
PO Box 1838
San Pedro, CA 90732
$0/issue
derful ideas and some fairly bad ones. Their works— weird mixtures of genius, generosity, delusion and ferocity, have shaped much of the world as we know it today. But it is possible to know them, take them seriously and not become a disciple. Single-mindedness is always a drag and anyone who's primary identity is as Marxist, Freudian or Christian has gone in for some terrific self-limitation.

Fritz has decided to be a Feminist more than a Whatever-it-wasist (Anarchist and Pacifist) and suddenly she's got this tremendous grudge against socialists. She's not about to "march under the banner of socialism", no matter what Bebel or Engels, two of her main targets, say about how it'll clear up your oppression. But they told everybody to march under the banner and lots of people refused for one reason or another. Since she's an anarchist, she should have figured that out a long time ago. I suppose that the whole tirade was brought on by the confusion raging amongst socialist-feminists as they attempted an uneasy reconciliation between a feminism committed to leaderless, non-hierarchical decentralized community with a socialism which generally requires leaders, centers and guns to get its way.

Since she's heard that "no socialist insists on the superiority of the Left to the Right", Fritz finds this a perfect example of how anybody who's a socialist is an example of how she's completely entrenched in the kind of thinking which she claims to oppose. The American Left mirrors the mentality of its own most hated empire builders whenever it issues dictums about what everybody everywhere else should do about everything.

Now I'm no part of the fan of the Middle Eastern revolutionaries, but it seems to me that when a people are down and have been kept down for a long, long time, their means of expression are not limited.

Fritz would probably find my views detached and uncommitted. She's pissed and deeply disappointed in her fellows. She's beginning to think (along with Robin Morgan) that "the more profoundly women studied the world's problems, the more we were driven to conclude that [feminism] is indeed the revolution." of getting up are going to be fairly fierce. In other words, the worse it's been for them, the harder they'll bite when they start fighting back and the more innocent by-standers you can expect to see get trapped upon. The idea of a nation full of women creeping around in veins while their men are liberating the streets may seem a little contradictory—it is. But it just is. And bitching about it isn't going to raise anybody's consciousness in Iran since they've got other things they're worried about. Our job in relation to other peoples is to keep our own busily greedy government from making things worse for them than is already the case.

I couldn't agree less but I would like to say to most of my movement friends that I think it is larger our notion practice which has driven bright, insightful people like Fritz into defensive corners. A commitment to feminism or anarchism or pacifism can make it virtually impossible to work in a broader social movement which treats its own people so badly and cops to business-as-usual politics too readily.

My sense of the Women's Movement is that it has become a provider of services and alternatives, creating havens for women which protect them from the worst physical abuse and places which allow them retreat from the harshness and coldness of daily experience. This includes day-to-day leftism. We're pushy, shy people, trying to be right all the time and pitting ourselves against the meanest schemers in the business. Trying to understand the forces we're up against, we spend too much time out-scheming the schemers or trying to haul people along on our rides without understanding what's not in it for most of them.

Many feminists so expressly or intuitively understand politics in a much more radical sense than "just feminism" simply cannot or will not be part of projects which tear the woman away from herself or put her into the competitive, frustrating relationships most women experience on the Left. There it is.

Understanding capitalism (sort of), we fail to understand ourselves or other people. We need to learn and re-learn the important practices of feminist groups which remind us that process, i.e. the way we treat each other, is part of the political statement.

A friend of mine once suggested that the slogan for her organization be "We're Right--You're Wrong." Her irony showed that she understood how our self-righteousness keeps us at each other's throats and away from our task as effective organizers of people and adversaries of big business and government. I'm suggesting that this tendency to over-simplify leads us also to divorce ourselves unnecessarily from another. There's a great deal of tension and ambiguity which must be tolerated for feminists to work with men on Left projects. But it is possible. In Seattle, as in Christian pacificists, the AIM defenders and the left lesbians have supported each other and worked it out during these various defense trials. Now if that's possible, surely some creative thinking and honest conversation will allow Fritz and the rest of us to think like women, i.e. keep track of intuitions and feelings and use them to improve the political style rather than having to defend our sensibilities against the assault of the radical mission.

---
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ERRATUM: In the Sam Dolgooff pamphlet "The Relevance of Anarchism to Modern Society", on page 11, at the end of the third line of the quote, add the word not. Should read: To establish Libertarian Communism it will not be necessary to invent artificial forms of organization.
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