

RESISTANCE

DL. XI, No. 3

AN ANARCHIST BI-MONTHLY

DECEMBER, 1953



The Years of the Demagogues

Truman has defined Brownellism very clearly—so far as it lies in the power of a liberal politician to do so. *Brownellism is the attempt of the Republican administration to incite people with Demagogy and Inquisitorial Circuses, in order to distract attention from its practical failures.*

Like most liberal ideas, this interpretation contains a great deal of truth—and misses the point completely.

The really crucial point is: What forces are creating the mass-following of Demagogy? Why does McCarthyism have such strong appeal in all sections of the population? Why has Demagogy become a successful political method? These questions have to be answered, for the vicious system cannot be understood and combatted, until the underlying pathology is exposed.

Demagogy, an old and recurring phenomenon, has a distinct anatomy. On the surface, it "incites"; in reality, it *exploits*, it brings to fever and action an existing mass state of mind. In ordinary times, people tend to be conservative, they vote for a traditional party, are basically apathetic to politics. A Hitler or a McCarthy preaches in empty halls. Demagogy appears when the population has deep grievances about which nothing is being done—when a deep social crisis stirs furious resentments, the institutions do not give satisfaction, and the people have no knowledge of a constructive solution. At such times, the successful political party is the one which panders dishonestly to this resentment with promises of magical solutions and with the persecution of scapegoats.

To understand the present American Demagogy, therefore, we must look to the grievances the McCarthys espouse—or, even more meaningfully, the grievances the millions of "independent voters" sent Eisenhower to Washington to remedy. When we understand these grievances, we know what drives the masses who follow the Demagogues.

Without ignoring independent issues—the Eisenhower personality, the publicized bureaucratic corruption—we can identify the chief grievances as the burden imposed

on the daily lives of Americans by the world military and economic struggle: the taxes, the draft, the casualties, the tension of a state of permanent crisis and fear. The Republican Party promised, explicitly or by implication, that it would by some magic alter these facts of our life. Now it has to answer to the millions of disillusioned "independent voters," who are beginning to suspect that this, as much as Democratic administration, is "government by postponement."

This mass susceptible to Demagogy now holds a balance of power in American political life, as the Republicans are aware. As politicians who want to survive, they are compelled to adopt policies which are obviously uncomfortable for their titular leader, are disastrous abroad, destructive of governmental efficiency. They are compelled to it, because they have no better substitutes for the impossible actions the voters expected, the impossible promises they themselves have made.

It is a rhetorical question, to ask whether the Republican Party, or the Democratic Party, can propose any alteration in the foreign policies which prepare the ground for Demagogy. The Republican Party has shown its powerlessness to take any advantage of the succession-crisis in Russia—perhaps the last opportunity for a long time, probably already irredeemably lost, to take advantage of a relatively unaggressive foreign policy in the Kremlin, to ease a little the ferocious imperial struggle. The Democratic Party, on the other hand, was the author, through the Truman Doctrine of 1947, of America's declaration of Cold War. It was the Truman administration which joined the military issue in Korea. And even as an Opposition party, the Democrats have in the last year scrupulously adhered to "bi-partisanship" in foreign policy.

At this point we find ourselves in a familiar and very formidable dilemma. The Demagogy is a consequence of the international struggle, and it is superficial to attack the symptom and not the underlying pathology. But the American government cannot disentangle itself from the world-struggle: its participation is dictated by reasons deep in the structure of the social order.

In such a case, most people seek comfort in clinging to a superficial view and hoping for the best. But the first step toward a clear grasp of our situation, the first step toward practical action, is to recognize how, in detail and on broad issues, the national politics deal invariably and helplessly with symptoms, and persistently confirm the

RESISTANCE
Vol. XI, No. 3 December, 1953
Editors: Resistance Group
Secretary: D. WIECK

Resistance, an anarchist review, is supported solely by voluntary contributions. Subscriptions are free on request. Articles are invited from our readers; the opinions expressed in signed articles are not necessarily those of the editors.

IMPORTANT: Make all money orders and checks payable to Resistance Magazine, Box 208, Cooper Station, New York 3, N. Y.

PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY

I met a traveller from an antique land
Who said: Two vast and trunkless legs of stone
Stand in the desert. . . . Near them, on the sand,
Half sunk, a shattered visage lies, whose frown,
And wrinkled lip, and sneer of cold command,
Tell that its sculptor well those passions read
Which yet survive, stamped on these lifeless things,
The hand that mocked them, and the heart that fed:
And on the pedestal these words appear:
'My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:
Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!'
Nothing beside remains. Round the decay
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare
The lone and level sands stretch far away.

pathological social process. Recognizing this, we are then compelled to address ourselves to the hard underlying problems: How to show the people deluded by the Demagogues that though their grievances are real and just, the action they are supporting is the revenge of liberticide—which will not remedy their grievances. How to show them

End of a Chapter

While friends of intellectual freedom have been rejoicing in their victory over "book burning" in State Department libraries, the objective of the burners continues to be achieved—more quietly.

On October 27 the story broke in Berlin that none of the purged works of 46 authors have been restored to the shelves of U.S. Information libraries in Germany. According to the "liberalized" July directive, only "Communist conspiracy" books and not "controversial" books were to be banned. The State Department informed Mrs. Vera Michaels Dean, Foreign Policy Association editor, that her books had been "removed erroneously and have now been restored to the shelves." On the contrary, the US High Commissioner's office issued "a list again proscribing all the books that it previously had ordered removed."

Informed of this, the US Information Agency in Washington insisted that the July policy still held and said it was repeating its instructions to Germany.

On the 28th, officials in Bonn and Berlin denied receiving new instructions to restore the books, and there the matter rested for another day, until Mr. Phillips, press officer for the USIA in Washington, supplied the following enlightenment to the *New York Post*:

"It is possible that these books might have been dropped because they were out-of-date treatments of their subject matter and that would not constitute a ban on books because of their content or authorship. Suppose, for instance, that I wrote a book about 1953 automobiles. Well in another three months that will be out of date and a librarian would be crazy not to throw it away and get a new one."

To the skeptical newsman, Mr. Phillips suggested further: "The books may simply be worn out," though he agreed they would "probably not" all wear out at once.

"All I can say is that the librarian has the right to replace any book he does not consider useful. There may be a better book on the subject by another author or by the same author, like Mrs. Dean. She writes a lot of books."

Finally, on October 30, the USIA in Washington acknowledged officially that none of the books have been restored, and offered an explanation to account for three unreturned works by Mrs. Dean and one by Walter Duranty: they do not meet the "basic test" of the aforementioned liberalized directive of "usefulness of the material in meeting the particularized needs of the program in the area in question." "They lack utility." As for the remaining 44 authors, one is left to presume that one of Mr. Phillips' ingenious theories fits them—except for Dashiell Hammett. Mr. A. V. Boerner, agency press officer in Berlin, has cabled Washington: "278 [sic] copies of fiction works by Dashiell Hammett were not replaced because the Berlin office felt that local interest and policies did not require them on the shelves."

what is needed, if the Permanent War is to be ended. How to begin to create, little by little, the spirit of community, of solidarity and freedom, which can be the basis of a warless non-governmental society.

R.

And that, it would appear, is the end of that—until some over-zealous patriot again actually sets fire to a book.

The Case of the "Out of State" Censor

Oct. 28, Shaftsbury, Vt. The local school board has removed from classrooms *Vermont, A History of the Green Mountain State*, an official history prepared under State Board of Education auspices. The local board chairman has not read the book, and does not believe either of her colleagues have. They have sent it "out of the state" for review by person or persons unidentified, to see if it is subversive.

A clamorous protest is afoot in Vermont.

Oct. 29. Two school board members, including the chairman, resign. The third, a retired Coast Guard commander, says the books will be returned as soon as they can be located.

Book Reviews: The Critics Circle

Sept. 28, Washington. McCarthy committee hears three critics give unfavorable review of "Psychological and Cultural Traits of Soviet Siberia," a U.S. Army study.

Must have been the "work of a concealed Communist," says Louis Budenz. "Cannot conceive of stupidity that intense."

"Extremely dangerous," contains much "deliberate misinformation," "deliberate intentions," says Igor Bogelepov.

"Extremely biased," "proving certain ideas the author set well in advance" "I am not questioning the intentions of the man who wrote this, but they are of the kind used for paving the road to hell," says Vladimir Petrov.

Nov. 19, United Nations. "Soviet Attacks Document Called Red by McCarthy" (*N.Y. Times* headline). "Mr. Vishinsky said the document was an example of hatred propaganda. He declared it contained instructions for organizing 'diversionary' acts in the rear of the Soviet Union in case of war.'"

Book Reviews: Interlocking Subversion

Oct. 19, Washington. "Soviet Link Cited to U.S. Reds in U.N.; Jenner Group Releases Data Described as Example of 'Interlocking Subversion.'"—*New York Times* headline.

"There is a definite thread from Twelfth Street in Manhattan, the headquarters of the party, to the Kremlin, back to the Palais de Chaillot where the United Nations was in session last year, or back to the United Nations [in New York]—a kind of modernized 'Tinkers to Evers to Chance.'"—Testimony of Robert S. Byfield, N. Y. Stock Exchange representative to the UN.

In evidence, Mr. Byfield offered the fact that speeches by Soviet representatives in the UN display an acquaintance with a book *American Imperialism* by Victor Perlo, alleged Communist.

The *Times* man, understandably confused by it all, identified Mr. Byfield's allusion as to "an historic triple-play [sic] in American baseball."

Some Iron Curtains are More Democratic than Others

From an editorial in the *Times*, Sept. 24:

"... for many months scholars, educational institutions, libraries and individuals with completely legitimate interest in books, magazines and other printed matter originating behind the Iron Curtain have found that delivery of such publications was slow, erratic or nonexistent."

"... The Post Office Department and the Customs Bureau have in effect become the judges not only of what foreign Communist propaganda is but of who in this country shall receive it. ... In at least one instance some scientific journals needed for a governmentally sponsored survey have been withheld from delivery. ... We do not doubt that most printed matter from behind the Iron Curtain, whether it deals with science or law or art or anything else, does contain Communist propaganda. On the other hand, we do not think that most Americans, whether they are scholars engaged in research on the Soviet Union or whether they are ordinary laymen, are so weak-minded as to be affected by such nonsense. ... It is almost a year ago that we first commented on this situation. Since then it has apparently grown worse."

The following supplementary information appeared in the *Times* Oct. 10: The censorship is practiced under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, which bars "political propaganda" from abroad from the mails, unless addressed to registered foreign agents. The departments have, however, "been allowing such material to go through to an estimated fifty responsible universities, libraries and scholars on their own discretion in what they believe to be the national interest." "The collector's office here, now maintaining translators in Russian, Polish, Hungarian and Chinese ... reports it is about two months behind in processing bulk freight arrivals, but is about up to date on individually addressed packages." "Statistics of some research centers show that far more than half of the periodicals due this year still are missing."

Some Censorships Are More Democratic

Nov. 8, New York. The October issue of *New World Review*, successor to *Soviet Russia Today*, has been held up for three weeks by the Post Office pending decision whether it contains "disloyal matter." The Sept. issue was delayed 18 days, and 4 earlier issues were subsequently declared unmailable under Sec. 2388, Title 18 of the U. S.

"The New Jersey State Board of Public Accountants for the first time in its history today administered a loyalty oath to new certified public accountants ..."

"A board spokesman said the oath is a milestone in the accounting profession."

—Oct. 19, Perth Amboy, N.J., A.P.

Code, applied pursuant to Truman's proclamation of National Emergency, Dec. 16, 1950. "It covers willful making or conveying of 'false reports' intended to interfere with the armed forces or to promote the success of the nation's enemies." Although the *Times* has a "private indication" that one issue was banned because of an article charging American use of germ warfare, the Post Office offers no explanations.

High Education

Oct. 18, New York. Dr. Joseph B. Cavallaro, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, receives awards for fight against communism from: The American Jewish League Against Communism (plaque and scroll), D.A.R. and associated patriotic societies (medal), New York State Catholic War Veterans (medal), Guardians of American Education (citation), Students for America (citation), Queens County Young Republican Association (award).

Dr. Cavallaro urges "that the teaching of American history be required in all tax-supported city schools and colleges, and that there be a return to the teaching of religious values on a non-dogmatic basis." Quote: "If it is the responsibility of our public educational system to give the students a complete understanding of their cultural background, then religion cannot be denied recognition."

Bill of Rights

"A review of these decisions (involving the First Amendment) establishes the disconcerting and perhaps startling fact that in no case (in the last decade) has the court liberalized or extended the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. The general trend has been in the direction of sustaining, in the interest of national security, new restrictions upon those liberties."—John Lord O'Brien, Washington lawyer, in *The Harvard Law Review* as quoted by James Reston in the *New York Times* of Sept. 30.

Deportations

Sept. 29. Under the Eisenhower administration, 42 "subversive aliens" have been deported. Cases pending have risen from 33 to 142.

Especially tragic is the case of Ignatz Mezei, as told in the *New York Post* Oct. 19. This spring the U. S. Supreme Court (5-4) upheld refusal of entry "on the basis of information of a confidential nature, the disclosure of which would be prejudicial to the public interest." Mezei, unable to find a country to deport himself to, is on Ellis Island, stuck fast. In April, Attorney General Brownell promised to study the case ("You may be sure that justice will be tempered with mercy") but six months have passed. A U. S. resident from 1923 to 1948, Mezei went to Hungary in 1948; subsequently he obtained a U. S. visa and escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. Refused entry because, Mezei believes, he acknowledged former membership in the International Workers Order, he was held at Ellis Island from Jan. 16, 1950, to May 10, 1952; released on bail, and returned to the Island April 23, 1953.

Sept. 23, Washington. "Revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act at the next session of Congress is ruled out under terms of an understanding ... that made

it possible to pass the Administration bill providing a haven for 214,000 refugees."—*New York Times*.

Item

Sept. 29, United Nations. U. S. "clearance" program has virtually halted hiring of U. S. experts by UN agencies to carry out Technical Assistance program.

"One branch of the program that last year searched out eighty-eight United States specialists for missions abroad has been able to get clearance this year for only five names of 100 submitted to the United States Government."

—*New York Times*.

Conscription

Oct. 7, New York. Richard D. Blazej, 22, of Chappaqua, New York, is sentenced to four years' imprisonment on charges of failing to report for induction and failing to have draft board classification card in possession. In March, Blazej wrote his Peekskill draft board "resigning from the Selective Service System" and enclosing his draft cards. "I believe that killing is wrong and have carried that belief to the extent that I am a vegetarian and don't wish to have any part of a system which includes killing and destruction."

Nov. 6, Chicago, UP. "Federal District Judge J. Sam Perry sentenced a draft evader today to spend forty-eight hours in jail each week for the next five years. Robert J. Hart, 22 years old, is a Methodist, and said he was a conscientious objector. Judge Perry, also a Methodist, declared that there was 'nothing in the creed of the Methodist Church that tells you to oppose a Government order.'"

The Law, Its Majesty: II

On Oct. 26 Michael Patrick O'Brien reached Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic, after nearly two years on the high seas. Two days later the United Press reported from Boston:

"A bewildered 'man without a country' has been detained eight months aboard a United States ship plying mostly along the Atlantic Coast."

"Cato Arvid Roggenbühl, a native of Drammen, Norway, who has worked American vessels for more than thirty years, was confined early this year aboard the collier Malden when he ran into immigration difficulties."

"'Sometimes I think I will go crazy,' he said on a stopover here. 'It is okay when I work but when my shipmates go ashore and I am left always behind * * *'"

"An armed guard ... stands at the gangway whenever the Malden puts into port. If the seaman 'escaped' ... her owners would be subject to a \$1,000 fine."

"Mr. Roggenbühl ... first came to the United States in 1920, when he was 21 years old, found lodgings overlooking the harbor in East Boston and began serving as a seaman."

"He said by failing to return to Norway, he automatically lost his citizenship. Now time has beclouded his entry into this country. Immigration officials say they have no records of his arrival."

"Early this year when the Malden returned from a foreign voyage, immigration officials denied the right of entry, citing him as an undesirable alien under the McCarran Act. He served two three-month jail terms, the second fourteen years ago, after escapades ashore."

"A plea for a pardon of his convictions is before Gov. Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts."

Citizens

U.S. Heroes to Star in History Study. New Curriculum Bulletin of State Board Urges Stress on Deeds of Leaders. Defense Emphasized, Too.

... The students will learn about the deeds that made America great, the importance of the free-enterprise system and the responsibilities of citizens—young and old—in a democratic nation.

From now on social studies long stressed in junior and senior high schools, will be known as "Citizenship Education" with emphasis on the "citizenship" part of the course.

New York Times, Oct. 16, 1953

CITIZEN. Noun masculine. A word of ancient times. It has never had a feminine form. In modern times it is used only by deliberate ironists, including politicians, and imbeciles. Some orators carry the joke so far as to call their female hearers citizenesses (citoyennes). It is really nearly as much a joke to call any man today a citizen.

The erudite orator is likely to cite Aristotle: "The citizen belongs to the State."

Those who depend on appeals to authority have a right, of course, to cite Aristotle in their support. But they are about on a par with the naturalist who describes the lizard by comparing it with the dinosaur. The citizen is a species which Aristotle knew, but which disappeared a long time ago.

The citizen is characterized by the fact that he takes part in the workings of the State. Now, the State—as Aristotle taught, and as the ancients practiced—has two main functions: legislative and judicial. The citizen, he who "belongs to the State"—is a man who acts as judge and who takes part in the legislative assembly. A modern deputy is, for four years, a quarter-citizen: he does not judge, and the laws he votes have force only if approved by another aggregation of quarter-citizens, the Senate. In the classification we are making—in Aristotle's fashion—the judge, a superior animal, is a half-citizen. As to the rest of us poor devils, whose social office consists of enduring the despotism of laws and law-makers and law-enforcers, Aristotle would observe humorously that they have castrated us of our two powers as citizens. To attach this fine historical title to us, is about equivalent to marveling at the virility of eunuchs and entreating them to remedy the depopulation of our dear country.

But perhaps if he heard us call ourselves citizens, Aristotle's laughter would take a different turn. He would remember Diogenes, light up his lantern, pass it in front of our faces, and announce that it illuminated only the faces of slaves.

"To arms, citizens ..."

HAN RYNER

(Translated from L'Encyclopedie Anarchiste, p. 335)

The Patriotic Revision of History

PART I: THE NEW APOLOGY FOR CAPITALISM

Allan Nevins, the historian from Columbia University, has asserted (*The New York Times*, Sept. 20) that the time has come "to reassess—and re-write—the recent history of our times." There is "a wide field," Nevins is quoted, "for the rewriting of American history, and for the re-education of the American people."

Nevins' ideas are: The Beardian method of writing history was wrong; American "bigness" and materialism are justified by the world-crisis; the old capitalist leaders should be given credit for achieving this bigness and power, at a price less than paid in other countries.

Even among the State-patriotic historians, Nevins is an extremist. Nonetheless, he may fairly be taken as a subject for inspection; the main trends in "official" history-writing in our time are all here. And what is official matters today as never before, what with the giant media of dissemination and the grants-in-monopoly furnished by the Congressional guardians of Americanism.

If I mistake not, Nevins' propositions may be summarized this way: The survival of a civilization, at minimum suffering, is the primary value historians have to work with. It is seen—he adds—that American survival has for some time depended on force of arms, which in turn depends on industrial might. Therefore, the rapid industrialization of America is fully justified, and its untoward incidents must be regarded as necessary evils. The capitalist leaders, responsible for this high-speed achievement, must be esteemed as the architects of our survival.

(I am taking Nevins for what he claims to be—an apologist for the State—instead of what he may be in fact—an apologist for capitalism who has found a new rationalization. It is reasonable to take him in this way, because it is as an apology for the State that his arguments will have an appeal for the conforming historians of our era.)

The following questions occur immediately:

Is the survival of a civilization, together with minimization of suffering, a sufficient measure of worth, a sufficient goal? Social scientists have accepted it, no question of that. But will it do?

Can the crisis of a "civilization"—the death-struggles with other States—be regarded as natural, external events? The patriotic historian, to be sure, is very careful to discover a definition by which the enemy States have invariably been the "aggressors." But we are not concerned whether this nation or that initiated actual hostilities; we are interested in their contribution to the crisis from which the hostilities arose. If the course of American industrialization *helped create* the military crisis, then the crisis cannot be appealed to in justification of the system—any more than the tyrant is permitted to justify his dictatorship by the insurrection it provokes, or the statesman his armaments race by the war it provokes.

Were the Rockefellers, et al., indeed responsible for the industrial revolution? Was their contribution necessary?

And was it of a kind that should cause us to assign a certain moral grandeur to them?

I.

The social scientists fall upon such seemingly "objective" and "self-evident" gauges of worth as, at one time, evolutionary progress, or, nowadays, survival of society or civilization. In their ascendancy, such criteria seem simply unquestionable. Only in retrospect are they seen clearly to have served an ideological purpose, as the evolutionary theory did by rationalizing the blighted cities and blighted proletariat of the 19th century as a necessary transition to higher things. A little attention, a little skepticism, and we see how the survival criterion is a story that eases the repose of those who see too well the blight of our nations in the senseless destructive wars.

An idea is not false just because it has an ideological, rationalizing function. But once suspicion is awakened, and we look at the currently dominant idea as an abstraction that may or may not be sound, and no longer as a revered truth—then it begins to disintegrate under our eyes. Such is the case here.

Consider what it means, that the Russians can with equal plausibility justify every action of the Malenkov regime and the whole course of Russian history, as necessary to keep *their* system going. Are the Americans and Russians perhaps going to admit that trial by force and cunning, in diplomacy and war, is the true test of the title of these systems to survive? Indeed, it would be a logical enough extension of their premises, but they shrink from it. It is easily apparent that the Americans mean, survival of "democratic" "free" American society, just as the Russians mean, survival of Communist totalitarian Russian society. In short, they are affirming, what seemed more "scientific" to avoid, the worthiness of their own society, its title to survival by virtue of the good-goings-on in it. (There has been an American attempt to avoid this, by alleging that totalitarian societies are inferior because tending to inefficiency and self-destruction. It is a woefully wishful argument.)

Their reasoning is, in short, *our* society is good, it is involved in wars; therefore everything that wins the wars is good. Here we leave the Russian historians to their own sad devices, and consider the American alone.

To put it as mildly as can be, our social scientists and historians overlook certain possibilities. Perhaps, for one, they are a little hasty about putting the *good* tag on "democratic" society; perhaps it is really an act of patriotism rather than of intelligence. Perhaps the methods of survival adopted by their State will gravely affect the quality of life within the nation: e.g., the consequences of Militarism and the Inquisition, already hard upon us. Perhaps they might also consider whether the *best* society would have a right to survive, if its survival meant the reduction of the rest of the world to rubble and corpses.

No wonder the State-patriots prefer not to know the premises of their own ideology, and take refuge in the formulas, "survival, therefore armaments," "armaments, therefore the means to procure them."

II.

It should be fairly self-evident that *none* of the great States can evade responsibility for the crisis of our times. In struggles for world-power, the "solutions" of each conflict are the sources of the next. We may, without dia-

History, as Revisited by Allan Nevins

The cardinal weakness of a controversial historian like Beard is that he repeatedly gave the impression—perhaps falsely—of having said to himself: "Let us take this provocative theory of the fact and see how impressive an array of facts we can collect in its support." Ideas in history . . . should be applied in subordination to the ascertainment of all the facts, and not in command of the ascertainment of one picked body of facts.

Without denying that many accomplishments of our swift industrialization were unhappy, we can now assert that this historical attitude (of apology for America's devotion to material progress, bigness and economic power) was erroneous. The nation grew none too fast. We can see today that all its wealth, all its strength, were needed to meet a succession of world crises—and we still dwell in a crisis era. Had we applied restrictions to keep our economy small, tame and pure, we would have lost the first World War. Had the United States not possessed the mightiest oil industry, the greatest steel industry, the best technological schools and the most ingenious working force in the world, we would indubitably have lost the second World War.

The architects of our material progress—the men like Whitney, McCormack, Westinghouse, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Hill and Ford—will yet stand forth in their true stature as builders of a strength which civilization found indispensable . . . The industrial revolution cost less in human travail here than it did in England, where it first came to birth; less than in Germany or Japan; far less than it is costing in Russia.

Allan Nevins, as quoted in the New York Times Sept. 20, 1953.

bolizing America, point out typical instances of the contribution of the American economy and State.

America's involvement in the world crisis—first of all—was a direct consequence of the industrialization of this nation, the rise to power of financial and industrial interests, and their "expansive mood." It is to abuse credulity, to suggest that a non-industrial America would have "lost" the first World War—for nothing was more voluntary than the decision of American leaders to go to war, to protect and advance interests created by industrial capitalism! Or, in considering the prelude to the second World War, we may mention the "peace" of antagonistic and uneconomic Nationalisms which America helped impose in 1918; and the tremendous impact of the American economic collapse of 1929, a disaster of utmost significance in the rise of German and Japanese fascism and militarism and in the march toward the second war. These examples may stand for others.

An America which had not created a powerful capitalist class with world-interests and world-ambitions, and did not draw the world into the orbit of its finance; an America which gave the world an example of the peaceful co-existence of nations—such a nation might well have lacked the capacity in 1945 to produce atomic bombs. But given these same conditions, perhaps the world around us would not be a vast array of armed camps, or our nation the object of rising hatreds.

Far from justifying the course of American industrialism and capitalism, the crisis of the Empire Wars is a ground for condemning the system whose methods helped prepare the crisis; and should lead the serious student to look for ways in which America's continuing commitment to capitalism and its technology are prohibiting rational steps to meet the crisis.

(Nothing said here may be taken as tacit agreement that the alternatives are capitalism or a pastoral economy. This is the choice the Nevinses wish us to believe in. The third alternative is to secure the real benefits of industry by adapting science and technology to man, to man's needs, not to adapt man to the needs of the State, the capitalist market, or bureaucratic planners.)

III.

When Nevins says, the capitalists were the "architects," who "will yet stand forth in their true stature," his intention is, no doubt, to say that capitalist leadership was beneficial to the growth of the nation; and second, that the capitalists should, because of their achievement, be regarded as morally superior and fit for emulation. Here we will disregard the previously-stated reservations about the worth of America's industrial accomplishment, and for the sake of argument accept the premise that our industrial revolution is something good.

What was the nature of the capitalists' service?

Will it be claimed that their command, during the time of industrial revolution, is sufficient evidence? But we know how a general of the lowest order of competence may win famous battles, simply because of the superiority of his army and through no fault of his own. The shrewd historian will not tolerate claims for him.

Will it be claimed that the capitalists performed an indispensable service, as the means of accumulating and channeling the needed capital, and providing organizational leadership? Of course, capital accumulation, and organization, are indispensable. But there are a number

of ways to go about it. That it has been done elsewhere by the State—though productive of even worse consequences—shows that the problem is technical and admits of a variety of solutions. The libertarian communes in the Spanish Revolution, for example, found ways even on a primarily agrarian foundation to create mechanisms for this purpose. (This question is, of course, of prime interest to the pre-industrial countries of today.)

Will it be claimed that the relative painlessness of American industrialization is a sign of the value of the capitalist method? Then we must take account of the unique American endowment: the ore, the coal, the fertile prairies, the political opportunities, the corps of fanatical inventors, the mass immigrations. In short, in the modern phrase, "they had the horses," as no other country ever had.

If it is claimed that American capitalists contributed major inventions and technological innovations, we must note, first, that this was true of a small number. ("McCormack was perhaps unique among wealthy industrialists of his era in that he was a genuine inventor."¹ Ford's contribution to the assembly-line—supposing we accept its worth—was his faith in it, his determination to carry it to the limit; he himself was not an inventor, and the specific problems of the assembly-line were solved by brilliant salaried engineers.) Second, that it was not as *capitalists*, but as inventors, managers, etc., that they made these contributions. And third, that nearly all the technically-creative work was done by the salaried technicians and isolated inventors.

Against such doubtful claims, we may set the extremely well-documented story of the vast work of obstruction, waste and spoliation accomplished by these men. It is a shame and a loss if time is obliterating the record.

To take a few characteristic activities: (1) they built duplicating railroads and then enriched themselves by consolidating them; (2) they slaughtered the forests of vast regions of America, until the calamity compelled government-regulation; (3) their speculations and corners and struggles for control destroyed enterprises and precipitated financial-economic disasters; (4) they held wages down to—and sometimes below—the minimum necessary for survival; the wage-rises which made mass-consumers-production possible, were gained by workers' unions and strikes, resisted with all the force and violence the capitalists could command;² (5) they corrupted judges, city officials, whole legislatures. . . .

But this is too general. We may cite a series of section-headings from Gustavus Myers' chapter (XXVI) on Hill in *History of the Great American Fortunes* (1907): "The Debauching and Swindling of Indians—The Seizure of Mineral Lands—The Colossal Thefts of Timber—Bribery of Officials—Honest Officials Maligned and Persecuted—" etc. etc. Or (from *The Age of Moguls*, p. 81) "Carnegie warned railroad presidents and purchasing agents the country over that rails 'made by the direct rolling process' were dangerous . . . more than intimated that derailment of trains . . . were to be expected. . . . The direct rolling process was . . . new, revolutionary, and cheaper than the older method . . . of the Carnegie Steel Company. It also made better rails." Later, Carnegie bought the hard-hit company. Again, Carnegie: his assignment of Frick to the job of breaking the steel workers' union in 1892, which the latter did by sending a Pinkerton army into Homestead with the tragic consequences.³ Or the well-known "labor policies" of Henry Ford, brushed over by writers like Holbrook, but documented *ad nauseum*, as a reviewer

said, by Keith Sward.⁴ Or Rockefeller: the notorious methods of assembling the oil trust by bankrupting rivals; or we may mention the Ludlow Massacre of 1914, when the Colorado militia burned to death 13 wives and children of strikers in the tent colony of evicted miners at the Rockefellers' Colorado Fuel & Iron mines (*The Age of Moguls*, pp. 140-1).

(We pass by, altogether, the vastly important question of the *specific kind* of industrialization that the profit-motive imposed on America: the utter dehumanization of the worker that an ingenuity like Ford's or Taylor's produced; the over-centralization of physical plants, etc. Nor can we enter upon the effects of capitalism upon every aspect of our way of life—one must draw the line somewhere.)

But even where the capitalists did not obstruct, despoil and corrupt, it was because profit and power lay in another direction. Are we to say: All hail to the man dedicated to enriching himself! In the case of Ford and a few others, pursuit of a technological goal became as much an obsession as accumulation of wealth. When this small concession is made, the motive of the capitalists remains—to get rich.

Our intention is, of course, to point out that the work of industrial creation, such as it could be within the capitalist system, was the collective work of the inventors, engineers, technicians, workers, and in some lesser degree the capitalists. Unlike the capitalists, none of the other groups contributed to the work of obstruction—unless we are so to regard the occasional efforts of workers to resist mechanization, just because they knew what, under capitalist control, it would mean for them, in brutalization, exploitation and unemployment.

HISTORICUS

(The second part of this article, in the next issue of Resistance, will discuss the writing and study of History, and the influences of the State-patriotic doctrine.)

¹Stewart Holbrook, *The Age of Moguls*. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1953.

²In reference to the terrible railroad riots of 1877: "We may well ask why such a line as the New York Central had cut its wages below what Vanderbilt admitted was a fair standard without requesting a single sacrifice of the shareholders. This great system had a nominal capital of about ninety million dollars, or twice its real capital, yet it stiffly maintained a dividend of eight per cent. Why should not Vanderbilt have reduced his rate to six per cent, an absolute easing of \$1,780,000 annually, or far more than he was obtaining by the wage cut, with all the suffering and convulsion it entailed?" Allan Nevins, *The Emergence of Modern America*, 1865-1878. Macmillan, 1935; p. 391.

³*The Age of Moguls*, pp. 83-85. Or, far better, the first chapters of Alexander Berkman's *Prison Memoirs of an Anarchist*.

⁴*The Legend of Henry Ford*. New York: Rinehart, 1948. When one wants to make an exciting story of the Moguls, like Holbrook, one neglects such a definitive study as Sward's; not without loss, of course. Holbrook's book, for all its superficiality, is useful because unlike Myers he is not "hostile." Nevins, incidentally, is engaged in a two-volume study of the Ford Motor Co., "drawing on the private and corporate papers of Henry Ford" (*New York Times*).

The Popular Intelligence in the Spanish Revolution

I want to call attention to a curious fact: the failure of the top, the directors, the guiding heads. I am referring not only to the socialist and communist politicians, but also to the better-known anarchist militants, the "leaders."

Spanish anarchism had a number of them. The ablest, Orobón Fernandez, died shortly before the revolution. A real sociologist, he had a broad and profound grasp of politics and economics. Others were highly-cultured persons, fine agitators, some of them notable orators, good journalists and writers; Federica Montseny was one of the most intelligent women in the intellectual life of the country.

But from the start these militants were absorbed in the official duties they accepted despite their traditional repugnance to government. The idea of anti-fascist unity had led them to this position. *It was necessary to keep quiet about principles, to make temporary concessions.* Hindered thereby from continuing to act as guides, they remained apart from the great work of reconstruction from which the proletariat will learn such precious lessons for the future.

Without doubt, they could still have given useful advice, they could have offered general principles for action and co-ordination. They did not. Why? It was because they were primarily demolishers. The struggle against State and capitalism had led them to subordinate all their culture and personal prestige to a political orientation. None of the best-known militants—apart from Noja Ruiz, and latterly Santillan—was competent to meet the economic problems of revolution. A constructive mentality,

that can grasp the essentials of a chaotic situation and harmonize them in a comprehensive vision, is not improvised overnight.

Even some of those intellectuals who stayed out of official positions took no part in the work of transforming the society.

How, then, was success possible?

The reason was nothing else than the positive intelligence of the people. This was our secret strength.

For decades, anarchist papers and reviews and pamphlets had been forming in militants a habit of acting individually, of taking initiative. They were not taught to wait for directives from above. They had always thought and acted for themselves—sometimes well, sometimes badly. Reading the paper, the review, the pamphlet, the book, each developed and enlarged his own personality. They were never given a dogma or a safe, uniform line of action. In the study of concrete problems, in the critique of economic and political ideas, clear ideas of revolution had gradually matured.

For some time, the problems of social reconstruction had been on the order of the day. Some of the better-known militants were rather scornful of the studies published by Puente, Besnard, Santillan, Orobón Fernandez, Noja Ruiz, Leval. But many of the more serious, and perhaps basically more intelligent, workers read them avidly. A great number of the 60,000 readers of the libertarian review *Studi* followed with interest the detailed articles on the problems a revolution faces, in food supply, fuel, or agriculture.

Many syndicalist groupings did likewise. And when at the Saragossa Congress in May, 1936, a renowned militant, who always displayed an olympian indifference toward such questions—later, he was just as good minister as bad organizer—presented an exposition of libertarian communism which revealed the lack of substance in his thought, the workers and peasants assembled from all the provinces showed their disapproval; for they knew quite well that social life must be thought of and organized in a more methodical way.

All this study, together with the need for men of will and action in the social struggle, gave birth to the qualities that made possible the marvelous achievements of the agrarian collectives and the industrial organization.

The capacity of the people. That is, intelligence plus will. This is the secret.

In this, not even the humblest laborers were lacking. I knew many syndicalist committeemen who understood the problems of revolution and economic organization very clearly. They spoke intelligently about raw materials, imports, the need to improve or eliminate this or that branch of industry, the armed defense, and other matters.

The prompt reaction against the Control Committees which threatened, in the big cities, to become a new parasitic bureaucracy; the rapid decision to resist the attacks of the 18th and 19th of July; the rise of untrained military leaders (Durruti, Ortiz, Mera, Ascaso and others) to command over professional military men, are all facts that support my conclusions.

When I made my first visit to the Aragon front, my attention was attracted by the countenances of many of the young men in the trenches. There was clarity, serenity,

The scarcity of English-language anarchist literature on the Spanish Civil War and Revolution of 1936-39 is only now beginning to be relieved, by publication of Vernon Richards' study Lessons of the Spanish Revolution (London, Freedom Press).

Gaston Leval's book, Né Franco, Né Stalin; le collettivita anarchiche spagnole nella lotta contro Franco e la reazione staliniana (Neither Franco Nor Stalin; the Spanish anarchist collectives in the struggle against Franco and the Stalinist reaction; Milano, Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1952), from which the present article is selected and slightly adapted, is the only extensive study of the constructive activities of the revolutionary peasants and workers. Although containing many imperfections, these social creations, particularly the voluntary agrarian collectives, serve as the finest example of what can be done by a population which takes the initiative and develops in each locality forms of cooperation that correspond to the needs of production, consumption and the life of the community.

In later issues we shall publish further selections from Leval's valuable work.

firmness in their eyes; they had the faces of thoughtful men. I rode back to Barcelona with a comrade—the region's counsellor for economics—who was going to Valencia to make a desperate effort, through the central government, to save his companion, held by the fascists in Saragossa.

He was a simple man, in externals and in character. But a remarkable man. Although tormented by the fate of his companion, he explained to me about the new lands that had to be cultivated, about coal and iron and manganese mines that could be opened, about canals that ought to be dug, about trade with Catalonia, about the relations between collectivist and individualist peasants.

We spoke of electrification. He expounded to me a plan for a single network to unify the hydraulic resources and distribute the power equally among the socialized regions, and avoid the concentration of industry and the excessive, often unfair, specialization of agriculture. His deep knowledge of the Spanish economy surprised me. He was a glass-maker, only 32 years old. Many ministers of economics and agriculture of the republic and the monarchy knew less than he about these subjects. . . .

One day the secretary of the Peasants Federation of Levante said to me:

"I want your advice, Gaston. We've been thinking of starting a bank. . . ."

"A bank of your own?" I asked.

"Yes. You see, we need money to keep things moving between our collectivized villages, and for trade with other towns. With the export of oranges stopped, it's hard to get. Instead of helping, the government cuts the ground from under us. We've just about decided to have a bank of our own. The problem is whether we ought to start one with our own resources, or take over one that already exists. . . ."

"How would you take it over?"

"By operations to make it lose money and accept our intervention."

I didn't have time to look into the plan closely. Some months later, I saw this peasant again—this peasant with the common-man look and the beret. He'd got his bank.

I was working on economic problems, so they consulted me about everything. But how often nothing remained to be done, so well had they already planned it!

The revolution developed in extremely complicated circumstances. Attacks from within and without had to be fought off. It took fantastic efforts to put the anarchist principles in practice. But in many places it was done. The organizers found out how to get around everything.

I repeat: it was possible because we had the intelligence of the people on our side. This is what finds the way, and meets the thousand needs of life and the revolution. It organized the militias and defeated fascism in the first phase of the war. It went to work, instantly, to make the armored cars and rifles and guns.

The initiative came from the people, above all from those influenced by the anarchists.

For example, the Aragon collectives. Among their organizers I found only two lawyers, in Alcorina. They were not, strictly speaking, intellectuals. But if what they did, together with the peasant and worker comrades, was well done, it was no better than what could be seen in Esplus, Binefar, Calanda and other collectives.

What was a surprise, was to find that a great many of these peasants were illiterate. But they had faith, practical common sense, the spirit of sacrifice, the will to create a new world.

I don't want to make a demagogic apology for ignorance. Those men had a mentality, a heart, a spirit, of a kind that education cannot give and official education often smothers. Spiritual culture is not always bookish, and still less academic. It can arise from the very conditions of living, and when it does, it is more dynamic. By adapting themselves to what was being done, by coordinating the work, by suggesting general directions, by warning a certain region or industry against particular errors, by complementing one activity with another and harmonizing the whole, by stimulating here and correcting there—in these ways great minds can undoubtedly be of immense service. In Spain they were lacking. It was not by the work of our intellectuals—more literary than sociological, more agitators than practical guides—that the future has been illuminated. And the peasants—libertarian or not—of Aragon, Levante, Castille, Extremadura, Andalusia, the workers of Catalonia, understood this and acted alone.

The intellectuals, by their ineptitude in practical work, were inferior to the peasants who made no political speeches but knew how to organize the new life.

Not even the authors of the syndicalist health organization in Catalonia were intellectuals. A Basque doctor with a will of iron, and a few comrades working in the hospitals, did everything. In other regions, talented professional men aided the movement. But there, too, the initiative came from below.

Alcoy's industries, so well organized, were all managed by the workers, as were those of Elda and Castellon. In Carcagente, in Elda, in Granollers, in Binefar, in Jativa, in land transport, in marine transport, in the collectives of Castille, or in the semi-socialization of Ripolls and Pugerda—the militants at the bottom did everything.

As for the government, they were as inept in organizing the economy as in organizing the war.

GASTON LEVAL



October 28, 1953

Peacemakers

513 West 166th Street
New York 32, New York

Dear Friends:

I have your communication of October 23 addressed to the Resistance Group, inviting us to sponsor a "Third Camp Conference." At present *Resistance* is not being edited by a group, but by myself. In stating the reasons why I decline to join in sponsoring such a conference, however, I believe I am speaking also for the persons associated with *Resistance*.

Anarchists heartily favor cooperation among kindred left-wing groups on specific issues for definite aims. A united front against war, and for a vague socialist goal, is another matter. We see no advantage, and much harm, in an alliance for an indefinite period, for objectives impossible to define in advance, among individuals and groups whose basic views conflict sharply. Such a political alliance, organically confirmed or not, must lead either to liquidation of the participants into the least-common-denominator movement, or to the hegemony of those groups, if any, which aim to incorporate the rest under their aegis.

The strength—or weakness—of an ideology or movement resides in the basic positive ideas which are unique to it. These either justify its existence or condemn it. The demagogic fanfare that commonly follows truncation of basic ideas for the sake of unity, confirms the necessity for each individual, group and movement to follow their unique trajectories, so long as they believe their ideas correct. If they find their ideas bankrupt, then they ought frankly to follow the logic of their discovery, and take a clear stand on a new ground of conviction.

Anarchism stands for total abolition of the State, for rejection of all forms of politics, for rejection of authority in the movement for freedom and peace. It stands, conversely, for voluntary cooperation and association on the

Postscript to a Discussion

In his letter to the editor in the October *Resistance*, Stuart said (in effect):

"You like to talk about the 'potentialities' and 'perfectibility' of Man—'anarchism corresponds to the best knowledge about men and society.' Do you know why you can talk like this? Only by refusing to look at the vile and vicious things men have done. You want to forget the six millions Jews the Nazis murdered. To avoid facing it, you publish an article that purports to teach Americans a lesson in moral responsibility, but really serves to deny that the Nazi atrocities raise any questions about man's nature!"

"A fine evasion!"

"No! Take a look at what your perfectible men and women did under the Nazis—the 99 in 100 who did everything asked of them, and often more. Then say if you believe in chasing Utopia, or in doing *everything* just to save the victims."

Perhaps anarchists do not habitually confront the "disease of our times" in its full horror. After all there is small virtue in adding to the sense of oppression, already so heavy upon men of good will. As we shall see,

part of free individuals and autonomous groups. These hard-learned and precious lessons must, in our view, some day be recognized if we are to achieve the ideals we all profess. We are aware that certain pacifist and socialist groups have moved far toward accepting these principles. But we do not ask them, until convinced of the rightness of our views, to pretend they are anarchists; nor would it be very sensible for anarchists to act as though they did not believe what they say.

As to the slogan "The Third Camp," we believe it to be founded on profound misconceptions of the American scene:

1. We see no objective verification of the sanguine appraisal of the sentiments of the American people, and hence no ground for a mass anti-war movement.

2. Given the psychology prevalent in America, a "Third Camp" movement would, if successful, become a new power-entity no longer at the service of its idealistic aims. To achieve a different issue, there must be a will to freedom, an acceptance of responsibility, that remains to be developed in America.

3. A superficial propaganda and anti-war agitation—not accompanied by deep-going positive education—plays irresponsibly into the hands of those who actually wield social and political power, and especially of the Demagogues.

Over the years, anarchists have had a considerable experience with united front movements, as far back as the First International and as recently as "Third Camp" movements in Europe. Some of us have had experience and acquaintance with analogous movements in the 1930s. To us, these experiences are definitive.

For these reasons, it is not possible to accept your kind invitation.

With best wishes and regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

David Wieck

(Because of lack of space in this issue, additional comment on these questions has had to be postponed.—DW)

anarchists must acknowledge that the victims in any particular catastrophe are doomed—the catastrophes have to be prevented beforehand; and if a man is not made of wood, it is painful to say. On the other hand, an ostrich philosophy of action cannot claim the right to exist. . . .

Very well, how does one save the victims?

One looks frankly at the Nazi atrocities, or the march of Communism in Korea, and one is moved to action. "Action." We cannot "stand idly by." How often have sympathy and grief and rage moved the "men of good will" to sponsor crusades of salvation! Action! One cannot stand idly by! But suppose it turns out time and again that the victims are not saved, the roots of the madness remain untouched, and we move on to new catastrophes? What action saves the victims? At what price?

First, Koreans were saved from the Communists. Now the shattered survivors have had to be saved from the war of salvation, and they are still waiting to be saved from Rhee's government of salvation. And how long ago were American planes liberating Korea by bombing Japan? (Or liberating China—to the advantage of Communism.) Is the case untypical? The Jews of central Europe were "saved"—how many?—at the cost of millions of people as innocent as the Jews of crimes against humanity; we cannot even be sure that the Nazi death campaign would have reached its ultimate fury, if not for the war and the

impending German defeat. And now the Russian armies and police are astride the continent.

Save the victims. By multiplying the victims, and readying the new tragedy?

As the human race now lives, we never stand more than a few years' journey from the condition where the State abandons its prosaic methods of empire and exploitation, and turns savagely and devouringly on its subjects and neighbors. It should not astonish us, when the last fragments of solidarity among the atomized masses are crushed, and power over the mass passes to adventurers and delusional idealists and bureaucrats without recollection of the meaning of the word "man," that monstrous things are done, the vicious run free, and the weak and compliant appease the State with their loyal service. Literally anything may happen then, once all resistance-within is crushed. The victims are lost. It is hard and brutal to say, if a man is not made of wood it should move him to tears. But if we do not learn the hard lesson, we shall certainly never be able to strike deep to the roots, the State organization of an atomized society.

It is the bitter irony of our situation, that those who want to crusade against these relatively localized disasters, can find no other means than disasters of even greater magnitude, the wars between the empires—which apart from the destruction, strengthen the Bureaucracy and introduce the Inquisition in our own nation. To the point where we wonder how long our own relative Liberty will endure.

It is not merely from idealism, from a wish to live humanly—though it is mainly this—that anarchists reject government and cooperation in its wars. It is also in order to do away with an order of society in which the logical extension of Statism and social atomization remains always a too ominous possibility.

Hope deferred maketh the heart sick. The aims of anarchists are not being achieved, and it is easy to understand how persistence in them can seem pointless.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, Nov. 14, 1953 CONTRIBUTIONS

CALIFORNIA: Inglewood: D.M. 3.00; Oakhurst: K.K. 1.00; San Francisco: A.G. & D.K. 5.00, F.T. 2.00, Anon. & Misc. 2.50, P.E. 2.00; Vista: A.S. 0.23.....	\$ 15.73
COLORADO: Denver: R.B. 5.00.....	5.00
ILLINOIS: Chicago: Free Society Group 10.00.....	10.00
MASSACHUSETTS: Chelsea: H.B. 3.00.....	3.00
MICHIGAN: Detroit: I Refrattari 50.00.....	50.00
NEW YORK: Albany: G & S 5.00; Brooklyn: B. 3.00, A.F. 1.00; New York City: S.G. 4.83, F.G. 2.00, D.R. 5.00, J.S. 2.00, U.P. Book Shop 1.00, D.D.W. 10.00, R.S. 2.00, Misc. 1.03.....	36.86
OHIO: Cleveland: T.T. 1.00.....	1.00
PENNSYLVANIA: Anthracite Labor Day Picnic: 50.00; Philadelphia: Circolo d'Emancipazione Sociale 10.00 Reading: J.M. 1.00.....	61.00
VIRGINIA: Hampton: D.J. 0.71.....	0.71
WASHINGTON: Seattle: R.H. 10.00.....	10.00
CANADA: Vancouver: N.E. 2.50; S.R. 1.00.....	3.50
ENGLAND: W. Sheffield: A.D. 2.60.....	2.60
MEXICO: Mexico City: M.F. 10.00.....	10.00
	\$209.40
Balance, Sept. 21, 1953.....	80.79
	290.19

EXPENDITURES

Cuts, Vol. XI, No. 2.....	\$ 13.45
Wrapping paper.....	13.98
Additional printing charge, Vol. XI, No. 2.....	2.00
Postage, Vol. XI, No. 3.....	32.50
Printing, Vol. XI, No. 3.....	201.00
	\$262.93
Balance, Nov. 14, 1953.....	\$ 27.26

The method of anarchism is simple enough. As John Dickinson showed, in the article which drew Stuart's fire, the passive, unresisting compliance of people with the demands of the State, their imitation of its spirit even when not under direct coercion, is one of the essentials of a governmental status quo. The system works, only if the mass of people *do not* act as responsible human beings in natural sociality, only if they remain under the dominance of the instinct to survive and avert the most imminent pain. It is wrong, and can lead to extremely wrong action, to think of them as "responsible" or "guilty" in the crimes of their society: a person cannot be held to account for not trying to do what no single individual has the power to do—to overthrow a social system. Yet if the acts of the subjects are not acts of subjection, the State society cannot endure. The transformation of society begins, we say, when some people learn that their choices count—that they choose part of the environment of their neighbors and fellow workers. We choose, by our ways of acting toward racism, employers and fellow workers, the military demands, the demands of the Inquisition, etc., etc., whether we present them an example of passive conformity, an example of hate-ridden rebellion, or an example of the attempt to become "recognizably human" individuals in search of a new sociality. We choose whether we echo the multitudinous doctrines of power, all ultimately variations on the theme of Statist collectivism, or whether we present and try to actualize the idea of freedom, individuality and sociality.

But a striking beginning has not been made. The tides of social movements are not running with us, there are no more revolutionary proletarian movements to open the way for anarchism. Neither this nor the depths man has sunk to—or might ever sink to—affects our idea of the conditions in which mankind would thrive. But neither can we prove, though we can make a case, that people so bewildered, and in America so arrogant in their bewilderment, can recover their latent powers.

But have we been offered a "half-way" proposal that does not, on examination and experience, turn out to be a replica, hardly modified, of the status quo? Has someone offered a way of "saving" the victims that does not multiply them? In principle, can there be another way to liberty and sociality, than their exercise by people? It takes no wit to ridicule the hopefulness of Anarchism. One does not see that the alternatives will survive inspection.

Once our situation is seen in its essentials, the ways to choose among are really few. One can close his eyes, numb his feelings, or relieve himself with the various current illusions, and feel that he has escaped the "dilemma" of radicalism; such a person is no better off than the mass of the people, with his perceptivity he resigns his individuality. Or he may say, "Damn them all, they are too stupid," and try to "live his own life," by the best principles but without social aspirations. The trap is a cunning one, it is the way of many an ex-radical; it is a trap, because man is a social and a "political" animal, who *cares*—as a question of fact—about what goes on around him, and if he chooses this way, he accepts for himself a crippling sense of alienation from the doings of contemptible people. If it had no other validity, Anarchism restores the radical to the fullest humanity possible in our dark days, by guiding him in the effort to build a community dedicated to freedom and enlightenment.

DTW