Sunday Mirror

9d. September 20, 1970 No. 388

A DOG WAITS IN VAIN FOR MURDERED GIRL
—Full Story Back Page

The last girl in Jimi's life —an ice skating champion

FULL STORY PAGE THREE

ANARCHY

Tory chief attacks the TUC leaders

EMPLOYMENT Minister Robert Carr blasted "irresponsible" and "unrealistic" union chiefs last night.

And he made a blistering attack on the TUC's failure to give leadership in dealing with wildcat strike anarchy.

This is the first time in industrial history that a Minister has made such a ferocious attack on the TUC. A big row is certain when he meets their leaders on Wednesday to explain his pay policy.

Mr. Carr let fly at the unions in a speech to North Hexdon Conservatives. He was clearly preparing the public for the introduction of tough laws against unofficial strikes in his Industrial Relations Bill.

Sunday Mirror Industrial Correspondent

HE DENOUNCED the present Trades Union Congress as "failing utterly to give any leadership in finding ways to remedy the trouble."

HE WARNED the unions that if they wanted to be listened to in the councils of the nation they must speak "with the voice of realism and responsibility."

HE POINTED OUT that earnings this year have been rising six times faster than production.

HE DECLARED that the Government has "an absolute duty to tackle this inflationary fever, no matter how hard and unpleasant that task may be."

Mr. Carr, who already faces a TUC pledge of "total opposition" to anti-strike laws, asked: "Who would think of listening to the outcry from their leaders, that the miners had just been offered an increase bigger than they have ever obtained in their whole history?

"This sort of attitude is neither realistic nor responsible."

Carr's Speech—Page Four.

This is the cover of Anarchy No. 116 which is yours for 3 shillings, 15 new pence or 40 cents: It's about instant Anarchy which is what the cover is, but do read the inside

Contents of No. 116
October 1970

Other issues of "Anarchy":
Please note that the following issues are out of print: 1 to 15 inclusive, 26, 27, 38, 39, 66, 89, 90, 96, 98, 102.

Vol. 1 1961: 1. Sex-and-Violence; 2. Workers' control; 3. What does anarchism mean today?; 4. Deinstitutionisation; 5. Spain; 6. Cinema; 7. Adventure playground; 8. Anthropology; 9. Prison; 10. Industrial decentralisation.

Vol. 2. 1962: 11. Paul Goodman, A. S. Neill; 12. Who are the anarchists?; 13. Direct action; 14. Disobedience; 15. David Wills; 16. Ethics of anarchism; 17. Lumpenproletariat; 18.Comprehensive schools; 19. Theatre; 20. Non-violence; 21. Secondary modern; 22. Marx and Bakunin.

Vol. 3. 1963: 23. Squatters; 24. Community of scholars; 25. Cybernetics; 26. Thoreau; 27. Youth; 28. Future of anarchism; 29. Spies for peace; 30. Community workshop; 31. Self-organising systems; 32. Crime; 33. Alex Comfort; 34. Science fiction.

Vol. 4. 1964: 35. Housing; 36. Police; 37. I won't vote; 38. Nottingham; 39. Homer Lane; 40. Unions; 41. Land; 42. India; 43. Parents and teachers; 44. Transport; 45. The Greeks; 46. Anarchism and historians.

Vol. 5. 1965: 47. Freedom in work; 48. Lord of the flies; 49. Automation; 50. Anarchist outlook; 51. Blues, pop, folk; 52. Limits of pacifism; 53. After school; 54. Buber, Landauer, Muhsam; 55. Mutual aid; 56. Women; 57. Law; 58. Stateless societies.

Vol. 6. 1966: 59. White problem; 60. Drugs; 61. Creative vandalism; 62. Organisation; 63. Voluntary servitude; 64. Misspent youth; 65. Derevolutionisation; 66. Provo; 67. USA; 68. Class and anarchism; 69. Ecology; 70. Libertarian psychiatry.

Vol. 7. 1967: 71. Sociology of school; 72. Strike City, USA; 73. Street School; 74. Anarchism and reality; 75. Improvised drama; 76. 1984; 77. Anarchist group handbook; 78. Liberatory technology; 79. Latin America; 80. Workers' control; 81. Russian anarchists; 82. Braehead School.

Vol. 8. 1968: 83. Tenants take over; 84. Poverty; 85. Anarchist conversations; 86. Fishermen; 87. Penal System; 88. Wasteland culture; 89. France; 90. Students; 91. Artists; 92. Two schools; 93. Radio; 94. Machinery of conformity.

Vol. 9. 1969: 95. Yugoslavia; 96. Playing at revolution; 97. Architects and people; 98. Criminology; 99. Lessons from France; 100. About anarchism; 101. Approved schools, Detention Centres; 102. Squatters; 103. Rights of the young; 104. Refusing; 105. Reich; 106. What is property?

Vol. 10. 1970: 107. Goodman on education; 108. GEC-AEI takeover; 109. Russell; 110. Tim Daly; 111. Anarchism, freedom, power; 112. Southern Africa; 113. Women in prison; 114. Goldman, Berkman; 115. Students' community action; 116. Chomsky on anarchism; 117. Conurb and country; 118. Work.

RATES:
Single copies 3s. (40c.). Annual subscription (12 issues) 36s. ($5.00). Joint annual subscription with FREEDOM, the anarchist weekly (which readers of ANARCHY will find indispensable) £3 19s. 4d. Cheques, P.O.s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, 84B Whitechapel High Street, London, E.1, England.

Printed by Express Printers, London, E.1

Instant anarchy
1: Festival moment

GRAHAM WHITEMAN

THE MAIN ARGUMENT OF ANARCHISM is concerned with the question of authority. Anarchists believe that a viable social organisation is possible without the assistance of a cruel, unjust and inherently evil coercive authority—and that mankind would be a happier, healthier and infinitely better species if it existed in a condition of freedom. Given this belief, all libertarian thinkers have attempted to construct theories of social organisation based on freedom and co-operation. But, from the earliest anarchist writings, down to those of the present day (see ANARCHY 62), the approach has been an intellectual one.

In the last few years, however, some most notable *ad hoc* experiments in this field have been made by people uncommitted to any political creed. It is possible that, through the medium of the open-air "pop" (the most convenient, if misleading word) festival, we are witnessing the beginnings of an "instant anarchy".

At first sight, the linking of a large-scale music festival with the idea of social freedom may seem a paradox; they are mostly designed by profit hungry promoters (see *Financial Times*, 6.7.70), in order to squeeze as much money as possible from their long-haired patrons. The audience is dependent—for their food, drink and general comfort—upon the facilities provided. These provisions are likely to be expensive, as are the fees charged for admission to the site. It lies with the nature of those attending a festival to transform what is basically an economic exercise, into an experiment in non-authoritarian (if temporary) community living. Without attempting any snapshot-sociology, it is clear that participants in the sub-culture of youth are anarchic in their life-style: they have rejected the handed-down values of the parent, the teacher, the politician. To put it simply, the "heads" can manage very well without the heavy hand of authority, even if their ideas of useful living conflict with those of the well-read anarchist.

The concept of open-air music festivals is not new. Pop festivals, however, with their drugs, nudity and general freedom, have only been with us since 1967, and, since that time, some thirty festivals—involving a rough total audience of three million—have occurred in the US alone. Britain was rather late in following the fashion, but has

since produced quite a few (Bath, Isle of Wight, Plumpton, etc.). To date, the most widely reported and discussed festival took place in New York State, in August of last year; because of the film illustrating it, those who were not present are able to see that this event—Woodstock—was notable in many ways. It has perhaps, a special relevance to the anarchist.

Woodstock lasted over three days, and the audience has been estimated as consisting of "half a million freaks", coming, ostensibly, to see some of the major pop musicians. The site was labelled, among other things, as the "10th largest city in the US". If it was a city, then it was certainly an unusual one. During the three days, there were no murders, thefts, fights, race-riots or any of the worse things that modern urban man accepts as "normal". Despite some of those problems that daily occur in cities (traffic jams, the disposal of rubbish, overcrowding, the straining of basic amenities), the film is able to show us people smiling, laughing, just enjoying themselves and their freedom; the interviews emphasise the important place that freedom has in the lives of these people. They regard it as a basic right, to be jealously guarded from the encroachment of the policeman and the parent; Woodstock was a massive affirmation of this right.

The *Village Voice* (21.8.69) confirmed this view. According to their reporter, the most amazing aspect of the festival was, again, not the music, but "the physical stamina, tolerance and good nature of a basically indoor, urban group of people caught in wretched outdoor conditions. It showed more dramatically than any planned demonstration could have that hip kids are fundamentally different from the beer-drinking, fist-fighting Fort Lauderdale crowds of yesteryear" . . . "people shared what they had, overlooked their differences, kept their cool, and generally smiled all weekend".

Unfortunately, not everyone realised the significance of Woodstock. The film shows us local traders, who are delighted at the crowds—and the money they have brought with them. It also shows us local residents who are anything but delighted, not only because their lawns are being trampled and defaced with rubbish, but because they have been confronted by a huge mass of people who are patently disinterested in tight suburban conformity—people who have long hair! people who go naked in public! people who use drugs! and people who do not have the slave mentality. These are the same residents who were pleased, when, after the festival, the Chief of Police was deprived of his job. He had offended his superiors by not arresting people inside the festival-grounds. It seems that part of a policeman's duties is to stop citizens enjoying themselves.

The Establishment Press too, where it is not being outrightly hostile, is generally bewildered by such manifestations of co-operation and fraternity as can be seen in Woodstock (a pleasing exception was Barry Norman, in the *Daily Mail* of 25.6.70). Having a direct interest in the maintenance of exploitation and conformity, the large dailies concentrate on the more superficial, sensational facets of the pop festivals, and ignore their true significance—just as, with a political

demonstration, they deal almost exclusively with the demonstration itself, and not the issue that promoted it. So, we read headlines, such as "Nude Girl Dances" or "New Drug Worry At Festival". As might be expected, they hardly believe that large groups of people can gather and live together, without going dangerously berserk, especially when those groups are made up of people who find no attraction in the life of the obedient cog in the great economic machine.

Accepting that "Woodstock" reinforces Kropotkin's optimism in the basic sociability of human-beings, it remains for us to ask certain questions. The crowd at Woodstock was continually urged, throughout the course of the festival, to remain calm; they were constantly congratulated on their behaviour. Would this behaviour have been any different if a Hitler or a Stalin had taken over the stage and made a speech? To answer this, we must return to the "freaks" themselves. Much of the music they favour has a strong element of violence—complete with guitar-smashing and screamed vocals; it might appear that this would be reflected amongst the audience. But no, the music seems to be a form of catharsis; the audience apparently grow more pacific as the noise-level increases. One remembers a heartwarming scene in the film, where people gaily trample down fences, and one is forced to doubt the willingness of the festival crowd to be led, or manipulated. As long as the harassment is verbal, they just ignore it, or employ that terrible weapon, the laugh.

Food, drink, sanitation and provisions for shelter are usually provided at the larger weekend festivals (though they tend to be badly organised). At Woodstock, there were indeed provided (and mismanaged)—and they had only to last for three days. Could the audience itself have organised these things and kept them going for a week, or a month? It is probable that necessity would have forced them to: there was much voluntary sharing of food at the festival, and this gives the impression that co-operation might have overcome any attempt at exploitation. Lastly, the members of the audience, in co-operating, were "looking after their own", drawing on the common strength of their own alternative culture. What if a group of middle-aged Americans had arrived, complete with prejudice and sons in the National Guard? The crowd at Woodstock had to pass through just such people to reach the site, and what happened on that site was an example to the latter. Admittedly, one must be a little cautious with one's enthusiasm, when one examines the composition of the pop festival audience. As the director of the Woodstock film (Michael Wadleigh) put it, "If you put 400,000 adults together in a field for three days, would they have produced a better record?" One naturally doubts if they would—through no real fault of their own. In a society that deliberately sponsors alienation and a blind obedience to all authority, it is much safer to live and react in a manner pleasing to those in control. The main example provided by festivals is that it is possible to live without the ministrations of an authority, once an instilled prejudice towards that authority is forgotten. The slave has to deny the validity of the slave-master.

There is an element of romance in some anarchist literature, a nostalgia for a golden past, a desire to return to innocence and simplicity of living (e.g. Tolstoy). From this view, there often follows a wish to retire into the countryside, and build a community based on mutual aid, free from those evils which appear to be inherent in city-living. The modern commune movement is an extension of this concept. Rock festivals provide a temporary illustration of this desire. One of those with experience of a large outdoor festival agreed. "You're 'escaping' from the city, you know? You can smoke, fuck, whatever, and mostly they are going to leave you alone" (*Rolling Stone*, 6.8.70).

One wonders if a temporary experience like this can have a more permanent significance. Woodstock, if permanent, would have become one of America's major cities in size alone, and certainly a unique one in the principles by which its citizens conducted themselves. Something lasting could well have come from a display of pop music—and pop music is basically a transitory experience, as is the whole spectrum of pop-culture.

A community functioning on the principles of harmony and freedom might have a better chance of survival if, initially, it was a smaller unit than that which forms the audience of a festival like Woodstock. However well-intentioned a group of people are, the common problems of living inevitably provide opportunities that could be exploited by the self-seeking; these opportunities would be magnified, where those to be led are great in number (sheer density of population, is, of course, an argument against democracy). So, until the organisation of a community is functioning, it might be advisable to limit the number of individuals concerned. Naturally, it would be of the utmost importance for those individuals to keep a jealous guard on their freedom; it would rest with them to collectively resist the encroachments of the potential boss or policeman.

Any community has to work to survive. Without entering into the common anarchist theories of industry and agriculture, it is possible to say that the means of production can be held in common and used in such a way that fair and plentiful distribution of basic necessities is maintained. Anyway, one feels that the "heads" would find the rigours of competition just too much of a "hassle" to be worth bothering with. Those who also find working too much of an inconvenience would either have to live off the charity of those who are willing to support them, or leave the community and re-enter "straight" society. It is probable that most would find that working for themselves under a mutually organised system of industry and in support of a non-capitalist idea is not too taxing, either spiritually or physically.

Those things that provide for the actual mechanics of living (e.g. housing, schools, hospitals, etc.) could be easily and cheaply provided —perhaps with the "Drop-City" structures in mind. All extra services would grow organically. Basically, housing itself, for instance, is expensive only when the price of the necessary land is itself exorbitant; one would assume that the land for our community is already available—the crowds at a pop-festival do not *have* to leave. They would merely be making use of what is already theirs! The ever-attentive policeman would have a difficult task in evicting several hundred thousand people, and would even the elusive conscience of society sanction the forcible removal of a group of people who just want to build their own homes, make their community, and start living in freedom?

The children born and brought up in such a city, under such a libertarian ethos, would be an added guarantee of the success and viability of the anarchist community. They would learn from their parents' errors, come to maturity and found their own communities, and, in turn, a new generation of children would inherit the example. Co-operative communities would mushroom until their very number made it impossible for them to be ignored. One then pictures an unemployed government, sitting in the midst of its redundant army and police-force, realising at last that the master is neither necessary or wanted.

Those who think that this is but an idealistic dream are the same people who thought that it was impossible for people to gather *en masse* in a peaceful fashion—a terrible pessimism. The anarchist vision might, in the end, be realised as an off-shoot of something unconnected with social change: the gathering of people to enjoy themselves. Thus, Malatesta's definition of revolution as being "the creation of new living institutions", the example provided by those institutions and an educative programme arising from them, might all arise from the much-maligned pop-festival: a process of "instant anarchy", feeling its way and being shaped by necessity, rather than a programme taken from the text-books.

> Ultimately cities will exist only as joyous tribal gatherings and fairs, to dissolve after a few weeks. Investigating new life-styles is our work, as is the exploration of Ways to explore our inner realms—with the known dangers of crashing that go with such. We should work with political-minded people where it helps, hoping to enlarge their vision, and with people of all varieties of politics or thought at whatever point they become aware of environmental urgencies. Master the archaic and the primitive as models of basic nature-related cultures—as well as the most imaginative extensions of science—and build a community where these two vectors cross.
>
> —MILES in *International Times 78*
> (April 24-May 7, 1970)

2: IOW moment

GRAHAM MOSS and BILL DWYER

"ACCORDINGLY, AROUND TEN THIS MORNING a force composed mainly of Hells Angels and French Anarchists attacked a fifty yard section of the south perimeter and after a brief battle with security guards in which London Angel President 'Buttons' was injured, both sets of fences were breached in a number of places." The Isle of Wight festival produced for itself alone many examples of mutual aid, one of which, and amongst the developed, was the festival's news sheet, FREEk PRESS, which, running into at least six editions, provides the above quote. It's really quite strange how in fact a news sheet of the people and for the people, aped the commercial press in its method of covering the events. But accepting that they had much the same problems as the commercial press, such as a relatively defined readership, space restrictions (in this case two sides of one foolscap sheet), and editors from a defined group (the hip papers *Oz, Friends, Ink!*, and later *International Times*), perhaps their selectivity is not surprising.

Activity at the festival by those who were consciously anarchists in some cases had little to do with the apparently anarchic activities of the others, who showed remarkable ability in self-organisation. The entire site was divided into five main parts, and one other. Three of these were camp sites, filled with tents that were so far from the actual arena that they were used for little but sleeping and eating. All were separated from the main arena, one by a road, one by space that filled up with large marquees and vans from which food and a wide range of goods were sold, and the third by the sub-section, Desolation Row. This was a small avenue formed by hedges and shrubs about 250 yards long, and was a marvel of ingenuity. The festival was not scheduled to start until the Friday, but the potential audience had started to arrive in largish numbers on at least the Monday before, and the hedge city of Desolation Row had been begun then. By the time we arrived on the Friday night, it was completed, and only a narrow path was left up the centre. Narrow, but not so narrow that late-comers were unable to sleep in the semi-protection offered by the wind-breaking hedges. But in the hedges themselves had been built an array of dwelling places, some with three rooms. Materials used were those available, including already liberated sheets of corrugated iron, sheets of polythene, bales of straw, branches from the few trees and sprays of thick foliage from other bushes. One roof was partially covered with flattened tin cans, which were also used to make interior fireplaces in the corners of some of the more intricate dwellings. A few had set their tents on the far side in such a way that the shelters were a fine, and cooler, arbor by day, and a living room for night, as the music generally went on till dawn, once it had started.

The other two main areas were the main activity of the festival, one organised by Fiery Creations, the organisers who hoped for a fat dividend, and the other by those who economically at least, opposed them, and who according to Fiery, were the cause of the festival being a financial failure, the only kind of failure they seem to be interested in. In an odd moment of clarity, one of the masterminds of Fiery is reported to have declared: "This free music scene makes me sick. But in a way I suppose it's inevitable. It may be that the spirit that created the festival—a defiance of convention—is now about to destroy the festival." The festival was in no danger, only his profits were in jeopardy.

The arena, entrance fee £3 for the entire festival, was encased by two ten feet high walls of corrugated iron set on scaffolding, with a road running between them, and formed a perfect state in miniature, with its own shops selling food and drink at fixed prices. The prices of drink at least was fixed at 50% above the usual. With its own police force. The dogs they used were on 18 hour shifts according to one "Security Officer"; he was on a 12 hour shift, as were the catering department. According to FREEk PRESS, at least two "Security Officers" were bitten by their dogs, who, as is shown later, don't seem to have been trained at all (either dogs or masters). With its own elite. Within the arena was a separate enclosure, the walls of which were removed on the first day of the festival at the insistence of the masses, who insisted by repeated charges and volleys of empty cans, that there was no room for such an elite of ". . . basically a bunch of rich honkies", as the White Panthers, seen in strength for the first time, put it. The walls were removed, but a fence remained. Nevertheless, it was low enough to climb over; a compromise like reducing the power of the House of Lords at Westminster! And the state controlled the effective media, in the form of the microphone and massive amplifiers, which covered the whole area quicker and far more effectively than the FREEk PRESS was ever able to, but only with the crowd within the walls. The crowd without were in a vastly different world.

By an ironic twist of circumstance the people on East Afton Down —christened "Devastation Hill"—had the best of it. The hill rose swiftly from the very base of the walls, and gave a fine view of the stage, running the entire length of the arena. It is National Trust property, and Fiery Creations had reportedly entered into some agreement with the NT to fence off the hill, and not even include it in their own arena. The job of fencing it had apparently only begun on Thursday evening, the day before they expected the bulk of people to start arriving. It was never completed, and what corrugated had been put up was mostly pulled down and used to make shelters for the folks on the hill. With the festival started, from the stage came occasional pleas. That the people on the hill should come off, enter the arena and pay their £3, or even stay on the hill, and pay their £3.

By the same token, £3 better off, we stayed on the hill, and even some ticket-holders chose to join us. What a surprise! Below us, the vast arena resembled nothing so much as a gigantic sardine can where any movement for a drink or visit to the toilet, was virtually impossible. If you stood up someone threw a tin at you and hustled you to resume your seat. No wonder many became exhausted. On Devastation Hill the devastation was only represented by the vast cut in profits for Fiery. The other audience watched a spectacular entertainment of an audience closed up in an arena waiting for their spectacular entertainment to begin. And when it did we had a few surprises. But the view could not be surpassed, and from the top of the hill one was also blessed with a panoramic view of cliffs and open sea to the far side. The contrast between the closed arena and the open parkland that no one could doubt which setting was better for an audience, and that for once the revolutionaries for a better world—such were many on the outside—had infinitely the best of it. Impecunious youths who came up the hill to sell tickets could not give them away, and were quick to appreciate the position. When Fiery, mid-afternoon on the last day, declared the festival "free", there were few takers. Rikki Farr, a member of the Fiery Creations group and one of the two comperes, the one who insistently tried to manipulate the crowd through use of the loudspeakers, in announcing the "free festival", said words to the effect that; you can tear down the walls, do what you like, take all the people off the ticket gate, anyone can come and go quite freely . . . it's now a free festival. But as ever, the organisers had lost any initiative that they may once have had. Those outside already had their shelters, and it was only those from inside the arena who felt a great need for windbreaks. And when they took them, Farr was back on the stage almost weeping and bitterly complaining that these "anarchists", as he chose to call those who'd not taken the initiative earlier, had made a wreck of his beloved, and previously neat, festival. He obviously ignored, forgot, or did not mean his previous statement. But those who had been "given their freedom" by him somehow were unable to make as much use of the materials at their disposal as those on the hill did. Even to the point of bending round a corner of the sheet of corrugated to make an efficient seal. At the same time, to make their fires, several of the interior shops were destroyed for timber, and would undoubtedly have been looted had the caterers not already given up, closed down, and joined the audience. We have since learned that one comrade who had been casually working on the Island for some time, had managed to get a job in one of these shops, and spent the time under-pricing the food, and giving much away toward the end. According to him, he was astounded with the response and the gratitude. Not all the anarchists were on the hill!

Most of the anarchists on the outside ranged themselves in a wide line from top to bottom, in three main clusters, each with a red and black flag. Thus many individual comrades found us, stayed for a while to swop impressions and ideas, and moved on. We two went

to sell FREEDOM as well as enjoy ourselves more generally, and intended meeting up with a comrade who hiked a suitcase full of copies of ANARCHY to sell. We've still, a week later, to find him! There are many varying estimates of how many got to the festival. According to one report, 600,000 people went onto the Island, not all to the festival. Before any such thing was needed, some treated the whole thing as a rescue operation. Free soup from the Salvation Army, free salvation from the more regular clergy at Sunday morning Mass. The local Women's Institute and Rotary Club with hot but undefined soup and bacon sandwiches. St. John Ambulance Brigade working entirely voluntarily and swept off their feet with minor injuries, headaches, and the odd bad trip. This again is quoted from the FREEk PRESS, which certainly here had its finger well on the spot:

> "Head doctors who got in touch with the festival beforehand . . . were told by the St. John Doc that they were not needed, everything's under control. . . . The main piece of organisation is apparent to anyone who goes for treatment, the long wait to fill in National Health Temporary Resident Forms. . . . The doctor gets 25/- per patient . . . 200 patients at 25/- a throw = £225 a day for the doctor, nothing for the VOLUNTARY St. John ambulance men who get fucked about. . . . Still managing to relate kids????"

For the uninitiated, "head doctors" are those who have become part of the hip world. For the first two days at least, there was one doctor and 15 to 20 St. John nursing staff, and they treated 400 patients. Not all got to them. On Devastation Hill we saw at least three people being treated for cuts, and in one case a burn, by those who had small tins of First Aid equipment.

Food was a large problem. Most people on the hill (not paying the £3 we don't know from ground level too much of what went on inside), seemed to have their own, and a lot was shared. It was certainly not only the groups of anarchists who spontaneously pooled all their food and drink, and in all ways there seemed to be few, if any, barriers. The beaches, about a 20 minute walk away, were at the foot of a chalk cliff, and with no ill-effects, and despite the attention it received in the sensationalist press, the mixed nude bathing was as fine as on any beach, anywhere. As on Devastation Hill, the feeling of strength in community was overwhelming, and natural. At that precise time, one could forget one was an anarchist, because one was with people who were already liberated. The "official" police did not bother us; they dared not come onto the hill, they dared not come onto the beach. No matter where people were breaking the laws of straight life, as it is somewhat perversely called by the freer people, the strength of these lawbreakers and their personal honesty overcame the threat of official authority. Release, an organisation aimed at helping drug takers of all sorts in all ways, was criticised by the Chief Constable of Hampshire, in whose realm is the Island: "It cuts across everything we are trying to do." Release raised at least £1,400 to pay bail for some of those arrested on drug charges, and for stealing food. Mr. Mark Woodnutt, MP for the Island, said: "There was nothing

they (the police) could do, but if you cannot enforce the law simply because too many people are breaking it, this must be wrong." At the assault on the fence this article started with, one person broke away from the scuffling and started running down the road between the two fences. A "Security Officer", seeing this, unleashed his dog, dramatically pointed at the running figure, and shouted "Get him". The police had watched the whole assault, but stood by doing nothing. The dog rolled free at last, rolled over on its back and waved its legs in the air! Even the police couldn't stop laughing. Later that day the police took over the entire security of the site. As they marched round patrolling the fences, it was we who rolled over on our backs and laughed.

3: Revolutionary moment

COLIN WARD

I ONCE SPOKE to a Scandinavian journalist, back from a visit to South Africa, whose strongest impression of that country was that the White South Africans *barked* at each other. They were, he thought, so much in the habit of shouting orders or admonitions to their servants that it affected their manner of speech to each other as well. "Nobody there is gentle any more," he said.

What brought this remark back to my mind was its reverse. In a broadcast on the second anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, a speaker looked back to the summer of 1966 in Prague as one in which, as she put it, "Everyone had become more gentle, more considerate. Crime and violence diminished. We all seemed to be making a special effort to make life tolerable, just because it had been so intolerable before."

Spring in Prague

Now that the Prague Spring and the Czechoslovak long hot summer have receded into history, we tend to forget—though the Czechs will not forget—the change in the *quality* of ordinary life, and the histories, busy with the politicians floating on the surface of events, and with this or that memorandum from a Central Committee or a Praesidium, tell us very little of what it felt like in the streets.

At the time John Berger wrote of the immense impression made on him of the transformation of values: "Workers in many places spontaneously offered to work for nothing on Saturdays in order to contribute to the national fund. Those for whom, a few months before, the highest ideal was a consumer society, offered money and gold to help save the national economy. (Economically a naive gesture but ideologically a significant one.) I saw crowds of workers in the streets

of Prague, their faces lit by an evident sense of opportunity and achievement. Such an atmosphere was bound to be temporary. But it was an unforgettable indication of the previously unused potential of a people: of the speed with which demoralisation may be overcome."[1] And Harry Schwartz of the *New York Times* reminds us that "Gay, spontaneous, informal and relaxed were the words foreign correspondents used to describe the vast outpouring of merry Prague citizens."[2] This was in April. What was Dubcek doing at the time? "He was trying to set limits on the spontaneous revolution that had been set in motion and to curb it. No doubt he hoped to honour the promises he had given at Dresden that he would impose order on what more and more conservative Communists were calling 'anarchy'."[3]

Spontaneous resistance

When the Soviet tanks rolled in to impose order, the spontaneous revolution gave way to a spontaneous resistance. Of Prague, Kamil Winter declared, "I must confess to you that nothing was organised at all. Everything went on spontaneously. . . ."[4] And of the second day of the invasion in Bratislava, Ladislav Mnacko wrote:

"Nobody had given any order. Nobody was giving any orders at all. People knew of their own accord what ought to be done. Each and every one of them was his own government, with its orders and regulations, while the government itself was somewhere very far away, probably in Moscow. Everything the occupation forces tried to paralyze went on working and even worked better than in normal times; by the evening the people had even managed to deal with the bread situation."[5]

In November, when the students staged a sit-in in the universities, "The sympathy of the population with the students was shown by the dozens of trucks sent from the factories to bring them food free of charge,"[6] and "Prague's railway workers threatened to strike if the government took reprisal measures against the students. Workers of various State organisations supplied them with food. The buses of the urban transport workers were placed at the strikers' disposal,

> Through the long summer days the debate smouldered on. While the fireflies danced animatedly among the trees of the countryside, fascinating ideas about freedom flew about the meetings in the towns. Tension mixed strangely with a holiday mood. The whole month was like a heavy summer evening: the sun still glowing eerily through the dark purple clouds of a threatening storm. Familiar objects seemed out of perspective and took on a different shape and colour. In private rooms and public meeting places an ominous feeling of destiny pervaded the air. The intellectuals seemed to sense the "dangers" inherent in their ideas. Yet they felt compelled to carry on, on to whatever ends free expression might lead them.
>
> —ANDY ANDERSON: *Hungary 56*

enabling them to come out without contravening the law forbidding assemblies of more than 20 people. Postal workers established certain free telephone communications between university towns."[7]

By the following spring it was over, and as Adam Roberts says, "where in August 1968 a people, deprived of its principal leaders resisted, in April 1969 the leaders bowed to new threats and the people felt they had to follow."[8]

Moral achievement

The same brief honeymoon with anarchy was observed twelve years earlier in Poland and Hungary. The economist Peter Wiles (who was in Poznan at the time of the bread riots and who went to Hungary in the period when the Austrian frontier was open) noted what he called an "astonishing moral purity". He goes on,

"Poland had less chance to show this than Hungary, where for weeks there was no authority. In a frenzy of anarchist self-discipline the people, including the criminals, stole nothing, beat no Jews, and never got drunk. They went so far as to lynch only security policemen (AVH) leaving other Communists untouched. . . . The moral achievement is perhaps unparalleled in revolutionary history. . . . It was indeed intellectuals of some sort that began both movements, with the industrial workers following them. The peasants had of course never ceased to resist since 1945, but from the nature of things, in a dispersed and passive manner. Peasants stop things, they don't start them. Their sole initiative was the astonishing and deeply moving despatch of free food to Budapest after the first Soviet attack had been beaten."[9]

Common sense of the street

A Hungarian eyewitness declared, "May I tell you one thing about this common sense of the street, during these first days of the revolution? Just, for example, many hours standing in queues for bread and even under such circumstances not a single fight. One day we were standing in a queue and then a truck came with two young boys with machine guns and they were asking us to give them any money we could spare to buy bread for the fighters. All the queue was collecting half a truck-full of bread. It is just an example.

"Afterwards somebody beside me asked us to hold his place for him because he gave all his money and he had to go home to get some. In this case the whole queue gave him all the money he wanted.

"Another example: naturally all the shop windows broke in the first days, but not a single thing inside was touched by anybody. You could have seen broken-in shop windows and candy stores, and even the little children didn't touch anything in it. Not even camera shops, opticians or jewellers'. Not a single thing was touched for two or three days. And in the streets on the third or fourth day, shop windows were empty, but it was written there that, 'The caretaker has taken it away' or 'Everything from here is in this or that flat'.

"And in these first days it was a custom to put big boxes on street corners or on crossings where more streets met, and just a script over them 'This is for the wounded, for the casualties or for the families of the dead', and they were set out in the morning and by about noon they were full of money, but not coppers, real big money: 10s, 20s, 100s, full of them—and everybody gave what they had."[10]

Power vacuum in Havana

In Havana, when the general strike brought down the Batista regime, and before Castro's army entered the city, a report from Robert Lyon, Executive Secretary of the New England office of the American Friends Service Committee, reported that "There are no police anywhere in the country, but the crime rate is lower than it has been in years,"[11] and the BBC's correspondent reported that,

"The city for days had been without police of any sort, an experience delightful for everyone. Motorists—and considering that they were Cubans this was miraculous—behaved in an orderly manner. Industrial workers, with points to make, demonstrated in small groups, dispersed and went home; bars closed when the customers had had enough and no one seemed more than nominally merry. Havana, heaving up after years under a vicious and corrupt police control, smiled in the hot sunshine."[12]

In all these instances, the new regime has built up its machinery of repression, announcing the necessity of maintaining order and avoiding counter-revolution: "The Praesidium of the Central Committee of the CPC, the Government and the National Front unequivocally rejected the appeals of the statement of *Two Thousand Words*, which induce to anarchist acts, to violating the constitutional character of our political reform."[13] And so on, in a variety of languages. No doubt people will cherish the interregnum of elation and spontaneity merely as a memory of a time when, as George Orwell said of revolutionary Barcelona, there was "a feeling of having suddenly emerged into an era of equality and freedom when human beings were trying to behave like human beings and not as cogs in the capitalist machine",[14] when, as Andy Anderson wrote of Hungary in 1956, "In the society they were glimpsing through the dust and smoke of the battle in the

> Certain Western observers thought their methods "chaotic". They deplored their "absence of organisation". But the Hungarian workers had instinctively grasped, although perhaps not explicitly proclaimed, that they must break completely with those traditional organisational forms which had for years entrapped both them and the working class of the West. This was their strength. They saw that it meant breaking with those institutions which they themselves had originally created for their emancipation, and which had later become fetters upon them. New organs of struggle were created: the Workers Councils which embodied, in embryo, the new society they were seeking to achieve. Western "observers" could hardly be expected to recognise all this, or to elaborate on this theme!
>
> —ANDY ANDERSON: *Hungary 56*

streets, there would be no Prime Minister, no government of professional politicians, and no officials or bosses ordering them about."[15]

Historians ignore it

Now you might think that in the study of human behaviour and social relations these moments in time when society is held together by the cement of human solidarity alone, without the dead weight of power and authority, would have been studied and analysed with the aim of discovering a new kind of "norm" whose preconditions could be set out as a desirable goal for people seeking an increase in social spontaneity, "participation" and freedom. The moments when there aren't even any police would surely be of immense interest, if only for criminologists. Yet you don't find them discussed in the texts of social psychology, and you don't find them written about by historians. You have to dig around for them, as you can see from the source notes with which I have spattered the little anthology of revolutionary moments given above, amongst the personal impressions of journalists and people who happened to be on the spot.

If you want to know why the historians neglect or traduce the revolutionary moment, you should read the essay "Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship" by Noam Chomsky, whose "Notes on Anarchism" appear in this issue of ANARCHY. It is certainly worth buying *American Power and the New Mandarins* (Pelican, 1969, 8s.) for this essay alone. He begins by quoting from Conor Cruise O'Brien the view that "power in our time has more intelligence in its service, and allows that intelligence more discretion as to its methods, than ever before in history" and the view that we are moving towards a society "maimed through the systematic corruption of its intelligence". O'Brien calls this "counter-revolutionary subordination", and Chomsky's examples in the first section of his essay come from American foreign policy, particularly in Asia. The second section is concerned with the effect of "counter-revolutionary subordination" on the writing of history, and the example he takes is the attitude of the historians to the Spanish Civil War and in particular, to the popular revolution. He is principally concerned with analysing the assumptions of a prize-winning American volume, *The Spanish Republic and the Civil War: 1931-1939* by Gabriel Jackson, but he has a few side-swipes at Hugh Thomas, whose *The Spanish Civil War* was criticised by V.R. in ANARCHY 5 (July 1961) for exactly the same reasons which impel Chomsky's heavily-documented onslaught.

Subordination of scholarship

Chomsky remarks that "as far as the Spanish revolution is concerned, its history is yet to be written" and he concludes, "I have concentrated on one theme—the interpretation of the social revolution in Spain—in one work of history, a work that is an excellent example of liberal scholarship. It seems to me that there is more than enough evidence to show that a deep bias against social revolution and a commitment to the values and social order of liberal bourgeois democracy has led the author to misrepresent crucial events and to overlook major historical currents". But this is not his main point. "At least

this much is plain," he says, "there are dangerous tendencies in the ideology of the welfare state intelligentsia who claim to possess the technique and understanding required to manage our 'post-industrial society' and to organize an international society dominated by American superpower. Many of these dangers are revealed, at a purely ideological level, in the study of the counter-revolutionary subordination of scholarship. The dangers exist both insofar as the claim to knowledge is real and insofar as it is fraudulent. Insofar as the technique of management and control exists, it can be used to diminish spontaneous and free experimentation with new social forms, as it can limit the possibilities for reconstruction of society in the interests of those who are now, to a greater or lesser extent dispossessed. Where the techniques fail, they will be supplemented by all of the methods of coercion that modern technology provides, to preserve order and stability."

Parenthesis on the professionals

(There is an irony about Chomsky's essay which supports his point about scholarship though he doesn't mention it. The authors he finds himself criticising are the professional liberal historian Gabriel Jackson, the professional socialist historian Professor Hugh Thomas, and the professional Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawn. The authors he finds himself supporting were anything but professional historians—Camillo Berneri, wandering anarchist editor; George Orwell whose *Homage to Catalonia* sold 300 copies before it was remaindered by the publishers; Vernon Richards, whose *Lessons of the Spanish Revolution* was bashed out week after week in the small hours of Monday mornings for FREEDOM and is now sought after by the academic libraries which couldn't be bothered to buy a copy when the book appeared; and Burnett Bolloten, newspaper reporter who could only finance the writing of his book *The Grand Camouflage* by the gradual sale of his material on the Spanish Civil War to American university libraries!)

Godforsaken village finds hope

But as a final instance of the revolutionary moment of what he calls spontaneous and free experimentation with new social forms, let me quote from the account he cites of the revolution in the village of Membrilla:

" 'In its miserable huts live the poor inhabitants of a poor province; eight thousand people, but the streets are not paved, the town has no newspaper, no cinema, neither a cafe nor a library. On the other hand, it has many churches that have been burned.' Immediately after the Franco insurrection, the land was expropriated and village life collectivized. 'Food, clothing, and tools were distributed equitably to the whole population. Money was abolished, work collectivized, all goods passed to the community, consumption was socialized. It was, however, not a socialization of wealth but of poverty.' Work continued as before. An elected council appointed committees to organize the life of the commune and its relations to the outside world. The necessities of life were distributed freely, insofar as they were available. A large number of refugees were accommodated. A small library

was established, and a small school of design. The document closes with these words: 'The whole population lived as in a large family; functionaries, delegates, the secretary of the syndicates, the members of the municipal council, all elected, acted as heads of a family. But they were controlled, because special privilege or corruption would not be tolerated. Membrilla is perhaps the poorest village of Spain, but it is the most just.' "

And Chomsky comments, "An account such as this, with its concern for human relations and the ideal of a just society, must appear very strange to the consciousness of the sophisticated intellectual, and it is therefore treated with scorn, or taken to be naive or primitive or otherwise irrational. Only when such prejudice is abandoned will it be possible for historians to undertake a serious study of the popular movement that transformed Republican Spain in one of the most remarkable social revolutions that history records."

NOTES

[1]John Berger: "Freedom and the Czechs" (*New Society*, August 29, 1968).
[2]Harry Schwartz: *Prague's 200 Days* (Pall Mall Press, 1969).
[3]*Ibid.*
[4]*The Listener*, September 5, 1968.
[5]Ladislav Mnacko: *The Seventh Night* (Dent, 1969).
[6]Schwartz: *op. cit.*
[7]Daniel Guérin: "The Czechoslovak Working Class and the Resistance Movement" in *Czechoslovakia and Socialism* (Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1969).
[8]Adam Roberts: "Czechoslovakia and Civilian Defence". Introduction to Pelican edition of *Civilian Resistance and National Defence*, ed. Roberts, 1969.
[9]Peter Wiles in *Encounter* (January, 1957).
[10]Tape-recording in the BBC Sound Archives.
[11]Robert Lyon in *Peace News* (February 20, 1959).
[12]Alan Brugess in *Radio Times* (February 13, 1959).
[13]Appendix III of Philip Windsor and Adam Roberts: *Czechoslovakia 1968 Reform, Repression and Resistance* (Chatto and Windus for the Institute of Strategic Studies, 1969).
[14]George Orwell: *Homage to Catalonia* (Secker and Warburg, 1938).
[15]Andy Anderson: *Hungary 1956* (Solidarity Pamphlets, 1964).

CORRECTIONS TO ANARCHY 112

In Adrian Wolfin's article on South West Africa the sentence on p. 191 beginning:

> "There are now about 300-400 SWANU freedom fighters in prison . . ."

should read

> "There are now about 300-400 SWAPO freedom fighters in prison . . ."

Notes on anarchism

NOAM CHOMSKY

A FRENCH WRITER, sympathetic to anarchism, wrote in the 1890s that "anarchism has a broad back, like paper it endures anything"—including, he noted, those whose acts are such that "a mortal enemy of anarchism could not have done better".[1] There have been many styles of thought and action that have been referred to as "anarchist". It would be hopeless to try to encompass all of these conflicting tendencies in some general theory or ideology. Even if we proceed to extract from the history of libertarian thought a living, evolving tradition, as the French writer Daniel Guérin does in his book *Anarchism*,[2] it remains difficult to formulate its doctrines as a specific and determinate theory of society and social change.

In his work *Anarchosyndicalism*, the German anarchist historian Rudolf Rocker[3] presented a systematic conception of the development of anarchist thought toward anarchosyndicalism along lines that bear comparison to Guérin's work. He wrote that anarchism is not

> . . . a fixed, self-enclosed system, but rather a definite trend in the historic development of mankind, which, in contrast with the intellectual guardianship of all clerical and government institutions, strives for the free unhindered unfolding of all the individual and social forces in life. Even freedom is only a relative, not an absolute concept, since it tends constantly to become broader and to affect wider circles in more manifold ways. For the anarchist, freedom is not an abstract philosophical concept, but the vital concrete possibility for every human being to bring to full development all the powers, capacities, and talents with which nature has endowed him, and turn them to social account. The less this natural development of man is influenced by ecclesiastical or political guardianship, the more efficient and harmonious will human personality become, the more will it become the measure of the intellectual culture of the society in which it has grown.

NOAM CHOMSKY's article is reproduced from the New York Review of Books *by kind permission of the author and editors.* *He is Professor of Linguistics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His political essays are collected in the recent book* American Power and the New Mandarins (*Penguin*).

One might ask what value there is in studying a "definite trend in the historic development of mankind" that does not articulate a specific and detailed social theory. Indeed, many commentators dismiss anarchism as utopian, formless, primitive, or otherwise incompatible with the realities of a complex society. One might, however, argue differently: that at every stage of history our concern must be to dismantle those forms of authority and oppression that survive from an era when they might have been justified by the need for security or survival or economic development, but that now contribute to—rather than alleviate—material and cultural deficit.

If so, there will be no doctrine of social change fixed for the present and future, nor even, necessarily, a specific and unchanging concept of the goals of social change. Surely our understanding of the nature of man or of the range of workable social forms is so rudimentary that any far-reaching doctrine must be treated with great sceptism, just as scepticism is in order when we hear that "human nature" or "the demands of efficiency" or "the complexity of modern life" requires this or that form of oppression and autocratic rule.

Nevertheless, at a particular time there is every reason to develop, in so far as our understanding permits, a specific realization of this "definite trend in the historic development of mankind", appropriate to the tasks of the moment. For Rocker, "the problem that is set for our time is that of freeing man from the curse of economic exploitation and political and social enslavement"; and the method is not the conquest and exercise of state power, nor stultifying parliamentarianism, but rather "to reconstruct the economic life of the peoples from the ground up and build it up in the spirit of Socialism":

> But only the producers themselves are fitted for this task, since they are the only value-creating element in society out of which a new future can arise. Theirs must be the task of freeing labour from all the fetters which economic exploitation has fastened on it, of freeing society from all the institutions and procedures of political power, and of opening the way to an alliance of free groups of men and women based on co-operative labour and a planned administration of things in the interest of the community. To prepare the toiling masses in city and country for this great goal and to bind them together as a militant force is the objective of modern Anarchosyndicalism, and in this its whole purpose is exhausted.

As a socialist, Rocker would take for granted "that the serious, final, complete liberation of the workers is only possible on one condition: the appropriation of capital, that is, raw materials and all the tools of labour, including land, by the whole body of workers" (Bakunin). As an anarchosyndicalist, he insists, further, that the workers' organizations create "not only the ideas but also the facts of the future itself" (Bakunin) in the prerevolutionary period, that they embody in themselves the structure of the future society—and he

looks forward to a social revolution that will dismantle the state apparatus as well as expropriate the expropriators. "What we put in place of the government is industrial organization":

> Anarchosyndicalists are convinced that a Socialist economic order cannot be created by the decrees and statutes of a government, but only by the solidaric collaboration of the worker with hand and brain in each special branch of production; that is, through the taking over of the management of all plants by the producers themselves under such form that the separate groups, plants, and branches of industry are independent members of the general economic organism and systematically carry on production and the distribution of the products in the interest of the community on the basis of free mutual agreements.

Rocker was writing during the Spanish Revolution, when such ideas had been put into practice in a dramatic way. Just prior to the outbreak of the revolution, the anarchosyndicalist economist Diego Abad de Santillan had written:

> . . . in facing the problem of social transformation, the Revolution cannot consider the state as a medium, but must depend on the organization of producers.
>
> We have followed this norm and we find no need for the hypothesis of a superior power to organized labour, in order to establish a new order of things. We would thank anyone to point out to us what function, if any, the state can have in an economic organization, where private property has been abolished and in which parasitism and special privilege have no place. The suppression of the State cannot be a languid affair; it must be the task of the Revolution to finish with the State. Either the Revolution gives social wealth to the producers, in which case the producers organize themselves for due collective distribution and the State has nothing to do; or the Revolution does not give social wealth to the producers, in which case the Revolution has been a lie and the State would continue.
>
> Our federal council of economy is not a political power but an economic and administrative regulating power. It receives its orientation from below and operates in accordance with the resolutions of the regional and national assemblies. It is a liaison corps and nothing else.[4]

Engels, in a letter of 1883, expressed his disagreement with this conception:

> The anarchists put the thing upside down. They declare that the proletarian revolution must *begin* by doing away with the political organization of the state. . . . But to destroy it at such a moment would be to destroy the only organism by means of which the victorious proletariat can assert its newly-conquered power, hold down its capitalist adversaries, and carry out that

economic revolution of society without which the whole victory must end in a new defeat and in a mass slaughter of the workers similar to those after the Paris commune.[5]

In contrast, the anarchists—most eloquently Bakunin—warned of the dangers of the "red bureaucracy" that would prove to be "the most vile and terrible lie that our century has created". The anarcho-syndicalist Fernand Pelloutier asked: "Must even the transitory state to which we have to submit necessarily and fatally be the collectivist jail? Can't it consist in a free organization limited exclusively by the needs of production and consumption, all political institutions having disappeared?"[6]

I do not pretend to know the answer to this question. But it seems clear that unless there is, in some form, a positive answer, the chances for a truly democratic revolution that will achieve the humanistic ideals of the left are not great. Martin Buber put the problem succinctly when he wrote: "One cannot in the nature of things expect a little tree that has been turned into a club to put forth leaves." The question of conquest or destruction of state power is what Bakunin regarded as the primary issue dividing him from Marx.[7] In one form or another, the problem has arisen repeatedly in the century since, dividing "libertarian" from "authoritarian" socialists.

Despite Bakunin's warnings about the red bureaucracy and their fulfilment under Stalin's dictatorship, it would obviously be a gross error in interpreting the debates of a century ago to rely on the claims of contemporary social movements concerning their historical origins. In particular, it is perverse to regard Bolshevism as "Marxism in practice". Rather, the left-wing critique of Bolshevism, taking account of the historical circumstances of the Russian Revolution, is far more to the point:[8]

> The anti-Bolshevik, left-wing labour movement opposed the Leninists because they did not go far enough in exploiting the Russian upheavals for strictly proletarian ends. They became prisoners of their environment and used the international radical movement to satisfy specifically Russian needs, which soon became synonymous with the needs of the Bolshevik Party-State. The "bourgeois" aspects of the Russian Revolution were now discovered in Bolshevism itself: Leninism was adjudged a part of international social-democracy, differing from the latter only on tactical issues.[9]

If one were to seek a single leading idea within the anarchist tradition, it should, I believe, be that expressed by Bakunin when, writing on the Paris Commune, he identified himself as follows:

> I am a fanatic lover of liberty, considering it as the unique condition under which intelligence, dignity and human happiness can develop and grow; not the purely formal liberty conceded, measured out and regulated by the State, an eternal lie which in reality represents nothing more than the privilege of some founded on the slavery of the rest; not the individualistic, egoistic, shabby, and fictitious liberty extolled by the School of J.-J. Rousseau and the other schools of bourgeois liberalism, which considers the would-be rights of all men, represented by the State which limits the rights of each—an idea that leads inevitably to the reduction of the rights of each to zero. No, I mean the only kind of liberty that is worthy of the name, liberty that consists in the full development of all the material, intellectual and moral powers that are latent in each person; liberty that recognizes no restrictions other than those determined by the laws of our own individual nature, which cannot properly be regarded as restrictions since these laws are not imposed by any outside legislator beside or above us, but are immanent and inherent, forming the very basis of our material, intellectual and moral being—they do not limit us but are the real and immediate conditions of our freedom.[10]

These ideas grow out of the Enlightenment; their roots are in Rousseau's *Discourse On Inequality*, Humboldt's *Limits of State Action*, Kant's insistence, in his defence of the French Revolution, that freedom is the pre-condition of acquiring the maturity for freedom, not a gift to be granted when such maturity is achieved.[11] With the development of industrial capitalism, a new and unanticipated system of injustice, it is libertarian socialism that has preserved and extended the radical humanist message of the Enlightenment and the classical liberal ideals that were perverted into an ideology to sustain the emerging social order.

In fact, on the very same assumptions that led classical liberalism to oppose the intervention of the state in social life, capitalist social relations are also intolerable. Humboldt, for example, in work which anticipated and perhaps inspired Mill, objects to state action because the state tends to "make man an instrument to serve its arbitrary ends, overlooking his individual purposes". He insists that "whatever does not spring from a man's free choice . . . does not enter into his very being, but remains alien to his true nature; he does not perform it with truly human energies, but merely with mechanical exactness". Under the conditions of freedom, "all peasants and craftsmen might be elevated into artists; that is, men who love their own labour for its own sake, improve it by their own plastic genius and inventive skill, and thereby cultivate their intellect, ennoble their character, and exalt and refine their pleasures". When a man merely reacts to external demands and authority, "we may admire what he does, but we despise what he is". Humboldt is, furthermore, no primitive individualist. He summarizes his leading ideas as follows:

> . . . while they would break all fetters in human society, they would attempt to find as many new social bonds as possible. The isolated man is no more able to develop than the one who is fettered.

This classic of liberal thought, completed in 1792,[12] is in its essence profoundly, though prematurely, anti-capitalist. Its ideas must be attenuated beyond recognition to be transmuted into an ideology of industrial capitalism.

The vision of a society in which social fetters are replaced by social bonds, and labour is freely undertaken, suggests the early Marx,[13] with his discussion of the "alienation of labour when work is external to the worker . . . not part of his nature . . . [so that] he does not fulfil himself in his work but denies himself . . . [and is] physically exhausted and mentally debased"—that alienated labour which "casts some of the workers back into a barbarous kind of work and turns others into machines", thus depriving man of his "species character" of "free conscious activity" and "productive life".

Similarly, Marx conceives of "a new type of human being who *needs* his fellow-men. . . . [The workers' association becomes] the real constructive effort to create the social texture of future human relations".[14]

It is true that classical libertarian thought is opposed to state intervention in social life, as a consequence of deeper assumptions about the human need for liberty, diversity, and free association. On the same assumptions, capitalist relations of production, wage-labour, competitiveness, the ideology of "possessive individualism"—all must be regarded as fundamentally anti-human. Libertarian socialism is properly to be regarded as the inheritor of the liberal ideals of the Enlightenment.

Rudolf Rocker described modern anarchism as "the confluence of the two great currents which during and since the French Revolution have found such characteristic expression in the intellectual life of Europe: Socialism and Liberalism". The classical liberal ideals, he argued, were wrecked on the realities of capitalist economic forms. Anarchism is necessarily anti-capitalist in that it "opposes the exploitation of man by man". But anarchism also opposes "the dominion of man over man". It insists that "*socialism will be free or it will not be at all*. In its recognition of this lies the genuine and profound justification for the existence of anarchism".

From this point of view, anarchism may be regarded as the libertarian wing of socialism. It is in this spirit that Daniel Guérin has approached the study of anarchism in the recently translated book *Anarchism* and in other works.[15] He quotes Adolph Fischer, who said that "every anarchist is a socialist but not every socialist is necessarily an anarchist". Similarly Bakunin, in his "anarchist manifesto" of 1865, the programme of his projected international revolutionary fraternity, laid down the principle that each member must be, to begin with, a socialist.

A consistent anarchist must oppose private ownership of the means of production and the wage-slavery which is a component of this system, as incompatible with the principle that labour must be freely undertaken and under the control of the producer. As Marx put it,

socialists look forward to a society in which labour will "become not only a means of life, but also the highest want in life",[16] an impossibility when the worker is driven by external authority or need rather than inner impulse: "No form of wage-labour, even though one may be less obnoxious than another, can do away with the misery of wage-labour itself."[17] A consistent anarchist must oppose not only alienated labour but also the stupefying specialization of labour that takes place when the means of developing production

> . . . mutilate the worker into a fragment of a human being, degrade him to become a mere appurtenance of the machine, make his work such a torment that its essential meaning is destroyed; estrange from him the intellectual potentialities of the labour process in very proportion to the extent to which science is incorporated into it as an independent power. . . .[18]

Marx saw this not as an inevitable concomitant of industrialization, but rather as a feature of capitalist relations of production. The society of the future must be concerned to "replace the detail-worker of today . . . reduced to a mere fragment of a man, by the fully developed individual, fit for a variety of labours . . . to whom the different social functions . . . are but so many modes of giving free scope to his own natural powers".[19]

The prerequisite is the abolition of capital and wage-labour as social categories (not to speak of the industrial armies of the "labour state" or the various modern forms of totalitarianism or state capitalism). The reduction of man to an appurtenance of the machine, a specialized tool of production, might in principle be overcome, rather than enhanced, with the proper development and use of technology, but not under the conditions of autocratic control of production by those who make man an instrument to serve their ends, overlooking his individual purposes.

Anarchosyndicalists sought, even under capitalism, to create "free associations of free producers" that would engage in militant struggle and prepare to take over the organization of production on a democratic basis. These associations would serve as "a practical school of anarchism".[20] If private ownership of the means of production is, in Proudhon's often quoted phrase, merely a form of "theft"—"the exploitation of the weak by the strong"[21]—control of production by a state bureaucracy, no matter how benevolent its intentions, also does not create the conditions under which labour, manual and intellectual, can become the highest want in life. Both, then, must be overcome.

In his attack on the right of private or bureaucratic control over the means of production, the anarchist takes his stand with those who struggle to bring about "the third and last emancipatory phase of history", the first having made serfs out of slaves, the second having made wage earners out of serfs, and the third which abolishes the proletariat in a final act of liberation that places control over the economy in the hands of free and voluntary associations of producers

(Fourier, 1848).[22] The imminent danger to "civilization" was noted by that perceptive observer, Tocqueville, also in 1848:

> As long as the right of property was the origin and groundwork of many other rights, it was easily defended—or rather it was not attacked; it was then the citadel of society while all the other rights were its outworks; it did not bear the brunt of attack and, indeed, there was no serious attempt to assail it. But today, when the right of property is regarded as the last undestroyed remnant of the aristocratic world, when it alone is left standing, the sole privilege in an equalized society, it is a different matter. Consider what is happening in the hearts of the working-classes, although I admit they are quiet as yet. It is true that they are less inflamed than formerly by political passions properly speaking; but do you not see that their passions, far from being political, have become social? Do you not see that, little by little, ideas and opinions are spreading amongst them which aim not merely at removing such and such laws, such a ministry or such a government, but at breaking up the very foundations of society itself?[23]

The workers of Paris, in 1871, broke the silence, and proceeded

> . . . to abolish property, the basis of all civilization! Yes, gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class property which makes the labour of the many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labour, into mere instruments of free and associated labour.[24]

The Commune, of course, was drowned in blood. The nature of the "civilization" that the workers of Paris sought to overcome in their attack on "the very foundations of society itself" was revealed, once again, when the troops of the Versailles government reconquered Paris from its population. As Marx wrote, bitterly but accurately:

> The civilization and justice of bourgeois order comes out in its lurid light whenever the slaves and drudges of that order rise against their masters. Then this civilization and justice stand forth as undisguised savagery and lawless revenge . . . the infernal deeds of the soldiery reflect the innate spirit of that civilization of which they are the mercenary vindicators. . . . The bourgeoisie of the whole world, which looks complacently upon the wholesale massacre after the battle, is convulsed by horror at the desecration of brick and mortar.

Despite the violent destruction of the Commune, Bakunin wrote that Paris opens a new era, "that of the definitive and complete emancipation of the popular masses and their future solidarity, across and despite state boundaries . . . the next revolution of man, international and in solidarity, will be the resurrection of Paris"—a revolution that the world still awaits.

The consistent anarchist, then, should be a socialist, but a socialist of a particular sort. He will not only oppose alienated and specialized labour and look forward to the appropriation of capital by the whole body of workers, but he will also insist that this appropriation be direct, not exercised by some elite force acting in the name of the proletariat. He will, in short oppose

> . . . the organization of production by the Government. It means State-socialism, the command of the State officials over production and the command of managers, scientists, shop-officials in the shop. . . . The goal of the working class is liberation from exploitation. This goal is not reached and cannot be reached by a new directing and governing class substituting itself for the bourgeoisie. It is only realized by the workers themselves being master over production.

These remarks are taken from "Five Theses on the Class Struggle" by the left-wing Dutch Marxist, Anton Pannekoek, one of the outstanding theorists of the Council Communist movement. And in fact, radical Marxism merges with anarchist currents.

As a further illustration, consider the following characterization of "revolutionary Socialism":

> The revolutionary Socialist denies that State ownership can end in anything other than a bureaucratic despotism. We have seen why the State cannot democratically control industry. Industry can only be democratically owned and controlled by the workers electing directly from their own ranks industrial administrative committees. Socialism will be fundamentally an industrial system; its constituencies will be of an industrial character. Thus those carrying on the social activities and industries of society will be directly represented in the local and central councils of social administration. In this way the powers of such delegates will flow upwards from those carrying on the work and conversant with the needs of the community. When the central administrative industrial committee meets it will represent every phase of social activity.
>
> Hence the capitalist political or geographical state will be replaced by the industrial administrative committee of Socialism. The transition from the one social system to the other will be the *social revolution.* The political State throughout history has meant the government *of men* by ruling classes; the Republic of Socialism will be the government *of industry* administered on behalf of the whole community. The former meant the economic and political subjection of the many; the latter will mean the economic freedom of all—it will be, therefore, a true democracy.

These remarks are taken from William Paul's *The State, Its Origins and Function,* written in early 1917[25]—shortly before Lenin's

State and Revolution, perhaps his most libertarian work (see note 8). Paul was a member of the Marxist-De Leonist Socialist Labour Party and later one of the founders of the British Communist Party.[26] His critique of state socialism resembles the libertarian doctrine of the anarchists in its principle that since State ownership and management will lead to bureaucratic despotism, the social revolution must replace it by the industrial organization of society with direct workers' control. Many similar statements can be cited.

What is far more important is that these ideas have been realized in spontaneous revolutionary action, for example in Germany and Italy after World War I and in Spain (specifically, industrial Barcelona) in 1936. One might argue that some form of council communism is the natural form of revolutionary socialism in an industrial society. It reflects the intuitive understanding that democracy is largely a sham when the industrial system is controlled by any form of autocratic elite, whether of owners, managers, and technocrats, a "vanguard" party, or a State bureaucracy. Under these conditions of authoritarian domination the classical libertarian ideals developed further by Marx and Bakunin and all other true revolutionaries cannot be realized; man will not be free to develop his own potentialities to their fullest, and the producer will remain "a fragment of a human being", degraded, a tool in the productive process directed from above.

The phrase "spontaneous revolutionary action" can be misleading, especially at a time when there is much loose talk of both "spontaneity" and "revolution". The anarchosyndicalists, at least, took very seriously Bakunin's remark that the workers' organizations must create "not only the ideas but also the facts of the future itself" in the pre-revolutionary period. The accomplishments of the popular revolution in Spain, in particular, were based on the patient work of many years of organization and education, one component of a long tradition of commitment and militancy. The resolutions of the Madrid Congress of June, 1931, and the Saragossa Congress in May, 1936, foreshadowed in many ways the acts of the revolution, as did the somewhat different ideas sketched by Santillan (see note 4) in his fairly specific account of the social and economic organization to be instituted by the revolution.

Guérin writes: "The Spanish revolution was relatively mature in the minds of the libertarian thinkers, as in the popular consciousness." And workers' organizations existed with the structure, the experience, and the understanding to undertake the task of social reconstruction when, with the Franco coup, the turmoil of early 1936 exploded into social revolution. In his Introduction to a collection of documents on collectivization in Spain, the anarchist Augustin Souchy writes:

> For many years, the anarchists and syndicalists of Spain considered their supreme task to be the social transformation of the society. In their assemblies of Syndicates and groups, in their journals, their brochures and books, the problem of the social revolution was discussed incessantly and in a systematic fashion.[27]

All of this lies behind the spontaneous achievements, the constructive work of the Spanish Revolution.

The ideas of libertarian socialism, in the sense described, have been submerged in the industrial societies of the past half-century. The dominant ideologies have been those of state socialism or state capitalism (in the United States, of an increasingly militarized character, for reasons that are not obscure[28]). But there has been a rekindling of interest in the past few years. The theses I quoted by Anton Pannekoek were taken from a recent pamphlet of a radical French workers' group (*Informations Correspondance Ouvrière*). The quotation from William Paul on revolutionary socialism appears in a paper by Walter Kendall given at the National Conference on Workers' Control in Sheffield, England, in March, 1969.

The workers' control movement has become a significant force in England in the past few years. It has organized several conferences and has produced a substantial pamphlet literature, and counts among its active adherents representatives of some of the most important trade unions. The Amalgamated Engineering and Foundryworkers' Union, for example, has adopted, as official policy, the programme of nationalization of basic industries under "workers' control at all levels".[29] On the continent, there are similar developments. May, 1968, of course accelerated the growing interest in council communism and related ideas in France and Germany, as it did in England.

Given the general conservative cast of our highly ideological society, it is not too surprising that the United States has been relatively untouched by these developments. But that too may change. The erosion of the cold war mythology at least makes it possible to raise these questions in fairly broad circles. If the present wave of repression can be beaten back, if the left can overcome its more suicidal tendencies and build upon what has been accomplished in the past decade, then the problem of how to organize industrial society on truly democratic lines, with democratic control in the work place and in the community, should become a dominant intellectual issue for those who are alive to the problems of contemporary society, and, if a mass movement for libertarian socialism develops, speculation should proceed to action.

In his manifesto of 1865, Bakunin predicted that one element in the social revolution will be "that intelligent and truly noble part of the youth which, though belonging by birth to the privileged classes, in its generous convictions and ardent aspirations, adopts the cause of the people". Perhaps in the rise of the student movement of the 1960s one sees the beginnings of a fulfilment of this prophecy.

In *Anarchism*, Daniel Guérin has undertaken what he describes elsewhere as a "process of rehabilitation". He argues, convincingly I

believe, that "the constructive ideas of anarchism retain their vitality, that they may, when re-examined and sifted, assist contemporary socialist thought to undertake a new departure . . . [and] contribute to enriching Marxism".[30] From the "broad back" of anarchism he has selected for more intensive scrutiny those ideas and actions that can be described as libertarian socialist. This is natural and proper. This framework accommodates the major anarchist spokesmen as well as the mass actions that have been animated by anarchist sentiments and ideals. Guérin is concerned not only with anarchist thought but also with the spontaneous actions of popular forces that actually create new social forms in the course of revolutionary struggle. He is concerned with social as well as intellectual creativity. Moreover, he attempts to draw from the constructive achievements of the past lessons that will enrich the theory of social liberation. For those who wish not only to understand the world, but also to change it, this is the proper way to study the history of anarchism.

Guérin describes the anarchism of the nineteenth century as essentially doctrinal, while the twentieth century, for the anarchists, has been a time of "revolutionary practice".[31] The present work reflects that judgment. His interpretation of anarchism consciously points toward the future. Arthur Rosenberg once pointed out that popular revolutions characteristically seek to replace "a feudal or centralized authority ruling by force" with some form of communal system which "implies the destruction and disappearance of the old form of State". Such a system will either be socialist or an "extreme form of democracy . . . [which is] the preliminary condition for Socialism inasmuch as Socialism can only be realized in a world enjoying the highest possible measure of individual freedom". This ideal, he notes, was common to Marx and the anarchists.[32] This natural struggle for liberation runs counter to the prevailing tendency toward centralization in economic and political life.

A century ago Marx wrote that the workers of Paris "felt there was but one alternative—the Commune, or the empire—under whatever name it might reappear".

> The empire had ruined them economically by the havoc it made of public wealth, by the wholesale financial swindling it fostered, by the props it lent to the artificially accelerated centralization of capital, and the concomitant expropriation of their own ranks. It had suppressed them politically, it had shocked them morally by its orgies, it had insulted their Voltairianism by handing over the education of their children to the *fréres Ignorantins*, it had revolted their national feeling as Frenchmen by precipitating them headlong into a war which left only one equivalent for the ruins it made—the disappearance of the empire.[33]

The miserable Second Empire "was the only form of government possible at a time when the bourgeoisie had already lost, and the working class had not yet acquired, the faculty of ruling the nation".

It is not very difficult to rephrase these remarks so that they become appropriate to the imperial systems of 1970. The problem of "freeing man from the curse of economic exploitation and political and social enslavement" remains the problem of our time. So long as this is so, the doctrines and the revolutionary practice of libertarian socialism will serve as an inspiration and a guide.

NOTES

[1]Octave Mirbeau, quoted in James Joll, *The Anarchists*, Little, Brown, 1964.

[2]English translation published by Monthly Review Press. Parts of the present essay appear as the Introduction.

[3]Secker and Warburg, 1938.

[4]*After the Revolution*, New York, Greenberg, 1937. In the last chapter, written several months after the revolution had begun, he expresses his dissatisfaction with what had so far been achieved along these lines. Though the matter still awaits a careful study, it seems to me that the results were impressive.

[5]Cited by Robert Tucker, *The Marxian Revolutionary Idea*, Norton, 1969, in his discussion of Marxism and anarchism.

[6]Cited by Joll. The source is *"L'Anarchisme et les syndicats ouvriers", Les Temps nouveaux*, 1895. The full text appears in D. Guérin, ed., *Ni Dieu, ni Maître*, Lausanne, Le Cité Editeur, undated, an excellent historical anthology of anarchism.

[7]Marx, of course, saw the matter entirely differently.

For discussion of the impact of the Paris Commune on this dispute see Daniel Guérin's comments in *Ni Dieu, ni Maître*; these also appear, slightly extended, in his *Pour un Marxisme libertaire*, Robert Laffont, Paris, 1969. See also note 24.

[8]On Lenin's "intellectual deviation" to the left during 1917, see Robert Daniels, "The State and the Revolution: a Case Study in the Genesis and Transformation of Communist Ideology", *American Slavic and East European Review*, Feb., 1953.

[9]Paul Mattick, *Marx and Keynes*, Porter-Sargent, 1969.

[10]*"La Commune de Paris et la notion de l'Etat"*, reprinted in *Ni Dieu, ni Maître*.

[11]Bakunin's final remark on the laws of individual nature as the condition of freedom can be compared with the approach to creative thought developed in the rationalist and romantic traditions. See my *Cartesian Linguistics*, Harper & Row, 1966 and *Language and Mind*, Harcourt, Brace, 1968.

[12]Reprinted in English translation by Cambridge University Press, 1969, edited and with an Introduction by J. W. Burrow.

[13]The similarity is noted by Burrow. See also *Cartesian Linguistics*, particularly note 51.

[14]Shlomo Avineri, *The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx*, Cambridge, 1968, referring to comments in *The Holy Family*, 1845. Avineri states that within the socialist movement only the Israeli Kibbutzim "have perceived that the modes and forms of present social organization will determine the structure of future society". This, however, was a characteristic position of anarchosyndicalism, as noted earlier.

[15]In addition to those already cited, see his *Jeunesse du socialisme libertaire*, Paris, Librairie Marcel Rivière, 1959.

[16]*Critique of the Gotha program.*

[17]*Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Okonomie*, cited by Mattick, *op. cit.* In this connection, see also Mattick's recent essay, "Workers' Control", in P. Long (ed.), *The New Left*, Porter-Sargent, 1969, and Avineri, *op. cit.*

[18]Marx, *Capital*. Quoted by Robert Tucker, who rightly emphasizes that Marx sees the revolutionary more as a "frustrated producer" than a "dissatisfied consumer" (*The Marxian Revolutionary Idea*). This more radical critique of capitalist relations of production is a direct outgrowth of the libertarian thought of the Enlightenment.
[19]*Capital*. Cited by Avineri.
[20]Pelloutier, *op. cit.*
[21]*"Qu'est-ce que la propriété?"* The phrase "property is theft" displeased Marx, who saw in its use a logical problem, theft presupposing the legitimate existence of property. See Avineri, *op. cit.*
[22]Cited in Buber's *Paths in Utopia*, 1945; Beacon, 1958.
[23]Cited in J. Hampden Jackson, *Marx, Proudhon and European Socialism*, Collier, 1962.
[24]Marx, *The Civil War in France*, 1871; International Publishers, 1941. Avineri observes that this and other comments of Marx about the Commune refer pointedly to intentions and plans. As Marx made plain elsewhere, his considered assessment was more critical than in this address.
[25]Glasgow, Socialist Labour Press, undated.
[26]For some background, see Walter Kendall, *The Revolutionary Movement in Britain*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.
[27]*Collectivisations, L'Oeuvre constructive de la Révolution Espagnole*, Editions, C. N. T., Toulouse, 1965. First edition, Barcelona, 1937.
[28]For a good discussion, see Michael Kidron, *Western Capitalism Since the War*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.
[29]See Hugh Scanlon, "The way forward for Workers' Control", Institute for Workers' Control, 91 Goldsmith Street, Nottingham, Pamphlet Series No. 1, 1968. Scanlon is the President of the AEF. The Institute was established as a result of the sixth Conference on Workers' Control, March, 1968, and serves as a centre for disseminating information and encouraging research.
[30]Introduction to *Ni Dieu, ni Maître*.
[31]*Ibid.*
[32]*A History of Bolshevism*, 1932; English translation, Russell & Russell, 1965.
[33]*The Civil War in France*.

Guerin in English

ANARCHISM: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE by Daniel Guérin, translated by Mary Klopper. (Monthly Review Press, New York $6.00, London 54s.)

THE ORIGINAL FRENCH EDITION of this book was discussed in ANARCHY 94 by Nicolas Walter, who remarks of this translation (in the *New Statesman* for August 7, 1970):

"A veteran socialist intellectual, with a reputation as a creative writer and also as a considerable scholar, Guérin moved away from strict Marxism after the war and began to advocate a libertarian socialism which would be a synthesis of communism and anarchism. In 1965 he published *Ni dieu ni maître*, the finest anthology of anarchist writings ever produced. In the same year he published *L'Anarchisme*, a cheap paperback which has had a remarkable success and has appeared in many languages; it now comes to us, introduced by Noam Chomsky, from the leading Marxist publisher in the US.

"It must be said at once that the price is outrageous; and even then this edition is not satisfactory. The translation is awkward and sometimes inept: to call Ravachol's *marmite* a 'stewpot' makes little sense. The introduction is as interesting as one would expect, but curiously unreal: to give the Marxist campaign for workers' control under trade union auspices as the only example of an anarchist revival in Britain makes no sense at all. The book is well produced, but the editing is perfunctory: Guérin's occasional mistakes—such as the belief that Bakunin translated *Das Kapital* (he typically never finished it)—have not been corrected, and the revised bibliography is unnecessarily eccentric.

"All this is particularly regrettable because what we have here is perhaps the best short introduction to anarchism there is; the sooner a revised edition is published in paperback, the better. Guérin's peculiar virtue among anarchologists is that he sees the movement not as a historical phenomenon but as an immediate reality, and he was one of the few outsiders to realise that, far from dying, it was being reborn. The first half of the book is a summary of basic anarchist beliefs, taken mainly from Proudhon and Bakunin (Guérin doesn't think much of Kropotkin). His theme is summed up by the title of one of his chapters: 'Anarchism is not Utopian'. Several important matters are not discussed, but the little essays on the issues Guérin considers essential to anarchism are models of their kind.

"The second half of the book is a survey of anarchist participation in the labour movement from the First International down to the Spanish Civil War. Guérin packs into 70 pages an account of 70 years which is full of life and interest. Just as he has stressed the libertarian aspect of Marxism, here he stresses the syndicalist aspect of anarchism—and this bias tends to lead him astray: no doubt Gramsci was more important than Malatesta, but to give him more attention in this context is rather perverse. In the conclusion, covering anarchism since the war, Guérin goes so far as to discuss tendencies towards workers' control in Yugoslavia, Algeria, Cuba, and even Russia, without mentioning the shift towards true anarchism in the anti-war and student movements; only in the postscript, on the 'events' of 1968, does he recognise the resurgence of anarchism in the West which he did as much as anyone to bring about.

"My chief reservation about the book is that in the end it is not really about anarchism as most anarchists understand it, but about 'council communism'—which is presumably due to its Marxist provenance. Chomsky indeed suggests that 'some form of council communism is the natural form of revolutionary socialism'; and

Guérin emphasises that in May 1968 anarchists and Marxists fought side by side. This may be the only way forward for both of them, but anarchists can never forget that deep differences still divide them —not just doctrine, but also in the bitter experience of a century during which the state has grown stronger than ever, especially in the hands of Marxists. There is still room for an even better book than Guérin's to show that anarchism is not only alive but is also alone in its insistence on liberation from both property *and* authority."

* * * *

In another interesting review of the book (*New Society*, August 6, 1970) John Berger raises important issues:

"Guérin reopens and poses anew certain questions. The most important of these asks: what structure of organisation, what order of political principles is most likely to guarantee the democratic rights of the masses (the workers' councils, the soviets), against the dictatorship of a small centralised revolutionary party acting in their name?

"To this question I would like to add another, addressed principally to anarchists, because I believe it is necessary to enlarge the area of our questioning. Socialist democracy depends upon a high level of mass political consciousness and on the absence of scarcity. The first may be spontaneously formed through the very exercise of that democracy. But the abolition of scarcity can no longer be achieved—if it ever could be—either at a local level or immediately; hence a need for an extensive long-term organisation and an extensive long-term defence against imperialism which has a vested interest in scarcity. How is this need to be reconciled with 'the visceral revolt' of anarchism against all forms of distant control? We need the answers."

Allowing for the differences in the language we use, these are the kind of questions for which, since its inception, this journal has sought to find answers.

Guérin himself is sufficiently challenging, not only to the popular misconceptions about anarchism, but to the historians who, he claims, have not given a true picture of anarchism, and to the anarchists themselves. For he recommends a constructive anarchism, rooted in the ideas of Proudhon and Bakunin, "which depends on organisation, on self-discipline, on federalist and non-coercive centralisation. It rests upon large-scale modern industry, up-to-date techniques, the modern proletariat, and internationalism on a world scale. In this regard it is of our times, and belongs to the twentieth century".

in

Anarchy 117: Conurb and County

in

Anarchy 118: Work