

# A prefatory note on Anarchism today

by P. M. Bergman

We live in an age of anarchy both abroad and at home.

—President Richard M. Nixon

Confronted with a choice, the American people would choose the policeman's truncheon over the Anarchist's bomb.

—Vice President Spiro T. Agnew

The revolutionary reaches beyond dissent to nihilism and anarchy.

—Mayor John V. Lindsay

This is a brutal book—sensual, rude, coarse, and cruel. However, it is timely and well-written, even witty. Professionally and painstakingly, all possible informative instructions for individual actions of destruction having a presumably social effect are detailed here.

There is no political merit in publishing this book; it is not a call to action. For the real Hippy and Yippy, especially for the rebellious student, it hardly contains anything basic that he does not already know. I believe that it is usually the "square guy" who wants to know what is going on, though (or because) shocked and even tantalized by such subjects. More often than not it is the subscriber to *Reader's Digest* and *Time* who constitutes the literary market for such boring commodities as, for example, *Games People Play*.

Still, the present book is an important reflection of American Anarchism. It has its historical precedent in a similar "Cookbook" which was published in many editions and sold openly around the turn of the century (by the Anarchist headquarters, at the time in New York City, 167 William Street). Its title was *Science of Revolutionary Warfare—A Handbook of Instruction regarding the Use and Manufacture of Nitroglycerine, Dynamite, Gun-Cotton, Fulminating Mercury, Bombs, Arsons, Poisons, etc.* The book was written by the Anarchist J. H. Most, who was the teacher of Emma Goldman.\*

\* Johann Joseph Most (1846-1906), a bookbinder by trade, was one of the first Marxist deputies to the German Reichstag. He wrote the first popularization of *Capital*. For his very radical publications against religion and patriotism, he was several times imprisoned,

I believe it to be very characteristic that such a book appeared only in this country. The same is true of the present "Cookbook." One might think this is because of the American constitutional "freedom of speech." But in other countries even the clandestine literature does not, so far as I know, show any similarities to such a "Cookbook." Blanqui's famous "Instructions for Insurrection" concentrates on mass actions (even if initiated by élites) like the building of barricades—something which neither Most's *Science* nor the present "Cookbook" gives any attention to. And this, in fact, expresses the basic difference—I think the only difference, even—between what is usually called Anarchism and revolutionary Marxism. I would like to go further and emphasize the specific nature of American Anarchism without denying that this local form still is Anarchism.

The word "Anarchism" as used in the present book might be somewhat misleading, even a misnomer. As often happens, it is confused with "Nihilism"—a word which Wendell Phillips favorably used after it was introduced by Turgenjev in *Fathers and Sons*. It frequented Russian literature until the time of Artzybashev. The chapter on narcotics, therefore, belongs to the present book. "Free Love"

and in 1878 had to flee Germany. In England, because of his extreme Anarchist views, Most broke with Marx and, after serving eighteen months at hard labor for advocating regicide, he emigrated in 1882 to the United States. Here he was, at the time of the Haymarket Square riot, considered the inspiration of radicalism throughout the country, but later, during the Homestead strike, Most spoke out against Berkman's assault on Henry Clay Frick. He was imprisoned for alleged sedition after the assassination of President McKinley.

(also religion) is missing here, for the good reason that it lost its sensational popularity in the Anarchist kitchen. Thus the popular synonymous use of Anarchism for Nihilism is understandable: Dostoyevsky's Netshayev was, after all, an important collaborator of Bakunin.

Nihilism *is* Anarchism, and Nihilism *is* revolutionary although it is an aberration of Anarchism. Like *all* other modern revolutionary tendencies, it is based philosophically on the Hegelian axiom: "Negation of Negation," which Friedrich Engels approvingly resolved with Goethe's words: "All that exists is worth perishing"; or, as recently expressed more simply in a note left in a bank burned by Anarchists in West Berlin: "Make *kaputt* what makes you *kaputt*."

Not only Anarchism, but any other real revolutionary movement is dragged into some forms of Nihilism. This understandably occurs especially in the formative stages as well as sometimes in the declining, depressive stages. Who can deny the historical importance of the wrecking of machinery by the Luddites (though today we are so clever that we tell them what they should have done instead)? There is no doubt that the assassination of czars and Russian governors effected, if nothing else, different treatment of political "criminals"—something which still has not been achieved in the "free" United States. Without denying the truly revolutionary character of the Palestinian commandos, their newest weapon, hijacking, is surely an aberration in their struggle for recognition. But the taking of hostages is nothing new in revolutionary history. The Paris Commune did it, as well as such partisans as the Titoists in Yugoslavia, the Maquis in France, and, before them, the Max-Hoelz Brigade in Weimar Germany.

"*Putschismus*," as it is called in German, or "*coup de main*," in French, is not limited to Anarchism. In the early twenties in Germany, attempts at bombing of public toilets and of the victory memorial in Berlin, or the famous bombing of the cathedral in Sofia (1923), and many other such "actions" were tacitly approved and initiated by Communists, especially at the time of their decline.

The main aspect of Anarchist actions, which surely do not conform with the civilized rules of politics and warfare (no government abides by them either, by the way) is to draw attention more to the existence of the movement than to its ideas. The attempt to free prisoners by taking hostages, or to reduce mistreatment of prisoners by individual attacks on officials and by bomb scares, will not create sympathy. However, it might lead to a "giving-in" by the government, forcing it to recognize the existence of the illegal Anarchist movement. As a matter of fact, the government itself commits an illegal act by "giving-in" to the assault. Usually a government fares better by "giving in," but, on the other hand, one of the criteria of a revolutionary situation is that a stage is reached where the government feels it can no longer give in.

Calling a policeman a "pig" seems silly and must antagonize the very people the revolutionaries want to win over or to neutralize. But the actual relationships of power are such that name-calling is the only weapon available at the moment. Besides, name-calling is an emotional outlet (and revolutionaries also have emotions). "Pig" is an assault, no doubt—an assault against the uniform which, though a fetish, is in itself a power, an assault against the whole power structure. It is an assault—and a crime punishable by law. Here is the strong policeman, heavily armed, with the entire physical and ideological power of the state behind him, and he is attacked by a word—by a word only, but it is still an attack.

What will the "pig" do? In the last analysis it is not up to the policeman, who, though having a loaded gun in his hand, has in fact no power; it is up to the state to give the answer. It might not be "smart" of Bobby Seale to provoke his jailers by repeatedly calling them "pigs," therefore getting brutally beaten and put in isolation. But "pig" is his only means of defense against the attacks upon his humanity at the moment and gives him a chance to get recognition for his beliefs and as a human being.

Basically what applies to the silly "pigs"-calling is also valid for the often Hollywoodlike hijackings, the taking of hostages, and even for the more harmful "Anarchist cooking." These methods are not "smart"; they are aberrations which sometimes border on insanity. But these methods of the revolutionary struggle of today are here and existing and real and, in the philosophical sense, reasonable. They reflect the true stage of the revolutionary struggle in the whole world. Its stage is today again embryonic.

In describing the American Revolution, history textbooks tell us only of such great episodes as the Boston Massacre, which unlocked the revolutionary spirit of the people; of the Boston Tea Party, which contested the power of the British parliament; or of the Battle of Bunker Hill, which took on the form of a real revolutionary war. The history textbooks, however, fail to describe the "Anarchist cooking" and innumerable sabotage actions which surely were going on in the several decades *before* the actual revolution. One cannot doubt that the Hessian mercenaries were called names.

The author of *Anarchist Cookbook* does not see in the individualistic acts of terror he describes the *ultima ratio*. He emphasizes that the real revolution will require the American people, and he has trust in them, but still he is not scared by the anger of short-sighted liberals and sensitive quasi-revolutionaries. However, I believe in the approach that Marx took toward the different forms of revolutionary struggles. This approach was not at all abstractly "theoretical," but very concrete and practical. It was limited to one question: "Whom does this serve?" But before dealing with this question, in regard to the "cook-

ing," it seems to me necessary to consider the all-important question: What is Anarchism?

Anarchism as an idea is *nonviolent*. Its philosophy is Spinozan, ethical, and nature-loving. Anarchism in modern times began under the intellectual and spiritual influence of the French Revolution and the late stage of Enlightenment of the young-Hegelian school.\* The progenitor of Anarchism is generally considered to be the German philosopher Max Stirner (Kaspar Schmidt, 1806-56), who in the tumultuous 1840's came out with the obviously neurotic form of Individual Anarchism. Except in England, an industrial proletariat hardly existed at that time but, seemingly without communication with each other (the telegraph was just invented), students in Paris and Rome, in Vienna, Berlin, and Madrid became rebellious. Interestingly, the only connection between the different places where students rioted was among the governments in suppressing these riots—the "Holy Alliance." Even at that time, it was the "foreigners" who misled these boys from nice families, as Heinrich Heine's verses satirically remind us. And, just as today, these students "never had it so good." They were mostly sons of the new and prosperous middle classes. Many of these "bums" received scholarships and the "best education ever," no doubt scholastically superior to the one Nixon in his ignorance is raving about today.

The idea of Anarchism already existed more universally when Stirner's confused writings appeared. American Anarchism began as far back as the 1820's with Josiah Warren, a New England Yankee of early colonial stock and a descendant of the famous Warren of Bunker Hill, who was followed by Ezra Heywood, William Greene, Lysander Spooner, Joshua Ingalls, Stephen P. Andrews, and later Benjamin Tucker. Thoreau is considered the American Anarchist *par excellence*, and, if we can believe Vernon Louis Parrington, all of the Adams family—from the two presidents to the brothers—wished nothing more than the burning of State Street, the site of Boston banking. (Parrington quotes that Henry Adams was held back from Marxism by "some narrow trait of the New England nature.")

Years before the Haymarket Riot, Wendell Phillips—this old-fashioned Yankee soul who was of the opinion that "if it must be bullets, so be it"—addressed the respectable Phi Beta Kappas at Harvard University with the words:

Nihilism is righteous and honorable. Nihilism is evidence of life. The last weapon of victims choked and

\* Hegel introduced the idea of *freedom* into philosophy. Much clearer than in his pedantically obscurantist philosophical writings, which often looked as if he favored the existing Prussian King, Hegel unmistakably expressed in his private letters the true meaning and the revolutionary character of his philosophy. For example, in a letter to Schelling: "The people will learn to feel the dignity of man. They will not merely demand their rights which have been trampled in the dust, but themselves will take them—make them their own."

manacled beyond all other resistance. I honor Nihilism, since it redeems human nature from the suspicion of being utterly vile, made up only of heartless oppressors and contented slaves. This is the only view an American, the child of 1620 and 1776, can take of Nihilism. Any other unsettles and perplexes the ethics of our civilization.

Anarchism in America, as an idea as well as a movement, was much stronger and more conspicuous than Marxism, even though Marx moved the headquarters of the First International to this country. The "Wobblies," who were the only ones representing the revolutionary labor movement, especially in the western United States, were undoubtedly mostly Anarchists.\* Later the impact of the Bolshevik revolution dominated and bureaucratized here all radical thought (the Communist Party in America was something like a slap in the face to Marx's suggestion that "every revolution will bear the birthmark of the old society from whose womb it sprang"). Again, today, while in Europe and Asia the revolutionaries agitate in the name of Marx (and Lenin), in the United States Mao, Ho, Guevara, Castro, etc., are the ones who are worshiped.

Anarchism as an idea reached its highest motives through the Darwin-Haeckel-inspired observation of *Mutual Aid* by Kropotkin. It also found strong support in Tolstoy's Christianity of Civil Disobedience. Anarchism as a theory of political science, however, as founded by Proudhon and Bakunin, has exactly the same goals as Marxism: abolition of private property, the basis of economic exploitation; and abolition of the state, the institution of social oppression. In this sense (and, after all, herein lies the premise of all revolutionary argument) Marx and Lenin consented to be true Anarchists. "As long as there is the state there is no freedom; when there is freedom there will be no state." (Lenin)

The formula of Blanqui (who was called by Marx "the heart and brain of the French proletariat") was the connecting word of Communism and Anarchism in the First International: "ni Dieu—ni Maître." Together, Proudhonists, Bakunists, Blanquists, and Marxists in the Paris Commune wrote, as Wendell Phillips said, "the grandest declaration of popular indignation on the pages of history in fire and blood." (Phillips added, "I honor Paris as the vanguard of the Internationals of the world.") And in the very beginning of Lenin's Third International, up till the Kronstadt episode, Anarchists from France, Italy, Germany, and also from America (Emma Goldman and Alex-

\* From the beginning, no other political idea was so severely persecuted in this country as Anarchism. Aside from the Chinese Exclusion Act, the only immigration restriction which existed up to the introduction of the quota system in 1924 was the law of 1901 forbidding Anarchists (and prostitutes) to enter the United States. The most renowned expression of American judicial murder was the case of the Anarchists Sacco and Vanzetti.

ander Berkman) took part in the Comintern at Moscow.\*

Anarchism is *anti-parliamentarian*. So, in fact, is Marxism. The only difference is that Marx and Engels, Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg believed in making use of Parliament against the power of the existing government. They never allowed active participation in any but a revolutionary government. The Paris Commune was surely not a parliament, and the Soviets of 1905 and 1917 came about as anarcho-syndicalist forms of free association completely independent from political parties.

Participation at elections is a purely tactical question. Anarchists in Romance countries sometimes took part in elections. Lenin was ambivalent toward elections to the Czarist Duma, and the first Communist Party Congress in Germany voted against participation (though their leader Rosa Luxemburg was for it). Today's students in America, diligently canvassing for politicians, are in for disillusionment, if their campaign for Gene McCarthy has not already disappointed them. The surprising fact that in this freest democratic country there are millions of conscientious non-voters (more than anywhere else in the world) is evidence of an interesting mass basis for "Anarchist cooking." It is a good sign for the ripening of revolutionary consciousness that, as James Reston reports in the *New York Times*, "all the excitement last spring about mounting a successive campaign by students to help elect peace candidates in the November elections has dwindled to a whisper."

Anarchism differs from Marxism in that the basic premise of Marxism is the class struggle of the proletariat against the capitalistic form of production. Therefore, society's taking possession of the means of production is, according to Marx, "the last act" the state fulfills. This state ("which is no longer a state") is identical with the dictatorship of the proletariat. By virtue of its permanent revolutionary character, the dictatorship of the proletariat consciously brings about such a condition that the state in any form *withers away*.

Anarchism wants the abolition of the state *out of hand*, since neither economic change in general nor the proletariat as such seems to guarantee freedom and humanity. Marx's whole revolutionary theory is based on his economic critique of bourgeois society—on what he regards as the all-decisive conflict which exists between private ownership and social production. Only as a result of this struggle on the part of the very often lethargic proletarians, caused by "objective" economic conditions, among which the most

\* Lenin's *Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder* was an opportunistic pamphlet that paved the way for the Rapallo policy, which introduced the Soviet foreign policy of "co-existence." Probably Lenin himself did not realize that this booklet would help the Comintern bureaucracy get rid of the radical critics in the international revolutionary movement—among them many of his closest friends outside Russia. It is interesting that today the foreign visitor will find at the bookstall in the Moscow airport huge stocks of this pamphlet in all languages, but *State and Revolution* is usually "out of stock."

important is the periodicity of crises, does true Communist society become possible and even unavoidable—while Anarchism simply does not need a theory of economics. The same is true of all new revolutionary philosophies. Neither Sartre nor Marcuse bothers about economic theory, while for Marx and Lenin it was of the utmost importance.

It is absolutely not true that Marx favored state socialism, as the social democrats and Soviet economists want us to believe. On the contrary, *Capital* characterizes *all* governmental economic measures—and especially state ownership of industry—as "feudal-reactionary."\* By the way, almost all criticism of Soviet Russia is limited to the political and cultural brutality of its system. When it comes to economics, this system rectifies itself shamelessly by Marxist phraseology. Even revolutionaries believe it is a great thing that the Soviet state owns the means of production.

Criticism of the Soviet Union almost never touches the main and real Marxian point that all the economic terms which, according to Marx, characterize capital, like "wages," "profit," "accumulation," and especially "value," are officially recognized by the Soviet regime as valid for a socialist economy. Marx's genial conception of the fetishism of commodities and the secret thereof, described in the first pages of *Capital*, is completely ignored.

Of even greater importance is the so-called role of the proletariat. The proletariat is the main social contradiction of capitalist society. This postulate united German Communists, French Socialists, Russian Anarchists with English Chartists around the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848 during and after the student revolts all over Europe initiated mass insurrections. The proletariat was declared the gravedigger of capitalism, whereas the students were criticized as "utopian," "reactionary," and "petit bourgeois."

But whenever Marx came into contact with the real facts of the organized proletariat, his and Engels' whole political life, as later that of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, was a constant struggle which resulted dialectically from the general role of the proletariat. Capitalism does create through the proletariat its own gravedigger, but the proletariat is an integral part of capitalism. The well-being of capitalist economy is, in any existing conditions, the best possible condition for the material well-being of the pro-

\* In his criticism of the German Social Democratic Party program (Erfurt, 1891), Engels very sharply said that Marxism "has nothing in common with the so-called State Socialism, that system of nationalisation which puts the state in place of the private owner and by so doing concentrates the power of economic exploitation and the political oppression of the workers in one hand."

There is no difference at all between Marxism and Anarchism in regard to the economics of Socialism. In the famous closing statement of the first volume of *Capital*, where Marx predicts "the expropriation of the expropriators," he makes it clear that the Negation of Negation will not reestablish *private* property (which in fact is being destroyed by corporate capitalism). He observes, however, that it will "certainly establish *individual property*, based on *cooperation* and the *possession in common* of the land and the means of production."

letariat. Marx was completely aware of this decisive contradiction and therefore emphasized the position which his Communists take toward the proletarian masses.

The proletarians are interested in economic affluence in its simplest form—dollars and cents—regardless of whether capitalism is private or state or semi-socialistic. In some ways they are even more interested in, and very apologetic toward, any militaristic-industrial establishment which guarantees employment, health insurance, and wage levels which can be attained without costly strikes. As long as there is affluence which provides even a measure of freedom of competition among “equals,” as long as increased productivity and a “just” distribution of produced wealth let the proletarian have a share (its relative size—an important factor in Marx’s analyses—is unimportant to him), what logical interest can he have in economic recession, depression, slumps, and crises, about which old Marx was so avid in his letters and which were once so ardently desired in the reports made up by the Comintern-economist Varga? On the contrary from a simple, logical point of view, the leaders of trade unions and of established Socialist and Communist parties became the healers of society’s economic and social sicknesses. Their bureaucratic degeneration is only part of their function—and secondary. Their corruption is only a symptom which helps, as in any state system.

Interesting in this connection is W.E.B. DuBois’s analysis of the English and German Socialist immigrants who came here as political refugees and first blurted out their disapprobation of Negro slavery on principle. Later they found they could increase wages and regulate working conditions much better in the United States than in Europe. This happy discovery, instead of increasing sympathy for the slave, turned the attitude of the immigrants directly into rivalry and enmity. “The wisest of the leaders,” DuBois observed, “could not clearly envisage how slave labor in conjunction and competition with free labor tended to reduce all labor toward slavery. For this reason, the union and labor leaders gravitated toward the political party which opposed tariff bounties and welcomed immigrants, quite forgetting this same Democratic party had as its backbone the planter oligarchy of the South with its slave labor.” This was and still is the role of organized labor with regard to the Negro question and party politics. It has been true even in those cases when organized labor was committed to Socialism and Communism. Needless to say, this attitude was always heavily criticized by Marx.

Thus the organized proletariat became in fact a *conditio sine qua non* for existing society. Without social democratic bureaucrats and without Communist *apparatchiks*, European capitalism could hardly have survived after the First World War. Even more so everywhere today, including in the so-called “developing countries,” classical capitalism has no chance whatsoever without social democracy and

Communist bureaucracy. Look at India—this greatest wonder of misery in the whole world is held together today by Liberal, Socialist, and even Communist bureaucracy. It is perhaps more corrupt than anywhere else in the world. Preaching nonviolence, it is in actual practice very violent toward its dissenters. It is only proper that India is the ideal of the liberals, such as John Kenneth Galbraith.\*

Marx emphasized that it is not the worker’s consciousness that leads him to revolution. It is the “objective situation” which will drive him to his historical role. In May, 1968, the students of Paris realized that they needed the help of the workers—that no revolution is possible without the proletariat. Remaining a rebellion of students, it can never become a revolution.

What do these naughty, ill-behaving, and ungrateful students want? We could quote Marx and Bakunin and Blanqui and Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky. I prefer to mention a recent resolution passed by students of the very “square” Harvard Business School and published as an ad in the *Wall Street Journal*:

We condemn the administration of President Nixon for its view of mankind and the American community which . . . is unwilling to move for a transformation of American society in accordance with the goals of maximum fulfillment for each human being and harmony between mankind and nature.

This is not only the idea, it is even the language, of Hegel and Marx. Those students have already passed the stage of protesting against the obscene war in Vietnam and the stage of the silliness of Hickel’s “Earth Day.” No student in America (and in Russia) believes any more that the Second World War was fought because Hitler killed six million Jews, but the textbooks, written by Liberals and Socialists, still say it. These students are now on the way to finding out that basically everything Lenin wrote about the First World War can be applied to the Second World War as well as to the conflict in the Near East. They are discovering, too, that what he wrote on imperialism is still valid for state capitalism, which must lead, if left to its “natural” development, to planned barbarism.

After so much costly confusion created mostly because the Russian Marxists were not able to cope with internal and international conditions, and after their intellectual fellow travelers covered up every Robespierian terror (and now *after* the “Gods have failed them” are angry about the Egyptian expedition of the little Napoleons in the Kremlin), the writings of Marx were put on the highest

\* Significantly, there are hardly any Anarchists (or Nihilists) in India. It is also interesting that ideologically Anarchism, even in its individualistic forms, has never been “Faustian” or Nietzschean or Spenglerian. Philosophically, today’s Hippies and Yippies, though a number of them are somehow “mystic,” are in complete contrast to the Jeremiad of the decline of the world. Toynbee does not interest them.

pedestal of modern philosophy, called psychology and sociology (whatever that means). At the same time only naïve "Anarchists" and incorrigible "dogmatists" still dared to believe in the great Marxian perception that the social destiny of man is his own work and that his goal—the solution of his fundamental historical 'problem, of his misery—can only be the abolition of state, of government in any form. And thus the emancipation of humanity requires revolution. This is the real principle of Anarchism. It is the quintessence of Marx and Bakunin and also of Tolstoy. What have the Liberals, Socialists, and Communists to offer instead?

When the students became more and more disturbed as they saw the illusory and contradictory conditions around them and throughout the world, with no solution in sight (as did the students in the times of young Marx), the psychology and sociology professors in Heidelberg, Paris, and Boston and also in Warsaw and Zagreb came out with a word which they found in the newly discovered early philosophical manuscripts by Marx. (He himself said that he preferred to leave those early manuscripts to the "gnawing critique of the mice.") The word was *Alienation*. Alienation is the basic evil of the world. So is "Pollution;" the newest fashionable word in politics. "Alienation" is class-less, and that is why it became a shibboleth of the critical minds of the philosophers. Although it really is revolutionary (after all it is Marxist), "Alienation" became fashionable and perfectly legal, in Poland as well as in Spain. This was for the very same reason that Marx 125 years ago had no more use for it from the moment he gave up the narrow academic life and began to take an active part in the real movement in France. It was then he turned from Hegelian philosophy, aesthetics, and psychology to revolution, and said: The philosophers are trying to *interpret* the world differently—what matters is to *change* the world.

It is tragic that those professors whose learned efforts in the fields of sociology and history, and in a wider sense of philosophy and psychology, bring them nearest to the real facts of life, which one would think are forcing them to make the jump to revolution (it can only be a jump!)—that those professors especially are most alienated and are left behind by the students. Those rebellious students are so nasty that they show them the behind (imagine, to those well-meaning professors!). Thus we learn from a report in the book publishers' trade weekly that Nixon's "bums" have stopped reading books. What books? Symptomatically, the same periodical reports that in Germany the students are reading mostly nineteenth-century books.

Interestingly, it is different in the field of the sciences, where there is a more real connection with production and business and where the students acquire something like the role the highly qualified worker used to have. (It is well-known that this worker was the intellectually advanced,

class-conscious stock of the old revolutionary movement in Europe.) This also might explain why frequently Nobel prize winners like Szent-Gyorgyi, Wald, and Pauling (to mention only American ones) are sympathetic toward the rebellious students—in fact, most of those scientists condone Anarchist "cooking" all the way, starting with the first chapter on dope. Today, an Einstein (who, by the way, was a pronounced Anarchist) would probably not go to the president to draw his attention to the military meaning of a discovery like the one by Hahn-Meitner. He would probably go with his information to the Anarchists. How frightening to think that among today's Italian students there might be a new Enrico Fermi!

The students are warned by Bruno Bettelheim, by Irving Howe, by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and by the established head of the emptiest philosophy in America, the Social Democrat Professor, Sydney Hook, that "Anarchist cooking" will lead to the situation that prevailed in Italy and Germany before Mussolini and Hitler took over. The "backlash" argument is as old as written history—even biblical—and could be chewed on endlessly. It would doubtless be a waste of space to quote what Marx and Lenin had to say about, "They should not have taken up the arms." Aside from all that, the historical analogy which Liberals are warning the students about is rubbish. Historical comparison is certainly necessary and for good reasons plays a big part in revolutionary literature. But no comparison with the pre-Hitler period can be proven by one single social, economic, political, or cultural event (aside the fact that Hitler could not have come to power without the tacit support of the Vatican, the Quai d'Orsay and the Foreign Office figuring that Hitler would fulfill his *Drang nach Osten*—something similar to the newest desire for a war between Russia and China).

When Hitler came to power, no war was going on, labor did not ask for higher wages, prices were deflating. Surely there was no "affluence." Students were not shaking the educational system. Racial or national minority struggle for equality did not exist. (Anti-Semitism did not arise because Jews asked for equal rights.) All such things happened, however, in Russia in 1905. One more interesting criterion: Unlike Italy and Germany, Russia at that time, like this country today, had no labor movement to speak of.\*

\* It is true that, in the immediate pre-Nazi period, the German Communist Party—on instructions from Moscow—"cooked anarchistically," throwing bombs, killing policemen, and initiating acts of senseless terror, even in cooperation with Nazi gangs. But it is false and only a legend that the transfer of power to Hitler by the German industrialists and the military was a "backlash from the Bolshevik danger." All the documents which have come out since the collapse of the Nazi regime, among them reports on conferences within the Hindenburg clique and the circles of big business and Prussian Junkers, do not even mention any serious concern about Communist activities. Rather, we find that breaking the power of the Social Democratic Party and the big trade unions was the foremost consideration of the Hindenburg-Papen-Schleicher group and of big business. In fact, the decisive act in paving the way for the

Dr. Bettelheim refers to the noisy, nauseating students at the Vienna University giving him a traumatic experience, and without a blink he—as a scientist—simply equates “students” with “students.” One hopes that this therapist does not in his profession treat all children alike. Aside from the decisive fact that those Vienna students Dr. Bettelheim berates were supported (and not only tacitly) by the half-fascist government which they wanted to be more fascist, doesn't the child therapist Bettelheim look at the faces of the children? One can proudly see the difference between the *teutsche* students and today's rebellious boys and girls in this country, in France, and, yes, in Germany, simply by looking at their faces. What Dr. Bettelheim says is an insult—at least an insult to the intelligence of his readers.\*

Just as false, of course, is the “radical” rationalization that today's American government is equal to Fascism—an argument which might “constitutionally” help to justify “Anarchist cooking.” The irony is that William Kunstler uses basically the same analogy to Germany as Irving Howe does, only for divergent reasons.

Though also ignoring the parliament, Nixon is not a Hitler and not even a Hindenburg. Only as a joke one could make an analogy, since there are so many Sauerkraut-names in the Nixon entourage. And, to facetiously stretch the analogy further, one might say that the “decent” conservative Nazi supporters tried to persuade Hitler to curb the offensive tone of his “African” (Goebbels), as the good Americans wish Nixon would do with his “Greek,” but here the analogy really ends.

Rather, Richard M. Nixon is—*cum grano salis*—a Czar Nicolas II, and Attorney General John Mitchell is his Plehve.\*\*

What went on in Kent, Ohio, and elsewhere is a small

Nazi regime was Papen's “backlash” against the Social Democratic government in Prussia, which capitulated to this illegal act, although the Social Democrats not only had organized labor behind them, but also the Prussian police force. The next and final “backlash” by the Nazis was caused by the readiness of the leadership of the German trade unions to put themselves at the service of the Nazi-Arbeitsfront. Thus, if the Nazi regime was a “backlash,” then it came not as a move against revolutionary activities. Rather, it clearly resulted from the impotence of the liberals who were afraid of a “backlash.” Such an attitude of course, directly led to the erosion of all the power the German liberals had.

\* The percentage of the students within the whole Nazi movement before 1933 was minute. Symptomatically, the bulk of the Nazi students were law students preparing themselves for administrative and judicial posts in the government—thus the real law-and-order people. Many of them would have gone to officers' schools, but there were none in the Weimar Republic, and the regular army was restricted by peace treaty to 100,000 men. That sociologists and historians can neglect such important differences is hard to believe.

\*\* Tom Wicker in the *New York Times* compares Mitchell with Rasputin. He is, of course, mistaken. Rasputin was not a member of the Czarist government and became prominent years after the 1905 Revolution. Rather, Billy Graham is Nixon's Rasputin. Nevertheless, Wicker's remark is discerning, because it draws attention to similarities between Nixon and Czar Nicolas II.

but true copy of Bloody Sunday in January, 1905, when the guards “felt threatened” by the petitioners led by the priest Gapon (who, it was revealed a year later, was in the service of the Russian police). At that time, all-mighty Czarist Russia was involved in a bitter and costly and hopeless war with a second-rate, little, aggressive Asian country; it was bothered by racial and minorities' demands, by stone-throwing bearded students, by bomb-fabricating boys and girls from good and even aristocratic families. Plenty of dope was used, also (not only by rebellious students who, as today, did not get drunk as did their fathers). The list of striking similarities could be much extended.

The “backlash” reaction to “Anarchist cooking” in Russia was not from S.S. and S.A. Storm Troopers or Fascisti, but such well-established income-earning people as today's construction workers. In old Russia, it was especially the poultry traders who broke up student meetings, while the police looked on. Those were the most active Jew-beaters also, because of the competition at the open street markets. After all, the hard-hats feel threatened by Negro demands for job opportunities. That these construction workers will become the nuclei comparable to the “Black Hundreds” in Russia I doubt very much. They are not the Ku Klux Klan type, of which this country has plenty, to be recruited for “White Hundreds”—even at the universities.

On the other hand, there were many Hickels in the Russian government and among the nobility, who pleaded for “understanding” of the rebellious students and their causes, and criticized the educational system.\* Millionaires gave money to the revolutionaries. The great opera singer Chaliapin arranged parties to collect for the imprisoned “Panthers” of that time. And also an impetuous women's liberation movement appeared.\*\*

It is hard to leave this historical “necromancy” because it is, besides amusing, very helpful in analyzing the present political situation and its probable perspective. It is amusing to observe the way in which Nixon “hawks and spits” (if a phrase by Schiller may be used) like Nicolas II. The Czar was also a great friend of peace conferences, and this especially used to enrage old Tolstoy. It was the same Czar who initiated the World Court of Justice in The Hague. And Nixon now tries to do in reverse what Nicolas II did by getting an American president to settle his war in Asia in 1905. (Why not? The Russians are our oldest “imperial friends.” They were called that a long time ago when we engaged them as umpire to get back our slaves according to the terms of the Treaty of 1783.)

What wonderful “generation of peace” this could be if only Czar Nixon and President Kosygin would get together

\* See Lenin's works, English edition, vol. 7. Excellent for the description of the student movements and their potencies; it offers some interesting analogies to today's events at the universities.

\*\* The women's liberation movement was a serious aspect of the Russian Revolution. Its achievements in the first five years after the

and continue where their counterparts Eisenhower and Khrushchev left off because of the damned U-2 incident! This was a time when the Anarchist Bertrand Russell was so frightened by the nightmare of Russian-American co-operation (just as frightened as Tolstoy was when he learned that the visiting Czarist fleet in Nantes played the "Marseillaise" and the republican French navy of Liberté, Egalité, and Fraternité responded with "Long Live the Czar") that he expressed the crazy wish that the Pentagon should throw atom bombs on the Kremlin.

History proves that it is not the antagonism which leads to wars, but paradoxically the *modus vivendi*, when, to paraphrase Heinrich Heine, they will both understand each other and promptly find themselves in the mud. (Bismarck and Louis Bonaparte, so also Stalin and Hitler.)

Moscow does not have to worry any more about NATO (if it ever seriously did). The drag on European economy by the American "stagflation" makes it probable that the successor of Willy Brandt may throw the American army out of Western Europe if the Federal Reserve should resist the return of the gold bullions (instead of paper dollars) it owes Germany. But what worries Moscow is the coming crisis of world economy; that might make the Kremlin's readiness for "co-existence" more palatable and stop its support of "anti-imperialist forces." Stalin's policy of "Socialism in one country" by exploiting the fellow-travelers of the Communist parties and national revolutionary movements in the world was in general very successful. Today, the Kremlin still keeps to this very profitable policy. To give up that policy—as was partially done during the Roosevelt-Stalin honeymoon—would require that American capital is ready to pay for it and to give much better trade conditions than Western Europe and Japan. Soviet Russia has a very substantial reason, one can call it an "imperialist" reason, for supporting the Arabs, the Vietcong, and Cuba—and to that degree Russia is a true ally of the revolutionary world. (Somehow similar to Napoleon's revolutionary role in Europe.) The trade figures for the last decade speak a clear language: The substantial surpluses that Russia earns from trade with the so-called developing countries cover its trade deficit with the Western industrial suppliers. Of course, there might arise the great problem of indebtedness, which the "aid" given so graciously by Russia creates, with all its eventual consequences—like Western

revolution were more progressive than anywhere else in the world.

It is interesting that such a good observer as Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., prognosticates that today's Women's Lib movement will have a greater revolutionary impact than that of the "kids."

As expressed by the best-selling book *Sexual Politics*, the basic theories of the new movement are not any longer the liberal ones, but the revolutionary opinions of Friedrich Engels' *Origin of the Family*. Author Kate Millett rightly criticizes the liberal and "free" sex literature of Norman Mailer and Henry Miller. Our objection is only that, by reproducing extensively the cheap filth, she seems to have fallen for the same old tricks as have other "unhurried viewers of Erotica."

"aid" already does, especially in South America where constant *coup d'états* are partially motivated by the desire to get rid of the indebtedness to the Chase Manhattan and by the same token to get new "aid" from the First National, or else from Russia.

The Smart Alecs at the *New York Times* advise Nixon to make use of the existing conflict between China and Russia to get out of Vietnam. The conflict between China and Russia really exists, but it is naïve to think that Peking and Moscow do not know what Washington wants. There is no doubt that Stalin was a neurotic and therefore he did it in his peculiar way, but his pact with Hitler threw off the Daladiers and Chamberlains, who wished that the Nazis would go against Russia and gain enough *Lebensraum* that France and England would be spared. And it is just because of the conflict between themselves that Russia and China desire that Nixon stay as long as he can in Vietnam, and go deeper and deeper into Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Burma, and, if possible, again into Korea.

Nixon wants to get out of Vietnam; one can believe him. (It is anyway not the "right" war as Korea was, and not as "popular" as, for example, an invasion in the Near East could be.) It is not the war Congress does not like (the Tonkin resolution was almost unanimous), but the unpopularity of the war in Vietnam. Nixon is right when he says that ending the war in Vietnam would not stop the student movement and solve the decisive internal problems. The internal policy of a big power is never dependent on its foreign policy. Rather, it is the reverse. Otherwise revolutionaries would wish nothing better than wars. It is not true that wars are the fathers of revolutions. Rosa Luxemburg and Lenin thought at the outbreak of the First World War that the chances of proletarian revolution were delayed and not progressed, and that the war brutalities would destroy the international spirit of the proletariat. What revolution resulted directly from the Second World war? Not even Stalin could say that the invasions by the Red Army were revolutions. But it is true that wars, even victorious ones, often add decisively to internal difficulties and therefore ultimately may lead to revolution.

Wars break out for economic reasons. We are told that the war in Vietnam damages the economy. Yes, but whose economy? Adam Smith argued correctly that slavery is unrentable, while he must have seen how Liverpool flourished as the mecca of the international slave trade. George Washington, the biggest slaveholder in Virginia, used to complain bitterly that he lost money on slaves. At the same time, he bought new ones (secretly, so that his good northern friends should not know). It is true that Wall Street protested strongly against the Cambodia invasion, and it is known as a historical fact that every time a war starts the stock market goes down, while peace or peace rumors usually bring the shares up.

We are told that economically the United States did not



win World War II, especially because of U.S. generosity in foreign aid and because the losers (Germany and Japan) are prosperous. Never mind that the bulk of our aid consists of armament which is not productive. Only one look at the list of American investments in Europe and at the interest obligations of the so-called undeveloped countries suffices to show that imperialism pays. Ford's newly negotiated participation at the automobile factory in—what irony!—Hiroshima alone will pay off more than the cost of the first atom bomb which was thrown on this town.

It is true that the military has its own interest, and so has every other branch of the ruling class—the banks, the insurance companies, the agrarian conglomerates etc., etc. The special interest of the military is a pretty old one, older than capitalism. Campanella nearly four hundred years ago complained that the Spanish commanders prolonged the war so that their pay as well as their authority might also be prolonged.\* There is no need for the special term "military industrial complex," since *Imperialism* characterizes sufficiently the stage of capitalism in which we live.

The military does not live in a vacuum. No doubt, American capitalism can exist without South America, without Arabian oil, and even without investments in Europe, though those alone are a greater investment than the British Empire ever had. But when those "third persons" (as Lenin called them) are once available, capital necessarily is somehow driven to exploit them and to swallow up the surplus profit the "help"-needing countries provide. About one quarter of India's, Brazil's, Argentina's, and Mexico's exports go for covering of the interest debts on foreign loans. This is the economic explanation for imperialism and war.

The economic difficulties of American capitalism were not created by the Vietnam war. In capitalism industry produces commodities, no matter whether industry is applied to production or destruction of things. True, military production does not create wealth. Neither does advertising. It is waste, overhead, misused capacities, and loafing that characterize cooperative capitalism, so that any wage demands threaten the rate of surplus value toward capital's point of no return so much that inflation becomes, in fact, the main source of profit. But profits are high. Look at the growth of American banking. Stopping the Vietnam war will not change inflation and improve employment. Acheson, the protagonist of the Pentagon, is right that it does not mean much if all that the U.S. military spends is hardly seven percent of a national growth amounting to a trillion!

All governments shed crocodile tears about inflation. Even the Thieu gang does it, while sucking dry the Americans with black-market operations. Who else but govern-

\* General Douglas MacArthur became seriously worried that the invention of atomic weapons, and thus wars of very short duration, might shake the whole idea of the military.

ments create inflation? There are no private money-printing presses. It is a pretext that welfare and education are the real causes of inflation. American industry has reached such capacities and productivity that, even with very high wages, prices could go down instead of up. Inflation is economically nothing but a method of avoiding the commercial crisis which, under normal capitalism, usually appeared periodically after the growth of industry reached a certain high point. The practical social effect of inflation is the same as Depression and Recession, but with other means. The pockets of labor and the middle classes are emptied, while their nominal earnings even increase. Unemployment, a typical result of Depression, disappears, while pauperism is growing. ("It is estimated that each year a million people become poor," says Columbia Professor Etzioni.) Surely inflation has its dangers and, like a Depression, it is threatening the existence of the capitalist system. No wonder that every measure Nixon is taking (or pretending to take) to stop inflation brings about "normal" depressing results: reduction of capital investments, a bear market, unemployment—all the symptoms of a regular economic crisis.

Looking at the economic and social realities, there is no reason to believe that any other government could do better than Nixon's—even if the computer could give the right answer—avoiding the catastrophe that Herbert Hoover did not foresee. Hoover kept saying, "Everything is so good." What else should he have done? Suppose Hoover had known what all the economics professors (who claimed that American ingenuity had abolished the normal business cycle forever) did not know—that the 1929 crash was coming? What nonsense to have expected him to tell the people to stop buying stock and to withdraw their bank deposits! What in all honesty should Nixon do now?

The first solution of (at that time) "free enterprise" American capitalism to the Depression was the classical one: mass unemployment, low wages, pauperization. That is the normal capitalist solution, which Nixon would like and for which the new economics genius Milton Friedman invented a formula of "government interference by government noninterference" (fits Nixon so nicely). One is reminded of the wizard of the German economy, Hjalmar Schacht, who was also strictly "free-enterprise" oriented, but managed the Weimar economy as well as Hitler's. (*Le Monde*, Paris, calls the Nixon economic policy "Friedman's paradox.")

There is always a way out for a capitalist economy as long as there is no revolution. In the heights of the Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt lowered the value of the dollar by the rate of 40 percent (a drastic inflation) and introduced Social Security and public works, thus government interference. Still the Depression was practically holding on till American business got the big push caused by the outbreak of the Second World War. By

"giving-in" to labor and farmer, Roosevelt succeeded in ameliorating the Depression and avoiding the revolutionary consequences of capitalist crises.

It is not possible to foresee the solution of today's Recession. But it seems probable that Nixon will "give-in." That will mean—as paradoxical as it sounds—more inflation and more taxation, higher interest rates and increased money liquidity, with all of which labor and big business can be neutralized. Or will he continue to follow the Friedman-paradox which claims that a big unemployment now will avoid a bigger unemployment later?

Nixon *is* in trouble. The present economy has made a shambles of the impressive computer-built "econometric" forecasts which were made for 1969. Still we have forecasts for the seventies with doubling and tripling of production (for the computer industry tenfold, I believe). The interesting thing is that, if the analysts would not predict these tremendous amounts of growth, they logically would have to prognose crisis.

The trouble Nixon faces is economic and quite normal, conditioned by the capitalist system in its imperialist stage. The situation parallels that of the British Empire, whose role has now been assumed by the United States. The British also used to invade the so-called undeveloped countries "solely" to protect lives and "to get our citizens out." To prove his theory of imperialism, Lenin quoted Cecil Rhodes, the main initiator of the Boer War who, as early as 1895, said: "If you don't want civil war, you have to become imperialists."

Like any other phenomenon of capitalist economy, which is solely motivated by divergent and competitive interests, imperialism has its contradictions. Only in the night do all cats look gray. The closing of the Suez Canal has hurt, but the owners of the big tankers, which could not use this shorter route anyway, now get the business.

Nixon, whose Republican Party traditionally has been for tariffs, now fights the protective measures which the Democratic-controlled Senate passed in the interest of the shoe and textile industries. High or low interest rates, inflation or price and wage controls, taxation or spending reduction are claimed to be principles. They are only interests, because a simple principle of economics is: What one loses another gains. Even in a bear market, every stock that is sold has a buyer.

Wall Street felt angry about Cambodia—but the real reason for the bear market is not Nixon's blundering in Cambodia. Ask any businessman, and he will always blame bad business on politics. While the government made inflation (which is always a swindle because the additional money supply does not really represent the volume of actual capital growth), the bull market was Wall Street's private inflation. Theoretically the average price of shares should be determined by the balance of activities—that is, by the earnings, like prices of any other commodities oscil-

lating around their real value. The bull market went much further than was justified by real growth plus inflation. The shares went much higher than the earnings and potentials of the companies allowed. They even went up for stocks of companies which were bankrupt or near bankruptcy like Penn Central, Lockheed, and Chrysler. It is "normal" today that many companies are paying prevailing interest rates of 10 percent while earning only 6 to 8 percent of their investment.

In addition to the blunders within the American economy, there is a crisis in the international capital market, where the U.S. dollar plays a dominant role, with inflationary effects. McNamara, who learned at the Pentagon that disagreeable events often repeat themselves, is now as president of the World Bank busy avoiding a new attack on the gold swindle of the Federal Reserve. An American Depression will undoubtedly drag in the European and Japanese economies which already are suffering under their own inflations. An international collapse is in the making, but when it will come and what form it will take depends on so many imponderables that nothing can be predicted about it. A world economic crisis will surely make acute the situation which already bears a revolutionary character. But permanent crises do not exist. There is always an escape hatch.

All governments are interested in avoiding economic crises, even such with a "principle of noninterference" (which is itself a contradiction and no principle at all). Nixon is trying very hard to prevent the Depression which has been threatening since he came to Washington. Nixon truly represents the interests of avoiding bad business *in general*, and he would like to represent the economic interest of the silent majority, if possible. However, the intricacy of the matter is that capitalism is a competitive system and acutely so in depressive situations, when the whole pie gets smaller. And since what one gains the other loses, government interference becomes increasingly directed by the most powerful interest groups. What follows is usually that the interests of the silent majority are neglected and even antagonized. Additionally, all governments have Bonapartist tendencies and often follow their own interests, as constantly increasing its own financial power, which might temporarily conflict with pure economics.

Obviously, in the face of the vast complexity of world political and economic affairs, it is impossible to predict when a revolution may occur.

The students are told that the time is not ripe. Ripe for what? If the actual revolution is meant, then even the great master of revolution, Lenin, did not prognosticate the revolution in 1905 until it really happened. A few weeks before the February revolution, in a speech to Swiss students, he told them it would be them, not him, who would live in the time of the coming revolution. The character of a revolution implies its timely indefiniteness. Eldridge

Cleaver's perspective of a right-wing *coup d'état* in the United States by 1972 which will trigger a mass eruption with the revolution victorious in the end sounds fine, but it reminds one too much of the 1932-33 Stalinite Comintern policy that "after Hitler come we." "It has to get worse before it can get better," is a banality. "The dawn of the morning does not appear again until the darkness of the night has completely broken" sounds like a Greek classic, but it is not a revolutionary thought. Sure, the Stalinites were "right" and it is true that they came after Hitler, but how and to what? "Perspectives" like the one by Cleaver lead only to illusions.

Anarchists have no "perspective." Mao had no "perspective." As he described it to Malraux, even if the revolution, which came as a "ripe fruit," had not come at all, the "long march" by itself had tremendous value: in the education of the masses, in developing the farms, in constantly breaking the power of the enemy.\*

Nobody can know how the revolution in America will come about. Impressed by the Emancipation war and Reconstruction period, even Marx thought about the probability of a peaceful (by-election-achievable) revolution in this country. He did not live long enough to see that all tendencies which he described in the theoretical analyses of "Capital," especially the one leading to monopolism and corruption, would, beginning with the 80's find their excessive and brutal triumph here, more than anywhere in the world.

American historians always avoided raising the question of what a conviction of President Andrew Johnson by the Senate after the impeachment by the House would have led to. Only one vote more for the constitutional two thirds required for removal and Reconstruction would have been the revolution the Anarchists Thoreau, Parker, Emerson, Phillips and Garrison were longing for!

All we can know of the near future is that the riots will multiply—the riots on the campuses, in the ghettos, in the jails; people will burn their apartments to get rid of the bedbugs, set fire to the garbage on the streets because the Sanitation Department cannot cope with the waste of affluence; the cops who are already more afraid than the people they are supposed to protect will be more scared to walk alone in the streets; people will put more iron bars and locks on the doors and windows of their homes. Who knows where the riots will break out next: in the high schools, in the plants, in the armed forces? By squatting

\* In *Man's Fate*, the greatest novel of our time illustrating the realities of the revolutionary movement, Malraux provides a masterly description of the relationship between Anarchists and Marxists in China. Significantly, it is Ch'en, the Anarchist, with whom this novel starts. Later, in his talk with Malraux, Mao emphasizes that the revolution took power while Hankow, the most industrialized city in all China, was quiet. Mao did not even properly inform the Stalinite Communists in the cities. The same is true of Castro—the Cuban Communist Party was surprised when the revolution came.

against speculating landlords, by jumping the subway turnstiles, by beating up dope pushers, by looting stores as the symbols of price inflation, by sit-ins as answer to unemployment and in support of wildcat strikes, by directing doctors in hospitals and teachers in schools to do what the people want them to do or get out, by wrecking draft boards and military installations, etc. etc., people will take their fate in their own hands. All such "Anarchist Cooking" represents good American tradition. "Anarchist Cooking" and self-protection are taught to American children by the Western movies.

### *Cui bono?*

Every Negation contains an Affirmation, Citizen Procurator.

—Bukharin to Vishinsky at the trial of the "Block of Rightists and Trotskyites"

Who are these revolutionary students? What do they want? And whom do they serve?

It is a lot of fun to see the play about Marat with the long-winded title, which reveals to us the great wisdom that the whole world is crazy. We learn that, because the People's Friend was irritated by a skin disease, he bloodily called for heads. Thus, Kropotkin's and others' efforts to find the reasons for and explain the terrorism of the French Revolution—which symbolized more than any other in history the eternal contrast between the goal of humanity and the means of violence—were in vain, since it is so simple. That Marat wrote his *Philosophy of Man*, wherein he proclaimed an extreme materialism almost twenty years before the Revolution even began, and that he vented his hatred not only against the king but also against Liberals like Voltaire, Mirabeau, and Lafayette, and *therefore* had to go into hiding in the sewers of Paris, where he contracted the disease, seems not to be relevant. The play is the thing!

A growing body of literature tries to explain the spreading of violence and drug addiction in our present society from the psychological viewpoint. And it is a fact that to hardly any other expression of human behavior can the fashionable term "Oedipus Complex," "Castration Anxiety," "Libido," "Aggression," "Rejection," etc., etc., be so impressively applied as to revolutionary movements and their protagonists. But even when this is done by serious analysts, such explanations often lead to silliness. For example, four decades ago Wilhelm Reich, who with Otto Fenichel was among the first politically oriented Freudians,\* came out with the most simple explanation for fascism, namely, "lack of a healthy orgasm."

\* Freud considered himself apolitical. He was very conservative until his later years, when his friendship with Romain Rolland began. In his letters, Freud clearly expressed sympathy toward the Kaiser and for Hindenburg's war successes (in which he believed up to the very end).

On a similar level, psychologists today are taking part in commissions set up by Nixon and Lindsay to explain the causes of addiction, violence, and crime among youth; and just as simple are the corrective gadgets these commissions propose.

We know that Anarchism is antiauthoritarian (a statement which is hardly more than a tautology). Hence it seems that Anarchists are like adolescents. They are—we are told—rebellious against the authority of government as young people do against the authority of the father. The comparison of the family with the state, though it has a certain historical juncture, cannot be taken seriously. But, for reasons of clarifying what Anarchism really is, let's deal with the analytic vulgarism which says that all these young people want is to do what their fathers are doing. Those bums do not want to go to school; and therefore they attack the educational system. They want to sleep with their mothers; therefore they kill their fathers. They want to be seductive and to addict themselves; their fathers talk big, get drunk, and become violent. If Father Nixon is allowed to play with B-52s in the Far and Near East, they see nothing wrong with planting a bomb in a department store. They also seem to subscribe to juridical logic: If surface atomic tests are outlawed, let's go underground. . . .

Such simplified psychoanalytic nonsense, which reduces the predestined disharmony of the state to seemingly the same for the family tends *ad absurdum*. The conservative, the liberal, and the status-quo solutions to the problem are: Agnew is for more spanking, Hickel for more love, and Nixon (by custom required to be the responsible father), for both.

The undoubtedly skillful handling of wayward and aggressive youngsters by August Aichhorn cannot be applied to today's student revolts. By disregarding the decisive political and ideological character of youth movements all over the world, valuable psychoanalytic observations on delinquency become psychological crap.

This is not to say that a serious psychological approach does not have its merits. After all, those rebellious boys and girls are human. They are very human indeed. In a highly interesting, recently published book (*In the Service of Their Country: War Resisters in Prison*) Dr. Willard Gaylin, a practicing analyst and professor of psychology at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center and at Union Theological Seminary, supplies analytical case studies of nonviolent draft resisters. He shows how it is the treatment by the government as well as the experiences with the penal system which change their emotions and thoughts into real revolutionary ones. Especially interesting is what Dr. Gaylin has to say about the reaction of his analyst colleagues, to whom he tried to transmit the results of his knowledge, efforts, and time: "They [the students] are masochists"; "they have deep-rooted guilt"; "they are psychotic. . . ."

There is undoubtedly a gap between the generations, ex-

pressed by different behavior from that which goes on in daily life. For example, a report by the Internal Revenue Service says that more than one out of every three American doctors appears now to be cheating on his income tax. While the affluent doctor is thus in constant fear of the government authorities, his sons and daughters are also affected, but in a peculiar way. The parent taught them not to cheat, and that this government is a sublime one. The father actually has good reasons for approving the government, one reason being that it gives him all the political freedom he wants, as well as the best freedom a liberal bureaucratic system can offer, namely the possibility of cheating. His children are less "objective" toward the state that threatens their father. They also have other and better reasons to become antagonistic to the father than that he sleeps with the mother: They are experiencing the hypocrisy and immorality of that father. They often see him in his so highly ethical profession put money interests above the interests of his patients "because," they hear him say, "I want to give my children a good education." (The morale of the son is not enhanced by his feeling imprisoned in college because of a 2-S draft classification.) Numerous examples like this can be cited, especially from the daily life in affluent circles of our society where many of the students in revolt come from. The "gap" is there and incomparable to the usual one between fathers and sons.

But what is socially redeeming about this conflict between father and son is that in general the strong human quality of mutual respect between father and son proves strongest and the idealism of the young is forced upon the old generation.

The point is this: the psychological makeup of individuals is not the determinant of real social movement. Even the most deep rooted customs and forms of relationships are steamrollered by participation of individuals in mass movements, which cannot wait on neuroses and complexes and which contrary to being based on the common psychological makeup of many in fact transcends such as a basis for unity or disunity, as a basis for action. It would seem that if anyone is hung up on unresolved problems of adolescence it is these same people who can only understand others in these terms. These are the alienated ones.

Why is it especially the student rather than youth in general? It is because the intellectually (and often also pecuniarily) privileged student, as any talented individual, develops an urge to communicate his knowledge and other gifts to the less privileged, to the poor, to the Blacks. This is a living process of learning in itself, far superior to any that formal education can offer. This urge will lead the fine mind to recognition of and involvement with others, an involvement which, if successful, will go beyond the narrow intellectual frame and become the real life. It was so with the students of the 1840's when, to meet the demands of industrial development, mass education started. It was so

before 1905 in Russia. And it is so with much greater quantitative and qualitative force now all over the world (very much also in the developing countries). Innumerable stories are told that during the strict Black Laws in the South, daughters and wives of slave holders had that motivation which knowledge usually awakens, and taught Negroes to read and write. Again those girls and women were often led, at great risk to themselves, to more manifest breaches of law and order when they supported the Underground Railroad.

It is often such involvement which shakes illusions about the established order—about the state, about religion, about conventional habits, among them especially sex and race prejudices. Contesting illusions leads to radicalism. To become radical—to question the existing system at its roots—requires a certain degree of consciousness. It is the same process of consciousness which Lenin's theory of class consciousness expected of the revolutionary worker: He reasoned that, through involvement in demands for pennies and other Sisyphean improvements which the masses raise naturally, the worker becomes conscious of the contradiction that the real producer is not the owner of his product, that the illusory and inhuman commodity relationships among men are conditioned by the political power of the state, and that therefore taking control of social production will mean Socialism.

No wonder that, as the degree of consciousness which leads to radicalization increases, students become more and more the real enemies of Liberalism, and vice versa. Liberalism is based on principles. Radicalism is based on consciousness and has no principles. Political Liberalism is based on the principle of majority rule—a wonderful principle, no doubt, but illusory, since the majority can only be achieved by power. (In democracies, it is also the power of illusion and of organization which creates majorities.) Baffled by the fact that Hitler, together with reactionary splinter groups, actually had the majority before Hitler took over the government, German Liberalism either had to stick to its principle and accept Hitler (which in the beginning it did) or to give up its principle, fight him *illegally*, and even to propagandize war against him (which at the end it also did). (That Hitler started that war is in this context irrelevant.)

Radicalism cannot respect Voltaire's principle to fight with all his power for the right of his adversary to express his opinion—it is a falsehood, and was used by Voltaire for opportunistic reasons.

To demonstrate the practical consequences of Liberalism for the actual example of fighting the war in Vietnam, let us for a moment consider the conflict between the two branches of Republican government: The Liberals contest the right of the president to make war without the consent of the Senate. But to defend that constitutional principle (which is circumvented anyway by the argument that this

is not a "war" but only an "action" to save the lives of our soldiers) in the face of an existing law passed by Congress that the president has the autonomous right, without asking anybody and when only *he* feels it necessary, to press the button to atomic holocaust, is a blatant absurdity.

There is for the Liberal senators the legitimate parliamentary method of filibustering to prevent the continuation of the Vietnam War. This could be effected by far fewer than the some forty Senators who claim to be for immediate withdrawal. But the principle of Liberalism is against filibustering, although it is perfectly legal.

When the government finally allowed the impressive anti-war demonstrations and even "gave-in" to some disturbances, although the government had the legal right to suppress them violently, Liberalism was stuck with the dilemma: "What do we do next?" Another peaceful demonstration, which would play on the nerves of the government as well as the nerves of the demonstrators? One of the answers was given by the nervous guards in Kent, Ohio. Such an answer, given by the government when it feels it cannot "give-in," creates a revolutionary situation and thus the challenge for which radicalism consciously and admittedly is waiting (as happened in one of the best examples in history, 1905 in Russia). Exactly the same kind of answer is given by radicalism—one might call it Marxism, Anarchism, or whatever. Radicalism by its very definition is always provoking the establishment with the clear intent of creating a revolutionary situation (as happened in 1917 in Russia).

At the beginning of this process, which in the end looks like the natural catastrophe of an avalanche (though in fact it never comes by "itself"), there is always the tendency of a seemingly similar interest between the establishment and its radical adversary. This "mutuality" of interest finds its most practical expression at the beginning of the process, and very often also occurs when the revolutionary process decays. A "mutual" interest among the voluntaristic arms of government *and* of radicalism, namely the police and the Anarchists.

Anarchist cooking contributes to the disrupting and weakening of the establishment. It is a response to the realities of the existing social forces and their legal institutions. It is also a response to the realities brought about by the alienation, with its accompanying illusions, phantasies, confusions, and its isolation from the real world. It responds to these as self-defense, but in its practical effect it could seem to be an invention of the police. The "cooking" is mostly done by confused (in fact, unpolitical) desperadoes with good ideas and intentions, and from good families, and by criminal neurotics who want to take from the rich and give to the poor. But soon the police—also interested in disruption, which is after all their *raison d'être*—make use of Anarchist cooking. One method is to use the very same people who get caught whom the police get in

the squeeze, as they still believe that they can dupe the police and achieve their aim—disruption of society. Classic is the case of the famous spy Azov who, with Savincoff, was leader of the terrorist wing of the Russian Social Revolutionaries. For a long time Azov successfully arranged most of the terrorist acts against the Czarist government with the direct help of the *Okhrana* (the Czarist FBI). Historians are still in dispute as to whether these secret police manipulations damaged or helped the revolutionary cause in Russia.

This system of *agent provocateurism* is nowhere so much in practice as in the United States, supported by the unique legal institution which lets a “state’s witness” (though an active participant and even the initiator of the crime) go free. The American Communist Party was always infiltrated by the FBI, in some localities to such an extent that without this infiltration the CP would hardly have had any members. It is well known that presently the FBI and state and local policemen appear as Hippies with long hair, smoke pot, etc. In many countries a spy is considered even among conservative people the lowest wretch of society. In Pilsudski-Poland, it once happened that the man who killed an infiltrator into the illegal Communist Party was acquitted by a judge, who asked: “What else could they have done to such scum?”

There is hardly a police department of any American city today which does not hire and train agents who are supposed to live and behave as hippies among hippies. They grow beards and long hair, and, since they have one of the best available sources of dope and any kind of weapons, they easily become influential within Anarchist circles.

The natural emotional reaction to discovering a spy or *agent provocateur* is to kill him—more so when he was a trusted friend—as a punishment and revenge. But there is not only the emotional side to it, which has an individualistic character, the punishment becomes a political and organizational question. Killing a spy seems to be the only way to save the organization, but it also puts the organization in jeopardy.

In many cases where assassination and bombing had considerable political after-effects, history could never ascertain whether these terrorist acts were committed by desperate radicals or by government agents. Characteristically even the best and most thorough investigations could not solve this riddle. And in most of these cases of “Anarchist cooking,” the established government was the gainer. We still do not know if Goering or the demented Dutch Anarchist Van der Lubbe set fire to the Reichstag, which triggered the Nazi terror. We still do not know if it was Mussolini who hired the Croatian terrorist to assassinate Alexander of Yugoslavia and Barthou, who as a man of letters was pleading for Liberalism in the Balkans. We

still do not know if Stalin organized the killing of Kirov, following which the novelty occurred that Bolsheviks were not only fired from their positions but executed *en masse*. Khrushchev in his four-hour-long speech about Stalin’s crimes was silent about the killing of Kirov, who was considered the most conciliatory among the Stalinists. And last but not least, we still do not know who killed President Kennedy, of whom it was said that he had just planned to recognize Castro’s Cuba. (That does not conflict with the fact that President Kennedy discussed with the Senator from Florida a plan to have Castro assassinated.)

Who was really behind the killing of Malcolm X, who had just achieved for himself a radical orientation similar to the Panthers? Who financed the killing of Martin Luther King, Jr., who, as is now known, intended to ignore the FBI threat to release telephone buggings which would allegedly show his “immorality,” if he were to give up his policy of nonviolence?

It was this dilemma inherent in individual terrorism—and *never* theoretical or political differences—which motivated Marx to dissociate himself from the French Blanquists (he always adored the courageous Blanqui) and to break abruptly with the “World Society of Revolutionary Communists.” It was also only the Nihilist machinations of Netshayev that made him break with Bakunin and led to the de facto liquidation of the First International.

Since the attitude of Marxism toward “Anarchist cooking” plays such an important role in the heads of radicals, I believe it necessary to add here a corrective picture of Marx and Engels as it was distorted by German Marxists. Marx and Engels always, from the beginning to the end of their political life, had great admiration for the Russian revolutionary activists. This was in clear contrast to their—often even personal—aversion toward their German followers, whose parliamentarian cretinism and revolutionary sounding programs they detested. They approved unequivocally that the tactic of a “party of action at the moment in Russia should be to bring about such strong disturbances which could intimidate the ruler.” A report to Maria Oshanina, the leader of the conspiratorial “People’s Will,” about conversations with Marx and Engels (the authenticity of this report is confirmed by Engels’ approval of its publication in 1893) leaves no doubt that Marx agreed to the assassination of Alexander II in 1881, which occurred on the same day the Czar signed a liberal constitution. Since Alexander II was a “liberal” Czar, who emancipated the serfs and introduced local self-government, the terror act undoubtedly served the reaction. Still Marx and Engels encouraged the Russian conspirators “to disturb as much as possible,” “to bring about un-order,” “to knock down the fatalistic power of inertia,” and “to shake society out of its indolence and immobility.” “Worldly wisdom” and “grand” were the words Marx used about

the letter of the terrorists written to the new Czar announcing they would not kill him if he amnestied all political prisoners.

Lenin's older brother who as we know was already influenced by Marxist literature hesitated to take part in the terrorist attempt against Alexander III, but finally he involved himself in it as the leading spirit and was executed.\*

It is silly to think that any revolutionary supposes "Anarchist cooking" could get rid of the government. One of the oldest devices of the state is: "The King is dead—long live the King!" Even ten blowups similar to the one at the University of Wisconsin could not destroy the military research for the Pentagon. It can only express the degree of radicalization. This process of radicalization is not the same as Socialist propaganda. It is not a step to organization. "Anarchist cooking" is destruction. It does not "build." It is not enlightenment through programs, opinions, and debates. It is real practical movement. Whoever is involved in it has radically broken with the rotten society of oppression, racism, war, and pollution. He is "out of it" as much as can be. "Anarchist cooks" do not build organizations. The campus, the neighborhood, and the street are their field. Any organization they could build by and for themselves would isolate them, as the tendency to isolation and sectarianism is always implied in radicalism. And, as we can see from the experiences at the campuses in the last years, their radicalism continues even when they get older—in contrast to the previous generation which kept switching in fellow traveling from Stalin to Roosevelt, from Castro to Kennedy, and back.

What will "Anarchist cooking" achieve? If bluntly put or in the sense of the bombasting goals Socialist educators used to close their lectures with, the answer is: *Nothing*. Today's rebellious youth are not bothered by the old question: Does the end justify the means? In fact, the end is already included in the means they use. These students do not break away and isolate themselves from society and from the family. On the contrary, they are very active—too active from the viewpoint of the establishment and their fathers. What they instantly achieve by their actions is liberation, the opposite of alienation. In using and tasting the "recipes," the joy is already there. It is a similar experience to the one of the old-time class-conscious worker who liberated himself from the dullness and alienation of the factory treadmill by joining his organization, by being active, and even risking his life for it. This was already Socialism for him, as much as it is possible within this world around him; here he achieved real human freedom. His motivation was not to provide for his children "a

\* Lenin in the later years, describing his sharp fight against the Russian Anarchists before 1917, says: "Naturally, only for opportunistic reasons (not for principled reasons) did we not approve of individual terror."

better world," as the devout sisters of Socialist or Communist churches believe.

"Anarchist cooking" can be as liberating to the student as participation in the Palestinian Liberation movement is to the Arab women who through it can for the first time rise up from the backwardness which has for centuries covered their faces and kept them home after 6 p.m.

The Anarchist achieves "better living through chemistry." His is not a protest movement, as liberals would like it to be. Anarchists are not much interested in strengthening the legal opposition against war and poverty or perhaps transitions to an economy of peace, to "normal capitalism," to a better education. Their aim is, indeed, disruption, confusion, undermining, and destruction—the most realistic and adequate aim in a world of organized chaos. "Positive" critique and opposition would make them a part of this world. Anarchists are not politicians, they are realists. Only they really can identify the means they are using with the goal they want to achieve. Since they do not know where to go, every way is the right one. The construction of the future is not their thing. (It is different with such movements as the Panthers, but even their strength evidently lies not in improving the lot of the poor Blacks, in "peace," in "equal rights," in "equal opportunities," in "desegregation" or "Black capitalism," but lies in "Anarchist cooking," which develops their personal dignity, holding their heads high as an answer to the drudgery into which not only birth but "benign neglect" forces them.)

When, after the Second World War, the mainstream of revolution had shifted from highly industrialized countries to underdeveloped ones like the Congo, Guatemala, Algeria, there seemed for a very long time to be no "Marxian" (i.e., economic and social) basis for class struggle and Socialist revolution. In this vacuum, Herbert Marcuse in the best German philosophical tradition was the first who conceived a new Hegelian theory of the "Dialectic of Liberation," a theory of "the Great Refusal" against the intellectual and sexual repression of modern industrial society. Marcuse, in combining Marx with Freud, became for a while the apostle of a new Anarchism (even Nihilism).

The newest development of this "Great Refusal" after the events of May and June, 1968, in France expressed the trend to a new recognition of class struggle and therefore the recognition of the role of the proletariat which, as the strongest link in the chain of exploitation, is where the break must come. Freed from his esoteric language, this meant—never mind sex, pot, and bombs—the *return* to Hegel and Marx. But is it?

In an earlier day, the old Marxists and Leninists became impressed by the growing propaganda power of mass movement, and interpreted, constructed, and applied "real-

istically" or "dialectically" the universal perception of human freedom, which is *Negation of Negation*. As they did so, they were immediately confronted with a demand to state the "Concrete alternative." Today Herbert Marcuse, whose theories have gained new attention as a result of the impressive events of 1968 in France and the nearly universal antiwar and antipollution movements in the United States, feels confronted with the same demand. The term *concrete alternative* came up at the Warsaw University, and was frequently used by legitimate Marxist professors after strict adherence to the party line was no longer demanded. Politically, *concrete alternative* means for them nothing more than the return to the France-oriented *Little Entente*. This time the *Entente* would consist of Dubcek, Tito, and Ceausescu, as an alternative to Russia and America.\*

Marcuse is a serious thinker and knows that all Utopians were authoritarian prophets who wanted to force their system on the people. Marcuse is moreover a man of integrity, not a politician, and agrees that "the demand is meaningless if it asks for a blueprint of the specific institutions and relationships which would be those of the new society: they cannot be determined *a priori*." "However," Marcuse says now, "the question cannot be brushed aside by saying that what matters today is the destruction of the old, of the powers that be, making way for the emergence of the new. Such an answer neglects the essential fact that the old is not simply bad, that it delivers the goods, and that the people have a real stake in it. There can be societies which are worse—there are such societies today. The system of corporate capitalism has the right to insist that those who work for its replacement justify their action."

Is this the newest Hegelian interpretation of "Negation of Negation"? Our answer is that the old is not only simply bad, but hopelessly rotten. This old is not like "the good old days," which old people always find better or at least "not simply bad." Today's world has reached that stage where its gradual development can only be, as Rosa Luxemburg called it, *Civilized Barbarism*. To get such a barbaric society, an eruptive event, as transformations from one society to another in history used to require,

\* Dubcek, this new hero of world liberalism, is the symbol of avoiding a "backlash." He, in fact, betrayed the Czech people. He seems to have been scared by the famous Czech "backlash of 1618," when the Emperor's delegation in Prague was thrown out of the window, thus starting the Thirty Years' War in Europe. For the next 350 years the Czech nation played the typical liberal role best expressed in literature by the good soldier Schweik. The "backlash" against Dubcek came just the same, although he avoided the *levee en masse* for which all conditions existed in 1968. He did not resist, because he fancied the idea of good old liberalism to which today the bureaucracy of the Communist parties and trade unions all over the world subscribes. His goal was that program which Jaroslav Hasek, the author of Schweik, once jokingly for his Socialist friends invented—the program's goal was "to achieve progress in the framework of the existing."

would not be necessary any more. It is true that the world is pregnant with all the material and technical conditions of a better world. But these conditions, prerequisites of Socialism, are already beginning to die; they are rotting and decaying. Mass transportation, one of the first requirements of advanced (and not so advanced) industrial society, often supported by the state, is now in this country systematically, and with the help of the government, destroyed in the interest of real estate speculation and automotive and oil capital. The progress achieved by the reduction of the working day to eight and even to six hours is annulled by a travel time to work of two to four hours in conditions which are more miserable than the factory and office work itself. The "good old days" were undoubtedly better. This part of Marx's description of capitalism is no longer valid, since the "dialectic of its progress" is disappearing.

The threat to society becomes even greater because everybody sees the madness, but lives and even becomes affluent with it. To use Marcuse's words, "People have a real stake in it." Lewis Mumford mentions the fact that only those who are over fifty can remember many features of that older world that now seems ideal, including travel without a passport.\* I would like to add that only those of us who are over sixty can remember that Anarchists and revolutionary Marxists from all over the world exiled without trouble to Switzerland, held openly their conferences there, and printed clandestine literature destined for their home countries. Today, under a supposedly more liberal government, the Swiss police often do not hesitate to practice their no-knock right, molesting harmless refugees at dawn even though passport and registration are in order, only under suspicion that they might be politically active.

In general, the majestic equality before the law which Anatole France once satirized has become in practically all countries so "democratic" that the poor do not suffer less, but the privileged also experience bureaucratic and police chicanery.

When Marcuse says, "there can be societies which are much worse—there are such societies today," he is even more indefinite than his peculiar esoteric language should allow. What can be "much worse"? And why not name "such societies"? Does Marcuse mean that it is Russia which is "much worse"? We do not agree. Such an opinion is just as wrong as the Stalinist theory that Social Democrats are "social fascists" and *worse* than Nazis.

With the reasoning that "the Czar is worse than the Kaiser," all Socialist members of the German Reichstag (with the only exception of one extreme radical) voted for

\* Such restrictions hurt only the law abider, since the criminal or Anarchist can easily produce false identification papers. Similarly, gun control laws have the effect that only criminals can own certain kinds of effective weapons.



the first war credits in August, 1914. And with the reasoning that Hitler is much worse than Stalin, radicals all over the world (with very few exceptions) supported the Second World War. Such was always the trap of the "Alternative."

The *Great Refusal*, yes. But *Concrete Alternative*, no. Because where "the alternative" comes from, it means the "Third World" of Mrs. Gandhi, Tito, and Nasser (and also of Moshe Dayan). It is the acceptance, not the refusal, of the harmony of "co-existence" by Khrushchev and Kennedy. This is what we have, adapted by Nixon and Kosygin. It is the pitiful world of Trade Union bureaucratism.

\* \*  
\*

Anarchism, Marxism, Leninism, Maoism—whatever one wants to call it—they all are the real and concrete Refusal, as formulated by Marx in the moment he broke with abstract Hegelianism and made his great jump to the real,

radical, and concrete Negation which justifies without "ifs and buts" *all* revolutionary action:

The construction of the future and the completeness for all times is not our task. What we at present have to do is the *reckless* critique of all the existing—reckless in the sense that the critique is not afraid of its results and likewise not afraid of conflicts with the existing powers. Thus we do not approach the world doctrinally with a new principle: "Here is the truth, here kneel down!" We do not tell the world: "Let go of your fights, they are silly stuff. We wish to cry out to you the true password of the struggle." We only show the world why it really struggles, and that consciousness is a thing which it *must* acquire, even if it does not want to. Then it will become obvious that mankind for a long time had the dream of a cause of which it only needs to possess the consciousness, to really possess this human cause.

