



de Moreland

R E S I S T A N C E

VOLUME 8 - NO.4
MARCH, 1950

Law and Liberty

The legal mentality now developing in America is such as to jeopardize the tenuous protection that the dissenter, the non-conformist, the rebel, has managed to preserve or command. The principle of the Hiss prosecution was the outrageous one that if a man cannot, for some reason or other, be convicted for what he is believed to have done, he can be tried for a liar. One would like to see this principle pursued, and all respectable citizens subpoenaed to testify under oath about their past behavior and all possible illegal acts. To hound men in this legal fashion is, in view of the actual proportion of power, an act of ungenerousness and vindictiveness; and likewise good precedent for action against other non-conformists, not suspected of working in the interests of the Russian State.

The legal lynching of the political leaders of defeated States, by laws and precedents invented just for the purpose; the Smith Act and the conviction of the Stalinist leaders for intent and advocacy without overt act; the Hiss trial; the new Supreme Court — all seem of a pattern. The Supreme Court's approval of search without warrant during the course of arrest foreshadows the undercutting of the last defenses of "civil liberties."

"Civil liberty" is indeed a recent and not very hardy discovery. In early America, the rights of speech, the protection of person, were guaranteed by a literal reading of the Bill of Rights and by the liberty implicit in a loose social organization and relatively decentralized government. The growth of monopoly, industrialism, the government, the institution of war, created de facto nullifications of liberty. The "liberal" Roosevelt regime supported and even initiated — less from principle than from political utility, it is true — a series of legal, statal defenses of liberty — labor laws to protect workers and their organizations, and a Supreme Court that defended personal freedom whenever it did not conflict with the large necessities of the State. Surely a weak enough and false structure of liberty — giving back a little of what had been taken away and calling this freedom. But now the political necessities have shifted, police efficiency is given precedence over personal liberty, the colors of government seem to be changing from liberalism to restriction. Not the restriction of a total police-state, but restriction and pursuit on the pattern of trumped-up warrants for arrest on petty charges and general searches without warrant (Frankfurter pointed this out) — just the flexible, opportunistic type of restriction desired by a government sure of the "loyalty" and blind obedience of the great majority and having to deal only with a handful of protestants and non-conformists.

The Miners In the struggle of the government and the coal operators to bring John Lewis and the miners to their terms, the nature of the Taft-Hartley Law, and of Truman's principles (though he does not want them codified in a Taft-Hartley Law) becomes clearer. The owners and government want to deal with unions moderate in their demands, with "reasonable" approachable leaders and docile membership. The unconscious philosophy of early unionism (and even of the pre-war CIO) was that the profit-system was unjust and any existing agreement was only a compromise for lack of strength. Unions have now deliberately repudiated this philosophy, and are concerned only to maintain the existing "standard of living" (with increases to compensate for rises in the cost of living) and "fringe increases," pensions, etc. They take for granted the principle of war-time wage-freezing, perpetuated extra-legally into the present, incorporated into the sliding-scale General Motors agreement of the UAW: that the existing proportion of wages to profits is just and not to be disturbed. Though also going after the "fringes" (which he regards as disguised wage-increases), Lewis has never conceded that the miners have reached a limit. This is the nature of Lewis, unconcerned about philosophy or economics, for whom strikes and wage-increases are the weapons of politics; on the other hand, the miners have retained a sense of the basic injustice of the wage-system, the basic unfairness of any wages men may be paid to go down in those mines. It is this spirit that the coal operators and government have time and again failed to break.

The Impasse

Nothing may be said about the hydrogen bomb except that nothing would be so surprising, from the perspective of a dozen or 30 years ago, as the complete public apathy. A small hall indeed would easily fit the number of possible protesters in New York's eight million. These bombs begin to take on the character of a natural disaster, an earthquake or a volcano; not because the artificers are not human but just because humans are the artificers — if it was simply a natural disaster, all hands would be turned to its prevention, evasion, limitation. The first fact to be faced is the apathy — defense against the panic; the futility of any action open to any one but perhaps a dozen scientists; the unavailability of any answer, short of revolutionary changes, to the America-Russia impasse; the impossibility of conceiving one's death by these bombs or in such war (the inconceivability of such a war); war-deadened feelings, hypnotic propaganda. Since Bikini, people have learned to tell themselves that somehow these bombs will be controlled (the myth of the Merely Bigger Bomb): controlled! somehow "The Enemy," and not ourselves, will alone be destroyed. These bombs make worse than useless all accumulated political thought, all calculation of the best settlement of power relations, all preferences for a particular outcome of war to a particular peace. One can counsel that the horror be felt, the possible disaster plainly looked at (looked at, not "accepted" and dismissed) — to

release the rage and indignation. But prevention of the natural disaster must have the form of general awakening to the horror, not to be brought about by propaganda. First to face the futility and the hopelessness. And then ask oneself if he can go on living in this way, living like a dog and dying in man-made natural disaster, and not do the great, simple, possible act of rebellion and living like a man even if treated like a dog and killed in the general disaster. The Heroic Age is past; yet each of us can behave like and be a great man, simply by being a man.

dw

With the Scientists

"New Treatment in Sex Offenses" (p. 38 *New York Daily Mirror* — 2 Nov. 49). "Two British doctors report they have discovered a treatment which kills the uncontrollable urges of sex offenders. "A recent issue of the medical journal, the *Lancet*, said sex hormones in the form of oestradiol benzoate or oestrone were injected into 13 volunteers and removed the sex urge in all of them as long as the treatment was continued.

"The treatment is described by Prof. F. L. Golla, of the Burden Neurological Institute in Bristol, and Dr. R. S. Hoge, of Musgrove Park Hospital in Taunton.

"They said the urge may be banished within two weeks by daily injections of 50,000 international units of oestradiol benzoate. If the same dosage of oestrone is used, it takes a month to kill the urge."

1984 here we come! What bitter laughter this must have aroused in George Orwell! Rather than dealing humanely and rationally with "sex offenses": curing those that are really antisocial (such as the sadistic violence of police-forces as well as that of rapists) by psychoanalytic therapy and ceasing to apply obsolete laws against those that are not really antisocial (such as the atypical sexuality of zoophilics, homosexuals and unmarried lovers — all of whom are discriminated against by many laws in all lands), our "scientists" choose rather to kill the sex urge (theirs is the word), to attempt to kill (thanks be that it is an impossibility!) that which to the Ancients was the Divine Eros, source of all creation. Eternal shame to these non-scientists — unworthy to be classed with Aristotle, Newton, Darwin and Freud.

jml

RESISTANCE

Vol. 8, No. 4 March, 1950

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.

IDEAS OF ANARCHY: — The Individual and the Community

by David Wieck

I. The Good Non-Sectarianism

The formal dispute between "individualist" and "communist" anarchists is not very interesting. It has to do with the institutions of a free society, and logical argument about them. Blueprints for a rather distant future are not very interesting ever. Fortunately, Lorraine Labadie ("Infantile Radicalism," December, 1949, *Resistance*) has raised the psychological question, by proposing that the dynamic of all communism is a longing for the security of the parent-producer economy and parent-authority polity of childhood. But before coming to the line of thought (and speculations) this suggests let me state briefly what some anarchists mean by calling themselves "anarchist-communists" and what some of us mean by calling ourselves "anarchists."¹

All anarchists have in common the belief that the State is a harmful institution, whose abolition is necessary to achieve a better society. The State is an organization for diplomacy and war, of the nation acting as a war-like whole vis-a-vis other nations; an organization to regulate and standardize economics and finance in a situation of monopoly, inequality and ruthless competition; an organization to suppress the "underlying population," the victims of the economy and social system; at worst, the monolithic organization of the whole society. Anarchists do not believe that a nation, as a political whole, should administer or regulate the economic, cultural and social relations among people; and we believe such an authority deforms the natural completion of these functions and destroys the freedom of the people. Anarchists agree, further, on the principle of freedom and non-authoritarianism in the creation of new social institutions.

Here the agreement ends. At this point the individualists argue that the economy should regulate itself by free competition; they believe it is only government-fostered and government-protected monopoly that prevents the just operation of truly free enterprise, and that economic independence, the possession of property, is the one effective guarantee of freedom: persons will cooperate only to their individual advantage, and society will be the working out in freedom of the self-interest of each. (It is not the fault of the individualists that some of the same phrases are part of the Republican cant.) On the other hand, in the period after the First International, European anarchists extended their rather undefined principles and evolved the theory of anarchist-communism. The main principle was the breakup of the nation into communities (usually called communes, after the free cities of the middle ages), autonomous, completely self-governing. The commune was regarded as an economic and social unit, but with no internal political authority. The principle "from each according to his

¹ Words so abused as communism and commune easily create misunderstanding, but these words have a strong good tradition, and it is not even important whether they ever had a pure meaning (it happens they did not).

abilities, to each according to his needs," was generally acknowledged by these anarchists, imbued with the idea of mutual aid and the principle of equality and much impressed by the historical and sociological information gathered by Kropotkin and others. Somewhat later, in what can be described as an adaptation to increasing industrialism and industrial centralization, anarcho-syndicalism was developed. An expression of the most revolutionary elements of the rising labor movement, it sought to save modern integrated production by constructing, parallel to the communes, a national organization of industry, by industries and functions, controlled by the workers.

There still remain these categories, though there has been sufficient interchange of ideas to preserve the good anarchist tradition of non-sectarianism (by and large). The view of some of us is that not all these matters are important (I believe Malatesta is the classical exponent of the non-dogmatic approach). Thus a small commune could be an economic unit, an "economic community"; in large communes, unified economic activity might be beyond the control of the persons involved, and each place of production might negotiate directly with producers of materials and with groups of consumers, or through marketing organizations, and each neighborhood could be a community of distribution, etc. We tend to suspect that the anarcho-syndicalist plans for a unified national economy underestimate the difficulty of controlling such a vast network from below and would result in "planification" from above. But, *a priori*, we would rule out neither the syndicalist idea nor the individualist idea of money exchange; as long as it is merely a question of form, the test would be workability. Given the fundamental principle of the freedom of each person, group and community to associate and dissociate voluntarily with others, we would simply put a sort of confidence in the future, aware that live people meeting immediate problems in a real situation, and not theoretic planning, is the crucible of social forms. We think of experimentation, flexibility, many possibilities, and emphasize attitudes rather than social forms: within limits, that is, people determined to be free will not tolerate restrictive arrangements; or, if not so determined, will not long tolerate freedom.

There is probably enough evidence in Spain during 1936 and 1937 to indicate that such a sociology of anarchy is not Utopian fantasy. What more can be said? When we want only beacons to guide our present efforts, and a moderate confidence that our social goal is feasible — when we are as open toward fresh possibilities as we are learning to be — even such rough outlines seem almost too arbitrary.

But there is more in this than futuristic problems. It is obvious that some of these questions are more than formal, this or that form seems appropriate to (would tend to lead to, tend to follow from) this or that conception of persons and relations among persons. We would expect, nevertheless, variety, experiment, etc.; and some

particular mechanisms are socially indifferent, but some are not.²

II. The Psychological Question

In general, anarchists have been suspicious of the psychological question. It is a pre-psychoanalytic idea that anarchists are merely irrational father-haters; and lately we have had quite elaborate and sophisticated reductions of radical ideas to infantile neuroses. When we discover what seems like a genuinely rational anarchist action, our defensive impulse is to say: — now **this** at least we don't have to drag in the Oedipus Complex to explain! And these "explanations," in addition to explaining away, impugning motives, debunking goodness, are intended also to show that these neurotics will most certainly corrupt the goals they proclaim. If it is to be careless and simplistic (that is to say, stupid), this kind of talk were better not;³ but perhaps finally, in the last analysis, we may discover hidden sources of strength and hope (but we had best proceed carefully, provisionally, always with the suspicion that we have omitted some significant matter).— Is it not (perhaps) **just because** Bakunin hated his tyrannical father (with such excellent reason) that he was so sensitive to all tyranny, so tireless in combatting it, could recognize the menace of authority in Marxism and not merely in a Czar?— Behind the hatred of the father, we are told, lies the rejected **love** for the father! Does this not make the revolutionist ridiculous? Or is it not, rather, noble to have drawn from these childhood disasters such capacity for action, such capacity for love (yes!)—is it not rather a source of hope? — (I do not mean that this is the deep motivation of all anarchists; but just to suggest that by defiantly refusing to discuss, we have conceded defeat for no good reason.)

But I have not come to Laurance's point. The grown-up child, encountering frustration, dreams of the return to dependency, when decisions and work were done by others, and the child played. We observe this: this is one of the things which makes the army tolerable for many, makes, for some, army, and even prison, "desirable"! The society is unbelievably cruel, on the one hand it demands nothing of us (of our creative powers) and on the other too much (it asks us to be perfect machines, perfect killers). We survive by hardening the

ego and locking shut the soul; or a few great spirits live through this, and fight it, or we live on the edge of hell, or we "go to pieces" and are ready for any salvation. To understand the "mass hysteria" of fascist movements, the appeal of the Welfare State, Stalinism, New Deal, etc. — that is, of false solutions to the superficial problems by the State, by a force outside the persons — we need to understand the weakness of personality, the sense of worthlessness, that leads to ideas and behavior (the State as father-figure, the irrational demand for security, etc.) which may be summarized as a desire for an infantile-type society. (But we should not forget that the Welfare State is, as well, the opportunistic solution, in strictly sociological terms, for those who simply do not take a deeper view; that it is consistent with a war-society, etc.)

To consider the proposition that the motivation of **all** communists (including anarchist-communists) is their infantile disposition. Now, to be convincing such a thesis would require other evidence than their rejection of individualism. That is, one would expect such a bias to betray itself in the anarchist literature by tell-tale images, in actions and conceptions of action, etc. In the case of the great anarchist writers, this seems clearly not so; and the initiative, activity and creativeness of the inarticulate "writers" of "anonymous history" in Spain is not the behavior of infantile personalities. I believe one could find irrational attitudes enough among anarchists. Toward Money, for example (I know hardly anyone, anarchist or not, who is rational about money); toward "Violence," "Non-Violence," Religion, Sex. I believe it could be shown that anarchists sometimes tend to look for the **very** simplest solution, to rule out the **very possibility** of perversions, when these pure solutions are in fact extremely complicating and a more "dangerous" solution would serve better. I believe one could find irrational attitudes toward Organization, pro and contra, and similarly (this is not the best strain of anarchism — none of these are) an excessive confidence in the efficacy of **form** as opposed to the character of the persons within the form. And so on; I choose at random. And we should not hesitate to add that mental pre-occupation with a free society (and therefore a theoretical overemphasis) may mask, and substitute for, lack of necessary occupation with the here and now, the day-to-day revolutionary acts; and the reverse: a bad conscience may insist on glorifying, as revolutionary, actions which are simply good and natural in their context and nothing more (I refer to some kinds of "personalism" and some kinds of "actionism"). There is a value in probing to the sources of these attitudes. Forthright analysis is a way to avoid a petty, foolish sectarianism. When we understand why we cherish a particular idea, and others do not, and in neither case for the reasons alleged, we have, astonishingly, the basis for solidarity! Though this experiment is not often made two-sidedly, and it should oftener be directed against ourselves than against others.

In this vein, individualists would have to come to terms with some such proposition as this: Is the individualist unduly rigid in insisting on private property, the wage system, etc.? Would the suspicion be justified that he feels uncertain about the independence and maturity he so strongly asserts, that he is guarding this independence too jealously, too anxiously? that because he does not trust himself to maintain his independence, and competi-

continued on page 14

The Theory of the "Removal of Inner Conflict"

by F.S.Perls and Paul Goodman

(This is an excerpt from a treatise on Gestalt-psychoanalysis that Dr. Perls and Paul Goodman are writing.)

Psychoanalysis has classically devoted itself to the uncovering of "inner conflicts" and their "removal." Certainly there is a world of truth in this concept, but even so we must inspect it much more closely than is usually the case. "Inner" presumably means either within the organism, inside the skin, or "within the psyche." For instance, a conflict between sexual tension and shrinking from pain, or again between instinct and conscience. Opposed to these, and non-neurotic, would presumably be conflicts with the environment or with other persons. But put this way the distinction between "inner conflicts" and other conflicts is not valuable, for clearly there are non-"inner" conflicts that are profitably called neurotic. To the extent that a child has not yet grown free-standing from the child-parent field, — is still suckling, learning to talk, economically dependent, etc. — it is pointless to speak of the neurotic disturbances (unawares starvation, unawares hostility, unawares deprivation of contact) as either within the skin or within an individual's "psyche". The disturbances are in the **field**; they spring from the "inner conflicts" of the parents, and they result in the introjected conflicts in the later free-standing offspring, but their essence is in the disturbed felt-relation, irreducible to the parts. So the lapse of community in political societies is reducible neither to the neuroses of individuals (for indeed they become "individuals" because of the lapse), nor to the bad institutions (which are maintained by the citizens); it is a disease of the field. The distinction of "intra-personal" and "inter-personal" is a poor one, for all individual personality and organized society develop from functions of coherence that are essential to both person and society, such as nourishment, love, learning, communication, sympathy, identification; and indeed the contrary functions of division are also essential to both: rejection, hate, alienation, etc. Contact-and-boundary is prior to intra and inter, or to inner and outer. And disturbances that could be called neurotic occur also in the organism-natural-environment field, for instance the magic rituals of primitives that develop, quite without personal neurosis, from starvation and thunder-fear; or our contemporary disease of "mastery" of nature rather than healthy symbiosis, for quite apart from personal and social neuroses (which are, to be sure, here working overtime), there is a dislocation in the interaction of sheer material quantities and dearths, caused by unawares abuses. The primitive says, "The earth is starving, therefore we are starving," and we say, "We are starving, therefore let us wrest something from the earth"; symbiotically both are dreams.

In short, let us speak of "unawares conflicts" rather than "inner conflicts." This change is a fundamental

simplification; for previously it was necessary to say, "we uncover the inner conflicts and bring them to the surface, make them awares," but now we can say "we make the unawares conflicts awares."

The classical wording, however, contains a very important truth, stated characteristically upside-down: namely that the inner conflicts, those inside the skin, within the organism — the opposed tensions and checks and balances of the physiological system — are for the most part reliable and not neurotic, they can be trusted to be self-regulating; they have proved themselves for thousands of years and have not much changed; they are not the subject of psychotherapy; when they are unawares they can be left unawares. It is, on the contrary, the **meddling-inward** of outside-the-skin social forces that deliberately upsets the spontaneous inner-system and calls for psychotherapy. These forces are new-comers and often ill-considered. Psychotherapy is, importantly, a process of disengaging these properly outside-the-skin forces from meddling inside the skin and disturbing organism-self-regulation. And by the same token, it is a process of disengaging such more distant unreliable economic and political forces, as competition, money, prestige, power, from meddling inside the primary personal system of love, grief, anger, parenthood, dependence and independence.

We come then to the terms "conflict" and "removal of conflict." Obviously in the classical formula "conflict" does not mean simply the opposition of tensions and the system of checks and balances that we have spoken of. The word is used pejoratively: conflict means "bad conflict," hence conflicts must be removed. Again let us distinguish carefully. The badness of conflicts seems, in the theories, to mean one or all of the following things: (1) all conflicts are bad because they waste energy and cause suffering; (2) all conflicts excite aggression and destruction, which are bad; (3) some conflicts are bad because one or both of the contestants are anti-social and, rather than let the conflict rage, the offender should be eliminated or sublimated, e.g. pre-genital sexuality or various aggressions; (4) false, mistaken, conflicts are bad. Now from our point of view, only the last of these propositions is unequivocally sound: conflicts that are unreal, dummy, projected, displaced, etc. must be removed. But even in this case we must remember that behind every false conflict — that is, where the contestants are erroneously conceived or are masks — there is a true conflict, of opposing real forces. The errors are tendentious, the masks express the real. Therefore we can say that, fundamentally, **no** conflicts should be removed by psychotherapy; but the goal of psychotherapy is to make awares unawares conflicts and to remove false conflicts. And indeed this may be simplified by omitting the last part, for once a false conflict is in awareness it dissolves of itself; one cannot be **aware** of what is not the case.

² By now I should have clarified what I have been calling "individualism." The referent is so-called American individualism, exemplified by Warren, Greene, Tucker, etc. (See **Rudolf Rocker, Pioneers of American Freedom.**) European individualists are often a different matter. Armand, for example, though severely anti-communist and individualistic, is strongly communitarian: rather combatting the tendency of the community to annihilate the individual than advocating what I conceive of as fundamentally anti-communitarian institutions.— But the philosophy of Max Stirner (see **The Ego and His Own**), much as it seems attractive to Armand, strikes me as essentially closed and fearful and crying out protest, despite his systematically-integrated concepts of a society of egoists.— By identifying individualism, and by attempting to suggest the relation among these "schools," I overreach myself, but if there is error, I don't think it is essential.

³ A respected psychoanalytic theorist (J. C. Flugel) has "explained" (e.g.): "the influence of displaced father-hatred is probably in large measure responsible for the fact that strikes and other crude forms of rebellion against authority in industry occur principally [sic] among the working classes, where the tyranny of the father is often of a primitive and repressive type."!!!

(Here, on points (2) and (3) let us say only the following: where the contestants are natural drives they **cannot** be reduced, tho they may be postponed by organism-self-regulation or even deliberately suppressed. When all the contestants are in awareness, a man may make his own hard decisions, he is not a patient; most often indeed, in such a case, a difficult drive spontaneously finds its measure by organism-self-regulation, without the need of deliberate choice.)

Let us, then, consider conflict itself, awares and attended by suffering. The notion that conflict, whether social, interpersonal, or intrapsychic, is wasteful of energy, is plausible but superficial. Its plausibility is that the work to be done could be got at directly, then it is wasteful for the contestant that will do the work to have to fight off an opponent; and perhaps both opponents can be made to join in as partners. But this is superficial, for it assumes that one knows beforehand what the work is that is to be done, and where energy is to be expended. Then the opponent must be deceived or he is lying. But where a conflict is real, **what** to do is just what is being tested. Even more, the true work to be done is perhaps **first being found out in the conflict**; it was not hitherto known to anybody and certainly not to the contestants. Surely this is true of any creative collaboration among persons: the best efficiency is attained not by establishing an a priori harmony among their interests and by their compromising their individual interests to a pre-arranged goal; rather, so long as they are in contact and are earnestly aiming at the best creative achievement, the more sharply they differ and have it out, the more likely they are to produce an idea better than any of them knew individually. It is the competition in games that makes the players surpass themselves. (We do not mean, of course, that habitual **competitiveness** is not a neurotic symptom.) In personal creation, also, as in art or theory, it is the warring of disparate elements that suddenly leaps to a creative solution. A poet does not reject an image that stubbornly but "accidentally" appears and mars his plan; rather he respects the intruder and suddenly discovers what **his** plan is, he discovers and creates himself.

The question is whether the same must not be true of intrapsychic emotional conflict. In ordinary healthy situations there is no problem: by organism-self-regulation a flexible instinct-dominance establishes itself, e.g. a strong thirst puts other drives in abeyance until it is satisfied. And longer range orderings healthily occur the same way: biting-chewing-drinking establish themselves over suckling, and the genitals establish themselves as the final aim in sexuality; genital orgasm is the conclusion of a sexual excitement. In the development of these orders there were conflicting tensions, but the conflicts worked themselves out. Now suppose the situation is unhealthy: e.g. the genital primacy was not strongly established because of oral unfinished situations, genital fears, so-called "regressions," and so forth. And suppose now that all these contestant drives are brought into the open, into open contact and open conflict, with regard to object-choices, behavior, interest. Must not this conflict and its attendant suffering and hardships be the means of coming to a self-creative solution, presumably the normal primacy? The conflict is severe because there is much to be destroyed. Is the destructiveness to be inhibited? If this is the meaning of conflict, it is obviously unwise to allay it or to suppress some of the contestants, for the

result must then be to prevent a thorough destruction and assimilation, and therefore to condemn the patient to a weak and never perfectly self-regulating solution.

From the physician's point of view, the danger in an emotional conflict is that its raging may destroy the patient, tear him to pieces. This is a true danger. But it must be met not by weakening the conflict but by strengthening the self and the self-awareness, so that as the conflict emerges and is attended to and sharpens the self may sooner reach an attitude of creative indifference and identify with the coming solution.

TWO POEMS

I

To have two sides,—theirs, ours,
and nothing in between,
to be extremists then
and clinch like mad dogs in the daedal dark
we'll take the fashion of a limited eye.
But is that all? Wars start
from a small secret unintelligent wound
and inward blocks hurl outwardly,
gear into act wild steel, protons
and man — most gulled,
most negative of all.
— Individual beings
change in a while to tools
paid monthly, letterwriters, clucks
afraid of white, trampers of the herd.

—If troops were told

the fiscal truth, the irreligious facts,
they'd fight then for the blood.
Men think a little and men change —
but slowly.

II CONVERSATION

— With savage naïvete we planned
a perfect life (our tracer-cigarettes
moving from hand to mouth
wrought on the darkness passion of design.)

— *They want me, all of us* you cried
I will not fight for Phazia or her cause—
you can have that realpolitik line.
They'll resurrect the lad with shrapnel jaws,
they'll draft the dwarfed, the musically inclined.

— I did not speak. I realized
you would be prisoned, take up wovenwork,
master the art of contradicting rage.
All this would be. — I touched
a flame downleaping through the air
from you to me with golden claws,
a fire that might not change the world
but made that room warmer than it was.

Howard Griffin

Notes on Literary Anarchism in England

by George Woodcock

One of the most interesting and, in some ways, encouraging phenomena in the English literary world over the past ten or fifteen years has been the increasing tendency towards anarchistic and more broadly libertarian attitudes among English writers, and even among artists and musicians. Writers like Herbert Read, Alex Comfort and Ethel Mannin, painters like Augustus John and Jankel Adler, musicians like Michael Tippett, represent only the highlights of this movement. Among the younger writers the movement towards anarchism and related movements like personalism has been even more marked; in a recent very representative anthology of young British poets, I counted, among the seventy names appearing, ten whom I personally knew to profess attitudes which were either avowedly anarchist or had no substantial difference from the anarchist point of view.

No less interesting has been the gradual permeation of the general field of literary thought, outside the more extreme conservative and Marxist circles, with anarchist ideas, and the attention which is now paid to anarchist writers of the past. During the last years of such a typically liberal literary magazine as **Horizon**, it was by no means uncommon to meet references to Kropotkin, Godwin and Bakunin, and in the columns of the **New Statesman and Nation**, the most widely circulated literary weekly, anarchism has become in the last ten years a subject, if not of approval, at least of discussion, with writers like V. S. Pritchett and Louis MacNeice expressing their views on the matter at some length.

Finally, it is significant that most of the ephemeral movements which have marked the changing progress of literary outlook during the past decade, like Personalism, New Apocalypticism, New Romanticism and so on, have embodied libertarian ideas into their general philosophies, and have often included anarchist writers among their leading figures, while Surrealism, which has undergone a certain revival in England during recent years, has completely shed its former Marxist tendency and turned in an anarchist direction.

From this it must not be assumed that I am claiming a great influx of writers into what is known in its more limited sense as the Anarchist Movement. English literary anarchism, from the days of Godwin and Shelley, has always carried a heavy proportion of individualism, and most of its representatives have distrusted any too close implication in the activities of groups which might constrict their work in an organisational or theoretical framework. It is an attitude which has, I feel, some justification in experience. The writer or the artist has, after all, a creative object of his own in view, and it always seems to me somewhat illogical and casuistical for the more involved anarchist, who declares his own faith in the freedom of creation, to expect the artist to restrict this very quality in favour of a general freedom which is, after all, for the moment strictly hypothetical. The artist who insists on doing the work he feels important, against what are often heavy material or moral odds, seems a pretty fair example of one-man direct action, and we should not invent our own kind of pie-in-the-sky as a reason for trying to divert him into open propaganda. The Com-

munists spoilt many good writers and artists that way; we should be glad to welcome them on their own terms, and to realize that the more free intelligence we can attract to our ideas, the less likely they are to become ossified into the deadness of orthodoxy.

Why have so many English intellectuals turned towards anarchism in recent years? There seem to me a number of reasons. The first is that libertarian ideas form a strongly perceptible thread in the English literary tradition. They appear in the ideas of the dissident sects during the Civil War of the seventeenth century, in the writings of Winstanley, the Levellers and the early Quakers, all of whom showed a strong distrust of central authority and desired to build their social pattern on the individual personality. It was originally a religious concept, based on the theory of each man having direct access to God as opposed to the indirect access through an ecclesiastical organisation which was the basis of orthodox religion, but it had a strong influence on the social ideas of these sectaries, and contributed to the shaping of English literature in subsequent decades. Many of Milton's works, and particularly **Areopagitica**, show the strong influence of extreme libertarian doctrines at this period.

The distaste for authority crops up continually during the eighteenth century, and particularly in the work of Swift at the beginning and Blake at the end of this era. A more immediate influence than that of Blake was the appearance of the first great treatise on anarchism, Godwin's **Political Justice**, in 1793. Godwin had an enormous influence in his time; both Shelley and Robert Owen were among his disciples, and, while the former brought anarchism directly into English literature in **Prometheus Unbound** and **The Revolt of Islam**, the latter gave the early English socialist movement a libertarian tint which was not wholly lost until the present century. During the nineteenth century such writers as John Stuart Mill, the early Swinburne, William Morris and Oscar Wilde all put forward interesting variants on the libertarian idea, and between 1886 and 1914 the presence of Kropotkin in England had an intellectual effect far beyond the anarchist movement of the time. It is a significant fact that such a technical revolutionary as James Joyce was, at this period, an enthusiastic reader of anarchist books and pamphlets, while he rejected Marx with amused contempt.

The present anarchist revival in English literature has certainly been influenced by this tradition, and there has been a strengthening of interest in almost all the writers I have mentioned, particularly the seventeenth century radicals, and Godwin, Blake, Shelley and Wilde. Not only have the lesser-known works of these writers been re-published and new books on them been written, but these events have created an unusual amount of attention among reviewers.¹ Similarly, the re-publication of some of Kropotkin's works and of Tolstoy's social

continued on page 15

¹ Woodcock's biographical study, **The Paradox of Oscar Wilde**, has just been published in an American edition by Macmillan (\$3.50).

THE HUMAN CONDITION: The Inside of the Inside

by Jackson Mac Low

There are a great many persons, probably a majority of the Americans, who have no realization of the kind of lives that have been the lot of most of the people in the world during the last 20 years. The conditions of most human lives during this time are in many cases unknown to these persons; in others, they are known statistically, as: that the Nazis burned or tortured so many persons, or that there are this or that number of persons in Russian slave camps or that this many Negroes were lynched in the South of the United States during this period; or, they are known anecdotally in more or less highly colored accounts which are known at their dullest as documentary reports, at their most vivid, as atrocity stories. To most of the persons I speak of the statistics and the anecdotes are largely a matter of indifference, altho many of them may make use of these or those statistics or anecdotes for their own irrelevant purposes. The fact is that the conditions of human life — of most human lives — during the last 2 decades (at least) is **un-thinkable** to those of us who have escaped the horrors of the wars & of the worse social oppressions.

Most of us — for I am one of these persons — do not **want** to envision the lives lived by most human beings in these times. There is a strong principle in the human mind itself which makes for this avoidance: the pleasure-principle, & I can hardly find it in my heart to blame those who see no reason to go "beyond" this principle to confront this reality: the anguish, & the cruelty, of human life today; & certainly I can find little sympathy for those who take pleasure in realizing & contemplating this anguish & this cruelty. There are those however who with twisting hearts & stinging narrowed eyes (that often widen till they ache) **confront** this reality, envision it as clearly as they can, since they believe that it is only with such a vision that they can enter into authentic relations with other human beings, that it is only thus that the larger human sympathy, the love of mankind, can be true & deep & not merely sentimental; & it is only with this vision that we can fashion strongly & authentically our ethics & politics of freedom.

Once we have chosen this confrontation, to subject ourselves to this vision, we find that the sources are manifold. Even the statistics & the anecdotes are useful. The newspapers, especially the tabloids with their astonishing picture-pages — often presenting to one glance the most devastating cross-section of our society by the supposedly fortuitous juxtaposition of various news-pictures — are invaluable when properly used. Even the most corrupt sources, even the publications of Luce or of Hearst, can help us if we know how to subject them to proper criticism. But occasionally there are works of which we know we can believe every word, which open our eyes to kinds of life we had hardly suspected, or of which we had at most heard vague reports. Such a work is David Rousset's **L'Univers Concentrationnaire**, such is

Anton Ciliga's **The Russian Enigma**, & such a work is Lowell Naeve & David Wieck's **A Field of Broken Stones**.¹

It is true that the lives of conscientious objectors (& other persons imprisoned for draft violations) seldom if ever reached the pitch of horror we have learned of from such accounts of the Nazi camps as those of Rousset (or of those of the prisons & camps of Russia under the Czars, Lenin & Stalin given by Dostoievsky, Maximov's **The Guillotine at Work** & Glicksman's **Tell The West**), but nevertheless we are astonished & wrenched to read of such incidents as that of the prisoner Mercier (pp. 63-69) who was beaten unmercifully by guards & finally placed in a straitjacket when he went insane longing for his parole. This happened at Danbury Federal Correctional Institution, a "liberal" prison not many miles from New York City! But why does this astound me? Is it not in New York City that hundreds of cases like that of Ladson Eskridge (**Why?**, December 1945, pp. 8-9) who was horribly maltreated & neglected by the police here, & that of Lowell Naeve himself in Bellevue Hospital's psychiatric ward (**A Field of Broken Stones**, ch. 16, pp. 115-126) — force-fed, doped, & otherwise mistreated — & of his alcoholic cellmate there, Harold (pp. 122-124) — again the unmerciful beating by a guard of a mildly insane man on the slightest of pretexts—is it not **here** that such cases take place by the hundreds year after year?

But the value of **A Field of Broken Stones** does not lie primarily in such true atrocity stories. It is a valuable human document because of its vivid communication of the concrete life of CO's & other prisoners during the last war, & especially the inner as well as the outward life of a particularly honest man confronted by the draft, the war, the prisons, & acting at each moment as he saw fit.

The psychoanalytically-minded & the cynical may find much to criticize in Lowell Naeve's idea of conscience (I can already hear the chorus of "Masochism! Masochism!" that will be showered upon this book in certain circles), & there are certainly valid objections, from an objective viewpoint, to "enlisting for jail," to not pulling every trick in the book to keep out of the clutches of the benevolent guardians of the peace,—but these are objections from a **general** viewpoint (objections, that is, for taking what Lowell Naeve did as a program for all persons in similar situations), or objections from within our own lives, subjective objections from our own inwardness: I didn't do that, & I won't do so in the future if I can help it, altho I **won't** join the army & I **won't** acquiesce to the rotten state, — but there is little possibility of objection once we make the attempt to feel & think ourselves into Lowell Naeve's life, to live the turmoils of conscience, the

¹ **A Field of Broken Stones**, just published by Libertarian Press, \$3.00. Available thru Libertarian Press, Glen Gardner, New Jersey, or **Resistance**.

difficult, yes, (from some viewpoints) the self-hurtful, decisions he was brought to at each point in the story he tells us thru his words & pictures. There is no doubt of it: he **had** to do what he did. It is possible that he wd do quite different things if he were again confronted (I was going to say "with the same situations" but if they **were** the same situations he too wd be the same & wd necessarily do the same) — that he will do quite different things if he is again confronted with a draft, a war, perhaps again, despite all, with prisons (& I hope fervently he will **not** face these again). But as for what he did: it was immensely necessary.

It is, nevertheless, astonishing that this book communicates Lowell Naeve's life, & the lives of the others in the prisons, as vividly as it does. The language of most of the book is reportorial & nearly colorless. I have the impression that by far the greater number of the sentences are simple or simple-compound. With certain notable exceptions, he keeps the expression of emotion to nearly a minimum; it is nearly as if he feels it his duty to conscientiously preserve a stoic deadpan thru it all. (Possibly this is due to the influence of Hemingway or of Dos Passos.) & in direct contrast with the prose is the great variation of emotion in the pictures: from the comic gaiety of the farm scene on p. 5, thru the ironic gaiety of the prison yard & sun scene on p. 41, to the terribly clenched heavy-lined rigidity of such inside-prison scenes as p. 15, p. 23, p. 25, p. 36, p. 33 &c, the hysteria of the prison-riot (p. 217), the gay & hysterical barricade of furniture—a wonderful jumble! (p. 195), such wry homely sketches as the sink-with-pitcher (p. 152), big Joe tending his plants (p. 147), the contrast of Joe's neat & Dave Wieck's frantically messy cells (even the window bars, the door-frame & the door itself are askew in Dave's—p. 149), to the gloomy foreboding of the night-sky with the small lonely walker at the bottom following the endless parallels of a prairie road (p. 94).



The reason, of course, for this strange contrast may be simply that Lowell Naeve is primarily a painter rather than a writer, & altho David Wieck, a much different writer, & a fine one, has edited the book, he has always, & quite rightly, preserved Naeve's style. It is somehow

an appropriate style (Paul Goodman in his preface has even conjectured that it is a matter of policy, "a continuation of the policy of non-violence") & as such it held me so strongly that I was forced to read the book (both times) in one sitting.

Goodman, in his preface, has well outlined the "plot" of this work. It is characterized "by the increasingly active character of (Naeve's) responses and his increasing participation in groups both inside & outside the walls. At first there is a sense of isolation, loss of love, passivity, waiting to be hurt, retaliating by punishing oneself; later there are lasting friendships, initiation of demands, cooperation, ingenuity, & more aggressive resistance . . . A closer social bond, a more outgoing action, a more essential demand . . ." & it is precisely these later sections of the book where there is the greater social bond, the more outgoing action, the more essential demand, that are the most heartening. The comradeship of the many strikes, the fact that a good number of them were actually won! & the often hilarious ingenuity of the many ways of outwitting & tripping up the jailers (cf. also: **Prison Etiquette**, compiled by H. Cantine & D. Rainer, Bearsville, 1950) — especially, perhaps, the wonderful "radio program" in the Lewisburg "hole" (a social evening between the men in "solitary", each in turn talking, singing, or telling stories thru the crack under his door—pp. 206-209) — these are all heartening, — but also they are depressing. One realizes that those strikes, those witty tricks, even the warm sociality of the men in solitary at Danbury & at Lewisburg, wd be impossible under conditions of not much greater repression. Strikes that cd be won or at least attempted at prisons such as Danbury are out of the question at the horrible Springfield Federal Prison "Hospital" (for incorrigible &/or "insane" troublemakers). Carry the repression & cruelty to the extreme, & as Rousset shows us, even the sociality begins to disappear, even the common front against the jailers begins to degenerate into collaboration to the extent that radical prisoners in the Nazi camps became the jailers & torturers of other radical prisoners: in the concentrationary universe humanity came to take such forms as can hardly be thought — to attempt to **feel** them is to risk madness. How heartened can we be by the warmest sociality, the simplest, strongest, most honest outgoing action, the most central demand when we know that we live on a tiny narrow shore, & a thin crust, around & below which lies the universe of the concentration camp, that **now** millions of persons, in Spain, South Africa, Yugoslavia, Russia, Bulgaria, Poland, Hungary, China & Springfield, Missouri, live & die in that universe: that that universe lies **within** us as well as around us — that until we eradicate it from within us we will never eliminate it from around us?

Nevertheless it is in this outgoing sociality (to which we may sometimes only grow thru deep solitude), in this direct, essential action (which arises often only from the deepest inaction) that all our hopes lie.

Finally, like the writer of the preface, I wd like to end with an anecdote. At the picketing of Danbury prison which he mentions, & during which there was, unknown to the picketers, the great 200-man demonstration inside (pp. 176-180), that writer raised a slogan that was soon taken up by all of us — at least, all of the anarchists: "Open the Doors of All The Jails!" It is now 4 years later. Please: We mean **ALL**!

THE AUSTRALIAN SCENE

The recent Federal Elections, though resulting in a victory for the Liberal and Country Party Alliance against the then Labour Government, were by no means the decisive defeat they seemed to be from a mere counting of members elected or defeated. The percentage swing in the popular vote was very small and mainly in the country districts which had been antagonised against Labour by the industrial disturbances created by the Communists for political purposes and by the attempts by Labour at nationalisation, particularly of banking. The working class districts remained solidly Labour . . . and even much of the middle class vote went Labour.

The Communists polled negligibly . . . They had made a great deal in their campaign of the Labour Government's gaoling of their leader, Lance Sharkey, for "sedition," and of the finings and gaolings of miners' leaders. The election results showed that the workers solidly supported Labour in all those actions, and were not prepared to be dragged into political strikes in the interests of Russia's foreign policy. At the same time, however, Communists were, in numerous instances, elected to important positions in Trade Unions. It seems that in these instances the workers vote, not on political lines at all, but solely on their opinion of the candidates' capacities for useful leadership. As the Communists take good care to pick young, vigorous men of a demagogic type, and as the Labour candidates are often old-time careerists, the Communists naturally win. . . . The Labour Party has attempted counter-action, but does so on openly political lines, forming straight-out Australian Labour Party Groups and going for election for union positions as straight-out Labourites; and the workers are interested in a man's industrial record rather than his political affiliations.

There is thus a great struggle for control going on in the unions to-day between Communists and the A.L.P.ers, with the issue still undecided. The new Liberal-Country Party Government is to bring in legislation shortly to ban the Communist Party, prohibit any Communist from being elected to union positions, and providing for control of union ballots by Government officials. The Labour Party is opposed to this policy, as they say Communists are best fought in the open, and governmental control of unions is undesirable. The Australian Congress of Trade Unions is also strongly opposed to these plans and the leaders of it interviewed Mr. Menzies the other day at Canberra and plainly told him there would be industrial trouble if he persevered with this policy.

The new Government is profoundly distrusted by the workers, as its personnel is almost exactly the same old Tory gang, representing Big Business and Finance Capital, which was thrown out by Parliament eight years ago because of their incompetency, internal dissensions and wranglings. The present Government corresponds very closely to the Republican Party in U.S.A.

. . . Since the small minority that consider Labour too conservative usually turn to the Communists, the extreme Left Wing

movement in Australia is of almost microscopic dimensions. There are a few Trotskyists in Sydney who have a little influence in one or two unions, and there is the Socialist Party of Australia with branches in Sydney and Melbourne and a few dozen members. This party corresponds to the Socialist Party of Great Britain and the World Socialist Party of U.S.A. . . . Its criticism of the existing order is good and sound but its absolutely academic, intellectual approach makes no appeal to Australian workers.

The Australian worker is not interested in theories. His view of political and social problems is short-sighted and he concentrates on immediate demands. He has no final objective in view, only better conditions. The idea of abolition of the wage system itself, and its replacement by one in which the **workers themselves** will collectively own and control the means of production, has never penetrated his consciousness. The reasons for this appear to me to be two: (1) State control and reliance on the State has been a very strong feature of Australian life since the foundation of the colony in 1788 as a convict settlement, when the government owned and controlled everything, men, materials, and land. The very great size of the country and vast distances between settlements made it necessary for the Government to take control of transport; land settlement developmental work had to be taken in hand by the Government because the arid nature of the country and lack of lakes and waterways made the expenditure too great for private persons; the same applies to educational facilities. The Australian is well-used to governmental control. It is only on the question of **degree** that opinions differ. The Liberal and Country Parties represent those who think we have gone far enough; the Labour and Communist Parties want to go further. (2) The population of Australia is overwhelmingly British and is as a consequence lacking in revolutionary elements. You have had the advantage in U.S.A. of a strong non-British leaven, in many cases radicals driven out by tyrannical governments. There is very little of that element here. At present, it is true, many foreign immigrants are being brought in, but they are carefully "screened" to make sure no revolutionaries enter among them, and consequently nothing progressive can be expected from this immigration.

As a result, any variety of genuine Socialism has never made much headway and there does not seem much prospect it will.¹ The I.W.W. collapsed after the trials and imprisonments of its members in 1916, and to-day its leading member, Donald Grant, is a Labour member of the Senate, having just been re-elected for another six-year term! There is no anarchist organisation. "Chummy" Fleming, who held up the Red Flag in Melbourne, died the other day, after having preached the cause of anarchism there for nearly sixty years, and, I am afraid, not producing much effect on public opinion.

The "Socialism" of the Labour and Com-

¹ Kenafick takes the view that anarchism is "revolutionary socialism."

munist Parties is merely nationalisation — with the former, governmental control of big monopolies, with the latter, State Capitalism where the workers will be even worse slaves than under the present system.

In fact, however, the Australian workers to-day are better off than ever before. Wages are high . . . and social services of various kinds prevent destitution. Before the war there were hundreds of thousands out of work; to-day there are thousands of jobs vacant, and boys and girls in their teens are offered wages that 10 or 15 years ago would have made their fathers gasp.

To try to tell these workers that they are living under a rotten system and should strive to change it is largely a waste of breath. They have no incentive to try to change a system which gives them so many advantages (including a 40-hour week) . . . and their political short-sightedness and lack of political consciousness prevents their seeing that this halcyon state of affairs cannot last and that, owing to the very structure of the Capitalist system, there must be a crisis. This is to talk theory to them, and they are not interested in theory.

Another result of this attitude of mind, and of the events of the past twenty years, is that the workers are not interested in any movement against war. The Peace Economy of 1929-1939 meant unemployment, destitution, insecurity; the War Economy of 1939-1949 meant full employment prosperity, social security. Is it any wonder that to the workers war and post-war conditions have no horrible associations but quite the contrary? . . . Australia suffered little or no material damage from the war, and even our casualties were insignificant compared with the First World War. Consequently anti-war movements here have no fertile ground . . . The anti-militarist spirit once so strong in Australia and particularly in the Labour movement is nearly dead. It is true that at the elections Labour opposed compulsory military training, but the Liberal-Country Party coalition advocated it and were returned, and plans are being made for the conscription of youths of 18-21. . . . The Second World War, involving nearly the whole population in one way or another, habituated the people to military direction and regimentation . . . There is, it is true, an Australian Peace Council in existence, but it consists largely of idealists of a sentimental kind, who are being used as pawns by the Communists in their efforts to support Russian foreign policy.

—K. J. KENAFICK

But if the workers solidly supported Labour against the Communist-led strikes, the miners must have considered their grievances important and their demands just; and the Labour Government's actions against the union were distinctly totalitarian. Indeed, the Welfare State can perhaps perpetuate the prosperity (or minimize the impact of depressions); but the very abolition of the business cycle would not alter the permanent facts of wage-slavery, authoritarianism, etc.; Kenafick is surely aware of this, but without, it seems, recognizing that destitution is unlikely again to be a revolutionary motivation (if it ever was), and that this would imply the need for a different approach.—That this kind of comment is possible, about an Australian letter, indicates how truly we look half way around the world, into a mirror.—RESISTANCE.

On Putting the Moral Questions First

by Irving Feldman

The general position taken by Dave Wieck in his reply to my article **Religion and Education** (in **Resistance**, August-September, 1949) seems to me to be weak — blank — in two crucial spots. The first is his discussion of scientific procedures, for it is not the case, except in the most indifferent matters, that fact upon fact is gleaned in the hope that some suitable hypothesis will present itself; but the facts are selected in accordance with some hypothesis, (or bias) already present. Now, we are not discussing indifferent matters but things that are dear to us — the ways of our life and its good conduct. But right here is his second blank! For though we may easily distinguish between atom bombs and loving friends **just like this!** it must still be recognized that there is some organization of personality basic to this valuation. Now, the frame for all hypotheses concerning values and the good conduct of life is character and animal and human nature. But it is just these — and their projection as ethical value, myth, and cosmology — which are the essential part of religious thought. **It would appear then that the basis for his arguments and the very matter I was discussing is just what Dave has left blank!**

But to go a little further. As anarchists we believe that political initiation is one of the great human functions; that is, that being a man entails personally and directly working out the decisions of communal enterprise, and that such enterprise covers a wide range of activities, productive, ceremonial, judicial, educative, etc. And this is the broad and pregnant sense in which Socrates in the **Meno** considers government in discussing the source of virtue (prudence) in regard to its good management. He puts it that right political acts are a matter of true opinion and not exact knowledge, and that such true opinions spring neither from nature nor from learning (science or art) but that they are a divine gift. And this, I think, is truly put. For that which is neither innate nor learned is character, and that character is divine in which the vast energies of the id freely guide and inspire the purposeful 'scientific' ego. We do act ignorantly, yet if blessed with such divinity it is all surprisingly easy.

This, however, is not to say that there is no place in our lives for rationality, for fine ideas and empirical investigation; surely enough these motor progress — but only in a healthy animal. We have lost such divinity, and the ego separated from the id is like a town perpetually at war; what can

be known of joy and creation in such a city when all reasonableness goes only to strengthen its armaments? But let me analyze in greater detail the function of scientific inquiry (and especially of the social sciences) in our society: and, correlatively, the kind of character structure that could develop and use such methods.

(1) Scientific inquiry helps maintain the capitalist economy by making available a great flow of goods with whose accumulation otherwise rebellious energies are distracted and absorbed, this accumulation itself also serving to body forth the vital contact missing and deeply desired.

(2) The accumulative procedures of the sciences is the attempt to replace, but not restore, the lost divinity; that is, it is the expression, socially, of the wish by the isolated ego to re-establish contact with the vast energies of the id and herd; the closed character tries to perform the ethical, essentially religious, act of judging, of engaging the soul, by means of collation and comparison. (So, the fable of Eden should be read backward: because man fell from Paradise, he ate of the tree of knowledge.) And this I think, is the psychological burden of the deep contradiction between scientific activity and scientific philosophy, where great systems of causality are built on the premise that "every effect is a distinct event from its cause" (Hume), the absence of the sense of causality being, once again, a sign of the loss of contact.

(3) Scientific procedures have become so recondite and complicated because they are designed to deal with the intricate secondary problems of the large world and because, again the lack of contact, people (and scientists) find it difficult to understand and face the primary problems; this preoccupation with these secondary issues serving to invest them with the energies seething below and to give them psychological reality for, habitually lived in, they appear to be basic to life. To see and solve the primary problems great knowledge is not needed, but more difficult things — courage, patience, loyalty, and inventiveness.

(4) Scientific, technical judgments lead to perfecting the function of things which appear to have arisen gratuitously and which one is not even sure are wanted (and these are precisely our social system). They appear gratuitous because they have a complicated history not easily understood and, more importantly, because they were never at any point chosen or disavowed. Thus

choice, the vital engagement of the soul, is pushed farther and farther off and the chances for the abreaction of the latent feelings is diminished.

(5) The apparent non-ethicality of scientific procedures and findings serves, like any myth, to mask the moral assumptions and character-attitudes by virtue of which they are made, and it is just these latter that energize our social system. This myth of feelinglessness and irresponsibility masks the most turbulent anxieties and destructive feelings, and the ceremonies by which these might be abreacted (e.g., accumulation) lead, circularly, to the further extension and intensification of the social system.

In view of these facts, it would be well to ask now why we anarchists have such small success, why we fail to win new friends. Is it because our science is so incomplete? our evidence not plain enough? Must we make our theories infinitely recondite and accumulate facts **ad infinitum** as do the professional sociologists? (But if this is so, how dare we be anarchists! Surely our faith has carried us far beyond what we can reasonably assert.)

Our evidence is only too plain. Yet they will not see it! We put our facts about sex, communality, and political initiation boldly and people do not understand what we are saying, or else they agree and do not act differently. Our evidence is too plain, it stirs (I hope) the deep-lying anxieties and ambivalences. They will not to see it.

I must extend what I said earlier: if human nature determines the range of values, and character (or, more broadly, the socio-psychological situation) determines the selection of particular values, the values themselves determine what will be considered relevant to a particular argument. Can we then hope to convince anyone with more recondite theories when the plainest facts have already been denied because of certain character-attitudes! And to extenuate our theories would be to betray ourselves, for it is thru hedging that great truths are vitiated or disguised, and thru the **habit** of doing so that great feelings are stilled; I don't think that in practice truths are very much different from the way they have been established.

In **Religion and Education** I put the moral problems first and I am doing this now, for to do this is precisely to challenge the character-attitudes that bedevil and constrain us all and keep people from **seeing**. But the first devil (and he is the subtlest) is the loss of contact, of vital feeling; the condition for this is the organization of the ego in opposition to the id — for how may a man know himself when the fount of his desires is shut, or know his brother when this is the source of empathy and mutual aid, or know the land.

Our social system is so tightly knit and its weight is so great that all but the most forceful and vital acts are drawn to it, and their powers removed to enforce it, and these acts themselves corrupted and debased. Therefore we must energize our truths with all the force with which we desire and value them. We must make them the source and matter of social contest and thus pierce thru the defensive myth to the moral assumptions and character-attitudes below and to the feelings that these bind, insisting always, as does the character-analytic therapist, "Why do you do this?" (And will this not serve to better establish our own values, for our choices are not so easy as Dave makes out — atom bombs or loving friends — and therapist and patient alike have much to learn.)

Only when we have activated the latent feelings will our truths begin to seem mean-

ingful; only when men desire can they know the objects and ways of their desire.

A NOTE ON RELIGION. I think that a fruitful view of religion might run like this: A religious position is basically an ethical one, but one, moreover, in which the id is manifestly the locus of the ethical proposals (according to Ruth Benedict the only belief common to all religions is that in a wonderful, supernatural power pervading all things). Religions, then, function to engage and fix character by formulating explicitly and in myth the rules by which people of the particular character live, and by celebrating in ritual and myth the conditions of life (birth, sex, death, character), of social living (the basic animal unity, the planting, the harvest), and of the world (the universal energies, the climate, the seasons) whose powers surpass the bounds and power of the individual ego. (So, even! bio-sociological material like Kropotkin's theory

of mutual aid has deep-going religious significance.) Greek tragedies, for instance, begin with a choice concerning a manifestly important issue. In the terrible events that follow the status, ceremonies, and loved ones which, introjected, compose the ego of the protagonist are lost to him, so it is as if his ego itself was torn away. But now, with the constricting ego gone, the continuum between mother and child may be reestablished — for it was this which was above all lost and missed. This relationship between unformed infant and mother subsists, however, in the ebb and flow of the primitive energies, so that contact with the id is once more established. Yet the wrong choice was made originally just because such contact was absent! So, for the audience, loss is catharsized, contact with the id renewed, the bonds of communal life strengthened, and daily life given fresh and deeper meaning.

aration enforced by law, up North the internal suspicion forcing similar interactions. And only the strong acts of the will or peculiarities of training overcome the childhood habituations.

The White Man's Burden Is His Own Childhood

Ghosts plague the land, the ghosts of yesteryear, yet so much of a piece with today that when the sacred taboo is broken, "... a whole town is drained ... and only the moral rot of past times remain ... these ceremonies in honor of white supremacy, performed from babyhood, slip from the conscious region where mature ideals rarely find entrance ..."

The teacher was Southern Tradition, taking the automatic form of a parent's gesture, a teacher's vocal motion, the preacher's raillery against sin and sex. And like all American children, they learned to (1) Fear God, (2) Avoid your sexuality, (3) and for the Southern child, Keep the Negro in his place.

"Three Ghost Stories" attempts to discover in the childhood patterns the mechanisms that "corrupt the white child and shame the Negro child." The "backyard temptation," neglected children of these "mongrel unions," and the black mammy. Ghosts that will shape the imagery required to sustain the dogma of white supremacy. Sex, religion and race mixed madly to produce the violence of lynchings and the inhumanity of segregation.

Miss Smith proclaims herself a liberal, largely because there is no other creed available. Her portrait of the liberal, Southern Style, makes pale the work of the Myralls and Johnsons. It is not that these gentlemen with their Rockefeller endowments do not speak of these ghosts, but their talk is the liberalism that avoids the facts of a child's education.

"There are hundreds of thousands of white People in the South whose earliest and most profound experiences of love and affection were given them by their nurse ... whose first playmates were Negro children. Often their black 'mother' gave them their first food ... held them close in her arms. They gave their first love to her and their first 'hate' to her, created their first fantasies around her, built her image and put it first in their hearts. And then the image, friendships were carelessly thrown out by the soft, belittling words. He was told that such love was a special love, like the love one gives one's dog ... not something to be ... esteemed among human relationships. He saw the tenderest experiences of his life held so cheaply ... by his people that they could listen as they did, recently, to the desecrating mouthings of demagogues about 'black mammals' with no protest of spirit, no memories that were offended. He cast the image out as he was taught so carefully to do. But the place is there, empty. No one else has filled it. No one ever will."

In view of this childhood experience, it is not "unreasonable to suggest that this feeling of owing profound obligations which he cannot pay (and does not want to pay) has deepened his sense of guilt until it has twisted itself into a dread ... a prophetic foreknowledge of ... disaster ... attending any attempts he (or his group) makes in the area of racial reparations."

Sadly, such insight does not eliminate the evil. Miss Smith, concerned with justice today, now, thought, at the time of the war, that there are "Things to Do Now," an article she wrote in her magazine *South Today*. "Whatever our reasons for wanting to act; love for the South,

love for democracy, desire to win the war, belief in the teachings of Jesus Christ, vision of a new world, fears of a race riot. ... What we can do now is ... read books by scientists, Negroes, poets ... stop using such terms as 'nigger' ... seek out Negro friendships ... train our little children to oppose injustice whether economic, racial, sexual ... we become 'trouble shooters for democracy' ... break bread together in the Lord's house, in your own homes." She ended this plea with an ecstatic "Freedom is ringing the bell."¹

Such a plea is based in her belief that "each of us ... want ... to live as a free man ... to follow our interests. ..." etc. Even further, "... the art of recognizing the luminous moment when men's imaginations see alike and their skill can be pooled in a strategy that piles up, in quick rhythmic succession, effort on effort on effort, until finally in orgasmic flowering, the whole body politic is made one in feeling, belief, desire, act. In the past these forces seemed always to be pulling against each other. Today this is no longer true."

I have quoted at length to show how worthwhile this book is: filled with honesty and a human love that struck me immediately. Miss Smith says at one point that there are those who will object to her program claiming that matters are "more complicated, that we must investigate deeper." This is not my objection to her belief that an orgasmic outflow is now possible. The specific mixture of manners and sex, finance and poverty, race and the doctrine of white supremacy, have produced in the South men and children incapable of outflow; in other areas of this our land, the mixture is different but the internal restrictions are just as potent. (And worse yet, America's Negro, if once educated, is as timid in the face of authority as any white. We can easily see an America free of race prejudice. But we cannot see an America free of its deeper character deficiencies. Prejudice is a symptom of the anxious personality, but the removal of this one factor obviously will not produce a character ready to question all authority. Miss Smith suggests this in her lament over the educated Negro.) Many of us have failed quite markedly in our private lives to give warmth, trust and affection to our loved ones, our fellow-workers, the bus drivers and the shop-owners. But Americans generally have no "idea" of childhood. It is as though adulthood is the time to gain revenge for the acts of your parents, your school teachers, a time to beat your children, "They did it to me."

If there were a dream in America's adults then perhaps a search could begin for the killers of that dream. But Society's members in our times are concerned vicariously with the dream, searching for their releases in popular culture, and, typically American, seeing this whole business as one's neighbor's problem.

We are hopelessly far from admitting our guilt as the killer. Perhaps this can never happen; now each of us must press our resistance to the universal demand for conformity and hope that fortuity, that maker of men's character, is on our side, in the short run.

—D. E.

¹ I personally (who would dare not to?) sympathize with her mixture of ideals, Christian, psychoanalytic, tradition of Robt. E. Lee. Each of us must work out his own personal system much different from our official ideologies if we are to survive. But it would seem that this mixture allows her to hope where no real hope exists.

Books in Review

KILLERS OF THE DREAM, by Lillian Smith. New York; W. W. Norton, 1949. 256 pages; \$3.00

In a sense, America's most damning taint is her treatment of the Negro. Lillian Smith has contributed a vital and brave analysis of segregation in her new book "Killers of the Dream"; but the day-by-day remains the day-by-day. She has "reached into the past" to tell her "story made of memory and historical fact."

Childhood

"We lived the same segregated life ... but our parents talked in excessively Christian and democratic terms ... we were told that all men are brothers ..." A dramatic event in the life of the author sharpened these teachings, reducing them to their Southern-most clarity: A white child was discovered living with poor Negroes. The women's club adopted this child and placed it in the Smith home. Later, after it had played with and shared the experiences of the other Smith children, it was learned that this child was mulatto. And, after a household of adult whispers:

"But she can't be. She's white."

"We were mistaken. She is colored."

"And like a slow poison it began to seep through me: 'I was white. She was colored. We must not be together. Though you ate with your nurse when you were little, it was bad to eat with any colored person after that. It was bad just as other things your mother had told you were bad.'" "Hearts broken. Conscience torn from acts. That is segregation."

Southern children, perhaps not so conscious of its drama as Miss Smith, all learn their lesson. As co-director

of a camp, the author continues, "I saw a group of southern children try their strength against that ghost (Southern Tradition) a few summers ago." Saint Exupery's familiar fantasy "The Little Prince" provided the form in which the campers could act out the thrill of maturing. One child is selected as the Prince who must leave his private planet as he begins to outgrow it. Maturing means learning the rules of the adult society: the Prince obtains companions: Conscience from his home, Southern Tradition from school and fellow playmates, then Religion and finally Science. The planet Earth is visited, and experiencing the Earth means playing with all the Earth's children.—"Down here," they protest, "we can't." Southern Tradition and Southern-style Christianity see to that. Science rescues the Prince and they triumphantly "danced together in unison ..." to Beethoven's Seventh Symphony.

However, late that evening a camper came into her office. After an intensive discussion (did not the young lady's parents practice ideals just 'driven' from the stage?) she whispered: "I'm scared ... I don't like the future ... it doesn't seem to belong to us. It's as though the older people have stolen it from us ..." In answer, Miss Smith distributes the guilt of the war between the North and South, both systems inhuman; the sin of the South is deeper. The virtuous talk of the North disguised its economic dream of dominating the Nation and the South in retaliation is prepared to accuse any critic of just such dubiousness.

The young lady presses her question: "But is it never to end ... No matter how wrong you think it is, laws are against you, custom is against you, your own family is against you. How do you even begin ... Since we had to practice segregation why didn't you make us believe it is right? When I have children I am not going to give them a single ideal they can't practice ..." Lord! The endless chain: childhoods filled with a child's love for immoral parents. And here in New York City a Negro ever watchful if a white dares sit beside him on a subway seat, so deeply buried; in the South, the physical sep-

tive spirit, in a situation of flexibility, he erects barriers (economic institutions) against his own desires for dependence and community; he is determined to compel himself to be independent? Perhaps the individualist wishes, as all persons do, for intense sociality, for adult love and community; but unable to imagine these (what comes to mind is the original ugly family, and much anxiety), he does not dare trust himself in interdependence and love among adult human beings. (It is true he finds little around him to reassure him.)⁴

Our main source of knowledge, our original data, is ourselves, our friends, and our social situations; it is the crucial scientific inquiry to perceive the important facts and truths, and to verify, modify or reject these through historical and sociological knowledge. Are we generalizing from an atypical case? Are our ideas about a future society intended to compensate for an attitude, or a social situation, that is significant today only because of some particular institution which we aim to (or might well aim to) eliminate? What I have called irrational attitudes inhibit such perceptions. Finally our so-called objective social judgments, ordinarily presumed not to be disturbed by such analysis, are found to be rooted in these perceptions.

III. The Individual and the Community

This article is already too long to permit a good exploration of the motivation that could provide the dynamics of a revolution and the basis of a free society. These are most difficult questions, unless we make some optimistic assumptions, as Reichians do in positing a "natural" character, self-governing in freedom. But we do have basic conceptions that shape our imagination of a free society, and therefore our present actions. We consider man a social animal; but more than this, as a working and loving animal. (Therefore we do not see the need to reward production in proportion to effort, or for the savage social boycott some anarchists have suggested to supply discipline in a non-legal society: we count on the sociality of man, his working and loving nature, not his hunger or his fear.) We believe, from historical evidence, that the hostile and distant persons of today are this way, not by desire, nor natural necessity, but because of the break-up of the old forms of community. We live in isolation because we have no natural communities, because we are fearful both of our neighbors and of what might become of our hardened, or dis-

integrating, fearful egos in a serious personal relationship. Therefore we would desire social forms which would bring persons closer together, lessen the isolation, reflect and strengthen the sentiment of mutual aid and community; and our present actions would be those tending to encourage such attitudes in ourselves and others, and to reshape social institutions (even those small ones we can reshape in our personal lives) after this fashion. Finally the community of persons, and not the isolated individual, would be the nucleus of an anarchist society.

We should respect the individualist's warning against submerging the individual and developing pure herd behavior — the rampant mutual aid, so to speak, that causes great masses to behave as masses, nations as warlike herds. The significant characteristic of the herd is lack of relations between persons, and a single mystical, filial relation between each individual and the Herd; instead of judging society by his own welfare and the welfare of his friends, the individual develops fantastic ideas of the herd-welfare ("nation," "society," "community").⁵ In bad senses, the alternating descriptions of modern society as "individualistic" and "collectivistic" are both true: it is an atomized herd. Thus the apparently contradictory tendencies in anarchism: to liberate ourselves from society (to "individualize") and at the same time to socialize.

Our information about human nature being mostly information about caged human animals, and our strivings for freedom, anarchists have often felt limited to speaking vaguely of a "balance" between individuality and society, and have often relied on persuasion in the ideal of freedom to offset an instinctual gregariousness. Having learned to stress the conditioning situation rather than the convinced person, we would argue somewhat like this: If there are real relations between persons, if the society is, at bottom, composed of groups in face-to-face relationship, if these groups are bound by feelings of love (and if hate can be expressed), if the rebellion of the children against the elders is frankly accepted and encouraged, then we would not expect the filial, mystical attitude to develop, we would not expect the society to wear the aspect of a herd, we would not feel that we had lost our personality in the group. We would argue somewhat like this, etc.; in fact we cannot very well argue it, because our strivings for freedom from the cage (in the cage, perhaps) do not provide a mountain of evidence, we are always crashing against the narrow limits of our character; yet such and such a group, such and such persons, such and such a Spanish village, such and such self-discoveries, such and such works of art. . . .

When the individualist, conceding that perhaps our "ideal" is the more beautiful, asks us why we will not "settle" for a society wherein the mutually-hostile and distant people of today will at least let each other alone — if they would merely stop killing and exploiting each other, or even merely stop the insane killing! — we point out that the genesis of this lunatic behavior (this killing

⁵ The language here ("herd," "filial mysticism," "gregariousness") is after Randolph Bourne in "The State." Bourne's view was instinctual: that gregariousness, an instinct useful for defense, is "enormously over-supplied" in man, and that in addition to constituting the basis for the State-organization of the herd for war it is the source of the demand for conformity ("this tyrannical herd-instinct" which "even in the most modern and enlightened societies" "shows little sign of abating"). Bourne took a largely quantitative view, and saw good sociality hardly absorbing all this energy. We would say the passionate demand for conformity, the herd-behavior, is set in motion by insecurity (panic).

and exploiting) is not the economic institutions, or some failure of reasoning, but this same distance and hostility, hatred and fear, lack of love and inability to love; and the rationalistic expectation that these same distant and hostile people, from observed self-interest, by creating institutions just adapted to their character, will let each other alone (even) is more doubtful than the seemingly more difficult work (realistic, not idealistic) of re-making our way of life through learning something more of our natures and creating a situation which will bring out the better in ourselves and the best in our children. Should inner fearfulness cause us to abandon hope for our friends and our neighbors? It is true we find little around us to reassure us. Our little dreams and hopes are blasted, by ourselves and our friends. But do we not also do tremendous things? The depravity and nobility of man, almost of every man, can hardly be described.

NOTES ON LITERARY ANARCHISM

continued from page 7

writings has created a renewed interest in the ideas of these writers, and has helped to dissolve the Marxist ideology of a preceding decade.

A second reason for the movement I am discussing can be found in the decay of Communism as an intellectual force in England. During the early 1930's, most of the younger English writers tended to be Communists or fellow travelers. It was a "revolutionary" period in Communist tactics, and little was known in England of the reactionary aspects which Communism had already shown elsewhere. This tendency reached its height in the Spanish civil war, but this event also marked the end of the Communist influence, for English writers who had gone to fight in Spain saw at first hand the authoritarian mentality which underlay the "revolutionary" talk of the Communists. George Orwell, in *Homage to Catalonia*, exposed the Communist intrigues to gain power behind the front lines. Other writers, like Spender and Auden, associating what they had seen of Stalinist methods with such events as the Moscow trials, seceded from their Communist allegiance. But few of the 1930's school of writers, although they abandoned Communism, turned to anarchism. This was mostly a phenomenon of the next generation, and the Auden-Spender group tended to embrace a rather vague, disillusioned social-democracy.

Read was the only important elder writer who actually embraced anarchism, and he was, in part, renewing a youthful tendency through the inspiration of events in Spain and a logical rejection of the authoritarian principle implicit in Communism. In 1938 he published *Poetry and Anarchism*, and in this book gave expression to a viewpoint which was already appearing in the formal tendencies of the generation of poets who were to become characteristic of the war years.

Among these younger people it was not merely a matter of theoretical revulsion from Marxism. They were also evolving a different literary outlook from the social realism of their predecessors. In the work of the 1930's, or rather such characteristic work as that of Auden, Spender and Day Lewis, the rational, intellectual element predominated. The new poetic movement, heralded by the work of Dylan Thomas and George Barker, given theoretical form in the criticism of Herbert Read, represented a revolt in favor of the irrational and emotional elements of man's nature, which these writers held to be the essen-

tial formative elements of literary art. The logical outcome of such an approach was to see in the individual, and not externally, the motive force of literature. In other words, writers declared themselves anarchists so far as their own work was concerned, and it was therefore natural that they should begin to look with sympathy on anarchist ideas of social relationships.

Finally, the war and later international events have forced writers to give renewed consideration to problems which are the special preoccupation of anarchist thought. The war brought writers, whether as conscientious objectors or as soldiers, into a closer contact with the state than they had known before, and they realized from direct experience how far its interests were inimical to their own freedom of expression. It was as a conscientious objector at the beginning of the war that I myself was first forced to a direct consideration of the conflict of the individual and the state which I had previously realized only vaguely, and I think that this kind of experience, which was decisive in my own case, had a similar effect on many other writers.

Moreover, the problems of power which were raised by the war and by the later revelations of the nature of authoritarianism have driven many writers who were not declared anarchists to examine these questions in their works. Novels like Rex Warner's *The Aerodrome* and *Men of Stones*, like Orwell's *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty Four*, show how deeply the question of the state, posed most openly by the anarchists, is concerning a much wider group of writers and readers.

These facts do not necessarily mean that in the near future we shall see a further large-scale adhesion of English writers to anarchism. What they do mean is that the anarchist approach to contemporary social problems has become a steadily more significant factor in the mental climate of English literature as a whole.

THE DELPHIC REVIEW

The Delphic Review, a new anarchist quarterly, has just arrived from England. It is edited by Albert McCarthy at Fordingbridge, Hants. The English subscription price is 10/6 for 4 issues.

This 1st issue (winter 1949) begins with an editorial drawing an interesting parallel between the present World Government movement & the "Popular Front" of the 30's. It predicts, possibly with accuracy, that the present rush of European & American intellectuals to get on this new "liberal" bandwagon will increase till a new catastrophe engulfs us.

There follows: a wonderfully witty, individualistic, aristocratically-libertarian essay on War, Peace, States, Frontiers & Hedges, by Augustus John; ("Classical Athens," this painter reports, "was hardly bigger than Fordingbridge"); then, an extract from Herbert Read's "Chains of Freedom", dealing with freedom, determinism & equality, stressing the distinction between economic equality & such inequalities as give rise to a healthy cultural rivalry; following this some pages from Tom Farrell's *Journal* (of which more below); an article by McCarthy on the American Negro & The Vote, one by George Woodcock on "The Rebel Falstaff"; a somewhat overly patronizing analysis of Cyril Connolly as a decadent liberal remnant of moribund capitalism, by Gerald Vaughan; 4 poems; a piece

on "profoundly bad" poems (with examples in *extenso*); & some reviews. Only one of the 4 poems, I'm sorry to say, is readable, & it is an anonymous work. I shd say that the poets wd do well to take to heart Tom Farrell's insistence, in animadverting against Surrealism, upon the "work of conscious effort" as being the crux of art. I feel that Farrell underrates the importance of the unconscious in the making of art-works, nor does he fully understand the Surrealist movement & its endeavors, but many a young (& not so young) poet wd do well to take to heart — even a bit overliterally — this plea for a more conscious exercise of craft, tho the Muse (to whom Farrell is too irreverent) must inspire us for the effort not to be vain.

As to the piece on bad poems: I found it extremely amusing, & the examples are thrilling, but it **does** seem a shame to devote so many pages to bad poems, when so few are given even to those the editor considers printable. Also, Mr. Fox is dead wrong when he says that a poet may learn more about "actual technique" from Ella Wheeler Wilcox & her ilk than from Marlowe, Donne, Milton or Yeats. We can — if I may be forgiven a true banality — only learn of the Beautiful, (or the Good or the True) from beautiful, good or true objects, not from the ugly, the evil or the lying-in themselves. From the latter we can learn a great deal, but they are not sufficient. Young poets: read your classics for technique, the Wilcox & M'Gonagall are good for laughs.

The book reviews are well-thought-out & carefully written — & on the whole the **Delphic** promises well. (The printing job alone is a delight!) **Resistance** welcomes its new colleague & wishes it a long, valuable life.

—Jackson Mac Low

FINANCIAL STATEMENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO MARCH 1, 1950

ARIZONA: Phoenix: C. C. 1.00	\$ 1.00
CALIFORNIA: Gilroy: C. T. 1.05; Jackson: N. Z. 2.00; Los Angeles: Man Group 15.00; Pleasanton: Pig Roast 25.00; San Francisco: Libertarian Dance 25.00; Santa Barbara: S. Z. P. 45; Sunland: A. S. .38	68.88
COLORADO: Boulder: J. T. G. 2.00; Denver: R. B. 2.00	4.00
CONNECTICUT: New Haven: B. B. 2.00, H. K. 1.00	3.00
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: Washington: E. B. Jr. 2.60	2.60
ILLINOIS: Chicago: R. C. 1.00, C. 5.00; Gillespie: "Coal Miner" 2.00	8.00
MASSACHUSETTS: Boston: A. McD. 1.00; Cambridge: J. K. 1.00; Needham: Gruppo Libertario 10.00; Somerville: V. C. 2.00; Worcester: W. G. .45	14.45
MICHIGAN: Detroit: Affair 73.45	73.45
NEW MEXICO: Clayton: D. A. T. 1.00	1.00
NEW YORK: Flushing: D. McS. 1.25; New York City: F. G. 5.00, A. B. 2.00, D. & D. 6.00, C. B. & O. A. 5.00, Social 5.25, M. R. 5.00, N. F. 1.00, S. G. 2.00, L. B. H. 1.00; Rochester: E. P. 2.00	35.50
NORTH CAROLINA: Black Mountain: J. McC. 10.00	10.00
PENNSYLVANIA: Pittsburgh: M. B. 5.00, F. P. 2.00; Pittston: A. P. 5.00, D. L. 3.00, Alessandro 1.00, A. M. 3.00, A. V. 5.00, Ernesto 1.00, Beduino 11.00, Neri 1.00, Masino 1.00, J. M. 1.00, S. C. 1.00, J. B. 1.00, J. C. 2.00, A. R. 1.00, P. B. 5.00	49.00
RHODE ISLAND: Riverside: J. B. 5.00	5.00
CANADA: Vancouver: L. B. 1.00; Montreal: A. P. 4.00	5.00
	\$280.88
Deficit, December 22, 1949	15.33
	\$265.55

EXPENDITURES

Printing, Vol. 8, No. 4	\$246.24
Postage, Vol. 8, No. 4	34.08
Cut, Vol. 8, No. 4	7.15
	\$287.48
Deficit, March 1, 1950	\$ 21.93

To our Readers

Beginning with this issue, *Resistance* is being printed by the Libertarian Press, a workers' cooperative.

Recently published: "The Dead of Spring," by Paul Goodman. A novel, third in the series including "The Grand Piano" and "The State of Nature." Libertarian Press, 220 pp., spiral binding, \$3.00 — "Existentialism, Marxism and Anarchism," by Herbert Read; Freedom Press; 56 pp.; available from *Resistance* at 45c a copy.

We have acquired a number of copies of Kropotkin's "Ethics" for 60c a copy. These are new copies of the 1947 Tudor \$1.98 edition. Our policy is to sell books and pamphlets at cost price — quoted prices do not include postage.

The Anarchist Bookshelf

• ANARCHIST THEORY

Bakunin, Michael—God and the State	\$.50
Berkman, Alexander—ABC of Anarchism (Now and After, abridged)	.25
Berneri, Camillo—Peter Kropotkin: His Federalist Ideas	.05
DeCleyre, Voltairine—Anarchism and American Traditions	.10
Godwin, William—Selections from "Political Justice"	.25
Goldman, Emma—Place of the Individual in Society	.10
Havel, Hippolyte—What's Anarchism	.10
Hewetson, John—Mutual Aid and Social Evolution	.15
Kropotkin, Peter—The State	.25
Kropotkin, Peter—Revolutionary Government	.10
Kropotkin, Peter—The Wage System	.10
Kropotkin, Peter—Selections from Kropotkin's Writings (edited by Herbert Read)	1.75
Kropotkin, Peter—An Appeal to the Young	.10
Kropotkin, Peter—Ethics	.60
Malatesta, Errico—Anarchy	.10
Malatesta, Errico—A Talk Between Two Workers	.10
Malatesta, Errico—Vote—What For?	.10
Read, Herbert—Philosophy of Anarchism	.20
Read, Herbert—Poetry and Anarchism	1.25
Rocker, Rudolf—Nationalism and Culture	3.50
Woodcock, George—Anarchy or Chaos	.35
Woodcock, George—Anarchism and Morality	.10
Woodcock, George—What Is Anarchism	.05

• HISTORICAL

Berneri, Marie L.—Workers in Stalin's Russia	.25
Borghesi, Armando—Mussolini: Red and Black	.50
Ciliga—The Kronstadt Revolt	.05
Hewetson, John—Italy After Mussolini	.10
Icarus—The Wilhelmshaven Revolt	.10
Voline—La Revolution Inconnue (in French)	1.75
Kenafick, K. J.—Michael Bakunin & Karl Marx	1.50
Laval, Gaston—Social Reconstruction in Spain	.10
Maximov, G.—The Guillotine at Work	1.50
Rocker, Rudolf—The Truth About Spain	.10
Three Years of Struggle in Spain	.05
Bulgaria. A New Spain	.25

• ECONOMIC

Hewetson, John—III—Health, Poverty and the State	.30
Warbasse, J. P.—Cooperative Decentralization	.10
Woodcock, George—Railways and Society	.10
Woodcock, George—New Life to the Land	.10
Woodcock, George—Homes orhovels—The Housing Problem	.10

• LABOR AND UNIONISM

Brown, Tom—The British General Strike	.05
Brown, Tom—Trade Unionism or Syndicalism	.10
Brown, Tom—The Social General Strike	.05
Equity—Struggle in the Factory	.10
McCartney, W.—The French Cook's Syndicate	.10
Rocker, Rudolf—Anarcho-Syndicalism	.85

• GENERAL

Duff, Charles—A Handbook on Hanging	.30
Faure, Sebastien—Does God Exist?	.10
Goodman, Paul—Art and Social Nature	1.05
Naeve, Lowell—A Field of Broken Stones	3.00
Olday, John—The March to Death (cartoons)	.25
Ridley, F. A.—The Roman Catholic Church & Modern Age	.05
Read, Herbert—Education of Free Men	.20
Tolstoy, Leo—The Slavery of Our Times	.10
Weil, Simone—The Iliad, or The Poem of Force	.10
Wilde, Oscar—The Soul of Man Under Socialism	.10
Woodcock, George—The Basis of Communal Living	.25

• PERIODICALS

Now—Nos. 6, 7 & 8	each .50
Now—No. 9	.10
Retort (Vol. IV, No. 3)	.40
Delphic Review (Vol. I, No. 1)	.25

The above prices do not include postage

Copies of the "Resistance" pamphlets "The State," by Randolph Bourne, and "War or Revolution" are free and available on request. Also available are sample copies of "Freedom" from England and "Le Libertaire" and "Etudes Anarchistes" from France.