

STUDI STORICI E POLITICI

4



FONDAZIONE LUIGI FIRPO
CENTRO DI STUDI SUL PENSIERO POLITICO

STUDI STORICI E POLITICI

4

GUSTAV LANDAUER

A BIBLIOGRAPHY (1889-2009)

Edited with an Introduction by
GIANFRANCO RAGONA



ROMA 2011
EDIZIONI DI STORIA E LETTERATURA

Prima edizione: luglio 2011

ISBN 978-88-6372-331-1

Le attività della Fondazione Luigi Firpo
sono sostenute da



*È vietata la copia, anche parziale e con qualsiasi mezzo effettuata
Ogni riproduzione che eviti l'acquisto di un libro minaccia la sopravvivenza di un modo di trasmettere la conoscenza*

Tutti i diritti riservati

EDIZIONI DI STORIA E LETTERATURA

00165 Roma - via delle Fornaci, 24

Tel. 06.39.67.03.07 - Fax 06.39.67.12.50

e-mail: info@storiaeletteratura.it

www.storiaeletteratura.it

CONTENTS

<i>Introduction</i>	VII
<i>Methodological note</i>	XIX
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	XXIII
<i>Bibliography 1889-2009</i>	3
<i>Indexes</i>	141

INTRODUCTION

1. *Gustav Landauer: notes on his life (1870-1919).*

Gustav Landauer was born in Karlsruhe in 1870, the third son of Hermann (1837-1900) and Rosa Neuburger (1845-1927). He showed an outstanding aptitude for study at a very early age and obtained his secondary school certificate from the prestigious *Großherzogliche Gymnasium* in 1888. He then began his university career in Heidelberg, Berlin and Strasbourg, but he soon put an end to it, caught up with a genuine ethical enthusiasm for civil commitment.

In 1891 he chose the capital of the Reich as his home, where he was immersed in the political debate that blossomed again with the suspension of the Anti-Socialist Laws that Bismarck had enforced in 1878. He became involved with the «young» Social Democrats lined up as opposition within the SPD in the name of a partly simplistic yet clear line: refusal of any collaboration with the State, criticism of parliamentarism and hostility towards the party's bureaucracy. Expelled during the Erfurt congress (1891), the group of the «Jungen» contributed to the foundation of the *Verein des Unabhängigen Sozialisten* (Association of Independent Socialists), to which anarchic fringes subscribed that were active in Berlin in particular. They created a propagandistic body, «Der Sozialist», of which Landauer – one of the few German revolutionaries of his generation who became anarchic without ever having been an active member of social democracy – was first of all a regular collaborator and later a real leader, even in the five-year period after the dissolution of the *Verein* (1894). In those years of highly charged discussions and frenetic activity, which didn't escape the attention of the political police, causing him repeated arrests and periods of detention, he took part in the Second International conferences in Zurich (1893) and London (1896), where the break between anarchism and political socialism occurred once and for all.

He soon obtained a certain notoriety on a European level. In October 1898, on the pages of the French periodical «La Revue Blanche», enliv-

ened by an avant-garde libertarian spirit that united prominent cultural figures at the time, including Toulouse-Lautrec, Claude Debussy, Paul Verlaine and André Gide, there was in fact an article that presented twelve portraits of some of the most active revolutionaries of the time in rapid succession, amongst which Pëtr Kropotkin, Errico Malatesta, Bernard Lazare and Élisée Reclus. The pen of the trade unionist Achille Steens, swept along by an imaginative enthusiasm, also sketched the figure of Landauer, the «Teutonic knight of anarchy», in no uncertain terms.

He has contributed enthusiasm in the tenacious fight of ideas, in which Liebknecht was now groping around, limiting himself to just giving advice. He had the courage to rebel against the subservience of the workers' parties of Germany, mainly Marxist and led by the old-style manager, regimented and dominating at will [...]. Resembling Christ, brightened up by the brilliance of his clear blue eyes. His black beard, shaven into a horseshoe; his hair dishevelled and fluctuating like a wave following the movements of his head. He is tall, diaphanous, muscular and exuberant; he nurtures the enthusiasm for his ideas and the cult of human pain and will be a martyr, if the holocaust becomes necessary for him, of a cause to which he has already offered up his life¹.

After about a decade of real commitment, the crisis of the revolutionary movement in Germany, which coincided with the polemics about 'revisionism', nevertheless led Landauer to a period of retreat and study. He collaborated temporarily with *Neue Gemeinschaft*, an association founded by the brothers Heinrich and Julius Hart from the point of view of spreading the ideals of communitarianism, cloaked however with a religious afflatus that he couldn't share. He stayed in London for a few months, where he met Kropotkin, whose main works he would go on to translate and distribute in the German speaking world. He resumed public activity in 1907, publishing his best-known and original work, *Revolution*. The following year, motivated by the results of certain lectures that had achieved great success – in 1911 they would be turned into a book entitled *Call to socialism* – he founded the Socialist Alliance and revived «Der Sozialist», making it into its official body. The organisation aimed to create free and self-managed communities to support the move towards an anarchic and socialist society, two ideal and political perspectives that weren't remotely opposites for Landauer: «We anarchists – by and large I also include the individualists who call themselves mutualists – are social-

¹ ACHILLE STEENS, *Des Révolutionnaires*, «La Revue Blanche», vol. XVII (October 1898), p. 179. Cf. the study by PAUL-HENRI BOURRELIÉ, *La Revue Blanche. Une génération dans l'engagement. 1890-1905*, Paris, Fayard, 2007. In the text of this brief introduction the use of notes is reduced to a minimum; for the reconstruction of the political and intellectual path of Landauer please refer to G. RAGONA, *Gustav Landauer. Anarchico, ebreo, tedesco*, Roma, Editori Riuniti University Press, 2010.

ists since we cannot really imagine a future society [...] without mutual help, community, solidarity, brotherhood»².

Tenacious and strict pacifist during World War II, which sanctioned the end of the Alliance and «Der Sozialist», he took part in the revolutionary events that passed through Europe after the defeat of the central empires, becoming People's Commissar for Enlightenment and Public Instruction during the first stage of the Soviet Republic of Bavaria proclaimed on 7th April 1919, on his forty-ninth birthday. The revolution was quickly defeated. The *Freikorps* took Munich on 1st May of that year, injuring and killing hundreds of men and women. Landauer was arrested and transferred to Stadelheim prison the following day, meeting with the 'martyrdom' that had been prophesied twenty years earlier on the pages of «La Revue Blanche». The platoon of soldiers that escorted him became the protagonist of the barbaric assassination of one of the lucid minds of the revolution.

His ideas remained, condensed in a vast harvest of articles and essays that appeared in newspapers and publications, as well as in three more extensive works, which summarised some of the crucial aspects of his political meditation.

2. *The ideal conception.*

In May 1895 an anonymous brochure entitled *One way for the liberation of workers* was distributed in Berlin, which Landauer soon claimed as his own³. The work was a decisive turning point in the formation process of his ideas. It in fact put forward a propositional view of anarchism at a time when the 'propaganda by deed' was still vital, a strategy that had gripped some waves of the international anarchic movement in the last few decades of the nineteenth century, inclined to justify political homicides, assassination attempts on heads of state and government and police officials, or more generally prepared to exercise a real bomb policy to fuel terror in the meeting places of the upper classes. The text was a finishing line of the first stage of his reflection, but also provided the theoretical framework of the consumer cooperative *Befreiung* (meaning 'liberation'), established in Berlin on 1st October 1895.

The short volume expressed in no uncertain terms the anti-parliamentary choice of the young Landauer, whilst recognising a primacy to economic action as a way to liberate labour through the creation of as-

² G. LANDAUER, *Anarchismus-Sozialismus*, «Der sozialistische Akademiker», II (December 1896), 12, pp. 751-754, the quotation is on p. 754.

³ [G. LANDAUER], *Ein Weg zur Befreiung der Arbeiterklasse*, Berlin, Verlag von Adolf Marreck, 1895, pp. 30; he claimed to be the author of the brochure in *Arbeiter aller Länder, vereinigt euch!*, «Der Sozialist», V (28th September 1895), 7, p. 39.

sociations of autonomous producers from capitalism within the confines of existing society. It was a view that, on one hand, was based on the lesson of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon – the French thinker had strenuously defended the hypothesis of creating ‘popular banks’ handing out ‘free credit’. However, on the other hand, it seemed to anticipate the future developments of the revolutionary syndicalism, which would only make itself known in Germany several years later.

Landauer’s plan was outlined as follows: workers would gradually have to win social power through establishing cultural, consumer and productive communities and organisations, not already set up for the conquest of political power, a deed that at most would have replaced the rule of a political class with that of the «so-called revolutionaries who, in an amateurish way, with dictatorial decrees, attempted to make the socialist society come out of nothing»⁴. First of all, it would have been necessary to create consumer cooperatives, which would then spark off production cooperatives. These institutions would have enabled workers to free themselves from exploitation, giving concrete proof of the possibility of regulating the production and distribution of goods in line with the principles of mutual support, solidarity and equality. Landauer didn’t intend to foment the illusion that this strategy alone was able to overthrow the system, creating a perfect society as if by magic. However, he did believe that a serious proposal of ‘transition’ couldn’t limit itself to magically conjuring up the dawn of a new day, capable of brightening up the debris left by a sudden and violent act of revolution. Instead, the future had to be prepared in the present conditions, creating ‘internal colonies’ in every state. The image of society that originates from it wasn’t fixed beyond time and space since it dealt with organising communities structured on the social division of labour and tasks, respecting the different skills of the individual and the collective needs, whilst resolutely excluding the reintroduction of any kind of exploitation. Landauer therefore rejected the apologia of the destructive mass revolt praised in the past by Bakunin and the deterministic and scientist nature of democratic socialism, disagreeing with an ethical idea of the revolution, which didn’t expect anything from the ‘development’, but attracted the active involvement of men in the issue.

The perspective was further explored in time and was clearly outlined at last in the essay on the *Revolution*⁵, published at the height of a political phase in which the majority of the socialist forces or those with socialist tendencies of Europe had renounced the same idea that the revolution was not only possible, but even desirable. Between the nineteenth and twentieth century, the German Social Democratic Party had put the plan

⁴ [LANDAUER], *Ein Weg zur Befreiung der Arbeiterklasse*, p. 8.

⁵ G. LANDAUER, *Die Revolution*, Frankfurt a.M., Rütten & Loening, 1907.

of the radical subversion of the dominant social organisations on the back burner: the dividing debate on revisionism of the Marxism doctrine, with criticism of the theory of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall (capitalism for Eduard Bernstein and followers wasn't destined at all to collapse) and the hypothesis of the growing impoverishment of workers (who, on the contrary, had seen their material living conditions improve over the decades), had opened the way to integration policies of the worker movement in a system that, if democratized, would have *evolved* into socialism. It's no coincidence that the Social Democrats, who played a hegemonic role also in the heart of the Second International, at that time read and made people read – thereby forcing an interpretation – the famous political testament of Friedrich Engels, the 1895 *Introduction* to Karl Marx's *The Civil War in France*. In the work the authoritative 'co-founder' of historic materialism judged that access to power by the proletariat would be allowed to happen peacefully and respectful of formal democracy due to the mediation of a powerful mass party. It dealt with opinions that poorly concealed an immense faith in history and progress, where you could make out a direction, the fatal exhaustion of the driving force of capitalism and the necessary socialization of production methods, at least in the better developed national structures.

In German social democracy and international socialism the positions were certainly more structured, but the writings of Rosa Luxemburg, especially her 1906 work, *The Mass Strike, the Political Party and the Trade Unions*, concentrated on the Russian revolution of the previous year, which for a moment had given the impression of being able to reopen that long cycle of socialist transformation of the world remaining in the blood of the Paris Commune of 1871, and Landauer's utterances represented the theoretical expression of the minorities.

In fact, *Revolution* used and developed a lexicon common to the oppositions of the left of the time; the revolution wasn't a deed, but a process that contained a spiritual dimension directed at a vast intellectual and moral reform. It showed off men as active subjects of the issue, not mere tools in the hands of providence, when this was also presented in the guise of the divine spirit, as it was called from time to time, Reason, Liberty, Progress. However, above all, Landauer's essay was a source of scandal for the original take on modernity that it proposed. Contrary to what the revolutionaries had always believed, the revolution wasn't a fact but an age, a long transition that began at the end of the Middle Ages and the Protestant Reformation, but which had not yet been fulfilled. From this viewpoint, the single revolutionary event, always recurring in modernity, was reduced to a «miracle of heroism», in which the possibilities of the future suddenly manifested themselves until that latent moment.

The «spirit of regeneration», to which the author referred, or rather the community of ideals, reasons for living and high objectives, would

nevertheless have only appeared when we had begun, even on a small scale, to build not so much happy oases hidden away from the gazes of power and the market in hostile realities, but pieces of a big, ideal collage: socialism. Landauer expressed an ethic of emancipation in this way; the rational foreshadowing of the future city, shown in terms of longing and possibility, had to enable the means of collective actions to be coherently derived. The spirit would therefore have materialized in community institutions, capable of producing useful values needed for the life of the individual in a cooperative and harmonious form. Accompanied by the intuitions of his friend and brother-in-arms Martin Buber, who he met in Berlin at the beginning of the century, Landauer didn't imagine these communities as pre-socials; on the contrary, they were original forms of cohabitation in contrast to the bourgeois and capitalistic society, in which the majority was reduced to the cog of a total mechanism of exploitation and oppression by organised minorities. Since his youth, he had looked at the community essence of the individual, never at an autonomous power fighting with equal and contrary powers. He had never viewed the community as a sort of 'super individual', but as a social relationship based on equality, solidarity and life together, in a concrete context capable of enhancing the specific details of each.

Finally, in 1911, Landauer published *Call to socialism*⁶, a work that in many ways betrayed his primogenial nature: a passionate lecture delivered by an orator of undisputed talent, yet unordered and fragmentary. A reasoning based on the main causes of servitude in capitalist society nevertheless emerged in the volume, including, firstly, the private property of the land, which snatched from many the possibility of accessing one of the essential conditions for production, forcing them to depend economically on the owners. Landauer, however, did not stop at this observation, which took in the Romantic or Neo-Romantic waves of nineteenth-century socialism, but also examined the mechanism of the circulation of goods. In an economy distinguished by capitalistic exchange, access to goods – for direct consumption and production – was limited to having money, a special commodity since it could increase in value over time, meaning that the wealthy enjoyed the privilege of limiting and controlling its circulation, always reproducing the same system. A third element at the basis of modern servitude was the surplus value, interpreted as the gap between the price and the effective value of the commodities. It is rather far away from the Marxist idea, according to which it was realised in the production process of commodities due to the conditions caused by class relations, and certainly not in the circulation process.

With a typical anarchic take, Landauer interpreted the society of capital as a whole, which permeated the social and political living conditions.

⁶ G. LANDAUER, *Aufruf zum Sozialismus*, Berlin, Verlag des Sozialistischen Bundes, 1911.

The State played an essential role in guaranteeing the conditions of exploitation, establishing the rules of exchange and access to the property of the land and work tools. But what did the thinker mean by the term ‘capital’? In his opinion, it was a ‘common spirit’ (*Gemeingeist*), or rather an accumulation of knowledge and know-how aimed at satisfying just as many of the primary needs as the spiritual ones, handed down over time and the heritage of the community. Therefore, in short, he didn’t reject the usefulness of capital as it was a relationship between men, «the spirit that unites in its economic reality». In this way, socialism would have preserved it, founding a system in which each man would have worked for himself, but without exploiting the work of others, fully reaping the fruits of his work and freely enjoying the products coming from the division of labour, exchange and work done together. To gain power over the system in force, however, the workers would first of all have to escape the grip of economic and political power by starting to build a sort of ‘counter-society’. This was an element that connected the *Call* not only to his work on the *Revolution*, but also to the old brochure on cooperativism.

Landauer did not concern himself with nominating a specific social subject capable of taking on the transformation; all the individuals who had decided to ‘begin’ and the groups capable of meeting in the consumer and production cooperatives would have founded the first cells of a ‘new population’, bearer of the community spirit and *regeneration*. It dealt with starting a complicated leakage from the existing society and recovery of a relationship with the land and nature, which – he supposed – would have rebuilt the social bond in terms of the community and solidarity; a way that certainly couldn’t intersect with the Marxism that dominated at the time, which presented socialism as a product of the ‘dialectically’ necessary development of capitalism.

On these foundations, this anomalous anarcho-socialist, who always occupied an heretical position also in the framework of contemporary anarchism, formulated an original interpretation of that «surrogate of the community spirit» now quenched, to which the name of the State was attributed; not already a foreign object that coerced individuals and groups, but actually a social relationship corresponding to a developmental stage of modernity, in which men were not yet able to satisfy their needs in an independent way. The State, however, was immortalized, invading the fields of the community self-government whenever it claimed to occupy spaces that the communities were able to manage in the collective interest. In this way, on the ridge that separated the lawful State from the excessive State (Buber’s expressions)⁷ the revolutionaries positioned them-

⁷ See M. BUBER, *Pfade in Utopia*, Heidelberg, Lambert Schneider, 1950; 1st ed. in English: *Paths in Utopia*, New York, Macmillan, 1950. New German edition, ed. Abraham Schapira, Heidelberg, Lambert Schneider, 1985.

selves who, resisting pressures to the contrary, attempted to always push beyond the borderline between effective and possible socialism, working in reality to make the State superfluous, not to destroy it.

In the two years from 1918 to 1919, Landauer proposed this task to the movement of the councils of workers, soldiers and farmers, which attempted without success to give Europe a socialist set-up after the carnage of the war, using means in line with the desired end: the building of a world in which free individual development was a condition of the free development of everyone. This purpose coincided with the old aspirations delivered by Marx to the 1948 *Manifesto*, one of the few texts of 'scientific socialism', which Landauer, in spite of the Anti-Marxism without intercession that had marked the *Call to socialism*, had always greatly admired because the revolutionary enthusiasm hadn't been remotely held back and locked into rigid and fixed formulae.

3. *The intellectual and political legacy.*

After his death, Landauer's memory certainly wasn't abandoned, but his theoretical contribution wasn't adequately appreciated. The foundations for a reflection on his legacy were laid by Buber's work, who prepared an edition of some lectures on Shakespeare in the Twenties, containing literary articles and with a general theme in the anthology *The Future Man* and drafted the most significant speeches on socialism that appeared in *Der Sozialist* between 1909 and 1915, entitled *Beginning*. Lastly, in 1929 he published two massive volumes of *Letters*⁸.

Work on the edition was virtually abandoned for several centuries. It was only at the end of the Sixties, in conjunction with the explosion of the youth protests in Europe, that new collections were prepared. Exceptions aside, they were never critical or scientific publications and articles and essays were often printed without any reference to the original edition and context in which they were written. At times they were mere reprints of the works edited by Buber in the Twenties⁹. In the mid Seventies, Ulrich Linse's collection was an exception, focusing on the period of

⁸ Cf. G. LANDAUER, *Shakespeare. Dargestellt in Vorträge*, ed. Martin Buber, 2 voll., Frankfurt a.M., Rütten & Loening, 1920; ID., *Der werdende Mensch. Aufsätze über Leben und Schrifttum*, ed. M. BUBER, Potsdam, Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1921 (new edition entitled *Der werdende Mensch. Aufsätze über Literatur*, with an essay by ARNOLD ZWEIG, Leipzig/Weimar, Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1980); ID., *Beginnen. Aufsätze über Sozialismus*, ed. M. Buber, Köln, Marcan-Block-Verlag, 1924 (anastatic reprint Wetzlar, Büchse der Pandora, 1977); *Gustav Landauer. Sein Lebensgang in Briefen*, ed. M. BUBER, 2 voll., Frankfurt a.M., Rütten & Loening, 1929.

⁹ Cf. G. LANDAUER, *Zwang und Befreiung. Eine Auswahl aus seinem Werk*, ed. Heinz-Joachim Heydorn, Köln, Verlag Jakob Hegner, 1968; *Entstaatlichung. Für eine herrschaftslose Gesellschaft*, ed. HANS-JÜRGEN VALESKE, Telgte-Westbevern, Büchse der Pandora, 1976; *Erkenntnis und Befreiung. Ausgewählte Reden und Aufsätze*, ed. RUTH LINK-SALINGER (HYMAN), Frankfurt a.M., Suhrkamp Verlag, 1976.

the Bavarian Revolution; works and lectures from 1918–19 appeared for the first time, together with a selection of letters taken from the edition of correspondence from 1929 and documents referring to Landauer's work as People's Commissar¹⁰.

The studies were resumed a decade later with the edition of some youth writings drawn up by Ruth Link-Salinger. In spite of the fact that a solid historical interpretation is also missing in this case, the work was pioneering, casting light on a time overlooked thus far of Landauer's career. Siegbert Wolf moved in the same footsteps, including some of the main articles of the Nineties in a 1989 volume dedicated to a Landauerian reflection on anarchism¹¹. These contributions encouraged the resumption of the discussion; symposia dedicated to Landauer were in fact organised due to the new documentation. The first one, organised on 6th and 7th November 1992 by Archiv Bibliographia Judaica and the Institute of German Language and Literature of the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University of Frankfurt am Main, turned the spotlight on his childhood years and the cultural and intellectual influences of his career¹². The second symposium took place in Düsseldorf on 7th April 1995 at the local university named after Heinrich Heine on the 125th anniversary of his birth and was distinguished by the international nature of the works¹³. Last but not least, the Landauerian scholars met at the end of a mobile visual and documentary exhibition, organised by the national theatre of the city of Düsseldorf and which was on show from 27th August to 20th October 1995. The exhibition was also open the following year at the Amsterdam Institute, the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute in the summer and the Munich City Museum in the autumn¹⁴.

For a time the interest generated by the diverse yet converging initiatives seemed to give new vigour to the debate. In 1997, Rolf Kauffeldt and Michael Matzigkeit, in observance of solid standards of expertise, published a homogeneous group of works dedicated to cultural and lit-

¹⁰ *Gustav Landauer und die Revolutionszeit 1918/19. Die politische Reden, Schriften, Erlasse und Briefe Landauers aus der November-Revolution 1918/19*, ed. ULRICH LINSE, Berlin, Karin Kramer, 1974.

¹¹ *Signatur: g.l. – Gustav Landauer im "Sozialist". Aufsätze über Kultur, Politik und Utopie (1892-1899)*, ed. RUTH LINK-SALINGER, Frankfurt a.M., Suhrkamp Verlag, 1986; G. LANDAUER, *Auch die Vergangenheit ist Zukunft. Essays zum Anarchismus*, ed. S. WOLF, Frankfurt a. M., Luchterhand Literaturverlag, 1989.

¹² *Gustav Landauer (1870-1919). Eine Bestandsaufnahme zur Rezeption seines Werkes*, ed. LEONHARD FIEDLER *et al.*, Frankfurt a.M., Campus Judaica, 1995.

¹³ *Gustav Landauer im Gespräch. Symposium zum 125. Geburtstag*, ed. HANNA DELF and GERT MATTENKLOTT, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1997.

¹⁴ "Die beste Sensation ist das Ewige". *Gustav Landauer: Leben, Werk und Wirkung*, ed. MICHAEL MATZIGKEIT, Düsseldorf, Theatermuseum, 1995.

erary criticism¹⁵. In the same year, the first *Complete Works* volume appeared, focused on the writings and lectures on literature, philosophy and Judaism. The project wasn't finished and the volumes announced for 2000 are still in a draft form¹⁶. Very recently, Wolf again edited two volumes of *Selected Writings* grouped together by theme; the first was entitled *Internationalism* and the second *Anarchism*¹⁷.

Overall satisfactory interpretations of Landauer's thoughts have not accompanied these publications thus far. The first study in which the intention to present an analysis of his reflection emerged was in 1967¹⁸. Almost forty years after Landauer's death, Wolf Kalz denounced the lack of an intellectual biography of reference, so as to permit the contextualisation of his theoretical contribution, albeit without being able to fill the gap. He in fact decided to approach the anarchist's thought by isolating the fundamental concepts from the environmental framework of their elaboration. In this way, the thinker's intellectual debts towards the ideas of Proudhon, Bakunin, La Boétie, Kropotkin and Tolstoy were highlighted, but without relating this response to the contemporary political debate.

Some attempts to systematically follow Landauer's career were carried out in the USA. In 1971, Charles B. Maurer at last published a biography with the aim of underlining the mystical aspects of the reflection whilst, however, sidestepping the more strictly political elements¹⁹. Two years later, Eugene Lunn's more in-depth research made an appearance²⁰. Working directly on the sources, the author turned the spotlight on the *relationships* with the intellectual world – in reality with individual eminent (or not) figures – and decisively put forward an interpretative standpoint that emphasised the romantic nature of Landauerian socialism, influenced by George Mosse's investigations into *The Crisis of German Ideology*²¹. Nevertheless, from the claim that the Landauerian anarcho-socialism was *also* influenced and pervaded from romantic elements, even

¹⁵ G. LANDAUER, *Zeit und Geist. Kulturkritische Schriften, 1890-1919*, ed. ROLF KAUFFELDT and M. MATZIGKEIT, München, Boer, 1997.

¹⁶ G. LANDAUER, *Werkausgabe*, Vol. III, *Dichter, Ketzer, Außenseiter. Essays und Reden zu Literatur, Philosophie, Judentum*, ed. HANNA DELF, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1997.

¹⁷ Cf. G. LANDAUER, *Internationalismus. Ausgewählte Schriften. Band 1*, ed. S. WOLF, Hessen, Verlag Edition AV, pp. 334; *Anarchismus. Ausgewählte Schriften. Band 2*, ed. S. WOLF, Hessen, Verlag Edition AV, pp. 399.

¹⁸ WOLF KALZ, *Gustav Landauer. Kultursozialist und Anarchist*, Meisenheim am Glan, Verlag Anton Hain, 1967.

¹⁹ CHARLES B. MAURER, *Call to Revolution. The Mystical Anarchism of Gustav Landauer*, Detroit, Wayne University Press, 1971.

²⁰ EUGENE LUNN, *Prophet of Community. The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press, 1973.

²¹ GEORGE L. MOSSE, *The Crisis of Germany Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*, New York, Grosset & Dunlap, 1964.

adopting mystical tones, it doesn't seem possible to derive that it constituted *the* distinguishing line of his work.

Contrary to the USA, in Europe studies have often turned out to be partial, limited to the examination of his most famous work, *Revolution* (also translated into French and Italian, but not into English so far), or, as in the case of Michael Löwy, included in an original way in a broader analysis of Central European culture²². Only the German Wolf attempted to offer a reconstruction by keeping politics at the centre and identifying an ethic in the anarchist's thought, aimed at the liberation of mankind from exploitation and oppression. He nevertheless restricted himself to publishing an *Introduction* to Landauer's thought and not developing his intuitions any further²³.

This same scholar made the first systematic attempt to create a list of Landauer's writings, essential to find your way around the anarchist's works. This was taken into consideration in this bibliography, but was widely added to and amended²⁴.

GIANFRANCO RAGONA

18th March 2010

²² MICHAEL LÖWY, *Rédemption et utopie. Le judaïsme libertaire en Europe centrale. Une étude d'affinité électorale*, Paris, PUF, 1988.

²³ SIEGBERT WOLF, *Gustav Landauer zur Einführung*, Hamburg, Junius, 1988.

²⁴ Cf. S. WOLF, *Gustav Landauer. Bibliographie*, Grafenau-Döiffingen, Trotzdem Verlag, 1992, and the harsh review of CHRISTOPH KNÜPPEL, *Gustav Landauer. Bibliographie* in «Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung», XXIX (1993), 3, pp. 76-78, whose directions gave me comfort for the attribution of some Landauerian works from 1889/90. I'm also pointing out a partial list of Landauerian titles in RUTH LINK-SALINGER HYMAN, *Gustav Landauer: Philosopher of Utopia*. With a scholarly bibliography "Oeuvres Gustav Landauer" edited by ARTHUR HYMAN, Indianapolis, Hackett Publishing Company, 1978.

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Due to the very character of Landauer's work, the *ongoing* nature of any attempt to create a *complete* bibliography is evident. He wrote for numerous publications, famous and less so; he regularly sent letters to editorials, short reviews or forms, news about the German and international anarchic movement, often not signed with his name. Moreover, extracts, passages and bodies of letters of this vast corpus have been drafted over time into a large number of very contained and high-impact collections, at times limited to the anarchic or anarchizing world, which we can presume couldn't be found in full.

Landauer's works are grouped by year. The comments, in a smaller corpus, specify whether they are reviews, articles, translations or notes that instead of being signed 'Gustav Landauer', 'G. Landauer', 'Landauer' or 'gl.' were signed 'ab', 'xyz', 'y', 'G.L.' or 'l.'. For the attribution, reference was made to the declarations contained in the letter dated 22nd February 1918 addressed to Siegfried Landauer, in which the author noted his contributions to «Der Sozialist. Organ des Sozialistischen Bundes». The document is preserved in *The Jewish National and University Library Jerusalem* (Ms.Var. 432 No. 169) and was cited by Andreas Seiverth in the introduction of the anastatic reprint of the publication (Vaduz, Topos Verlag, 1980, p. XXXV). By extension, and following direct checks, it is presumed that the same acronyms were also used in the previous series of «Der Sozialist». In the letter, Landauer also declared that he had done all the translations as well as the report 'Man schreibt uns'. The report 'Aus der Zeit' was also compiled by the editor, unless stated otherwise. With regard to the translations that appeared in the fortnightly publication, it should be noted that Landauer rarely specified his sources. The editor's comments indicate – in all the cases in which they could be traced – the title and main identification details of the translated work. On the other hand, since in many circumstances it was completely impossible to ascertain which edition he actually used, the original editions are always noted.

As regards the articles and translations that appeared in several parts, the comments are not repeated every time, but only refer to the first part.

Lastly, unsigned articles are included that have been attributed to Landauer based on an analysis of content and style or due to logical deductions. For example, an editorial in «Der Sozialist» on a topic that the thinker had tackled at public assemblies or had discussed in correspondence at that time is undoubtedly attributed to him. However, everything that appeared anonymously in «Der Sozialist» wasn't arbitrarily assigned to him. Every 'uncertain attribution' is highlighted with an appropriate note. The journalistic accounts on Landauer's activities have not been included.

The town of publication of newspapers and journals not published in Berlin is specified. «Der Sozialist» is always stated without the sub-heading so as to avoid making the bibliography pointlessly longer. It is presented as follows:

- *Der Sozialist. Organ der unabhängigen Sozialisten* (Berlin), from 15th November 1891;
- *Der Sozialist. Organ aller Revolutionäre* (Berlin), from 22nd July 1893;
- *Der Sozialist. Organ für Anarchismus-Sozialismus* (Berlin), from 17th August 1895;
- *Der Sozialist. Anarchistische Monatsschrift* (Berlin), from May to December 1899;
- *Der Sozialist. Organ des Sozialistischen Bundes*, from 15th January 1909 at the end of 1915; the formal place of publication was Berne until 15th June 1913, then Berlin. The progressive numbering of the year of publication starts from the beginning again, so it is therefore regarded as a 'new series'.

In the comments reference is made to the collections of writings that appeared after Landauer's death using the designated list of the 'Abbreviations'. Unpublished works or documents not noted in the Bibliography that appear in these anthologies are shown according to the year of first publication. Information concerning the few anthologies printed in non-Latin languages is given according to the year of publication.

All titles are in italics and all interventions by the editor are within the brackets. The names of periodicals are placed in quotation marks. The names of Tolstoj and La Boétie have been standardised, correcting the forms Tolstoi, Tolstoi, Tolstoy, La Boétie etc. Lastly, it should be pointed out that the *Stenographischer Bericht über die Verhandlungen des Kongresses der Arbeiter-, Bauern- und Soldatenräte vom 25. Februar bis 8. März 1919* (München, n.p., 1919) is always cited according to the anastatic edition edited by Gisela Kissel and Hiltrud Witt (Glashütten im Taunus, Verlag Detlev Auvermann, 1974).

I would like to express my gratitude to the Department of Political Science at the University of Turin and to the 'Luigi Firpo' Foundation - Centre for the study of Political Thought for support for this publication. Heartfelt thanks to Laura Fachin, Samantha Novello and Giuliana Zeppegno for their precious help and to Gian Mario Bravo for his constant advice and valuable encouragement.

G. R.

(Translation by Helen C. Farrell)

