Rudolf de Jong

I

Looking backward, in 1984, at the days Orwell wrote his now famous novel about our year 1984, we have to admit that there are many reasons for saying that we have since moved towards an Orwellian state and society, towards a world that is in complete contradiction with everything anarchism stands for. We only have to look at the repression by state, police and special forces everywhere in the world, at the growing militarisation, at the powers of capitalism, at dictatorships and totalitarian regimes in the third world: 'ignorance is strength' and even love of football is based on hate.

However...

Hardly anybody, anywhere, seems to be really in love with the big brothers of America, Russia or China (not to mention their little sister in Great Britain). ~~The~~ There are the smaller big brothers in less powerful nations. Nobody believes that Khomeiny, Gadaffi or Castro - to mention three very different men, each trying to play the big brother in their respective countries - will continue to be accepted and loved, as Orwell expected. (By the way, the existence of smaller nations is already in contradiction with Orwell's predictions).

In fact, with the growtn of the state and control, frustration and protest have grown too, and anarchism has re-emerged.

In 1948, the year in which Orwell wrote his book, anarchism was generally considered as a historical phonomenon, completely out of date, both in western democracies idealising the welfare state and in the world of Stalinism. The only remnants of the old anarchist movement seemed a few old fighters 'just fading away'. The return of the black horse of anarchy in the sixties surprised everybody, including most of the old-timers of the movement.

But was is really a surprise? About the same time that Orwell published his novel a young German scholar, Peter Heinz (not himself an anarchist), published an obscure, small book 'Anarchismus und Gegenwart' (1951), containing an attempt at a libertarian interpre-

tation of the social - and especially the cultural - processes of Western society in those days. The historical movement was dead in Heiz' conception, but modern society was moving towards libertarian models.

And while we have to admid that today Orwell's 1984 is in many ways more realistic than in 1948, we can also recognise a development towards more libertarian relations and ways of life. Heinz, too, seems more realistic today than he was in 1951.

In his 'Anarchismus und Gegenwart' he made a distinction between positive and negative anarchism. The second form is the fight against authority in all its forms and appearances.
According to Heinz the historical anarchist movement, with its conception of the social revolution and class struggle, should be classified under this negative anarchism and belongs to the past.

Positive anarchism is characterised by (all) efforts to create relations, structures and situations without authority or hierarchy (taken together). In 1951 he saw these efforts mainly in the cultural sphere and in science. Today it is easy to see that these efforts are extending to other spheres: man-woman relations, adult-child relations, organisational and action models of action groups and even of more formal organisations, alternative ways of living and subcultures; inside the existing hierarchical structures people tend to accept authority less automatically and are looking and sometimes fighting for less authoritarian structures.

All this 'positive anarchism' emerged without an anarchist movement, even without much - if any - knowledge of anarchist ideas and philosophy.

I would like to make three remarks on this ambiguous situation.

My first remark is that both the vision of Orwell and that of Heinz were partly right. Speaking about the perspective of anarchism there are as many reasons to be optimistic, as there are reasons to

be pessimistic. We just have to admit that the dangers of authoritarianism, with its possibilities to destroy humanity and its environment, to control and dehumanise the individual, has never been so big and threatening.

I think the same ambiguity - optimism and pessimism, hope and despair - is also to be found in the historical movement, even if it is neglected by most historians. Take Peter Kropotkin, for instance. He ends his "Memoirs of a Revolutionary" with some very optimistic pages: he sees anarchism (Heinz' positive anarchism) growing everywhere. George Woodcock, in the chapter on Kropotkin of his book 'Anarchism', tries to explain - using quotations from Kropotkin's articles and public speeches - how and why he became so positive about developments in British society. Martin Miller, on the other hand, who also, used quotations from Kropotkin's letters to his confidential friends, in his biography of Kropotkin shows a much more pessimistic man, sometimes in despair about the growing imperialism and imperialist feelings in England, about the lack of revolutionary and libertarian spirit in the trade unions, etc.

The second remark. The anarchist 'spirit' goes far beyond and is much more important than the existing 'movement'.

That, too, is 'nothing new under the sun'.

(Just look at the novels of B. Traven. Even if we take into consideration that he idealised his heroes, his books show a world full of 'anarchists' without any idea about anarchism.)

Today people are much more aware of informal forms of authorianism in organisations (even if their structure is anti-authoritarian), at schools and in other relations. If we study the organisational history of anarchist and syndicalist groups and trade unions, we have to agree with Robert Michels, who included syndicalist organisation in his study of oligarchical tendencies in socialist organisations: 'Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens'. And a history of the man-woman relations in the anarchist movement of the past will be painful reading today!) The same is true for the relations between children

and parents. Nearly a century ago, Albert Parsons, one of the martyrs of Chicago, wrote in his farewell letter to his children: "obey" your mother.[2] I think it would be difficult to find a man of Parsons' stature among anarchists of our days, but it is unthinkable that an anarchist would write these same workds today.

My third remark concerns the difference between the old anarchists and the present ones.
There used to be a general and coherent vision about existing society and about the foundations of the new societies. Perhaps the way to arrive at the new society was not easy but at least the anarchists could see the road and they had a general idea of what had to be done once the social revolution had cleared the obstacles on the road to feedom.
Today even inside the movement there are no generally accepted conceptions about the anarchist contribution to solve the big problems of today: economic and demographic questions, pollution, automation and work, underdevelopment, etc.

II

I tend to disagree with Heinz' sharp distinction between positive constructive) and negative (destructive) anarchism. Bakunin's famous statement about the urge of destruction also being a constructive urge, dating from his most Hegelian period, can be considered as a fine dialectical synthesis of negative and positive anarchism! (Personally, however, I am not too fond of Hegelian - and other - dialectics).

It remains a fact that anarchists, fighting against many forms of authoritarian rule and structures, had high hopes of 'positive anarchist' effects and results, once the struggle would be over. They hoped en expected that the outcome of the class struggle against capitalism, the fight against political dictatorship, absolutism and oppression, the fight against imperialism and colonial rule was to be a liberation in a libertarian sense; maybe the anarchist dream would not come true entirely, but the least thing that was expected was that a fundamental effort could be made to try and realise it by anarchist ways and means.

The last sentences of Kropotkin's memoirs contain words of hope about the revolution, soon to come, in czarist Russia.
The Dutch anarchists and anti-militarists who influenced the movement between the two World Wars were highly impressed and inspired by the anti-authoritarian and pacifist heritage of the old cultures of China and India. They saw the dangers of authoritarian influences in the anti-colonial struggle but in spite of it, they expected a revival of this old heritage.
In the sixties, at the time of the first wave of independence in Africa, the English review 'Anarchy' published several interesting articles about libertarian characteristics in the cultures of African tribes, such as spontaneity and a capacity to express individual emotions.

Today we know what happened.

The outcome of revolutions and liberations from colonial rule has been a very, very authoritarian form of 'emancipation', without any liberation in the anarchist sense. On the contrary, the new forms of domination, the new states, have turned out to be even more oppressive, more authoritarian than the old rulers had been.

Thus, every victory and revolution has ended in a deep crisis of the anarchist movement, a lot of internal discussions and bitter accusations against the authoritorians who 'took hold of' the revolution and 'poisoned' the so promising fruits of victory.
The Russian and the Spanish revolutions and, to a lesser degree, the Cuban and Algerian ones, and even the Chinese cultural revolution are good exampels of such lost victories or lost hopes.

Anarchist bitterness is understandable. Revolutions have always started as a liberation in the real libertarian sense of the word, with spontaneous non-hierarchical organisations (soviets, collectivisations, selfmanagement) of the workers themselves, creativity, etc. Bitterness - and accusations - are, however, no substitutes for reflections and analyses.

Let me try to make three remarks about this bitterness. The first one is about the differing opinions among anarchists once they get confronted with a revolution. Students of the Russian anarchist movement during the Russian revolution have distinguished three different attitudes among the comrades:

1. the anarcho-bolshevists collaborated with the bolshevists and accepted their 'dictatorship of the proletariat' for the time being.
2. other anarchists completely rejected the new dictatorship of Lenin's party and opposed it as the mortal enemy of the Russian revolution.
3. a third group of anarchists held a position somewhere between: they hoped that the social revolution could survive Lenin's dictatorship.

Of course, many anarchists changed from one position to another in the course of the revolution and in the end only a few anarchists of the second group, who had had the opportunity to leave Russia in time, survived. (Accordingly, their attitude towards the Russian revolution became <u>the</u> attitude of anarchism towards the Russian revolution).

We see the same difference in attitudes - cooperation, benefit of the doubt, rejection - in other revolutions. In Spain it did not come to a split, perhaps because everybody was frustrated about the policy of the CNT-FAI. In the aftermath discussions about the libertarian revolution, devoured by the war, we see the three positions very clearly.[3] Our Italian comrades will certainly remember the discussion about the Cuban libertarian movement in exile - at the international anarchist congress held in Carrara in 1968. And today, here in Venice, I think we all share the same 'mixed feelings' about the Nicaraguan revolution and the Sandinists.

The second remark is about the splendid beginnings of revolutions: the soviets in Russia; the collectivisations in Spain; the 'comités d'action' in 1968 in France; the occupations in Portugal in 1974; the organisation of the arrondissements in Paris during the French revolution and in the first weeks of the Commune; the 'freedom

in the air' in Cuba in the first months of the revolution and in so many other countries liberated from dictatorship or foreign occupation. The same thing happened in the first stages of revolutions which took place before the age of industrialism and modern socialism. (The peasants and Thomas Münzer in Germany, the first baptists in the Netherlands and the Diggers and Levellers in England).
To say that all these promising projects were destroyed by the authoritarian victors of the revolution is too easy an explanation. The revolution~~ary~~ not only had to overcome the (old and new) enemies and difficulties outside, but also had to face a lot of internal problems and often authoritarian developments inside the new (often not authoritarian -) structures.
The inner history of soviets and collectivisations is not necessarily the story of the good guys inside, against the bad ones outside of the new institutions! The construction of a world without authority was never easy. This leads me to a third remark:

Max Nettlau made an interesting distinction between two types of revolutions: if revolutions were preceded by a national defeat in a war, or a long period of dictatorship and hard repression, that had wiped out the more social and free traditions of a country, there was not much to expect from such a revolution.

However, revolution has much more perspective from a libertarian point of view, if it emerges after a long process of preparation, of growing possibilities to express new ideas about freedom and after these ideas have had time to grow and to enter people's minds. According to Nettlau, anarchists, too, had expected too much from the Russian revolution, the child of czarism and the First World War. Of course Nettlau's ideas about revolution are related with his more general conception that (more) freedom is born out of the existing freedom; that freedom has to grow.

III

If Nettlau is right, there is no reason to be optimistic about the anarchist perspectives of revolutions in Latin America and other developing continents. There is a great revolutionary potential everywhere. But the radical conceptions and models of revolutionary intellectuals who are themselves the victims of repression by the

rightist regimes are far removed from anarchism. 'Révolution par l'Etat', revolution through the state, is the title of Louis Mercier Vega's last book. In his analyses he has put such different regimes as those of Castro, Pinochet, Peron and Allende in one context (without neglecting their differences): authoritarian modernisation through 'révolution par l'état'. Most leftists, often calling themselves Marxists, only take an interest in the ideology of the ruling élite. Mercier paid attention to the fact that behind the different ideological façades the same social process was going on. A growing middle class, belonging to or dependent on the state apparatus and using the state to strengthen both the state and its own position in society. We can observe this process of authoritarian modernisation, through a revolution from above, and an increasing role of the state in society, everywhere in development countries.

The archetype was Kemal Atatürk's regime in Turkey. More that 50 years ago Max Nomad (Max Nacht) rightly called this regime the 'missing link between bolshevist Russia and fascist Italy' (Hitler was not yet in power). Atatürk's regime did mean a lot of progress: women's rights, alphabetisation, Europeanisation, separation of state and Islam. At the same time his regime was responsible for the genocide of the Armenians. This 'missing link' is now the standard model of the state in former colonial countries, whatsoever their ideology.
Even if we have, or try to have, an open eye for the positive aspects of these forms of progress and modernisation, they lack every libertarian - or even humanitarian - perspective.

Interesting effects are only to be found among the victims: the peasants in the countryside and the poor in the cities. Struggling for survival and for material improvements they often organise themselves in small-scale basis organisations, based on solidarity, self-help, direct action and participation. When reading about these struggles an anarchist historian feels a 'shock of recognition'. He has to realise, however, that these struggles in the past merely helped to change existing society, but did not destroy it.

If we take Nettlau's remark about freedom growing out of freedom for granted, always and everywhere, we should not expect anything from Eastern European societies, dominated by their 'socialist' states. But I think the picture is more interesting here.

The revolutionary movements and revolts in the years following the death of Stalin in 1953 - to a larger or smaller extent - shocked nearly all the countries of the communist world: in Russia itself in the labour camps; in Czechoslovakia and in the German Democratic Republic; in Poland and in Hungary; in Vietnam figures of 50.000 people killed in the native province of Ho Chi Minh have been mentioned. It was a revolutionary wave only to be compared with that of 1848 and the years following the Russian revolution. It ended in violence and repression everywhere, but it started a long-term process of erosion of authoritarian communism, with several spectecular outbursts (Czechoslovakia, 1968; Poland 1972, and in recent years).

Slowly, too slowly, this erosion process reached western Europe and the western communist parties. And one of the most fundamental ideas of anarchism has gradually been gaining ground again: there is no authoritarian alternative to authoritarian rule.

IV

According to Bakunin the German working class of his time had little revolutionary or socialist potential; it had already entered the 'petit bourgeoisie', sharing its bourgeois values and standards.

Marx and the Marxists had another idea. They believed that the German proletariat and its organisations were to become the model for the working men 'of all countries'.

Today we have to accept the painful truth that both Marx and Bakunin were right!

Everywhere the working class has accepted the world of the bourgeosie. The labour movement and its struggle, its organisations and its ideologies, have merely changed bourgeois society but failed to destroy it. On the contrary, the working class changed even more than the bourgeoisie

and followed the German example Bakunin abhorred so much.
Of course the proletariat did not disappear. In the western world the workers, even though now less hungry and generally fare better off, are well aware of their position. The first thing poor people learn in the university of life is to face the fact that some animals are more equal than others - to use the famous phrase of Orwell - and that they are the ones that are less equal, have fewer opportunities, less money. The miners' strike in Great Britain in 1984 is as fierce and bitter as the strike of 1926.

Today's workers still have to fight for a place under the sun. But there is a difference between the old days and ours. Revolutionary socialists of all tendencies, including anarchists and marxists, never believed there was a place for workers under the sun of bourgeois society. They did not fight for that. Instead, they fought for the 'aurora roja' of a new sun, the sun of socialism. Of course they defended the workers' fights and fought for material gains ('defence' is a key word among the first generations of conscious workers). At the same time they believed that nothing could be expected from bourgeois capitalism or the state. If you look through the old periodicals of the old Labour movement you always find remarks like these: ... this society cannot offer the workers...; capitalism is unable to (give food, shelter, justice, etc. to the workers of their children) ...; we have nothing to expect from the bourgeoisie... etc.

It is this mentality that has undergone a fundamental change. Working people still want work, higher wages, lower prices, justice, welfare but they ask and fight for it now inside the existing structures; they blame the people in power, rather than the power structures; they accept politics and the state; they wish to change their position inside society. They are now 'inside the whale'.
Not Germany, as Marx predicted, neither countries as Spain and Italy as Bakunin expected, but America became the 'development-model' of the working class. The USA do have a great history of labour struggle but the struggle and the organisations of the workers has always ended inside the whale of the American dream.

Nineteenth century anarchists, marxists and socialists of other schools in fact shared the erroneous idea that the bourgeoisie of the western world - with its economic system based on private property of the means of production, competition and laissez-faire capitalism - represented the bourgeois order in its ultimate stage. Every change, every struggle, they thought, could only end in 'la lutte finale': the downfall of the bourgeoisie, a social revolution giving birth to a workers' society and to socialism.

They did not foresee that other forms of bourgeois society could develop. And it was just this what happened. Bourgeois society did not disappear in the struggle but changed (in western societies) and new forms of bourgeois rule emerged after revolutions (with the 'new classes' in 'communist' states and in the third world). The bourgeoisie did not vanish from the earth as a result of the social struggles of workers, anarchists, socialists and syndicalists; on the contrary, the bourgeoisie used the state to start a very successful process, whereby the working class was absorbed into the bourgeois system. While the working class - once an autonomous social entity with a specific mentality and moral value system - fell into decay, the bourgeoisie merely changed. The working class lost its revolutionary temper and anarchism disappeared.

This process, capital using the state to give away some concessions to the workers and so destructing the anarchist movement (that did not have an answer to the concessions) even happened in countries with the most heroic and longstanding anarchist traditions, such as Argentina[4]).

Society had become more bourgeois, not less. The incredible growth of the modern state is an indication of the triumph of the bourgeoisie. The state, with its impersonal apparatus, rules and laws, its abstract philosphy, was born and has grown together with the bourgeoisie. The state, not private property of the means of production, is the most typical institute of the bourgeoisie. Nowadays bourgeois society can exist without this private property - see Russia - not without the state.

The relation between anarchism, the labour movement and the working class reflects the process of absorption of the workers into bourgeois society. Everywhere - sooner or later - anarchism and libertarian ideas and organisation-models have to give way to political and parliamentary conceptions and forms of organisation in the labour movement. Not because the workers' organisations 'ripened', as social-democrats and communists thought, but because these models accelerated the absorption process. The results are well-known: social legislation by the state; the labour organisations are no longer controlled by the workers, but the workers controlled by the organisations, by the state and by politics. Well-known, too, is the fate of revolutionary syndicalism and anarcho-syndicalism.
In the process of adjustment of the working class, through state legislation and regulations, revolutionary syndicalism got into a crisis, because it could not face the emerging dilemmas, and almost disappeared (we only have to look at the decay of the IWMA (AIT) of Berlin, the split in the CNT, the development of the SAC towards a relatively moderate position).

Bakunin and syndicalism shared with Marx one fundamental conception: 'ideas', 'propaganda' and the 'good example' (the 'utopian' projects) were not enough to realise socialism. A social force was needed. Socialism had to be linked with the economic struggle of the workers: the class struggle against capitalism. This link was broken by politics (and marxists played a large role in politics!). Politics could link the economic struggle with social legislation and the state. So the economic struggle lost its socialist and libertarian dimensions. Anarchism (and syndicalism too!) however, had always more dimensions than the economic struggle.

It has been argued that the whole concept of the class struggle, which the syndicalists shared with Marx, does not fit in with the anarchist vision of mankind. And it is true that the marxist idea of the class struggle as the only fundamental vehicle of human history and progress is not an anarchist idea. For anarchism it is one of many items ~~under certain circumstances~~ in the struggle for justice and freedom. But in 1984 there are other and more fundamental

issues: war and peace, nuclear and economical disaster, underdevelopment.

The anarchist attitude towards the working class and class struggle has now to be the same as towards colonial rule: solidarity but without too many illusions about anarchist perspective.

V

'What is to be done?'
Since the Russian revolutionary novelist Chernystevskii asked this question, it has haunted generations of revolutionaries.
Lenin deliberately used it for the title of his pamphlet on the organisation of the bolshevist party. In Fontamara, the novel of Ignazio Silone, the peasants of the village of that name, use it, as an outcry against fascism in their clandestine paper. I found the title back in a periodical of the re-emerging Spanish labour movement around 1970.

Lenin had an exact and detailed answer to the question. In Fontamara there is no answer: the question remains open. But Lenin embodied the authoritarian principle, was in search of power, whereas Silone and his peasants did not think in authoritarian power relations.
For libertarians the question will never be solved once and for all.
We have to ask ourselves again and again:
What is to be done?

I won't pretend to have an answer, but perhaps some of the remarks that follow here can be useful.

Both social composition and social position of the anarchist movement have changed a lot. Anarchists still reject the existing order and its authoritarian structure. But they are no longer fighting the capitalist sharks from the outside; they are 'inside the whale'.
One of our problems today is how to fight the system if we are part of it.

I know that a lot of anarchists will make objections against this statement. These anarchists refuse to be 'inside the whale', they drop out of the system and fight against it or try alternatives. This is however a personal decision and what I have in mind is the social context.

Marx, Bakunin and revolutionary syndicalism shared the view that the proletariat as a social-economic force was obliged, by the mere fact of its exixtence, to fight against the system and ~~that out of this class-struggle the road to a free socialist society could emerge.~~ not because it was a personal decision of the (workers / individual)

Of course personal decisions have always been important in the anarchist tradition. The word 'anarcho-syndicalist' links the personal decision (being an anarchist) with a given social position (being an organised worker).

There exists yet another tradition which is based only - or mainly - on personal decisions: conscientious objection; the 'acte gratuit' and all kinds of anarchist projects: modern schools, productive associations, communes.

The idea beind such projects is well-known: we have to leave the capitalist order ('Treten wir aus dem Kapitalismus aus' - Gustav Landauer) and set an example. The projects started small and idealistic; and small and idealistic they remained: a large movement never developed. And many disappeared after internal conflicts and problems.

Are there today more perspectives for alternative projects and experiences and ways of life? They are much more numerous that ever before, include a considerable number of - mostly young - people and they certainly have much more influence than the old idealistic people. The people involved do not 'leave' capitalism in the peaceful way Landauer had in mind. On the contrary. There are terrible confrontations with the existing order. In the eyes of the public the image of the anarchist is determined by these confrontations. What is interesting, however, is the unbelievable distance between often very modest claims and the bitterness of the confrontations (not only with the police, but in the press, in discussions). The Zurich revolt is a good example. I am afraid there is often a lot of violence without much perspective for the creation of real alternatives for the whole of society. I am afraid too that the effect of violence is isolation from the population.[6]

The idea of a 'complete' revolution, destroying the existing order, is no longer realistic for anarchists 'inside the whale' and has even lost its attraction, in any case in the western world. Many ~~anarchists of long-time~~ pay attention to the question how to change existing authoritarian structures into anarchist relations.

It means that we have to consider the old working class tradition in anarchism, with revolutionary syndicalism, the conception of the general strike and the class struggle as more or less out of date and offering a limited perspective.

The same applies to the second tradition, which creates libertarian projects - islands in the authoritarian sea: this too, affords little perspective.

There exists yet a third tradition, associated with Kropotkin and communist anarchism, the communal one. It has paid more attention to the people in their totality and to man as a consumer and less to the class concept. It is interesting to see that many of the issues of re-emerging anarchism since the sixties fit in with this tradition: anarcha-feminism; ecological and nuclear issues; anti-militarism; neighbourhood struggles; self-management, which today is no longer limited to factory workers; claims in the field of consumption.

Of course I do not want a revival of Kropotkinism. What I have in mind is an approach on all these fields of interest that the common people share today; as consumers more than as producers, as victims of all kinds of control. An approach without self-isolation, by joining the popular movements with practical proposals and militant activities, based on and fed by the anarchist dream.

Old anarchism had an ardent revolutionary fervour. Today the perspective is not revolution against, but erosion of the principle of authority. Authoritarian structures have accumulated more power that ever before, but perhaps its erosion is easier that in the age of revolutionary socialism.

Not only the working class has moved toward the bourgeoisie, the bourgeoisie itself has also been on the move. The revolt against the values of the existing order in the sixties has been a revolt of the sons and daughters of the middle class, rediscovering or re-inventing the socialist and libertarian heritage.

It is impossible to predict how this erosion is going to affect the powers of destruction and authoritarianism. If there are no libertarian alternatives, the erosion will create frustration and agression and new forms of authoritarian rule. Only yesterday we have seen fascism and stalinism at work. Today we see agression, frustration and the small big brothers in power. Creating positive anarchism seems to me the most promising alternative: it means erosion of the old authority and trying to evitate new - bitter - ones, by the creation of libertarian alternatives, not for individuals or in subcultures, but for everybody, for society.

Notes

1) José Alvarez Junco, La ideologia politica del anarquismo (1868-1910), Madrid 1976, p. 288, mentions even that some anarchists argumented that women needed many sons in order to accelerate the revolutionary process!

2) See Paul Avrich, The Haymarket Tragedy, Princeton N.J., p. 411-412, ...your mother. She is the greatest, noblest of women. Love, honor and obey her.

3) It is interesting to compare the discussions on the Spanish civil war and the CNT-FAI with the following remarks of Victor Serge, written in 1921 in his Les Anarchistes et l'Expérience de la révolution russe (reedited by Alexandre Skirda in his les anarchistes et la révolution russe, 1973):

. On peut pourtant distinguer parmi eux trois tendances :

I. — Les « anarchistes clandestins » ou « souterrains », ennemis mortels de la dictature communiste à laquelle ils reprochent ses abus, les excès d'autorité de ses agents, sa centralisation et les misères subies par la population du fait de la révolution. Ils ont préconisé la lutte à main armée contre le pouvoir des soviets et commis, en réponse d'ailleurs aux mesures de répression prises en Ukraine, l'attentat du 25 septembre 1919, contre le Comité Central du Parti Communiste de Moscou, attentat qui fit 36 victimes dont dix morts et suscita parmi l'immense majorité des anarchistes une réprobation unanime. L'organisation qui l'avait commis semble bien avoir péri tout entière dans la lutte qu'elle soutint ensuite contre la Commission Extraordinaire de Répression.

II. — Ceux que j'appellerai le *Centre* parce qu'ils occupent une position intermédiaire entre les anarchistes anticommunistes et communistes (au sens bolchévik du mot). C'est là très grande majorité. La dictature, l'absence de liberté, les excès de toutes sortes les choquent souvent et souvent les aigrissent. En théorie, ils reprochent au Parti Communiste ses procédés d'autorité, ses principes de centralisation absolue, son étatisme, son intolérance. A première vue, leurs critiques sont très fortes; mais sitôt qu'on les approfondit, elles apparaissent vaines, n'étant pas complétées par l'indication des remèdes.

III. — Les anarchistes « soviétistes » qui se croient un devoir de travailler à l'heure actuelle avec le Parti Communiste bolchévik, voire s'y rallier complètement. Nombreux sont, en effet, les camarades qui y sont entrés, pensant que l'heure n'était pas aux réserves philosophiques et que son programme était le seul applicable, le seul pratique pour assurer les conquêtes de la révolution d'octobre. Sans adhérer au parti, les camarades du groupe anarchiste-syndicaliste *Goloss Trouda* (Moscou et Pétrograd) se sont pratiquement solidarisés avec lui, jusqu'à approuver la militarisation du travail (Grossman-Rotschin, fin 1919.)

4) See: Osvaldo Bayer, Die argentinischen Anarchismus, in: Unter dem Pflaster liegt der Strand 5, Karin Kramer Verlag, Berlin, S. 191-193;

> Man kann sagen, daß seit dem Jahre 1960 die argentinische anarchistische Bewegung nicht mehr existiert. Was geschah? Wie ist es möglich, daß eine Bewegung, die seit Beginn des Jahrhunderts der Motor aller Arbeiterkämpfe war und über eine absolute Mehrheit verfügte, auf diese Weise unterging? Obwohl dieser Aufsatz sich nicht zentral mit der Arbeiterbewegung befaßt (was aber ein Grund sein könnte, daß es einmal theoretisch mit dem argentinischen Experiment geschieht), sei hier zusammenfassend gesagt, daß der Anarchismus mit der großen Masse der Ärmsten rechnen konnte, solange die argentinische Gesellschaft das krasse Bild von Ausbeutern und Ausgebeuteten, ohne Schattierung, zeigte, d. h. als der Arbeiter völlig rechtlos dem allmächtigen Arbeitgeber ausgeliefert war. Sobald aber der Staat begann, einige Brosamen auszustreuen damit das System nicht zusammenfiel, sobald dem Arbeiter einige Garantien und ein paar grundlegende Gesetze zugebilligt wurden, sobald der Staat – als treuer Vertreter des Kapitals – mit dem Arbeitervertreter ins Gespäch kam, da

---

> fand der Anarchismus keine passende Antwort mehr. Er setzte seine unbestechliche Haltung fort: keinen Dialog, keinen Pakt. Doch da stieß er auf Feindschaft. In erster Linie bei den Sozialisten, die, obwohl sie das gleiche Ziel, die Befreiung der Arbeiter, verfolgen, einen weniger dornigen Weg boten: den Staat anerkennen, mit ihm ins Gespräch kommen, nicht vom Parlamentarismus abweichen und die wilden Tiere nicht allzusehr reizen. Dann, 1917, die russische Revolution und der Kommunismus. Die Euphorie darüber verunsicherte die Arbeiterklasse sehr. Viele Gruppen hatten den jahrzehntelangen harten Kampf satt und verfielen dem anscheinend leichteren Weg des Bolschewismus.

5) The 'autonomists', in prison in Segovia (often considered as the anarchists 'enragés' of our days) answered the question 'What do you think of the youth of today?', with the following remarks: 'Vast sectors of this youth are refusing to take on their roles of exploiters, exploited or intermediaries in this kind of exploitation; in a word, they are refusing salaried work...' (Anarchist Insurrection, Year 1, Issue Two, 1984). The key word is here 'refusal', a personal decision. Interesting is that the decision comes from all classes: the 'exploiters' (first mentioned!), 'exploited' and 'intermediaries'.

6) Both in individualistic anarchism and in projects there is a strong tendency of anarchist self-isolation. It is not surprising that individualists joined the very social anarchist communities in the period after 1900.

Even today the famous design of E. Armand and his publication L'Unique is popular: the free anarchist looking from a rock to the distant masses, marching like sheep into three buildings - labelled factory, barrack and school (sometimes church). There is certainly no slave-master relation betwee the fre man on his rock and the masses, but he seems to have forgotten that man is only free if his fellow-men are free too!