

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

Individual Action Newsletters

Axe Collections of Freethought, Socialism,
Radicalism, and Anarchy

2017-02-01

Individual Action - 1953, October 27, Tuesday

John Goldstein

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/ian>

Recommended Citation

Goldstein, John, "Individual Action - 1953, October 27, Tuesday" (2017). *Individual Action Newsletters*. 17.
<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/ian/17>

This Newspaper is brought to you for free and open access by the Axe Collections of Freethought, Socialism, Radicalism, and Anarchy at Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Individual Action Newsletters by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact mmccune@pittstate.edu, jmauk@pittstate.edu.

INDIVIDUAL ACTION

Vol 2, No. 1

October 27, 1953

An Anarchist Publication

Price Five Cents

FOREIGN MINISTERS BACK IMPERIALISM

John's Corner

With this issue, we commemorate the first anniversary of *Individual Action*. Although the publication has not brought about anarchism and has not halted the inane drive towards war and total destruction, it deserves credit, so we think, for continuing to exist in spite of the witch-hunt atmosphere perpetrated by the government of these Benighted States. And we hope to make I.A. a better and more enlightening publication during its second year of publication.

President Eisenhower, on the anniversary of the Chinese Republic, sent a congratulatory message to Chiang Kai Chek on behalf of the American people. We can, though, assure the downtrodden Chinese and Formoseans that Eisenhower was not speaking for us or a large segment of the American people. Chiang Kai Chek was—and is—the spokesman and agent for the European and American imperialists in China. Is it any wonder, then that we cannot possibly show any compassion for such a ruthless ruler?

We do not, however, condone the present Marxist government of China. On the contrary, we realize that it is just as abject as Chiang and Co. inasmuch as the new rulers have afflicted the Chinese Workers with Stakonovism and other replicas of Soviet society. Neither Chiang nor Mao will ever mitigate the suffering of China's population.

High Government officials have given three different reports about Russian progress on the H. bomb. But these same officials agree that the Soviet Government will soon be able to produce a hell bomb that could liquidate the population of New York and other metropolises. The American Government, needless to say, is stockpiling

Democracy—British Style

Despite the fact that the citizens of British Guiana — those who voted anyway — elected the alleged Communist government, Churchill and his underlings suspended the colony's constitution and invoked martial law under the guise of protecting the colony from Communism. According to British and American propaganda, the "free world" safeguards "democratic" rights. We would like his majesty's government to explain this discrepancy in words and deeds. We nonetheless realize that ALL governments are hypocritical.

bombs that could destroy Soviet cities. If an intelligent person analyzes horrifying facts of this sort, he can not help but come to the conclusion that the annihilation of the human race is close at hand unless the American and Russian people force their respective governments to cease manufacturing H bombs along with other destructive weapons.

Certain self-styled intellectuals have criticized Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman for being active. They infer that the two beloved anarchists were not only demagogues but that they did not educate their adherents properly. Those alleged anarchists who excoriate Berkman and Goldman have never accomplished anything. Berkman and Goldman, on the other hand, participated in the people's struggles and promulgated anarchist thought as simply as they possibly could. We admire our two predecessors greatly and have only met one anarchist who is their peer and that is Ammon Hennacy. We wish that the aforementioned critics would do something constructive for the humane cause of anarchism instead of bewailing late comrades.

Dispute Methods

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, British Secretary Anthony Eden and French Foreign Minister Georges Bidault held a conference in London for the purpose of resolving differences among the Big Three. They discussed many topics including the dispute over Trieste, the advisability of admitting Communist China into the U. N., the possibility of allowing a "neutral" nation to attend the forthcoming Korean "peace" conference, and ways of aiding and abetting the French imperialists in their war on Indo-China rebels.

So far as the capitalist powers are concerned, the hassle over Trieste is their most urgent problem since it involves two members of the "free world", Yugoslavia and Italy. The city is now controlled by American and British forces. But the United States and Britain have announced that they are withdrawing their soldiers from the seaport and are thus dividing the disputed territory between the two contending governments. However, both Tito and the Italian premier have stated, in effect, that they will employ violence to secure Trieste. The State department and the British foreign office hence will probably decide to remain in the disputed city in order to avert a war between allies.

Even though Italy's and Yugoslavia's altercation over Trieste is the most pressing problem to the three big powers, it is not an issue that threatens to split the conferences because the foreign ministers expressed no differences on the subject.

On the contrary, the disagreement between the United States and Britain about allowing Marxist China to enter the U.N. seems insoluble. The United States Government is bent upon restoring Chiang Kai Chek as head of the Chinese government, while the British rulers have recognized Mao. Churchill and his cronies, though, did not establish friendly relations with Red China because they desire peace with the Soviet World, but because they covet to procure China's vast markets for British capitalists. In short, the British foreign office feels that they can exploit China under its present rulers; the State department believes that Chiang would give American capitalists a free hand in China, if he were able to

overthrow Mao. Neither government, needless to say, is interested in the welfare of the Chinese people.

But the three foreign ministers have reached an agreement regarding the pending conference among the participants in the recently concluded Korean war. The foreign ministers have agreed to allow some "neutral" nation to sit in on the talks provided that certain problems cannot be resolved after interminable discussions among the former belligerents.

As might have been expected, Dulles and Eden also agreed to supply the French army with enough equipment to liquidate the brutally exploited Indo-Chinese peasants. The investments of Standard oil in Indo-China must be protected regardless of the cost in blood sweat and tears.

No matter what agreements were made in London, we can be assured that the people will not benefit from them. Govern-

Continued on page 4

Individual Action

Single Copies 5c, Yearly Subscriptions: \$1.50, Six Months: \$.75
Order from Individual Action, Apt. 2F., 15 Sheridan Square, New York, N. Y.
Published every three weeks by John Goldstein and Felix Ortiz;
Address: Apartment 2F, 15 Sheridan Square, New York 14, N. Y.
Editors: John Goldstein, Felix Ortiz, Russell Roemmele
Make all checks and money orders payable to Individual Action

WORLD GOVERNMENT OR ANARCHISM

Many thinkers are cognizant of the palpable fact that national boundaries are obsolete. They realize quite well that it is not only foolish but utterly inane for barriers to divide people whose cultural, economic and intellectual aspirations are similar. Sagacious human beings have come to the conclusion that nationalism is one of the prime causes of war and of the other miseries that afflict mankind.

Unfortunately, there is no unity among those who abhor narrow-minded patriotism. As a matter of fact, the differences among anti-nationalists cannot possibly be resolved. Most of them either espouse World Federalism or Anarchism, two philosophies which are incongruous.

Of these two groups, the World Federalists have more adherents. They advocate the establishment of a universal centralized government which would have its own army and courts. They, of course, believe that every person should be subservient to its edicts. In other words, the World Federalists want a super world government to replace the present national ones.

This idea may sound plausible to some, but so far as we are concerned it possesses innumerable flaws. In the first place, the World Parliament, which would probably reside in Geneva, would make laws for the inhabitants of Denver, Colorado and other remote places, if The World Federalists' philosophy were adopted by the human race. We do not feel such a super-government could understand the problems that face residents of Denver and the surrounding area.

For example, suppose that the inhabitants of Colorado wish to divide Denver into several communities in order to relieve congestion and the World Government opposes this humane plan, the super-stafists would, thus, frustrate the bountiful desires of Colorado residents, even though the politicians would be thousands of miles away from Denver. In short, the World Federalists propose a plan which would permit a highly centralized government to make laws for communities that the Parliamentarians never inhabited.

Secondly, since the World Federalists offer no alternative to the capitalist social order and since war is an integral part of said social order, what government could the super state wage war on for the purpose of relieving the insoluble contradictions of capitalism? And so there would be literally millions of people unemployed; if the World Federalist schemes were ever applied. Is this unstable situation worth fighting for? No, it is not!

An even worst aspect of World Government is that it would be totalitarian. It has been proved that when a government becomes more centralized and acquires more power, it subverts, to the best of its ability, the rights of its people. Who could deny, for example, that the strongly centralized Soviet Government is far more oppressive than the Czarist administrations.

Likewise, the American Government as soon as it strengthened itself, encroached on our elementary liberties. Before Congress passed the Smith Act, with Roosevelt's approval, the United States government did not prosecute a radical for merely holding unorthodox opinions. Now, however, both the Trotskyists and the Stalinists have been convicted under the Smith Act without committing overt acts. And Roosevelt contended, that he and his associates increased State power to protect the downtrodden from the economic royalists.

A World Government would even demand more submission on the part of the people than the two previous governments mentioned. This is so because a super-state would be omnipotent. As Lord Acton said "power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

For these reasons, Anarchists oppose the creation of a World State. On the other hand, they advocate the formation of Federated Communes, communes that would make their own decision on affairs that affect them and them alone. And Anarchists state that all communes should participate in making decisions on problems that require an international solution.

With a third world war on the horizon it is absolutely im-

A New Ally

"We are governed by what you find in the bottom of dead beer glasses that whores have dunked their cigarettes in." From a character in Hemingway's ATRAITT

No single event in recent months depicts so candidly the hypocritical opportunism and impersonal materialism of governments and the odious authoritarians who rule them as the current pact between Spain and the United States. Of this infamous act, I feel only disgust for the apathetic Americans and a profound sorrow for the long suffering Spanish people. This partnership in crime by two heroic patriots (they have the medals to prove it) forms an ugly comparison with the Hitler-Stalin pact of rather short memory. Thus once more is demonstrated the cruelty and dishonesty and plain nonsense of so-called Christian morality and democratic statesmanship. The decaying regime of Franco is given financial aid by the desperate power-lusted timocrats of Washington in their fight against "World Communism" (whatever that is). This murderer, Franco, resting his head on the cancerous breast of the Mother Church, commands, without mercy, the lives of the sick and hungry children of joyless Spain. He now has the opportunity to suck dry the ample bosom of the U.S. Treasury, while the starved babies of dying mothers are buried in the cold ground, a ground blessed, of course, by the satiated priests.

Why must the innocent suffer again? Because, for one, in America the four high Inquistors — McCarthy, McCarren, Spellman and Sheen — along with wealthy Catholic politicians, pressed the scheming Dulles to make the arrangements which now allows American bombers to be based on a land (wet with the blood and tears of Franco's victims) from which will fly the death planes, with their germs and

nepalms and A-bombs, to bring terrible doom to the defenseless Russian peasant and worker, while the hateful Party commissars go safe and sound underground paying homage to God . . . or should I say, Stalin?

Does this not give cogent evidence to the fact that Eisenhower was and is as inhuman as Franco. If Franco's planes bombed civilian areas — did not Eisenhower's do likewise? If the butcher of Castile ordered young boys to kill and die against their will did not Eisenhower also commit so soulless a crime? If the Catholic destroyed families, devastated the land, and then went to Church to pray — did not the Protestant beat his chest too? If the Falangists form Franco's Gestapo — what do the agents of the F.B.I. constitute? (Or well might have called them, Big Brother's Boy Scouts.) And would it be impertinent to ask, who, of these two Atilas, is personally responsible for more pain and suffering, death and destruction? History may never record the exact figures to compare; but, perhaps, those in misery may not wait for the future historians to quibble over numbers . . . they, the suppressed millions, might arise; they, themselves, to write finis to the last book of tyrants; they, once free, to write a new testament.

The sickness than will surely pass, so leave us be awake to its departure. Let us, we who have not betrayed them, join with our Spanish brothers to erase the stains of government, of violence, of authority from the garments of humanity. And, remember, if the tyrant parts, his priests will be entombed with him. So to Eisenhower, I say; — perhaps I had better not say. As for Franco, who dreams of himself as another, as a modern Caesar, I must cry out with the chorus of his slaves, "Oh brave Brutus! where art thou?"

—RUSSELL ROEMMELE

the One-Man Revolution

"The end justifies the means" seems to be the attitude of most radicals and conservatives in their pursuit of that illusive goal: success. The bourgeois seeks security with a one-ulcer job with a pension in view, or subsidies from the government and/or especial contracts with the connivance of crooked politicians. If in the armed services he obtains a bullet proof job,

and depending upon his prejudices, he has the satisfaction of humiliating those whom he has been brought up to feel are inferior to him.

The radical is often envious of the wealthy man. If he really had the right conception of values he would know that the rich man is only a poor man who has money. True wealth and true security consists in not be-

Continued on page 3

perative for thinking individuals to make a choice between programs of the World Federalists and Anarchists. We strongly feel that thinking human beings, if they examine the two philosophies candidly and carefully, will choose Anarchism.

—JOHN GOLDSTEIN

God is

Demopheles — You have been told that there is no God and you have also been told that we do not, or cannot, know if there is a God and you have also been told that there is a God and that He can be reached; but verily I say unto you: there is a God, but He cannot be reached.

Philalethes — If He cannot be reached, how is He related to us?

Demopheles — God has the same relationship to our souls that the sun has to its planets. God is like a magnetic pole with a gravitational pull that is strong enough to keep it's opposite pole (the soul) from flying away aimlessly and weak enough not to destroy it by pulling it against itself.

Philalethes — Your analogy is not so good.

Demopheles — Analogies are seldom, if ever, perfect. But it might be better to say that God is like a magnetic pole possessing a gravitational force that is simultaneously centripetal and centrifugal. This force is both negative and positive. It both pulls and pushes away.

Philalethes — I don't see such a pull being exercised in modern times.

Demopheles — You have been told by a great thinker — Nietzsche that God is dead and that we have killed him. This is not precisely the case. What we have done is to turn

our backs to a road whose destination cannot be reached. The corpse that Nietzsche saw was not God but Christian Morality. He was therefore, on this occasion — speaking as a cultural historian, not as a philosopher.

Philalethes — Nietzsche was right, however, when — as a critic — he questioned our moral values. We cannot, or should not, assume the existence of a "moral order" a priori as an unquestioned premise. The great philosopher, poet, artist, psychologist, prophet and saint was annoyed by the lack of intellectual integrity in those who would invoke God to cut discussion short. I say that if God is not dead he should be done away with.

Demopheles — You have been told by a great rebel — Bakunin — that God can be abolished. This is not quite true. Bakunin was wrong as Christ was wrong when he told you that if a part of your body "offend thee" you should "cut it off". What we actually do is repress part of ourselves in our endeavor to save the other parts. But repression does not destroy. That much Freud has told you.

Philalethes — Bakunin was right, however, when he protested against the moral oppression of the Church — an authoritarian institution that claims the right to interpret for us the will of God. Do you consider yourself an agnostic?

Demopheles — No. I say that God is.

Philalethes — Do you mean to

valued and measured by those whose ethical aims are the opposite of ours. In this spirit we can take difficulties in our stride. Instead of the attitude that "no one is telling me what to do", "I'm not going to let that loafer mooch on me", etc., etc., we will daily evaluate our actions in that golden rule of the true radical: From each according to his ability and to him according to his need." Then there is no possessiveness, there is less of animosity, there is more of the feeling of brotherhood of which we sing and of which our best poetry is composed. It is the acceptance of bourgeois standards by us radicals which causes us to be uncharitable to our "mooching" brother. When we view our daily actions in the light of the sacrificial lives of Berkman, Malatesta, Debs and Gandhi we will approach that care-free courageous spirit of the old time Wobblies that laughed at prison bars and job security.

By Ammon Hennacy

say that God exists?

Demopheles — I don't use the phrase "God exists" because existence is a process of becoming and God doesn't seem to be becoming anything.

Philalethes — Nietzsche castigated those agnostics who are "worshippers of the Unknown and Mysterious as such". What right have they to "adore a question mark as God?" If God is what you say He is, why should we adore Him?

Demopheles — Saying that God "is" is not the same as saying that we should adore him. A God that makes our existence miserable does not deserve our adoration.

Philalethes — You offer no consolation then?

Demopheles — No, but I provoke thought.

Philalethes — That reminds me that Nietzsche also asked: "Why could not the unknown be the Devil?"

Demopheles — Nietzsche's own irreverent agnosticism can be discerned in his intimation that God is unknown. He was wrong in this because, whether we call "it" God or Devil, "it" is not completely unknown. We do have a **partial** knowledge of it. We do know,

at least, that it exercises a pull. A pull that splits personalities and makes "schizophrenics" of most of us.

Philalethes — A Freudian can plainly see that a person's belief in God is nothing more than the transference of an emotion which was repressed within the family when that person was a child.

Demopheles — That may be true of the anthropomorphic God. The God that is called Father or Lord. But it is not true of the God I have conceived. And besides, Freud's "libido" is nothing more than **one** manifestation of the basic force.

Philalethes — You're right. But the basic drive of our existence is the will to power. Our chaotic passions, our "split personalities" are manifestations of this basic force. As you said, Christ was wrong in urging us to cut off offending parts. Freud demonstrated that the libido can be sublimated. Nietzsche, before him, maintained that **all** of our chaotic passions (including the sex drive), being manifestations of the will to power, can be organized, controlled and **employed** (not

Continued on page 4

In This I Am Free

"You are the Kings of Kings, King of stones and and stars, King of the waves of the sea, But you are not my master. I am my own freedom. No sooner had you created me than I ceased being yours." Sartre in "The Flies."

God is an irrelevancy! I don't need Him: I never did. But alas, oh alas, I did not know of that until now. After so long a search, the hours of endless woe, I now stand firmly as a man who has forsaken his God. This was a profound despair in the beginning; but it is a remorse no more; nay, it is an ultimate faith, the kind of resolved confidence that comes only after the deepest disillusionment. I have lost my God; I have lost my Master — and in this I am free! The tyrant is vanquished; I have renounced the world's servitude by renouncing the God Who created it — and in this I am free! A horrible memory of fear and trembling has collapsed a non-entity in the bottomless abyss of the unconscious, to disturb not again, a remembrance of a thing past — and in this I am free! Where a kingdom flourished, castles of opulent grandeur, multifarious armies of purple robed priests, is today a wasteland, a miasmal no man's land. My God is but a markless tombstone among the fallen monuments of other once proud

rulers. A graveyard where time never moves on, where not so far away kneel the sick, the suffering, and the guilty. I hear their moans of misery, the unlisted dead. I remember lying prostrated and condemned before my unseen, unmerciful Lord. I too cried out in torment. I too was given a choice . . . God or Man. I can in agony recall the anguish, the dread in that choice . . . Either God or Man! I made my commitment. Thus I now stand alone in a world of cruelty, absurdity, and tyranny. And in my solitude I see those who have abandoned their manhood for salvation, a meaningless heaven. But I see also, however faintly, those few and tragic souls who have affirmed themselves by dethroning God from mind. To them as to me the nightmare of terror is at last ended; fear of the Unknown is evaporated. All that remains is the mud of slavery and the tears of freedom. Thus I cry out in sorrow for a world in bonds. My life appears as an open, bleeding wound. I shall bear whatever my involvement in freedom intuits. Perhaps, because of this, I shall be forever alone; and the masses will go to their Paradise. But I must not follow the masses to their celestial realm: I must walk with the few to Hell — and in this I am free!

—RUSSELL ROEMMELE

The One Man Revolution

Continued from page 2

ing a slave to material possessions. As Thoreau said of the farmer: he thought he owned the cow but the cow owned him for he could not get away from milking her twice a day.

The radical who puts his trust in building up organizations of unions, political parties, or in pressure groups to push conservatives and the great mass of gadget-minded mediocres into following his program works himself also into ulcers or he becomes the tired radical.

We should attempt our Utopia ideal in the spirit of Malatesta who said that it did not matter just how our future society could be run or how we would gain that society but the problem was how much each day we could make our actions tend toward that anarchist ideal that mattered. Here indeed is a goal that is far away yet near; one whereby we can assure our own success rather than have our actions

Felix says . . .

"There is no sacrifice too hard to bear to protect the freedom and dignity of the individual." These true words came recently from the lips of Dwight Eisenhower, a man whose entire adult life has been devoted to sacrificing the freedom and dignity of millions of individuals. This is indeed irony in its most hideous form. The executioner reciting the fifth commandment! Or, as Hennacy would put it: "The butcher putting a vegetarian sign on the window."

In the October issue of the *Catholic Worker* Dorothy Day quotes some notes by Ammon Hennacy in which Ammon refers to yours truly as "Felix the atheist Anarchist". I don't mind being called an atheist, but I consider myself an Anarchist period. I don't feel the need to put an adjective in front of the word Anarchist.

Having nothing else to do the other night, I took a walk to Union Square to see what was going on. There was no Anarchist speaker there that night, so things were pretty dull. On one side of the park I saw some Party Hacks teaching some Good Americans the Facts of Life, but adding the Bunk. Green Spiders and Scarlet Skunks. On the other side of the park — a group of Bums.

I was about to leave when I chanced to meet my old friend Mr. Rigidly Stolid, the smart and erudite Marxist theoretician. His appearance brought back fond memories. I could never forget his wise and kindly advice. "Son," he once said to me, "everything depends on the structure of the dialectical process." These words have been a source of consolation for me throughout the years.

Mr. Stolid was once a Trotskyite, but he left the Trotskyist Party because the Party was not truly Trotskyist. He eventually gave up Trotskyism altogether because Trotsky was not a Marxist. He then spent a couple of years with the International Socialist League.

(Note: The names of some of the organizations mentioned in this story are fictitious. So is the name of the Hero. Any resemblance to persons living or dead is a dirty shame.)

The International Socialist League spends most of its time, year after year, at the job of electing committees and functionaries, revising its constitution, refuting the charges of bureaucracy made by its Chicago faction, passing resolutions, and debating the fine points of par-

liamentary procedure. In spite of all this, the League does manage to put out a mimeographed sheet filled with quotations from the N. Y. Times.

Mr. Stolid is today the leading functionary (and only member) of the Genuine Revolutionary Socialist Working Class Party (U.S.A.). This party is the only true honest-to-goodness Marxist party in the whole world. All other parties or groups using the name Socialist are either Right Opportunist or Left Sectarian and are therefore, (objectively) agents of the capitalist class. As Marx said in a letter to Schmugelman: "A People's Army is an army with people in it." (Collected Letters and Fragments of Scribbled Paper Pads. Vol. 3, P. 69)

The G.R.S.W.C.P.U.S.A. is the vanguard of the proletariat. Altho Mr. Stolid is the only member, he is not the only General-Without-An-Army around these parts. And altho Mr. Stolid is a respectable businessman (he owns a chain of liquor stores) his party, nevertheless, represents the true interests of the working class. All those who disagree with this are petit-bourgeois, just as petit-bourgeois as the workers in his liquor stores.

It was nice meeting Mr. Stolid again. I enjoyed the verbal battle which lasted for hours. Besides, I didn't have the 68 cents to go see a movie.

God Is

Continued from page 3

repressed) by means of sublimation or spiritualization until a **transfiguration** is attained. It takes a great deal of suffering to do this. He who can do it becomes the **Superman**. The will to power sublimates itself! Self-overcoming — that is all we can do.

Demopheles—You're right about sublimation, but let us go farther. Let us go beyond all secular thought. Schopenhauer's "will" and Nietzsche's "will to power", that's as far as secular thought has gone concerning the basic force (essence) of all things. The "essence" that these two philosophies recognized as the basic force is only the primitive, pagan, subjective side of the **Will to God**. Nietzsche's monistic "will to power" (sublimated or otherwise) is the subjective side of the drive toward something — "something greater than which cannot be conceived" — the Supreme Power, in short, God. This subjective drive exists because God wills it. The will to God is caused by the will of God.

—F. O.

At The Flea Circus or Between the Dog-faced Boy and the Human Pincushion

Is there a psychiatrist at the show? Or an empathetic vet in the house? Help is needed for a young neurotic crow — quickly, cheap, cheap, cheap!

Something loose in the bird-brain of this brainy bird? Absurd, absurd, absurd! But sad, too.

It isn't her fault but her mother's and no other's. For ma could have delivered her in Central Park, instead of on the steps of The New York Public Library where she was influenced, during her formative years, by the lions at the entrance and has, since, preened herself because of the purple sheen on her feathers. Most crows know nothing of silver spoons, but this one has read books and scorns corn. "It is all right for peasant pheasants and PIGEONS" Nothing but wheat germ for her. "Must watch my figure."

Somehow, I think she would have pulled through all right, if it wasn't for those trips to Union Square and Washington Park during her adolescence. (A crow, quoting Marx, in the parks'. A boid reading Freud, absoid'.)

But she did, this kid, until one day, a dove flew above her head and believing him to be the holy ghost, she proclaimed herself one of the elect — an arteest of some kind, or other. Looking down her beak at the birds who study rhumba at MacLevy's from the window sills, she stationed herself on the frame of Martha Graham's fenetre and learned 'Modern Dance', "The intellectual ballet, you know!" (And her just a crow with two left feet and taut talons — a choreographic crow, it's enough to make terpsic, hic, sicker!) She claims to have turned down a job at Radio City Music Hall, "It isn't art, that's all. Isadora, I adore her, wouldn't do it!"

One day out of loneliness, she joined a group of bourgeois

pigeons on an organized sight-seeing flight to the Bronx Zoo and, there, met her fate. None other must be her mate, but a king, Old Baldy, the fiercest eagle beating his wings against the roof of the giant cage. That night, she went home to the Library, weeping crow tears and fell asleep perched on a copy of Proudhon. She awoke shouting, "Down with cages!" and tried to organize a group of birds to help work out a plan for releasing their feathered brothers. But they were too full of popcorn to listen and were heerden-volk, anyway who thought "Cages are good places for eagles and there should be a Bellevue for mad crows!"

When I found her she was in a sad state writing odes, to Old Baldy such as the example we use in the act; "Nobody, not even the wind, has such strong wings" Has a flavor of e.e. cummings, what? After a few cozy conversations, I convinced her that she could do more for that eagle by taking a job. She immediately thought of the Met, but, what the hell, she's no philomel! So here we are with an eight weeks' contract and a specialty act that has been drawing the crowd and the moola and me drinking her brand of hooch so that we can paste the labels, with the picture of her pa, all over the props. But, tonight, my cawing Prima Donna, La Belle Corbeille, refuses to go on. With matinees and all, she hasn't had time to visit Old Baldy and besides, she says, because of her purple blood, she is too good for the Flea Circus.

Is there a psychiatrist at the show? Or an empathetic vet, in the house?

— Hyacinthe Hill

Continued from page 1

ments are not instituted to bring about peace and prosperity. As Randolph Bourne so eloquently stated, "War is the Health of the State." We the people are the only ones who can engender peace. It is time we did so.

INDIVIDUAL ACTION
Apt. 2F, 15 Sheridan Square
New York 14, N. Y.

Sec. 34.66 P.L.&R.



Postmaster: Return postage guaranteed